Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Deborah Regnaud

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Jason Etchegaray, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Amanda Evans, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Rodney Ford, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2014

Abstract

The Relationship Between Top Leaders' Observed Narcissistic Behaviors and Workplace

Bullying

by

Deborah A. Regnaud

MBA, Lindenwood University, 1996

BS, Lindenwood University, 1999

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

August 2014

Abstract

Workplace bullying is a global problem that leaves workers emotionally harmed and organizations financially strapped; yet in many cases, business leaders fail to adequately address the problem. The purpose of this research was to determine if the top leader had a direct impact on the presence of bullying within the workplace. Based on personality trait theory as a theoretical foundation, the key issue this study explored was the relationship between the presence of workplace bullying and observed narcissistic behaviors exhibited by the top leader. Participants consisted of 84 human resources professionals reporting directly to the CEO/president of companies located in the United States. Observer-rated assessments were used to measure the leader's observed narcissistic behaviors along with the prevalence of bullying within the workplace. Logistic regression and Pearson correlation were used to analyze assessment data. Results revealed a strong and positive relationship between top leaders' observed narcissistic behaviors and the presence of bullying within the organization. These results suggest the top leader may not only directly impact the presence of workplace bullying, but may actually create the problem. This study contributes to social change by providing support for the need to use personality assessments when hiring or promoting top leaders. By identifying those who contribute to the sustainability of bullying, these individuals can be excluded from the selection process and workplace bullying will therefore be minimized, improving the well-being of employees and the financial performance of organizations, world-wide.

The Relationship Between Top Leaders' Observed Narcissistic Behaviors and Workplace

Bullying

by

Deborah A. Regnaud

MA, Lindenwood University, 1996

BS, Lindenwood University, 1999

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

August 2014

UMI Number: 3633423

UMI

Dissertation Publishing

UMI 3633423

ProQuest

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my husband Angus (Gus) Louis Leigh Regnaud, who provided much needed encouragement and support throughout this long journey while selflessly sacrificing personal needs and precious family time. I would also like to thank my father (Charles F. Sobolewski) for his natural curiosity, intelligence, and logical view of the world along with my mother (Mary Sobolewski) for her exceptional tenacity, drive, and spirit; without them I would not be the person I am.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

The topic of this study is workplace bullying and the top leader's role in the process. Workplace bullying, particularly among managers, is a social issue that impacts workers and businesses in almost every country including England, Ireland, Germany, Spain, France, Japan, China, Malaysia, South Africa, Australia, and Kuwait, among many others (International Labour Organization, 2006). A study of workplace bullying conducted in Iceland found 8.3% of workers reported being victims of bullying within the previous six months while 23.4% reported having witnessed bullying within the same time frame (Jóhannsdóttir & Ólafsson, 2004). A more recent study conducted in Madrid, Spain revealed 26% of those surveyed had been bullied within the previous 12 months; of that group 52.5% were bullied solely by superiors, 18.4% were bullied solely by coworkers, and 7.1% were bullied by both (Moreno-Jiménez, Rodríguez-Muñoz, Salin, & Morante, 2008). It is believed the problem is so severe in some regions it has reached epidemic levels (International Labour Organization, 2006). Like the rest of the world, the United States is not immune to this social problem. It has been estimated half of American workers are now or have been affected by workplace bullying either through direct victimization, witnessing the act, or both (Namie, 2007). A recent national survey revealed 8.8% of U.S. workers are currently victims of workplace bullying, 25.7% had previously been victims of bullying, 22.4% are currently witnesses to bullying, and 19.6% had previously been witnesses to bullying (Namie, 2010). These research results highlight the prevalence of bullying throughout the world, and particularly the United States.

This study was needed because although there has been significant research conducted on the topic of workplace bullying, researchers have failed to empirically explore why many employers fail to resolve the problem of bullying when made aware of its presence in the organization (Harvey, Heames, Richey, & Leonard, 2006). A better understanding of the leader's role in the bullying process can lead to more effective intervention strategies which ultimately will result in positive social change as the minimization of bullying can improve the well-being of both employees and employers.

This chapter provides background information on the topic of workplace bullying which includes the various definitions of bullying, the consequences associated with bullying, and how employers respond to bullying. A statement of the problem being addressed is also presented based on prior research and a specific gap within that research. Next, the theoretical framework driving the research will be discussed along with the purpose, including the type of study conducted. Research questions and hypotheses are defined along with assumptions being made, limitations of the study, delimitations of the study, and key term definitions. The chapter ends with a summary of information presented along with an overview of the remaining chapters.

Background

Workplace bullying has been defined as intentional and harmful mistreatment such as verbal abuse, humiliation, intimidation, threats, and sabotage, used to harm or control the victim (Lutgen-Sandvik & Sypher, 2009), but it is also synonymous with a number of other terms and definitions including psychological terror, which is hostile or aggressive communication resulting in the victim feeling defenseless and helpless

(Leymann, 1996); petty tyranny, which is the use of power in a cruel, spiteful, and malicious manner resulting in the target feeling confused and vulnerable (Ashforth, 1997); emotional abuse, which is the use of intimidation, antagonism, and aggression (nonphysical) resulting in the victim feeling incompetent (Keashly, 1998); workplace incivility, which is behaving in a disrespectful and offensive manner with a complete lack of regard for others (Andersson & Pearson, 1999); abusive supervision, which is the continued use of aggressive and antagonistic verbal and/or nonverbal behaviors on the part of the supervisor, leaving the employee feeling weak and feeble (Tepper, 2000); and mobbing, which is the use of negative behaviors designed to disgrace, embarrass, and invoke shame on another with the intent of removing the individual from a group (Sperry, 2009). Despite the term used, there is a general consensus among researchers that bullying is characterized by four features: (a) frequent and repeated unwanted negative acts, (b) acts happen over an extended period of time, (c) a power disparity between the parties exists, and (d) there is an intent to cause harm or distress (Bartlett & Bartlett, 2011; Cowen, 2005; Ferris, 2009; Lutgen-Sandwick, Tracy, & Alberts, 2006; Parzefall & Salin, 2010).

Workplace bullying can be accomplished through a number of tactics including verbal, nonverbal, and physical (Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik, & Alberts, 2006), and can also be work-related or personal (Bartlett & Bartlett, 2011; Beswick, Gore, & Palferman, 2006). Work-related behaviors can be categorized as (a) work-load, which includes work overload, removing responsibilities, assigning meaningless tasks, and setting unrealistic goals; (b) work-process, which includes overruling decisions, controlling resources,

withholding information, and flaunting status or power; and (c) evaluation, which includes micromanaging, unfair criticism, judging work inaccurately, and blocking promotions (Bartlett & Bartlett, 2011). Based on a literature review conducted on workplace bullying, Beswick et al. (2006) estimated 45% of bullying behaviors are work-related. Personal behaviors can be categorized as (a) indirect, which includes isolation, ignoring, excluding, failure to communicate, gossip, false accusations, and undermining, or (b) direct, which includes verbal attacks, belittling remarks, yelling, humiliation, intentional demeaning, intimidation, personal jokes, negative eye contact/staring, manipulation, and threats (Bartlett & Bartlett, 2011). Beswick et al. (2006) estimated 55% of bullying behaviors are personal. Upon review of the definition of bullying and the types of behaviors exhibited, it is easy to understand why this phenomenon can have such an impact on all parties.

Consequences

A cross-level assessment of bullying reveals a complex system which can have both direct and indirect impact on the victim (dyadic level), the work group (meso level), and the organization (macro level); it is believed once one level feels the wrath of bullying, it can quickly spread to the other levels (Heames & Harvey, 2006). As a result, bullying negatively affects not only victims, but witnesses and organizations as well (Namie & Namie, 2009).

Bullying impacts victims in a variety of ways and can include both psychological and physical ailments (Cleary, Hunt, Walter, & Robertson, 2009). Psychological harms include higher levels of anger and fear (Ayoko, Callan, & Hartel, 2003), reduced levels of

self-esteem (Burton & Hoobler, 2006), increased levels of stress (Keashly & Harvey, 2005), reduced self-confidence (MacIntosh, 2005), damaged personal relationships (Tracy et al., 2006), reports of depression and anxiety (Tepper, 2000), educed self-efficacy (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002), symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder (Namie, 2003a), and in the most serious cases, thoughts of suicide (Leymann, 1990; Yilderim & Yilderim, 2007). Physical harms include high blood pressure, migraines, body aches, and sound sensitivity (Hallberg, & Strandmark, 2006); additionally, higher levels of heart disease (De Vogli, Ferrie, Chandola, Kivimäki, & Marmot, 2007), digestive problems (D'Cruz & Noronha, 2010b), chronic disease, higher body mass, and decrease in overall health (Kivimäki, Elovainio, & Vahtera, 2000) have all been discovered among targets. Victims also experience work-related consequences such as job burnout (Einarsen, Matthiesen, & Skogstad, 1998), increased absenteeism (Hoel & Cooper, 2000), loss of organizational commitment (Tepper, 2000), lower job satisfaction (Loh, Restubog, & Zagenczyk, 2010), preoccupation with thoughts of quitting (Quine, 2001), poor morale (Yilderim, 2009), decreased performance (Paice & Smith, 2009), increased time off (Vartia, 2001), and loss of income due to medical expenses or job loss (Gardner & Johnson, 2001).

Witnesses and observers of bullying often suffer consequences similar to those targeted. Increased anxiety and stress (Vartia, 2001), preoccupation with thoughts of quitting (Quine, 2001), decreased job satisfaction, and increased health problems (Hoel & Cooper, 2000), have all been reported by witnesses.

Additionally, organizations are negatively impacted by bullying. Negative effects include loss of productivity (Peneberg, 2008), increased turnover (Keashly, Trott, & MacLean, 1994), decreased organizational citizenship behaviors (Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002), increased workers' compensation and medical insurance costs (as cited in Lutgen-Sandvik & Sypher, 2009), higher levels of absenteeism (Namie, 2003b), decreased quality (Paice & Smith, 2009), increased employee counter-productive behaviors (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007), weaker customer relationships (Johnson, 2009), increased legal costs and incidents of employee theft, along with lower creativity (Glendinning, 2001). All of these issues can result in significant financial costs to businesses. A study conducted by Giga, Hoel, and Lewis (2008) revealed bullying costs businesses in the United Kingdom more than £28 billion per year. It has been estimated workplace bullying costs businesses in the United States over $23 billion each year (Tepper, Duffy, Henle, & Lambert, 2006).

Employer Response

Despite the significant costs and negative consequences associated with workplace bullying, many employers seem uninterested or unwilling to effectively deal with the problem and in fact often condone bullying after being made aware of its existence (Harvey et al., 2006). This is supported by results of a study which discovered when bullying was reported, 44% of employers failed to do anything about it and 18% made conditions worse for the victim; only 32% successfully ended bullying (Namie, 2007). Findings from another study are even more alarming. Participants reported after telling their employer about being bullied, 71% were retaliated against and of that group

24% were terminated; only 6% reported the employer punished the bully while merely

2% reported their employer completely resolved the situation to full satisfaction (Namie,

2008).

For organizations with human resources (HR) departments, the results are just as

dismal. A recent poll conducted by the Workplace Bullying Institute revealed HR

representatives typically fail to resolve the problem. Of those polled 11.5% chose not to

report the bullying to HR, 30.9% indicated HR took no action, and 37.3% stated HR was

not helpful and retaliation occurred; 18.2% reported HR was not helpful and job loss

occurred, and only 1.9% indicated HR was helpful resulting in justice and complete

satisfaction (Namie, 2012a). According to Hoel and Beal (2006), one reason HR often

fails is because HR representatives are not in a position to help victims because their

allegiance must be to the organization; they simply cannot be neutral.

Research on the reasons employers allow bullying in the workplace is scarce with

most being propositional rather than empirical. Lutgen-Sandvik and McDermott (2008)

argued many organizations ascribe to a classical management perspective which adheres

to a strict chain of command; in these companies upper management does not get

involved with decisions made at lower levels. Others have suggested executives,

managers, and HR representatives are simply not educated and do not understand what

bullying is and how to address it (Namie & Namie, 2004). Strandmark and Hallberg

(2007) proposed top level executives may not be aware bullying is present because lower

level managers are in a position to hide the problem. Ferris (2004) suggested some

employers find bullying acceptable behavior and view the target as being weak; often

these organizations are in competitive industries, are fast paced, and focus primarily on financial performance. Similarly, Boddy (2006) argued many organizations are so focused on achieving financial goals they are willing to overlook negative behaviors and in many instances embrace them if they contribute to high performance.

There is a general consensus among researchers that workplace bullying is a multifaceted problem involving a number of contributors including the bully, the target, and the organization (Bartlett & Bartlett, 2011; Beswick et al., 2006; Namie, 2003b). Andersson and Pearson (1999) looked deeper into the cause of bullying and posited individual temperament, social identity, and the organizational environment all interact and under the right conditions may result in bullying. Researchers in the United States argued the key to understanding why bullying exists is to study the interactions and relationships between three core players: the environment (organization), the bully, and the target; they proposed bullying evolves as a result of these interactions (Harvey et al., 2006). Others believe the environment (organization) is the key to bullying and suggest it only occurs in organizations that view bullying behaviors as acceptable; they look to organizational culture as the driver behind the sustainability of bullying (Harvey et al., 2007; Hodson, Roscigno, & Lopez, 2006; Liefooghe, & Davey, 2001). Missing from the literature is research focused on why employers fail to address the problem when it is revealed within in an organization and is the reason this study is needed.

Problem Statement

Workplace bullying is a widespread social problem that results in considerable negative consequences for both employees and organizations (Heames & Harvey, 2006).

Researchers have discovered bullying is a multidimensional problem that develops from a number of factors (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Bartlett & Bartlett, 2011; Beswick et al., 2006; Namie, 2003b), bullying can only thrive in organizational settings that condone it (Harvey et al., 2007; Hodson et al., 2006; Liefooghe, & Davey, 2001), and more often than not employers fail to stop bullying when it is reported (Harvey et al., 2006; Namie, 2007, 2008). Due to the numerous factors associated with bullying, it can be concluded its emergence within an organization is inevitable, but its sustainability is dependent on organizational or employer reactions. The root of the problem is not that bullying happens, but that employers allow it to continue; this points to the top leader as a highly influential force in the development and sustainability of bullying.

One explanation for organizations' failing to stop bullying is the culture created by the top leader (president or CEO). Several studies have shown the significant impact leadership behavior can have on the organization (Ashforth, 1997; Harvey et al., 2007; Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007), but none have looked specifically at the top leader and the role he or she may play in allowing bullying to take place. While a number of factors contribute to the culture of the organization, it has been argued that culture starts with the top leader (Tsui, Zhang, Want, Xin, & Wu, 2006) and researchers have shown a strong relationship between top leader personality and organizational culture (Giberson et al., 2009). Narcissism is one personality trait which may result in leader behaviors that directly impact organizational culture. Nonpathological or "healthy" narcissism has been associated with high self-esteem and psychological health (Sedikides, Rudich, Gregg, Kumashiro, & Rusbult, 2004), but it has also been proposed that high levels of narcissism

are negatively correlated with consideration for others (Resick, Whitman, Weingarden, & Hiller, 2009). When leaders accept bullying as part of the organizational culture they are essentially showing a lack of consideration for their workers and therefore may be a possible contributor to workplace bullying. This is congruent with the toxic triangle of destructive leadership model proposed by Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser (2007); they suggested leader characteristics can result in negative organizational outcomes such as bullying.

This research has contributed to the understanding of why or how a top leader may condone bullying by looking at the relationship between the leader's narcissistic behaviors and the prevalence of bullying behaviors within the organization. If a correlation is found, this could result in assessment tools which can be used to prescreen leadership candidates and weed out those which may contribute to the sustainability of bullying.

<div align="center">**Theoretical Framework**</div>

The theoretical framework that drove this study was personality trait theory, specifically the trait of narcissism, which proposes that individuals are born with inherit personality traits that result in predictable behaviors and motivations (Miller & Campbell, 2008); further explanation is provided in Chapter 2. This is consistent with other studies which have used trait theory as a basis for understanding workplace bullying (Boddy, 2011; Mathisen, Einarsen, & Mykletun, 2011; Seigner, Coyne, Randell, & Parker, 2007). Additionally, Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser's (2007) toxic triangle of destructive leadership model was used as a basis for key assumptions. This model is composed of three

elements: (a) the leader, (b) the followers, and (c) the environment; the authors asserted destructive leaders make decisions based on selfishness and fulfillment of personal needs (characteristics of highly narcissistic individuals), which result in environmental conditions such as cultural values that negatively impact followers (Padilla et al., 2007); it is proposed workplace bullying fits within this model.

Purpose of the Study

Workplace bullying is a problem that has plagued businesses and employees for many decades (Fevre, Robinson, Jones, & Lewis, 2010). Despite the number of research studies conducted on the topic, little progress has been made on solving this significant social problem (Beswick et al., 2006). Of the literature addressing the prevention of workplace bullying, most propose mild intervention strategies geared toward organizational culture. Glendinning (2001) recommended the adoption of a strict antibullying policy along with the implementation of a process by which employees can file complaints without fear of retaliation as a solution. Yamada (2008) proposed the answer to workplace bullying was putting a leadership team in place that strongly opposes bullying and exhibits this through antibullying policies, processes which quickly address bullying when it is reported, and training of all personnel. Fox and Stallworth (2009) suggested implementing an alternate-dispute resolution process in conjunction with training all staff in the definition of workplace bullying as a solution. Similarly, Namie and Namie (2009) argued implementing a conflict resolution system, providing coaching to supervisors, managers, and top leaders, along with the implementation of antibullying policies is the way to stop bullying. While these intervention strategies may

be effective in organizations where the top leader views bullying behaviors as unacceptable, the literature presented in Chapter 2 shows in many cases top leadership may not only fail to see bullying as a problem but may actually contribute to the problem.

This quantitative study has filled a gap in the literature by focusing on the influence the top leader has in creating and condoning a culture of bullying; it explored the relationship between top leaders' observed narcissistic behaviors and the presence of workplace bullying. The current literature on workplace bullying is heavily focused on the characteristics associated with the victim, the environment, and the bully (Bartlett & Bartlett, 2011; Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Harvey et al., 2006). Most do not look specifically at the role of the top leader and the two that have indicate this is an area that needs further investigation (Cemaloglu, 2001; Thornton, 2004). With the strong link between destructive leadership and bullying incidents (Aasland, Skogstad, Notelaers, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2010; Hoel, Glasø, Hetland, Cooper, & Einarsen, 2010; O'Moore & Lynch, 2007), along with the proven relationship between narcissism and destructive leadership (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Goldman, 2006), it is plausible that narcissistic behaviors exhibited by leaders may be the reason the problem of workplace bullying remains unsolved. The purpose of this study was to quantitatively explore the relationship between observed narcissistic behaviors among organizational top leaders and the prevalence of workplace bullying.

Nature of the Study

The nature of the study was predictive using quantitative data collected from surveys and assessments; as detailed in Chapter 2, this is a popular approach used in the

study of workplace bullying. It examined the relationship between a CEO/president's level of narcissistic behaviors and incidents of workplace bullying; additional facets explored include the leader's personal participation in bullying, the leader's tenure, and the presence of antibullying organizational policies. The study was based on narcissism as a personality trait resulting in predictable behaviors; these behaviors were the focus of the study. Narcissistic behaviors were measured using the Narcissism Measure developed by Resick et al. (2009). This tool was specifically designed for observer ratings of narcissism and has shown convergent validity with both the Hypersensitive Narcissistic Scale and the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Resick et al., 2009).

Workplace bullying was measured using a modified version of the Bullying Behaviors Scale (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006a). This scale was used to determine the level of bullying exhibited by the top leader and the level of bullying each participant has personally experienced and/or witnessed within the organization.

A random sample of the target population was used for data collection and consisted of high level HR professionals reporting directly to the top leader (CEO/president). Participants were randomly selected using the social media site LinkedIn. This was an effective source of participants because LinkedIn consists of over 147 million members from all over the world; 58.5 million members are from the United States; 39% have the title of manager or higher; 3% are HR professionals; and 17 industries are represented (LinkedIn, 2012).

The relationships between the predictor and criterion variables were analyzed using logistic regression and the Pearson correlation. The logistic regression analysis

determined first if there was a correlation between any of the variables and second which variables were the strongest predictors. The Pearson correlation determined the degree and direction of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. Further explanation of the methodology, population selection, data collection, data analysis, and assessment selection is provided in Chapter 3.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The literature review presented in Chapter 2 resulted in three key topics which were explored in this study: (a) the leader's observed narcissistic behaviors, (b) the leader's tenure, (c) the presence of antibullying organizational policies, and if each of those are related to the leader's personal participation in workplace bullying and/or bullying by others within the organization. In addition to the three core variables, four company demographic factors were also included in the data analysis as independent variables: company size, company revenue, industry, and sector.

Narcissism. There are a number of theories which attempt to explain how narcissism evolves (Meissner, 2008), but from a business perspective the most important issue is how it impacts people's behavior, particularly the top leader. Holtzman et al.'s (2010) study of the behaviors of narcissists in everyday life confirmed narcissists exhibit specific behaviors which are congruent with theories of narcissism. Because it is believed some level of narcissism is required in leadership positions (Kets de Vries, 2004; Lubit, 2002), it can be assumed this is a common personality trait among organizational top leaders. As the level of narcissism moves toward the pathological side, behaviors become more pronounced and detrimental to the organization; because the leader is

desperate to fulfill personal needs of power, prestige, and superiority, he or she will take whatever steps are necessary to make it happen (Kets de Vries, 2004; Lubit, 2002). A small body of research exists which established a connection between narcissism and bullying (Ang, Ong, Lim & Lim, 2010; Baughman, Dearing, Giammarco & Vernon, 2012; Crick & Dodge, 1999; Parkings, Fishbein & Ritchey, 2006; Seigner et al., 2007); this, in conjunction with the assumption that narcissism is a common trait among top leaders and the strong correlation between top leader personality and organizational culture (Miller & Dröge, 1986; Schneider & Smith, 2004; Tsui et al., 2005; Whetstone, 2006), led to the first topic explored.

Research Question 1. Is there a relationship between the leader's level of observed narcissistic behaviors and his or her observed participation in workplace bullying?

Null Hypothesis (H1$_0$). There is no statistically significant relationship between the leader's level of observed narcissistic behaviors and his or her personal engagement in workplace bullying behaviors

Alternate Hypothesis (H1$_a$). There is a statistically significant positive relationship between the leader's level of observed narcissistic behaviors and his or her personal engagement in workplace bullying behaviors.

Research Question 2. Is there a relationship between leader's level of observed narcissistic behaviors and observed workplace bullying within the organization?

Null Hypothesis (H2$_0$). There is no statistically significant relationship between observed workplace bullying within the organization and the leaders level of observed narcissistic behaviors.

Alternate Hypothesis (H2$_a$). There is a statistically significant positive relationship between observed workplace bullying within the organization and the leaders level of observed narcissistic behaviors.

Tenure. It has been argued narcissism can be broken down into two zones; the time spent in each zone varies depending on the situation (Campbell & Campbell, 2009). The emerging zone evolves at the beginning of situations involving unacquainted individuals and early relationships while the enduring zone evolves as the relationship continues and becomes more familiar (Campbell & Campbell, 2009). Research has confirmed that when in the emerging zone, narcissists are perceived as exceptionally likeable; however, when they enter the enduring zone, they become more and more disliked (Paulhus, 1998). During the emerging zone, the narcissist exhibits desirable behaviors such as a positive self-view, enthusiasm, resilience, and interest in others, but over time these behaviors change to aggression, compulsion, emotional distance, over confidence, and volatility (Campbell & Campbell, 2009). Based on these findings, it is possible leaders scoring high in narcissism may exhibit more positive and effective behaviors at the beginning of their tenure but as they become more comfortable, they may start exhibiting negative and ineffective behaviors which was the basis for the next topic of exploration.

Research Question 3. Is there a relationship between the leader's tenure and his or her observed participation in workplace bullying?

Null Hypothesis (H3$_0$). There is no statistically significant relationship between the leader's tenure and the leader's observed participation in workplace bullying.

Alternate Hypothesis (H3$_a$). There is a statistically significant positive relationship between the leader's tenure and the leader's observed participation in workplace bullying.

Research Questions 4. Is there a relationship between the leader's tenure and observed workplace bullying within the organization?

Null Hypothesis (H4$_0$). There is no statistically significant relationship between the leader's tenure and observed workplace bullying within the organization.

Alternate Hypothesis (H4$_a$). There is a statistically significant positive relationship between the leader's tenure and observed workplace bullying within the organization.

Antibullying Policies. The final topic explored involved organizational defined policies. Many believe the source of workplace bullying lies within the culture of the organization and the most basic forms of expression are the formal policies which are published and enforced (Namie & Namie, 2009). Researchers have confirmed higher prevalence rates of bullying in organizations that fail to adequately address it (Einarsen, 1999; Salin, 2003); the presence of antibullying organizational policies is one way a company shows it will not condone bullying within the workplace (Vega & Coiner, 2005). Since narcissism has been associated with an interpersonal characteristic of "moving away from people" which is a complete lack of concern for others (Hogan &

Hogan, 2001), it can be argued that organizations run by leaders who are highly narcissistic will not have policies in place designed to protect employees from bullying.

Research Question 5. Is there a relationship between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and the leader's observed participation in workplace bullying?

Null Hypothesis (H5$_0$). There is no statistically significant relationship between the leader's observed participation in workplace bullying and the presence of antibullying organizational policies.

Alternate Hypothesis (H5$_a$). There is a statistically significant negative relationship between the leader's observed participation in workplace bullying and the presence of antibullying organizational policies.

Research Question 6. Is there a relationship between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and observed workplace bullying within the organization?

Null Hypothesis (H6$_0$). There is no statistically significant relationship between observed workplace bullying within the organization and the presence of antibullying organizational policies.

Alternate Hypothesis (H6$_a$). There is a statistically significant negative relationship between observed workplace bullying within the organization and the presence of antibullying organizational policies.

Significance

This project is unique because it explored a key nonparticipant's influence (the top leader) on the bullying process rather than the actual participants (the bully and the victim), which is where previous researchers have devoted their energies. This type of study was greatly needed because solving the problem of workplace bullying requires a more thorough understanding of the causes; since the leader has a significant impact on the culture of the organization and organizational culture defines acceptable behaviors (Tsai, 2011), additional information regarding the leader's role was desperately needed. The results of this study lead to a deeper comprehension of the relationship between a leader's personality and its effect on acceptable behaviors throughout the organization, specifically workplace bullying. This information can lead to positive social change by contributing to intervention strategies designed to eliminate workplace bullying and the introduction of assessments that can help identify future leaders which may be prone to condoning bullying behaviors.

Scope and Delimitations

The problem addressed in this study pertained to the leader's personality and its influence on workplace bullying. While there are a number of personality traits which could be explored, the decision to focus solely on the trait of narcissism was a result of the vast body of research connecting narcissism and destructive leadership in conjunction with the strong evidence that narcissists are drawn to leadership roles and therefore is a common trait among leaders (specific studies are presented in Chapter 2). Using leadership theories as a foundation is another direction this study could have taken; there

is significant research on this topic, some of which involves its relationship with workplace bullying. Leadership behavior theories were not the focus of this research because it was assumed personality influences leadership style and therefore personality would be a more effective variable to investigate.

Because this study looked at leadership in general, no organizations were excluded from the population. The population included companies of all sizes, from all industries and sectors. The only type of company that may have unknowingly been excluded from the participant pool was smaller organizations that do not employ an HR professional since HR professionals were the target participants. The decision to include all companies of varying size, industry, and sector was due to the limited research exploring relationships between company characteristics and bullying; it is thought this study may expose relationships between specific company characteristics and bullying which could form the basis of future studies.

<div align="center">**Assumptions and Limitations**</div>

There were a number of assumptions that drove this research. Because self-assessments of narcissism were not used in this study, it was assumed personality traits actually result in predictable behaviors and the observer-rated instrument selected to measure narcissistic behaviors was a valid and reliable predictor of this trait. It was also assumed the tool used to measure workplace bullying was a valid and reliable predictor of the construct being assessed. Additionally, it was assumed the predictor variables were linearly independent and all independent variables were linearly related to the dependent variable, workplace bullying. Assumptions regarding the population were not only that it

was normally distributed, but also that it was adequately represented in the participant pool selected. Furthermore, it was assumed the participants were truthful, honest, and unbiased in all of their responses. This is of particular concern since the participants were being asked to describe their leader's behavior; this relationship could have unknowingly skewed their responses. However, drawing upon research on subordinates' ability to effectively evaluate their bosses performance, it was expected participant ratings would accurately reflect the leader's behavior (McEvoy & Beatty, 1989; Shipper & Wilson, 1991). Finally, it was assumed the methodology selected was sound and the statistical analysis was conducted properly without bias.

There were also a number of limitations to this study. One key issue was the participant pool consisted of only HR representatives which may have influenced the reliability of responses as it has been suggested HR's role is to protect the organization (Lewis & Rayner, 2003). If participants felt the need to protect their leader and the company, they may not have responded honestly to the survey questions. Another limitation was that the instrument used to measure narcissism did not have the level of proven validity and reliability as a number of other self-rater assessments; however, this was one of only a few observer-rater assessments available that does not require trained professionals to interpret and since it has been used in previous research it was the best option. This leads to the next limitation which was relying on observer perspectives to assess narcissism; although it has been argued observer ratings of leadership personality are more accurate than self-ratings (Hogan & Hogan, 2001), personal bias may still have skewed the data. Another limitation was the low response rate. Although the targeted

number of participants was acquired, only a portion successfully and fully completed the survey and assessments. This may be confirmation that HR professionals were reluctant to participate due to the nature of the study. Finally, because the study was looking for correlations between variables, determining the cause of any relationships was not within the scope of this project.

Definition of Key Terms

Dark Triad: Three personality constructs, Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and narcissism, which are associated with characteristics of self-promotion, aggressiveness, and emotional detachment (Paulhus & Williams, 2002).

Destructive leadership: Direct and indirect behaviors exhibited by leaders which are harmful towards followers and/or the organization (Thoroughgood, Tate, Sawyer, & Jacobs, 2012).

Leadership: Influencing others through a number of tactics including persuasion, power, and social interactions (Bass, 2007, p.16).

Leadership style: A pattern of behaviors used to influence others (Bass & Bass, 2008, p. 41).

Narcissism: A personality trait involving characteristics of extraversion, aggressiveness, self-assuredness, and the need to be admired (Wink, 1991).

Organizational culture: Shared assumptions used by group members to solve problems, adapt to internal and external forces, and guide ways of thinking, acting, and feeling (Schein, 2010, p. 18).

Organizational policies: Written definitions of employment standards relating to various

employee/employment activities (SHRM, n.d).

Personality trait theory: The belief that individuals are born with inherit personality traits

that result in predictable behaviors and motivations (Miller & Campbell, 2008).

Toxic triangle: A leadership model which proposes destructive leaders make decisions

based on selfishness and fulfillment of personal needs, which result in conditions

that negatively impact followers (Padilla et al., 2007).

Workplace bullying: Frequent and repeated unwanted negative acts which happen over an

extended period of time between two or more individuals with the intent to cause

harm or distress (Lutgen-Sandwick, et al., 2006).

Summary

The intent of this chapter was to provide a sound foundation supporting the need for additional research on the topic of workplace bullying. Information regarding the magnitude of the problem was presented including the negative impact bullying has on victims, witnesses, and organizations. It was revealed, despite the terrible consequences associated with bullying, many employers fail to deal with the problem effectively and understanding why this happens is a missing link in resolving this social problem. The theoretical framework guiding this study was discussed along with the logic used when developing research questions and hypotheses. The purpose of the study explained the literature gap this paper is intended to address and important information such as assumptions, limitations, and definition of key terms was also presented.

Chapter 2 will provide a thorough review of the most current literature relevant to this study. In some cases older articles may be cited if the findings were ground-breaking or of particular importance to the topic being discussed. A summary of the sources used to find literature pertinent to the topic being explored will be presented in the introduction. The remainder of the chapter will explore three key topics: (a) organizational culture, (b) leadership, and (c) narcissism. These topics will be broken down into several subtopics including organizational culture and bullying, destructive leadership, leadership style and bullying, leadership and personality, narcissism and leadership, and finally, narcissism and bullying. This chapter will end with a brief summary of the literature findings.

Chapter 3 will summarize the overall methodology used. It will recap the research questions and hypotheses explored and will identify specific variables included (both independent and dependent). It will explain how the sample size was determined along with how participants were solicited. A thorough explanation regarding the selected instrumentation will be provided which will include reliability and validity data. The statistical method used to analyze data will be discussed and defended; tools used to compile and analyze data will also be reviewed. A discussion regarding threats to validity and ethical concerns will be included. This chapter will end with a brief summary of the overall methodology.

Chapter 4 will summarize the process used for data collection including who the participant pool was, why they were selected, and how they were secured. It will also present data regarding the demographics of the sample pool. Statistical assumptions will

be discussed and a thorough statistical analysis will be presented for each research question and hypothesis. This will lead to a final decision regarding the acceptance or rejection of each null hypothesis. Supplemental statistics calculated, but not directly related to any of the original hypothesis, will also be presented and summarized. The chapter will end with a summary of the overall results.

Chapter 5 will begin with a reminder of the purpose of the study and a concise summary of the findings. A thorough comparison will then be made between the findings of this study and results from other studies which will be presented in Chapter 2. Results will then be analyzed in the context of the theoretical foundation used for the basis of this study. This will lead to an overview of the limitations associated with this study. Next, recommendations for future research will be suggested and the impact this study will have on positive social change will also be discussed. The chapter will end with final conclusions regarding the relevance of the study.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The problem explored in this study was the relationship between the top leader's observed narcissistic behaviors and its relationship with bullying within the organization. This is a global problem which impacts employees and businesses from around the world (International Labour Organization, 2006). In the United States alone, it is estimated approximately half of workers have either been victims of or witnesses to bullying (Namie, 2010). The negative consequences associated with bullying can be devastating to both employees and employers. Victims of bullying can experience a number of physical and psychological ailments including increased stress (Keashley & Harvey, 2005), depression (Tepper, 2000), reduced levels of self-esteem (Burton & Hoobler, 2006), high blood pressure (Hallberg & Strandmark, 2006), higher levels of heart disease (De vogli et al., 2007), and digestive problems (Moayed, Daraiseh, Shell, & Salem, 2006), to name just a few. It is estimated bullying costs U.S. employers over $23 billion each year (Tepper et al., 2006).

The purpose of this chapter is to present a summary of literature relevant to the topic addressed which is the top leader's influence on workplace bullying. The theoretical foundation is explained and it is proposed that leaders exhibiting narcissistic behaviors will create a culture which condones workplace bullying. The information presented will exemplify the relationship between organizational culture, leader personality (through observed behaviors), and workplace bullying. The first section defines organizational

culture and summarizes a number of studies which have connected workplace bullying to this construct; it ends with research linking the top leader's behavior with organizational culture. This leads to the next section, which presents an in-depth review of research on the topic of leadership. Specifically, destructive leadership is defined along with its role in bullying; the section ends with an examination of the relationship between leadership personality and leadership style. The final section defines the personality trait narcissism and reviews literature pertaining to narcissistic leadership along with studies connecting narcissism with workplace bullying.

The intent of this literature assessment was to include only the most recent and applicable studies; however, it was necessary to include some older studies which were groundbreaking or relevant to the purpose of this paper. To ensure a thorough review was conducted, a number of databases were included from both the fields of psychology and business including PsychINFO, SocINDEX, PsycARTICLES, SAGE Journals, Business Source Complete, ABI/INFORM Complete, Science Direct, SAGE Premier, and Emerald Management Journals. Several word searches were conducted among the various databases including *workplace bullying, bullying and leadership, bullying and organizational culture, leadership and organizational culture, leadership and narcissism,* and *narcissism and bullying.* Additional research was conducted on the topics of *narcissism, the Dark Triad,* and *upper echelon theory*. Results revealed well over 5,000 peer reviewed articles which were selected based on the relevance to the topic. Additional information and statistics were retrieved from a number of sources including the Society for Human Resource Management website at www.shrm.org, the Workplace Bullying

Institute website at www.workplacebullying.org, Unite the Union website at

www.unitetheunion.org, the International Labour Organization website at www.ilo.org,

and Bully on Line website at www.bullyonline.org.

Theoretical Foundation

The theoretical foundation used for this study was personality trait theory. The

leading pioneer of this theory was Allport; he posited every person has a set of unique

qualities which determine behavior and thought (1961). Trait theorists believe people are

born with personality traits which result in foreseeable behaviors and motivations (Miller

& Campbell, 2008). While there are a number of different personality traits, this research

focuses exclusively on the trait narcissism as exhibited through observed behaviors. It is

argued narcissism is a specific personality trait which results in unique, observable

behaviors (Paulhus, 2001), and these consistent behaviors may result in organizational

cultures which condone bullying within the workplace. It is important to clarify the

difference between trait narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder (NPD). NPD is

an axis II mental disorder which is believed to emerge during early adulthood (APA,

2000). Trait narcissism is a nonpathological view of narcissistic behaviors which are

derived from the pathological definition (Widiger, 2010). The intent of this study was not

to determine a relationship between NPD and bullying; it was solely looking at

relationships between trait narcissism (as exhibited through observed behaviors) and

bullying.

Currently there are no known studies which have looked specifically at

relationships between the top leader's narcissistic behaviors and workplace bullying;

however, there are a number of studies which have used personality trait theory in ways that are relevant to this research. Several researchers used personality trait theory as a basis for explaining leadership style and have shown relationships between specific leader traits and personality traits (Brown & Reilly, 2009; Hautala, 2006; Judge & Bono, 2000; Kaiser & Hogan, 2011). Additionally, a number of studies have confirmed bullies often exhibit behaviors associated with the trait of narcissism (Baughman et al., 2012; Crick & Dodge, 1999; Seigner et al., 2007). Personality trait theory, specifically narcissism, was selected as the foundation for this research because there is evidence narcissism is associated with bullies (Baughman et al., 2012; Crick & Dodge, 1999; Seigner et al., 2007) and there is also evidence narcissism is a trait often found in top leaders (Kets de Vries, 2004; Lubit, 2002). Current research on workplace bullying has failed to focus on the reason why most employers neglect the problem when made aware of its existence. This study was based on the presumption a top leader's personality, as exhibited through specific behaviors, will influence the culture of the organization; if the leader exhibits narcissistic behaviors and those behaviors result in a focus on success at any cost, it is possible this may result in the acceptance of bullying behaviors within the organization.

Additionally, the foundation of this research was guided by Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser's (2007) toxic triangle of destructive leadership model. According to this model, destructive organizational outcomes are a result of the interactions between destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conductive environments (Padilla et al., 2007). They proposed destructive leadership evolves when leaders are charismatic, have a need for

personal power, are narcissistic, have negative life themes, or adopt an ideology of hate; susceptible followers evolve due to unmet needs, low core self-evaluations, low maturity, high ambition, or bad values; and conducive environments evolve as a result of instability, perceived threats, cultural values, or lack of checks and balances (Padilla et al., 2007). This research proposed workplace bullying is a destructive organizational outcome resulting from leaders who exhibit narcissistic behaviors and create organizational cultures accepting of bullying; the by product is followers who are either too afraid to make a change or have personal values congruent with the destructive leader.

Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is defined as shared assumptions used by group members to solve problems, adapt to internal and external forces, and guide ways of thinking, acting, and feeling (Schein, 2010); it sets the stage for various organizational and employee behaviors (Chatman & Cha, 2003). Bond (2004) referred to culture as a system of constraints and affordances which molds members' behaviors into similar patterns. Under the right conditions, a culture of bullying can develop and is dependent on several factors including standard operating procedures, norms, rules of conduct, values, symbols of importance, taboos, key personalities, and the level of civility (Harvey et al., 2006).

Organizational Culture and Bullying

Research has revealed a direct link between certain organizational conditions and bullying behaviors (Hoel & Salin, 2003); many of these conditions are products of organizational culture and subcultures (Harvey et al., 2006). Duffy (2009) and Cilliers

(2012) argued bullying can be institutionalized and must be viewed as a by-product of organizational culture. As an example, Bloisi and Hoel (2008) have proposed bullying is expected in certain industries such as luxury end restaurants where historical and social structures support the emotional outbursts, high demands, and use of intimidation by head chefs. Aquino and Lamertz (2004) proposed two types of cultural norms that can result in bullying: the first is a perception that coercion and aggression are effective strategies for motivating employees; the second is the acceptance of bullying behaviors. One sign an organization may condone bullying is the absence of antibullying policies (Namie & Namie, 2009). Policies define the rules of conduct and outline unacceptable behaviors which are core elements of the culture and directly influence employee behavior (Harvey et al., 2006). Researchers have confirmed the prevalence of bullying is higher among organizations that allow it and fail to protect employees from bullying (Einarsen, 1999; Salin, 2003). The presence of antibullying policies is one way a company shows bullying will not be tolerated (Vega & Comer, 2005). According to Richard and Daley (2003), an antibullying policy opens the door for employees to raise issues regarding bullying; without such policy, it is unclear if bullying behaviors are unacceptable. Similarly, Hubert (2003) claimed without an antibullying policy, managers have no foundation to intervene on behalf of employees. There is limited research in the field of workplace bullying regarding the impact of antibullying policies (Cowan, 2011); however, there are studies in the field of school bullying that show a relationship between antibullying policies and bullying incidents. For example, researchers in the United Kingdom discovered schools that implemented antibullying policies reported 8% less incidents of

physical harassment, 8% less incidents of theft, and 8% less incidents of verbal taunting than those without policies (Glover, Cartwritght, Gough, & Johnson, 1998). Similar results have been found when studying sexual harassment. Gruber (1998) found when antisexual harassment policies are present, women respond more assertively to unwanted sexual attention and men modify their behaviors resulting in reduced incidents. When it comes to workplace bullying, many businesses appear to be void of antibullying organizational policies. In a recent survey conducted by the Workplace Bullying Institute, 62% of participants stated their company did not have an antibullying policy (Namie, 2012a). Results from a qualitative study conducted by Cowen (2011) were similar; 36 HR professionals were interviewed; only one indicated his or her company had an antibullying organizational policy that specifically used the word bullying, 14 indicated their company did not have an antibullying policy, five indicated they were unsure if their company had an antibullying policy, and the remainder indicated their company had a generic harassment policy but nothing specific to bullying. While simply having an antibullying policy does not guarantee bullying will be minimized, failure to have one is a direct reflection of the cultural norms existing within the organization and imply bullying is an acceptable behavior (Vega & Comer, 2005).

A number of researchers ascribe to the work environment hypothesis which suggests workplace bullying is triggered by stressful organizational and work characteristics (Hauge et al., 2007; Leymann, 1996; Skogstad, Torsheim, Einarsen, & Hauge, 2011). In support of this theory, numerous studies have shown correlations with workplace bullying and a variety of job-related factors such as role conflict (Baillien &

De Witte, 2009; Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994; Hauge et al., 2011; Notelaers, De

Witte, & Einarsen, 2010; Skogstad et al., 2011), role ambiguity (Baillien & De Witte,

2009; Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Skogstad et al., 2011; Vartia, 1996), monotonous tasks

(Einarsen & Raknes, 1997; Vartia, 1996), low autonomy (O'Moore, Lynch, & Daéid,

2003), job insecurity (Hodson et al., 2006), and workload (Agervold, & Mikkelsen, 2004;

Baillien & De Witte, 2009; Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Hauge et al., 2007; Zapf, 1999).

Results from one study revealed a three way interaction effect between job demands, job

control, and job resources; it was discovered bullying was most prevalent in conditions

when job demands were high but job control and job resources were low (Tuckey,

Dollard, Hosking, & Winefield, 2009). More recently, researchers used the Jobs

Demands-Resources model (JD-R model) as a basis for exploring the relationship

between organizational factors and bullying (Baillien, Rodriguez-Muñoz, Van den

Broeck, & De Witte, 2011). According to this model, work characteristics can be

separated into two classifications: (a) job demands, which are aspects of the job requiring

sustained cognitive and/or emotional effort such as work load and role conflict, and (b)

job resources, which are aspects of the job that impact a workers' ability to learn and

achieve goals such as skill utilization and task autonomy (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

Results from this quantitative study revealed bullying was most prevalent in conditions of

high job demands and low job resources; it was suggested this is a result of employees'

energy being depleted from high job demands and then withdrawing from work due to

low job resources, making them vulnerable to bullying (Baillien et al., 2011).

It has been proposed the likelihood of bullying occurring within an organization is dependent on three organizational antecedents: (a) informal alliances, (b) misuse of authority, and (c) tolerance for bullying (Baillien, Neyens, De Witte, & De Cuyper, 2009; Hutchinson, Jackson, Wilkes, & Vickers, 2008). According to this model informal organizational subcultures develop which may foster a bullying attitude among workers or managers; this may result in the misuse of power resulting in unreasonable job demands and withholding resources as seen in Baillien et al. (2011) and Hutchinson et al. (2008). It has also been established that managers and supervisors who are exposed to bullying are more likely to become a bully themselves (Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2009). Additionally, in organizations that are focused on self-interest or are highly competitive, bullying may not only be accepted but may also be rewarded as well; both of which result in the perpetuation of the problem (Hutchinson et al., 2008; Vartia, 1996). Results from a study conducted in Finland showed a strong correlation between organizational politics and workplace bullying (Salin, 2003). Organizational politics is defined as the intentional use of influence geared toward enhancing or protecting an individual or group of individuals (Allen Madison, Porter, Renwick, & Mayes, 1979). According to Salin (2003) many tactics used by individuals involved in organizational politics are considered bullying including attacking others, blaming others, and withholding information. She argued organizational politics flourish in competitive and hectic work environments and research has confirmed a relationship between these environments and bullying (Appelberg, Romanov, Honkasalo, & Koskenvuo, 1991; Cilliers, 2012; Einersan et al., 1994; Vartia, 1996). This is exemplified in a qualitative

study conducted by Kelly and Waddington (2006); semistructured interviews of current and previous professional soccer players in the United Kingdom and Ireland uncovered a highly competitive environment controlled by abusive, intimidating, and sometimes violent management behaviors.

Glendinning (2001) argued bullying may be more prevalent in organizations with traditional top-down hierarchies because there is greater power distance between top-leadership and lower level staff; he suggested this power disparity may result in leaders experiencing a greater sense of superiority which could be manifested in bullying behaviors. This is supported by a qualitative study conducted by a researcher in the United Kingdom. He looked at bullying in a Fire Service organization which exemplified the manner in which organizational culture can influence behaviors that result in bullying; participants explained how managers' aggressive and abusive actions were not only accepted, but expected and encouraged (Archer, 1999). The managerial structure consisted of a strong hierarchy with significant power differences resulting in a chain of command similar to the military; when told about perceived bullying among lower staff members, those higher in the chain explained how they had similar experiences when they were at that level and expressed how newcomers were pressured to conform and accept the culture (Archer, 1999).

Leadership and Organizational Culture

Ultimately it may be the top leader that has the greatest influence on organizational behaviors, systems, and designs. Proponents of upper echelon theory have argued that characteristics of the top leadership team are the most influential factors

involved in developing the work environment and determining organizational performance; factors such as cognitive ability, age, experience, education, and socioeconomic status, combine to create predictable behaviors (Hambrick, 2007; Hambrick & Mason, 1984). Others have argued this theory is incomplete and must include psychological factors such as personality traits (Carpenter, Geletkanycz, & Sanders, 2004). In support of the importance of personality traits, there are a number of studies showing a correlation between organizational culture and the top leader's behavior and personality (Miller & Dröge, 1986; Schneider & Smith, 2004; Tsui et al., 2005; Whetstone, 2006). While Schneider (1987) argued upper echelon leaders have the greatest influence on the development and evolution of organizational culture, others have suggested the goals of the organization are a manifestation of the top leader's personality (Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995). According to Schein (2010), there are six ways in which a leader can influence culture:

1. What the leader pays attention to and measures,

2. How the leader reacts to crisis,

3. How the leader allocates resources,

4. How the leader teaches and coaches,

5. What behaviors the leader chooses to reward, and

6. The methods and personalities the leader chooses to recruit and promote; the essence of these mechanisms reside in the organizational structure, along with organizational systems and procedures.

It can thus be concluded the structure of organizational culture does not just appear; it is a direct product of the top leader's personality and characteristics (Giberson et al., 2009).

These assumptions have been confirmed in several research efforts. One study revealed chief executive personality had a significant influence on the decision making of the executive team which ultimately impacted organizational performance (Peterson, Smith, Martorana, & Owens, 2003). Another quantitative study looked at employee personality traits along with personal values and their congruence with top leader and organizational personality traits and personal values; findings supported the theory that organizations' modal personality and value profiles were consistent with the leaders' profiles (Giberson, Resick, & Dickson, 2005). Another study focused specifically on the link between leader personality traits and organizational culture (Giberson et al., 2009). Using a sample of 32 chief executive officers, and 467 employees, researchers used Goldberg's 50-item Big-five personality inventory to evaluate personality and the Competing Values Instrument to assess organizational culture; results revealed a strong relationship between certain leader personality traits and organizational culture values (Giberson et al., 2009). The authors proposed leaders scoring low on agreeableness were more likely to create cultures of competitiveness with a focus on performance rather than human relations (Giberson et al., 2009). Additionally, it has been argued the top leader can have the most significant impact on organizational performance (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005).

Leadership

Leadership within an organizational setting is about dealing with change and involves developing a vision, aligning resources, then motivating and inspiring people to follow the vision (Kotter, 2007). It has been the subject of numerous studies over the past several decades; however, the definition of leadership has changed over the years and to this day researchers fail to agree on one meaning (Bass & Bass, 2008). Leadership has been perceived from a number of angles including group performance, personality traits, exertion of influence, patterns of behavior, forms of persuasion, interactions with followers, goal achievement, and power relations; resulting in the emergence of a variety of specific leadership theories (Bass, 2007). Some have argued that true leadership only involves ethical and positive behaviors (Yukl, 2006) and any individual who uses coercion, intimidation, or manipulation is not really leading (Schilling, 2009). This view has been the driving force for much of the current research where the focus is on positive leadership behaviors and effects (Schyns & Schilling, 2012); this is exemplified in recent developing theories of ethical (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005) and authentic (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wemsing, & Peterson,, 2008) leadership. Others disagree and believe leadership is about bringing people together to achieve a goal and the underlying motives, strategic tactics, and end goals may not be based on ethics and morals; they believe some leaders have a dark side and choose to use manipulation and coercion to fulfill personal agendas (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Support for this dual perception of leadership can be found in a metaanalysis conducted by Kilburg and Donohue (2011); they discovered leadership is a multifaceted process of interactions

between three participants: (a) the leader, (b) the followers, and (c) the environment, which influence behaviors, processes, structures, tactics, directions, and strategies. They proposed these interactions can result in either positive or negative organizational outcomes.

Destructive Leadership

Due to the increase of corporate leaders who have been publicly exposed as leaders that have made decisions resulting in significant negative consequences to both shareholders and employees, a growing interest in understanding the dark side of leadership has emerged (Conger, 2007; Schyns & Schilling, 2012). According to Hogan and Hogan (2001), the dark side of leadership pertains to leadership behaviors which become destructive to the organization and result in poor organizational outcomes; it has been suggested there are three elements related to the problem: the leader's strategic vision, the leader's communication and impression-management approach, and the leader's general management practices (Conger, 2007). According to Conger (2007), leaders who develop visions based on personal needs, use false information when communicating the vision (exaggerate claims or withhold information), and are autocratic or controlling in their management style, are relying on their dark side to lead and are more likely to fail.

According to Schilling (2009), leadership can be constructive (positive) or destructive (negative) and determining which a leader is depends on several factors including the leader's behaviors, the leader's intentions, and the end consequences or outcomes. Similar to the dark side, destructive leadership has been defined as active,

passive, direct, or indirect behaviors exhibited by leaders which most would perceive as negative and harmful towards followers and/or the organization (Thoroughgood et al., 2012). Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser (2007) have suggested destructive leadership can result in significant negative consequences for a business and its employees. Their model of destructive leadership (the toxic triangle) is composed of three elements: (a) susceptible followers which are those with low self-esteem, unmet needs, and low maturity; (b) a conducive environment which is an organizational culture of instability, perceived threats, and poor values; and (c) destructive leadership which involves leaders who are focused on personal gain and adopt a negative life theme (Padilla, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2007). The authors argued destructive leadership evolves as a result of interactions between the leader, followers, and the environment; as conditions which are conducive to destructive leadership increase, so do negative consequences (Padilla et al., 2007). Information from a recent metaanalysis revealed destructive leadership resulted in a number of negative outcomes including: poor productivity, employee resistance, poor job satisfaction among workers, turnover, counter productive work behaviors, and poor organizational performance (Schyns, & Schilling, 2012).

It can be argued that workplace bullying may be one of the negative consequences associated with destructive leadership as seen in a qualitative study which looked at the behaviors exhibited by toxic or destructive leaders; participants were asked if they had ever witnessed their leader act in a harmful manner and if so were then asked to explain the behavior (Pelletier, 2010). Based on data collected, the author identified eight behaviors defined as toxic or destructive: (a) attacking follower's self-esteem, (b)

pitting group members against each other, (c) excluding individuals, (d) showing

favoritism or promoting inequalities, (e) angry outbursts and yelling at workers, (f)

threats to job security, (g) taking credit for other's work, and (h) indifference or failure to

make decisions; each of these behaviors, excluding indifference, are behaviors associated

with bullies (Pelletier, 2010). These results are similar to those found in a previous study

where behaviors such as use of threats, withholding information, excluding followers,

and outward aggression where all identified as behaviors associated with negative or

destructive leadership (Schilling, 2009).

Some researchers have proposed bullying is a form of destructive leadership that

negatively impacts the organization on three levels: (a) individual, (b) group, and (c)

organizational (Harvey et al., 2007). In line with the toxic triangle, it has been posited

that leaders concerned with personal gain and acquiring power will use bullying as a

tactic to fulfill their needs; this becomes more probable as they exert greater influence on

the organization by condoning bullying behaviors in others; the workforce then begins to

feel anxiety, fear, and dissatisfaction with the organization (Harvey et al., 2007).

According to some, bullying can be a strategic tactic used as a political maneuver by top

leaders or a conscious choice to improve performance of low-maturity workers (Ferris,

Zinko, Brouer, Buckley, & Harvey, 2007).

Leadership Style and Bullying

A number of studies have looked at the relationship between leadership style and

bullying. Researchers in Norway evaluated the prevalence of four types of destructive

leadership styles: (a) tyrannical, (b) derailed, (c) supportive-disloyal, and (d) laissez-faire;

three of which are known to exhibit behaviors often associated with bullying: tyrannical, derailed, and laissez-faire (Aasland et al., 2010). Tyrannical leadership was defined as pro-organization and anti-subordinate behaviors resulting in successful performance (in terms of meeting organizational goals) through tactics which may involve the humiliation, manipulation, and belittlement of employees; the prevalence rate for this style was 3.4% (Aasland et al., 2010). Derailed leadership was defined as anti-organization and anti-subordinate behaviors resulting in the abuse and intimidation of employees in conjunction with counter-productive work behaviors such as absenteeism and fraud; the prevalence rate for this style was 8.8% (Aasland et al., 2010). Laissez-faire leadership was defined as indifference and avoidance behaviors; the prevalence rate for this style was 21.2% (Aasland et al., 2010). These prevalence rates are similar to reports of bullying victimization (Jóhannsdóttir & Ólafsson, 2004; Keelan, 2000; Namie, 2007; Namie, 2010), indicating there may be a relationship between bullying and leadership style.

In support of this argument, researchers looked specifically at the relationship between workplace bullying and four leadership styles: (a) noncontingent punishment (NCP), (b) autocratic (or tyrannical), (c) laissez-faire, and (d) participative (Hoel et al., 2010). NCP was defined as administering punishment and rewards arbitrarily or in situations where noncompliance with unreasonable demands occurred; autocratic was defined as failure to involve employees in decision making and erratic outbursts of rage and aggression; laissez-faire was defined as indifference, passivity, and failure to take action; and participative was defined as valuing employees and involving them in the

decision making process (Hoel et al., 2010). Results revealed NCP, autocratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles were all positively correlated with both self-labeled and observed bullying with NCP leadership being the strongest predictor of self-labeled bullying and autocratic leadership being the strongest predictor of observed bullying; participative leadership showed a negative correlation with bullying (Hoel et al., 2010). Another study investigated the relationship between workplace bullying and two leadership styles: autocratic and laissez-faire; 67.1% of those bullied reported their leader being autocratic while only 18.4% reported their leader being laissez-faire (O'Moore, & Lynch, 2007). A similar study looked at the relationship between leadership and workplace bullying and discovered a strong negative correlation between fair and supportive leadership and bullying (Hauge et al., 2011). More recently, researchers in Iran evaluated the relationship between workplace bullying and three leadership styles: transformational, transactional, and laissez-fair; results revealed a significant positive correlation between both transactional and laissez-fair leadership styles and bullying while a significant negative correlation was found between transformational leadership and bullying (Gholamzadeh & Khazaneh, 2012). Like the studies conducted by Hoel et al. (2010), O'Moore and Lynch (2007), and Hauge et al. (2011), this study focused specifically on leaders at the department level rather than the executive level.

Research on the topic of the top leader and his or her relationship with bullying is surprisingly lacking but a sampling of studies have addressed the issue and shown similar results. Thornton (2004) used data collected from a number of Australian universities geared toward understanding various changes in academic work cultures to identify

corrosive leadership as a factor associated with bullying; she found those who complained about being a target of or witness to bullying also reported top leaders who were aggressive, competitive, and exhibited bullying behaviors. Similarly, a researcher in Turkey surveyed 500 teachers in 25 primary and secondary schools to determine if there was a relationship between the school principal's leadership style and workplace bullying (Cemaloglu, 2011). The author found a strong negative correlation between transformational leadership and reports of bullying among teachers; as transformational leadership behaviors increased, incidents of bullying decreased which supports the theory that the top leader can directly impact the prevalence of workplace bullying (Cemaloglu, 2011).

Leadership and Personality

Leadership style is the product of behavior patterns and therefore can be explained, at least in part, by personality (Brown & Reilly, 2009; Lord, de Vader, & Alliger, 1986; van Eeden, Cilliers, & van Deventer, 2008; Zaccaro, 2007). Leader traits can be defined as consistent patterns of personal characteristics which reflect individual differences that result in coherent leadership effectiveness or ineffectiveness (Zaccaro, Kemp, & Bader, 2004). According to Zaccaro (2007), leader traits act collectively and include factors such as motives, values, and cognitive skills; the end result is behaviors which vary from situation to situation but become relatively predictable. A number of studies have investigated the relationship between leadership style and personality (Hautala, 2006). Researchers from the business discipline commonly use the Myers-Briggs type indicator (MBTI) as an assessment of personality, particularly when looking

at leadership (Hautala, 2006). The MBTI measures a person's preference within four dimensions: (a) focus of attention, extroversion (inner world) versus introversion (outer world), (b) how information is taken in, sensing (through use of five senses) versus intuition (through patterns), (c) how decisions are made, thinking (logic and reasoning) versus feeling (values and gut reaction), and (d) dealing with the outer world, judging (planned and organized approach) versus perceiving (flexible and spontaneous approach); these dimensions result in 16 different personality types (Brown & Reilly, 2009). Using the MBTI as a measure of personality, Hautala (2006) looked at the relationship between transformational leadership and personality; the study included both leader self-ratings along with follower perceived-ratings. Results revealed leaders who rated themselves as extraverted, intuitive, and perceiving, also rated themselves as highly transformational whereas followers who rated their leaders as high in sensing perceived them to be the most transformational (Hautala, 2006). While the results between leaders and followers were different, this study showed there is a relationship between personality and leadership style (Hautala, 2006). Similarly, Brown and Reilly (2009) discovered a correlation between leaders who perceived themselves as extroverted and intuitive with transformational leadership; however they found no relationship between leader personality and leadership style when evaluating follower perceptions. A more recent study focused on personality type and task versus people oriented leadership styles; results confirmed both extroversion and intuition were highly correlated with a people-oriented leadership style, while sensing was highly correlated with a task-oriented leadership style (Bahreinian, Ahi, & Soltani, 2012).

A more widely accepted tool for assessing personality among the social sciences is the five factor model (FFM) which has shown reliability, stability, and validity (Johnson & Hill, 2009); furthermore, trait psychologists concur it provides a comprehensive representation of the human personality (Hartmann, 2006). The FFM is comprised of five broad personality dimensions with each being further broken down into six facets (Costa & McCrae, 2000). Neuroticism measures a person's level of emotional stability and consists of the facets anxiety, hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness and vulnerability; people scoring high on this trait tend to be self-conscious, anger quickly, and act impulsively (Costa & McCrae, 2000). Extraversion measures a person's level of sociability and consists of the facets warm, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, excitement seeking, and positive emotions; people scoring high on this trait tend to be socially assertive, have high energy, and thrive on being around others (Costa & McCrae, 2000). Openness to experience measures a person's level of intellectual curiosity and consists of the facets fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, ideas, and values; people scoring high on this trait tend to be adventuresome, have creative imaginations, and crave new experiences (Costa & McCrae, 2000). Agreeableness measures a person's level of cooperation with others and consists of the facets trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty, and tender-mindedness; people scoring high on this trait tend to have a high level of concern for others, be compassionate towards others, and easily trust others (Costa & McCrae, 2000). Conscientiousness measures a person's level of self-discipline and consists of the facets competence, order, dutifulness, achievement striving, self-discipline, and deliberation;

people scoring high on this trait tend to be organized, dependable, and goal-oriented

(Costa & McCrae, 2000).

Like the MBTI, this model has been the basis for a number of studies on the topic

of leadership style and personality (Johnson & Hill, 2009). Using the FFM as a

foundation, Judge and Bono (2000) found the personality traits of extraversion and

agreeableness were both positively related to transformational leadership. Similarly, a

group of researchers conducted a metaanalysis concentrating on studies based on the

FFM; they discovered extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness to experience, were

all strongly correlated with leadership (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002). In line

with previous findings, Johnson and Hill (2009) discovered military leaders who were

best able to motivate and influence people in a manner that resulted in accomplishment of

goals scored highest in conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and openness to

experience while scoring low in neuroticism. Others have discovered that extraversion

and conscientiousness are the most important leader traits when looking at the

relationship between leader effectiveness and interpersonal attributes (DeRue, Nahrgang,

Wellan, & Huphrey, 2011); and extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness are

the only traits related to both task and people oriented leadership styles (Ali, Nisar, &

Raza, 2011). More recently, Kaiser and Hogan (2011) evaluated the relationship between

leadership style and personality; they focused on four leadership dimensions as measured

in the Leadership Versatility Index: (a) forceful which involves taking charge, being

decisive, and demanding results; (b) enabling which involves empowering, including, and

supporting, people; (c) strategic which involves determining a direction, expanding

capabilities, and investing in new ideas; and (d) operational which involves executing, utilizing resources, and following plans in order to complete projects. Results revealed extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism were all positively related to forceful and enabling leadership styles, conscientiousness was positively related to an operational leadership style, and openness to experience was positively related to a strategic leadership style (Kaiser & Hogan, 2011).

Based on the expansive body of research supporting the relationship between personality and leadership behaviors, it could be argued that personality would play a key role in destructive or toxic leadership. It has been proposed when personality scores are too extreme, either exceptionally high or exceptionally low, ineffective leadership is the result (Ames & Flynn, 2007; Kaiser & Hogan, 2011; Le et al., 2011). Narcissism may be an example of extreme personality scores resulting in negative leadership behaviors (Maccoby, 2000).

Narcissism

Narcissism is a term often used to describe any individual with behaviors or traits of self-importance, over confidence, arrogance, and preoccupation or obsession with the self (Miller et al., 2010); while in some cases these are simple personality traits, in other cases it is a sign the individual has a serious pathological disorder (Sperry & Sperry, 2011).

Research on the topic of narcissism comes from two primary perspectives. The psychiatric discipline uses a classification approach based on psychodynamic theory and clinical case reports to define pathological narcissism or narcissistic personality disorder

(NPD); while the psychological discipline uses a dimensional approach based on empirical research methods to define nonpathological narcissistic traits (Blais & Little, 2010). These two approaches can sometimes overlap resulting in confusion regarding the true state of the individual. For example, according to the fourth revision of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV), a diagnosis of NPD occurs when five or more of the following traits and behaviors are consistently present: grandiose sense of self-importance, preoccupation with thoughts of success and power, belief of superiority over others, need for admiration, sense of entitlement, willingness to exploit others to meet personal needs, failure to empathize with others, arrogant and condescending attitudes, and envious of others (APA, 2000); however, if only four of the traits and behaviors are exhibited, the individual is viewed as simply having traits associated with the disorder (McNeal, 2007). According to trait theorists, people's behaviors vary from situation to situation but there is a core consistency that exists; it is this consistency or stability which separates mood-related behaviors from personality trait behaviors (Matthews, Deary, & Whiteman, 2003). However, traits have also been described as a propensity to act in a particular way; therefore, the trait may only be manifested under certain conditions; as a result, an individual may score low on a particular trait but may exhibit that trait strongly in some situations (Tett & Guterman, 2000). This applies to the trait narcissism.

In line with Kernberg's overt and covert theory of narcissism, Wink (1991) argued there are two distinct sides to narcissism: the grandiose/exhibitionist side and the vulnerable/sensitive side. According to Wink (1991), both shared some characteristics

including: preoccupation with the self, conceit, and lack of concern for others but they differed in a number of ways; the grandiose/exhibitionist side included characteristics of self-confidence, sociability, assertiveness, aggression, and the need for admiration, whereas the vulnerable/sensitive side also included characteristics such as helplessness, anxiousness, bashfulness, defensiveness (Wink, 1991). This argument was confirmed in a study of 641 outpatients conducted by Fossati et al. (2005); they discovered two distinct types of narcissistic symptoms which were congruent with Kernberg's overt and covert theory and Wink's grandiose/exhibitionist and vulnerable/sensitive theory. Other research has provided further support including Dickinson and Pincus (2003) along with Miller and Campbell (2008). Many individuals that exhibit narcissistic traits lead perfectly normal lives and show no signs of pathology; however, extreme scores an assessments such as the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) can be an indication that narcissistic personality (NPD) is present (Miller et al., 2010).

Ronningstam (2005) has proposed there are four dimensions of narcissism which can range from healthy to pathological and anywhere in between: (a) self-esteem, (b) affect regulation, (c) interpersonal, and (d) super-ego regulation. On the healthy extreme of self-esteem, highly extravagant fantasies become motivators and drive the individual to achievement and success, but on the pathological extreme, these fantasies result in over-confidence and inflated self-esteem (Ronningstam, 2005). On the healthy extreme of affect regulation, the individual is aware of and can tolerate feelings of jealousy, embarrassment, arrogance, and inferiority; but on the pathological extreme, the individual is not aware of these feelings and often expresses them through anger, aggression, and

assertiveness (Ronningstam, 2005). On the healthy extreme of interpersonal the

individual feels empathy and concern for others and is able to have meaningful

relationships but on the pathological extreme the individual is incapable of feeling

compassion for others and uses interpersonal relationships solely for the purpose of

fulfilling personal needs (Ronningstam, 2005). Finally, on the healthy extreme of super-

ego regulation the individual can effectively balance principles, needs, and talents, but on

the pathological extreme the individual exhibits erratic ideals which can vary from

excessive perfectionism to deviant behaviors including criminal activity and violence

(Ronningstam, 2005). Due to the overlap between pathological and nonpathological

narcissism, research covering both topics will be presented in this literature review

although the study to be conducted will only deal with narcissism as a personality trait.

Narcissism and Leadership

A leader can be described as narcissistic when his or her actions are based on

fulfilling personal needs (grandiosity, success, power, admiration) at the expense of the

organization (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). It has been suggested some level of

narcissism is a prerequisite to obtain a position as a top leader of an organization (Kets de

Vries, 2004; Lubit, 2002; Resick, Whitman, Weingarden, & Hiller, 2009); this is

supported by a study that revealed narcissism was a consistent predictor of leader

emergence (Brunell et al., 2008). It has also been argued narcissists are naturally drawn

to leadership positions (Campbell & Campbell, 2009). This is supported by research

which assessed levels of narcissism among university students; results confirmed

business majors exhibited the highest levels of narcissistic traits (Sautter, Brown, Littvay,

Sautter, & Bearnes, 2008). Problems occur when the leader's level of narcissism leans

more toward the pathological side versus the healthy side (Kets de Vries, 2004; Lubit,

2002). Healthy or constructive narcissistic leaders have a drive and vision for

organizational success and work collectively with others to achieve goals; there is no

need for distorting the truth because they have high levels of self-esteem and are

confident in their ability to succeed (Amernic & Craig, 2010; Kets de Vries, 2004).

Pathological or destructive narcissistic leaders also have drive and vision, but their focus

is on obtaining personal power, status, and success; when faced with challenges or

potential failures these leaders turn to abusive and unethical behaviors which become

toxic to the organization (Anernic & Craig, 2010; Glad, 2002; Kets de Vries, 2004). The

end result is narcissistic leaders are not always bad; those with strong egos and high self

esteem are often perceived as effective and desirable while those with low self esteem,

and inflated egos are perceived as ineffective and toxic (Paunonen, Lönnqvist, Verkasalo,

Leikas, & Nissinen, 2006). According to Ouimet (2010), there are five components to

narcissistic leadership: (a) charisma, which is the use of expressive and nonverbal

communication used in a manner to seduce followers; (b) self-interested influence, which

is the need for self-enhancement and fulfillment of egocentric preoccupations; (c)

deceptive motivation, which is the use of bold actions and sensationalism to motivate

staff; (d) intellectual inhibition, which is the inability to except criticism which results in

aggressive outbursts; and (e) simulated consideration, which is the use of manipulation

and exploitation of employees in order to meet personal needs. Supporting Ouimet's

claims are a number of studies revealing negative characteristics associated with

narcissism including aggression (Barry, Pickartd, & Ansel, 2009), sense of entitlement (Reidy, Zeichner, Foster, & Martinez, 2008), impulsivity (Vazire & Funder, 2006), obsessive need for achievement (Foster, Campbell, & Twenge, 2003), need for power (Kets de Vries, & Miller, 1997), unwillingness to compromise (Campbell, Goodie, & Foster, 2004), lack of empathy (Clements, & Washbush, 1999), poor listening skills (Maccoby, 2000), sense of grandiosity (Rosenthal, & Pittinsky, 2006), arrogance (Maccaby, 2000), inflated self-view (Campbell et al., 2004), negative social exchanges (Resick et al., 2009), focus on personal goals (Schmidt, 2008), and use of self-enhancement strategies at the expense of others (Campbell, Reeder, Sedikides, & Elliot, 2000). One particularly damaging characteristic of a narcissistic leader occurs when he or she is in a situation that may result in embarrassment or a threat to his or her ego occurs; this often leads to bouts of narcissistic rage leaving employees confused, threatened, and in many instances submissive (Horowitz & Arthur, 1988). There are three potential outcomes resulting from persistent episodes of leader rage: (a) ruination, the organization succumbs to the narcissistic leader, (b) blood bath; the leader removes existing staff and replaces them with individuals of his or her own selection, or (c) mutiny, the leader is removed as a result of employees' refusal to follow (Horowitz & Arthur, 1988). More recent research confirmed narcissistic leaders are likely to act aggressively when threats to the ego are present (Jones & Paulhus, 2010). Narcissists are also more apt to participate in counterproductive work behaviors such as theft, sabotage, and organizational politicking (O'Boyle, Forsyth, Banks, & McDaniel, 2012). According to

Maccoby (2004), narcissistic leaders destroy the organizational culture and inevitably leave a trail of damaged relationships and systems.

Research exploring the relationship between narcissism and leadership behaviors goes back as far as Freud (Campbell, Hoffman, Campbell, & Marchisio, 2011), with the bulk occurring within the last 20 years (Higgs, 2009). An early study revealed a positive correlation between narcissism and aggression (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). Participants were placed in a situation where they were insulted and those scoring highest in narcissism exhibited the greatest aggression towards the insulter (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). Similarly, Penney and Spector (2002) proposed when faced with threats to the ego, individuals scoring high in narcissism experience negative emotions and express this through acts of aggression. Researchers in Germany confirmed a relationship exists between narcissism and crime; they surveyed a number of high level executives who were convicted of white collar crime and discovered a higher level of narcissism was present in criminal leaders versus non-criminal leaders (Blickle, Schlegel, Fassbender, & Klein, 2006). Narcissism has also been associated with poor manager ratings of interpersonal skills such as team building, sensitivity, confrontation effectiveness, and integrity (Blair, Hoffman, & Helland, 2008). Goldman (2006) proposed narcissistic leaders create a toxic work environment due to cold, distant social interactions and an inability to empathize with workers. It has also been shown that dimensions associated with narcissism were positively correlated with poor leadership performance (Benson & Campbell, 2007). More recently Chatterjee and Hambrick (2011) discovered social praise was positively correlated with a CEO's level of risk

taking; as the level of narcissism increased, so did the level of risk taking. This is consistent with an earlier study conducted by the same researchers which confirmed narcissistic CEOs favored making bold decisions that were visible and resulted in either extreme wins or extreme losses; the consequences being erratic organizational performance (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007). Others have evaluated the impact narcissistic leaders have on group performance and concluded even though these leaders are perceived to be effective, they in fact inhibit communication and interactions in group settings resulting in decreased group performance (Nevicka, Ten Velden, De Hoogh, & Van Vianen, 2011). Due to their high competitiveness and need for achievement, narcissistic leaders often appear to have socially desirable traits such as self-awareness and clear vision but their intrinsic motivation to obtain attention and admiration from others results in goal outcomes which may not be the most desirable (Furtner, Rauthmann, & Sachse, 2011).

Narcissism and Bullying

Workplace bullying is much more prevalent in organizations with cultures that are not supportive or concerned with the well-being of workers (Baillien, Neyens, De Witte, 2011); a characteristic associated with narcissistic leaders (Blair et al., 2008; Clements, & Washbush, 1999; Goldman, 2006). Additionally, a positive relationship has been established between individuals holding management positions and narcissism, indicating narcissistic behaviors exist at a number of levels within an organization and are likely to be exhibited by individuals in authoritative positions (Andreassen, Ursin, Eriksen, & Pallesen, 2012). Cilliers (2012) proposed workplace bullying can be institutionalized and

begins with the bullies' narcissistic need for recognition and success while ending with a toxic and demoralizing work environment.

Research directly linking narcissism and bullying is limited, with only a handful of empirical studies available. One specific trait of narcissism, lack of empathy, has been identified as a trait present in both school yard and adult bullies (Crick & Dodge, 1999; Parkins et al., 2006). In one study a group of researchers surveyed over 300 Irish workers and learned that bullies were more competitive, assertive, concerned with their own success, and aggressive, than non-bullies (Seigner et al., 2007); all characteristics associated with narcissism (Kets de Vries, 2004). A study in Singapore revealed a positive correlation between narcissism and bullying among school children; the authors argued bullying is a form of proactive aggression initiated by the narcissist's exploitativeness (Ang et al, 2010). In a more recent study, researchers sampled the general adult population in Canada looking at the relationship between narcissism and different types of bullying including direct, and indirect; results confirmed a positive correlation between narcissism and bullying with indirect bullying tactics, such as taking credit for work, withholding information, feeding misinformation, and sabotage, being the most common (Baughman et al., 2012).

Research focused on the Dark Triad of personality traits is also relevant to the topic of narcissism and bullying. The Dark Triad refers to three nonpathological personality characteristics which exhibit very similar behaviors and overlap on many dimensions, yet still remain distinct constructs (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). The three traits are: (a) Machiavellianism which involves manipulating and deceiving others in

social situations for personal gain, (b) narcissism, and (c) psychopathy which involves impulsivity and the inability to empathize with others (Baughman et al., 2012). Prior research has confirmed a direct relationship between narcissism and both Machiavellianism (McHoskey, 1995) and psychopathy (Gustafson & Ritzer, 1995), with the strongest correlation occurring between narcissism and psychopathy (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). In line with the study conducted by Baughman et al. (2012), researchers concluded children scoring high in Machiavellianism were more likely to exhibit indirect bullying behaviors than those scoring low (Peeters, Cillessen, & Scholte, 2010). Similarly, researchers found children scoring high in callous and un-emotional traits (key characteristics of psychopaths) exhibited both direct and indirect bullying behaviors (Viding, Simmonds, Petrides, & Frederickson, 2009). Another important study focused specifically on corporate psychopaths and workplace bullying (Boddy, 2010). Participants, which included 346 managers from various Australian organizations, were asked to complete the Psychopathy Measure-Management Research Version (PM-MRV); and were then broken down into three groups based on assessment scores: (a) normal managers which exhibited no signs of psychopathy, (b) dysfunctional managers which exhibited moderate levels of psychopathy and (c) corporate psychopaths which were classified as psychopaths (Boddy, 2010). They also answered a series of questions to determine their exposure to bullying; results revealed when corporate psychopaths are present the incidents of bullying are significantly higher than when corporate psychopaths are not present (Boddy, 2010). This is in line with the findings that 29% of corporate psychopaths are bullies (Babiak & Hare, 2006). Additionally, in organizations

lead by a corporate psychopath, employees have reported significant levels of dissatisfaction with the company's treatment of and concern for its employees (Boddy, Ladyshewsky, & Galvin, 2010). One controversial issue still persists which is the over-use of the term psychopath when describing bullies. Researchers have found victims of bullies are more likely to use the term psychopath when describing their perpetrator; however, when selecting from a list of behaviors and terms associated with psychopaths, there is consistency in results indicating victims may be witness to the true behaviors of the psychopath whereas non-victims are simply not exposed to that part of the psychopath's personality (Caponecchia, Sun, & Wyatt, 2012).

It has been argued any one of the dark triad personalities can result in workplace bullying because each is concerned with the fulfillment of personal needs over the needs of others; this leads to destructive goal setting and toxic social interactions (Krasikova, Green, & LeBreton, 2013). Due to the strong correlation between narcissism with psychopathy (Paulhus & Williams, 2002) and Machiavellianism (McHoskey, 1995) along with the fact many traits associated with narcissism are exhibited by bullies (Harvey et al., 2007), it can be posited there is a relationship between narcissism and bullying.

Conclusion

The literature pertaining to the topic of workplace bullying provides support for the argument that organizational culture and leadership are both important contributors to the existence and perpetuation of the problem (Padilla et al., 2007); what is not known is why leaders would allow or condone bullying. Environmental factors previously associated with workplace bullying such as job ambiguity, work load, role conflict, task

complexity, and autonomy, are all a reflection of the company's culture (Baillien et al., 2011). Similarly, manager and supervisor behaviors which have been associated with bullying such as intimidation, withholding information, unreasonable job demands, and unfair criticism, may also be a reflection of the organization's culture (Hutchinson et al., 2008). Just as culture can have a positive impact on the organization in terms of positive work attitudes, lower turnover, and enhanced performance (Glisson, & James, 2002), it can also have a negative impact in terms of poor employee attitudes, weak operational performance, and dismal financial effectiveness (Hartnell, Ou, & Kinicki, 2011). Researchers have identified a number of organizational values (a dimension of organizational culture) which are of particular interest when exploring the relationship between culture and bullying: respect for people and aggressiveness (O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991), employee involvement (Dinison & Mishra, 1995), employee job orientation, and level of control (Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, & Sanders, 1990); all of which are directly influenced by the top leader (Jaskyte, 2010). The fact the majority of employers fail to effectively address bullying when it is reported (Namie, 2007) indicates it may be an accepted practice that is imbedded within the organization's culture; but it is not known why.

Empirical research has verified the personality and behaviors of an organization's top leader are instrumental in defining the company's culture (Giberson et al., 2005; Giberson et al., 2009). The end result can be either positive, with exceptional financial performance and high employee satisfaction, or negative, with dismal financial performance and low employee satisfaction (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Studies have not

only shown a correlation between toxic or destructive behaviors and workplace bullying at the supervisory and management levels (Aasland et al., 2010; Hoel et al., 2010; Pelletier, 2010; Schilling, 2009), but have also shown a relationship when looking specifically at the top leader (Cemaloglu, 2011; Thorton, 2004). These negative behaviors include bullying tactics such as aggressive acts towards others, threatening employees with the loss of employment, purposefully creating conflict among group members, taking credit for other employees' work, showing favoritism, and excluding others (Pelletier, 2010).

It has been argued leader personality drives leadership behaviors (Bahreinian et al., 2012; Hautala, 2006; Johnson & Hill, 2009; Judge & Bono, 2000; Judge et al., 2009; Kaiser & Hogan, 2011) and several studies have revealed high scores on the personality trait narcissism result in undesirable leadership behaviors (Blickle et al., 2006; Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007; Goldman, 2006; Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Narcissism is comprised of several components including autonomy, entitlement, exhibitionism, exploitation, self-sufficiency, superiority, and vanity (Raskin & Terry, 1988). Individuals scoring high in narcissism love themselves much more than they love others (Sedikides, et al., 2004). They perceive themselves as more attractive and intelligent than they really are (Gabriel, Critelli, & Ee, 1994), act aggressively toward others when threatened or criticized (Stucke, & Sporer, 2002), overestimate their contributions to group tasks (John, & Robins, 1994), take credit for successes without giving credit to others' input but blame others for failures (Sedikides, Campbell, Reeder, & Elliot, 2002), and like to be in direct competition with others (Morf, Wier, & Davidov, 2000). This translates to leadership

behaviors which emphasize the fulfillment of personal needs with no regard to the impact on others or the organization (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). What is not known is if these behaviors can result in an organizational culture which condones bullying behaviors.

This research is the first of its kind by exploring the relationship between top leader narcissistic behaviors and the acceptance of bullying within the organization. Current research has failed to explore why employers allow bullying to take place, this gap will be narrowed as a result of this study. It is argued, due to their selfish focus, top-level leaders who exhibit narcissistic behaviors have little concern for the well-being of others and therefore create organizational cultures that condone and even encourage workplace bullying; it is also argued these leaders engage personally in bullying behaviors. Because narcissists are attracted to leadership positions (Campbell & Campbell, 2009) along with the fact this trait is often a requirement for success at the upper echelon level (Kets de Vries, 2004), it can be reasoned more organizations than not will have a narcissist at the top and this may explain why so many companies refuse to effectively address bullying when it is reported (Harvey et al., 2006). The next chapter summarizes the methodological approach used to conduct this quantitative study.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between leaders who exhibit narcissistic behaviors and bullying within the organization. It also explored any relationship between leaders' years of service and bullying within the organization. Finally, it investigated any relationship between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and bullying within the organization. This was accomplished by having key HR representatives from a number of organizations assess the level to which the top leader of their organization exhibits narcissistic behaviors. They then assessed their top leader's personal involvement in bullying and also the level of bullying that exists within the organization (excluding the leader).

This chapter provides a summary of the research design and methodology. It starts with an overview of the design including independent and dependent variables, assessment tools, consistency with other studies, and an explanation why it was decided to use observers to assess narcissistic behaviors and bullying rather than using self-ratings. Key research questions are presented along with six null and alternative hypotheses. Next, the methodology is explained which includes a description of the population and participant pool, the sample size including rationalization, the process used to obtain participants, instruments used to assess three key variables (narcissistic behaviors, the leader's bullying behaviors, and bullying within the organization), the

statistical method selected to analyze data, threats to internal and external validity, and an overview of ethical concerns.

Research Design

This quantitative study examined if leader observed narcissistic behaviors, leader tenure, and antibullying organizational policies, relate to the leader's participation in workplace bullying along with the prevalence of bullying within the organization. It determined if a correlation exists between three independent variables: (a) narcissistic behaviors exhibited by the top leader, (b) leader tenure, and (c) the presence or absence of antibullying organizational policies, along with two dependent variables: the leader's participation in workplace bullying and the prevalence of bullying within the organization. Observed narcissistic behaviors was measured through an observer-rated instrument which contains a list of behaviors known to be associated with narcissism; using a Likert scale, the participant determined the applicability of each behavior when evaluating his or her boss's behaviors. Tenure was defined as the total number of full years the leader has worked for the company and was categorized as (a) *1 year or less,* (b) *2 to 5 years,* (c) *6 to 10 years,* (d) *11 to 15 years,* (e) *16 to 20 years,* and (f) *21 years or more*; additionally, using the same categories, the total number of years the leader has held the top position was defined. The presence of antibullying organizational policies was defined as either *yes* or *no*. The leader's personal engagement in bullying behaviors and the presence of bullying within the organization were both assessed using an observer-rated instrument which contains a list of behaviors known to be associated with workplace bullying; using a Likert scale, the participant identified how often he or she

has witnessed the top leader exhibit each behavior and also identified how often he or she has witnessed others (excluding the top leader) exhibit each behavior.

The approach used in this study deviates slightly from others conducted in the field of workplace bullying. Specifically, the use of observer-ratings has not been a popular method because most researchers have looked at bullying from the target's perspective (Rayner & Keashly, 2005). There are several studies which have used either observer ratings or observer perceptions as a basis of identifying both leader behaviors and workplace bullying. One study used an observer-rater assessment of narcissism to explore the effects of perceived supervisor narcissism and employee enactment behaviors (Hochwarter & Thompson, 2012). A similar study asked employees to complete an observer-rater assessment to identify his or her manager's leadership style (Aasland et al., 2010). Another study used semistructured interviews to understand employees' perceptions of their work environment and discovered a common theme of corrosive leadership and bullying (Thornton, 2004). Archer (1999) used an observer rating of bullying to identify individuals who have witnessed bullying and followed up with a semistructured interview to solicit data regarding the participant's perceptions of the bully's personality.

The decision to use of observer-rated assessments was made for several reasons. First, it has been argued that top leaders are reluctant to personally participate in research studies (Cycyota & Harrison, 2006); because the top leader was a key subject of this study, there was concern enough participants would not be solicited. Additionally, because this study was looking at narcissistic behaviors among leaders and workplace

bullying, it was believed leaders would not be willing to participate because the subject matter may be considered too controversial. Of concern was leaders not wanting to label themselves as narcissistic and therefore being untruthful in their responses. Furthermore, because so many employers fail to address bullying when made aware of its presence (Namie, 2008), it was speculated leaders would not be interested in contributing to a study on the topic. It was therefore concluded in order to have a large enough participant pool to effectively look at the relationship between narcissistic behaviors among leaders and bullying, witnesses and observers needed to be the target population. In support of the observer approach for measuring narcissism, it has been suggested observed leader behaviors are more relevant in a work setting than self-perceived behaviors (Hogan, 1991); in support of the observer approach for measuring workplace bullying, it has been argued prevalence is best established through witness observations (Agervold, 2007). By using HR professionals that report directly to the CEO/president, an ample population of participants was available that were in a position to effectively assess the top leader's narcissistic behaviors, had information regarding the leader's tenure, were familiar with the presence of antibullying organizational policies, and were knowledgeable about the leader's personal participation in bullying and the prevalence of bullying within the organization.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

After a critical review of the literature presented in Chapter 2, there was strong reason to believe that leaders who exhibit narcissistic behaviors may contribute to both the leader personally engaging in workplace bullying (Andreassen et al., 2012; Ang et al.,

2010, Baughman et al., 2012; Parkings et al., 2006; Seigner et al., 2007) and workplace

bullying behaviors being accepted or condoned in the workplace (Cemaloglu, 2011;

Schneider & Smith, 2004; Tsui et al., 2005, Wetstone, 2006). Additionally, there was

support that narcissists may not exhibit negative behaviors early in their relationships and

therefore tenure (years of service) may be related to bullying prevalence (Campbell &

Campbell, 2009; Paulhus, 1998). Furthermore, it was believed the presence or absence of

antibullying organizational policies may be linked to workplace bullying (Einarsen, 1999;

Salin, 2003). As a result, the following research questions and hypotheses evolved and

formed the basis of this study.

Research Question 1. Is there a relationship between the leader's level of

observed narcissistic behaviors and his or her observed participation in workplace

bullying?

Null Hypothesis (H1₀). There is no statistically significant relationship between

the leader's level of observed narcissistic behaviors and his or her personal engagement

in workplace bullying behaviors.

Alternate Hypothesis (H1ₐ). There is a statistically significant positive relationship

between the leader's level of observed narcissistic behaviors and his or her personal

engagement in workplace bullying behaviors

Research Question 2. Is there a relationship between the leader's level of

observed narcissistic behaviors and observed workplace bullying within the organization?

Null Hypothesis (H2$_0$). There is no statistically significant relationship between observed workplace bullying within the organization and the leaders level of observed narcissistic behaviors.

Alternate Hypothesis (H2$_a$). There is a statistically significant positive relationship between observed workplace bullying within the organization and the leaders level of observed narcissistic behaviors.

Research Question 3. Is there a relationship between the leader's tenure and his or her observed participation in workplace bullying?

Null Hypothesis (H3$_0$). There is no statistically significant relationship between the leader's tenure and the leader's observed participation in workplace bullying.

Alternate Hypothesis (H3$_a$). There is a statistically significant positive relationship between the leader's tenure and the leader's observed participation in workplace bullying.

Research Questions 4. Is there a relationship between the leader's tenure and observed workplace bullying within the organization?

Null Hypothesis (H4$_0$). There is no statistically significant relationship between the leader's tenure and observed workplace bullying within the organization.

Alternate Hypothesis (H4$_a$). There is a statistically significant positive relationship between the leader's tenure and observed workplace bullying within the organization.

Research Question 5. Is there a relationship between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and the leader's observed participation in workplace bullying?

Null Hypothesis (H5₀). There is no statistically significant relationship between the leader's observed participation in workplace bullying and the presence of antibullying organizational policies.

Alternate Hypothesis (H5ₐ). There is a statistically significant negative relationship between the leader's observed participation in workplace bullying and the presence of antibullying organizational policies.

Research Question 6. Is there a relationship between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and observed workplace bullying within the organization?

Null Hypothesis (H6₀). There is no statistically significant relationship between observed workplace bullying within the organization and the presence of antibullying organizational policies.

Alternate Hypothesis (H6ₐ). There is a statistically significant negative relationship between observed workplace bullying within the organization and the presence of antibullying organizational policies.

Demographics. Additional company demographic information was collected including company size defined as number of employees and categorized as follows: (a) *under 500*, (b) *500 to 2,499*, (c) *2,500 to 5,000*, and (d) *5,000 or more*; company revenue, defined as annual sales and categorized as follows: (a) *under $5 million*, (b) *$5 to $10 million*, (c) *$11 to $50 million*, (d) *$51 to 200 million*, (e) *$201 to $500 million*, (f) *$501 million to $1 billion*, and (g) *over $1 billion*; sector, defined as (a) *public*, (b) *private*, (c) *non-profit*, (d) *government*; and industry, defined as (a) *aerospace and defense*, (b)

biotechnology, (c) *business services*, (d) *chemicals*, (e) *construction*, (f) *education*, (g)

energy and utilities, (h) *financial services*, (i) *healthcare*, (j) *hospitality and leisure*, (k)

insurance, (l) *internet business*, (m) *media* (n) *manufacturing*, (o) *military*, (p)

pharmaceuticals, (q) *retail*, (r) *wholesale*, (s) *software and networking*, (t)

telecommunication, (u) *transportation*, and (v) *other*. Each of these variables was

included in the regression analysis.

Methodology

Sample Population

Participants for this quantitative study consisted of HR representatives from U.S.

companies reporting directly to the CEO/president of the company. The target

population of over 7.4 million company top leaders within the United States (United

States Census Bureau, 2012) consisted of a variety of business sectors (private, public,

nonprofit), industries, and company size (number of people and revenue); they will were

represented by a participant pool of HR professionals. The only restriction placed on the

organization which the HR person was representing was it had to be headquartered in the

United States. HR representatives were selected as the target participant pool because it

was believed this group was most likely to have the greatest involvement with workplace

bullying (Lews & Rayner, 2003). It is common for targets of bullying to file complaints

with HR (D'Cruz & Noronha, 2010), plus they are often assigned the task of conducting

investigations when bullying is reported and are also responsible for enforcing

organizational policies (Glendinning, 2001; Lewis & Rayner, 2003; Salin, 2008).

According to Cowan (2009), due to their position within the organization, HR

professionals can provide a unique perspective on workplace bullying and should be included more often in research. A recent study evaluated HR professionals' perspective of workplace bullying and concluded there is great congruence between what HR people define as bullying and what traditional targets have defined as bullying (Cowan, 2012). This same study revealed 100% of HR professionals interviewed indicated they generally believe bullying takes place within the workplace and 80% of respondents reported bullying within their current or previous workplaces (Cowan, 2012). This, in conjunction with the fact that HR will be knowledgeable about formal complaints of bullying within the organization and the presence of antibullying organizational policies, made them a viable source of information. By including only representatives reporting directly to the CEO/president, the participants were in a strong position to effectively evaluate the leader's behaviors, including those considered narcissistic; in addition to having information regarding the organizational culture as it pertains to the acceptance of workplace bullying.

Sample Size

The purpose of this study was to identify potential correlations between three predictor variables: (a) top leader level of perceived narcissistic behaviors, (b) leader tenure, (c) the presence of antibullying policies and two criterion variables: (a) observed leader bullying behavior and (b) observed bullying within the workplace. Identifying the sample size was crucial in order to ensure it adequately represented the population and was able to detect any relationships that existed (Taborsky, 2010). Determining the appropriate size required three elements: (a) statistical power, (b) alpha, and (c) effect

size. Statistical power $(1-\beta)$ is the probability that the study will accurately identify any

true relationship between the variables; an acceptable level in behavioral research is .80

which means 80% of the time a real effect will be found (Cohen, 1992). Alpha (α)

determines the rejection region, a smaller alpha increases the chances of rejecting the null

hypothesis resulting in greater power; an alpha level of .05 is commonly used in

behavioral research which means there is a 95% chance the correct conclusion will be

drawn (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2010). Unlike power and alpha, the effect size (how strong

a relationship is) must be calculated and is derived by dividing the mean difference by the

standard deviation; a review of previous literature can be used when making this

calculation or if this information is not available a standardized effect size class can be

used (Taborsky, 2010).

For this study, power and alpha levels were set at the standard acceptable levels

for behavioral research: $1-\beta = .80$ and $\alpha = .05$ (Cohen, 1992). While there was limited

research pertaining to a direct relationship between leadership personality and workplace

bullying incidents, there were some studies which looked at the relationship between

leadership and environmental factors associated with bullying (Hauge et al., 2011; Hauge

et al., 2007; Hoel et al., 2010). The correlation coefficient for these studies ranged from r

$= 0.35$ (Hoel et al., 2010) to $r = 0.60$ (Hauge et al., 2011) with the average being $r = 0.46$;

to ensure adequate strength, the smallest correlation coefficient of $r = 0.35$ was used in

this study. An effect size calculator for regression was used to determine the effect size

(f^2) based on a correlation coefficient of .35; the result was an effect size of 0.14

(Statistics Calculators a, n.d.). Next, a regression sample size program was used to

determine a desirable sample size using an effect size of 0.14, an alpha level of 0.05, a power level of 0.80, and number of independent variables of seven (narcissism, tenure, antibullying policies, company size, company revenue, sector and industry); a sample size of 110 was recommended (Statistics Calculators b, n.d.). To ensure an adequate sample size was selected, a second approach was undertaken. According to some, a general rule of thumb consisting of ten participants for every independent variable plus one can be applied when determining sample sizes for regression analysis (Bartlett, Kotrlik, & Higgins, 2001; Halinski & Feldt, 1970; Miller & Kuncel, 1973); based on this logic, a sample size of 80 would be appropriate. While this approach has been a commonly used method, it has been argued it almost always underestimates the sample size needed (Maxwell, 2000); as a result, the samples size of 110 derived from the original calculation based on power, alpha, and effect size was used.

Sampling Procedures

Access to the total population of over 500,000 HR professionals in the United States (Leonard, 2011) was not possible therefore, a cluster sampling was used. The professional social media website LinkedIn was used to solicit participants. Information regarding the survey was posted in in three LinkedIn groups which targeted high level human resources executives: (a) VPs of HR, (b) VP of Human Resources, Director of Human Resources, and Chief People Officer Network; and (c) STL HR Executives. Permission to post the survey in each group was granted by the group owner. The post included a message requesting participation in a dissertation study exploring the relationship between top leader behaviors and behaviors within the organization along

with a link to the survey; the terms *narcissism* was not used in order to avoid any bias

that may be associated with that word. To ensure results from individuals who do not

report directly to the top leader were excluded from this study, the following question

was included in the survey: Do you report directly to the top leader of your organization?

Results from participants who answered *no* were not included in the data analysis.

Participants were asked for informed consent; once consent was received (by clicking on

"I consent"), they were brought to an on-line survey which asked for basic demographic

information about their organization along with the two instruments being used to

measure narcissism and bullying. Included in the consent was a disclaimer regarding the

sensitive nature of the study and the potential risk associated with employers' learning of

their participation was included and participants were urged to refrain from accessing the

survey or communicating with the survey author from their work computer or other

electronic devices. At the end of the survey they were thanked for their participation and

asked to click on "submit" to complete the survey and have the information captured in

the survey instrument. Survey results were converted to a file which was imported into

the statistical program which was used to analyze the data. No follow up was conducted.

The required 110 participants was not secured after one week, therefore the

survey was posted on two additional LinkedIn human resources groups: (a) SHRM

Networking group, and (b) HR.com. Enough participants were not secured from these

additional groups after two weeks, so individuals with titles that contained director, vice

president, executive vice president, chief human resources officer, or any similar title

indicating the individual may be the top HR person in the organization, was identified

from the author's personal LinkedIn connections and contacted. It has been confirmed that contacting personal connections for participation in a dissertation study was not a violation of the LinkedIn User Agreement. Titles and email addresses were entered into a spreadsheet. In order to ensure the required sample size of 110 was obtained, 250 individuals were contacted initially. Enough participants were not achieved therefore additional individuals were contacted until the minimum number of responses, 110, was received.

Instrumentation

This study had two key variables which were measured: narcissism, and bullying; bullying was assessed both as the leader's observed participation in bullying and observed bullying within the organization. Information was collected by creating an online survey using Surveymonkey.com; all questions contained in each instrument, along with some additional demographic information, was included in the survey.

Due to the topic of this study, it was designed specifically to use observer-rated assessments rather than self-report assessments for both narcissism and observed bullying within the organization. This is because the primary subject of this research project is the top leader of an organization and it has been argued this population is often reluctant to participate in external studies (Cycyota & Harrison, 2006). Results from a metaanalysis conducted by Cycyota and Harrison (2006) revealed a median response rate of only 32% from upper echelon leaders which raises concerns there may be significant differences between those who respond and those who do not; possibly resulting in response bias. Adding to this problem, it has also been discovered that traditional techniques used to

increase response rates (such as incentives, personalization, advance notice, and follow up) are not effective when the top leader is the target participant (Cycyota & Harrison, 2002). Furthermore, there is support that observer-ratings are acceptable when assessing both narcissism and bullying (Hogan & Hogan, 2001)

Narcissism. While self-assessments are the most common type of tool used when measuring narcissism, there is evidence that individuals who over or under rate themselves on one personality trait will do so consistently (Nilesen & Campbell, 1993); because narcissists are known to have an over-inflated view of themselves, it could be argued their self-view may not be as accurate as an observer perspective (John & Robins, 1994). It has also been suggested observed behavior is more relevant then self-perceived behavior when applied to a work setting (Hogan, 1991). This is supported by a quantitative study which compared self-report and observer-rated assessments of the Big-Five personality factors; Mount, Barrick, and Strauss (1994) discovered observer-rated assessments of manager personality were not only equal to self-ratings but also revealed some differences which were more accurate predictors of manager performance. More recently, researchers used observer ratings of narcissism as the basis for identifying leader emergence; the authors argued those who work intimately with the leader are more apt to identify narcissistic behaviors which may be masked to others (Paunonen et al., 2006). Similarly, Hochwarter and Thompson (2012) developed an assessment tool to measure perceived supervisor narcissism for their study of the interactions between enactment behavior and supervisor narcissism on four different work outcomes.

Narcissism was measured using a modified version of the Narcissism Measure which is an observer-rated measure of perceived narcissism developed by Resick, Whitman, Weingarden, and Hiller (2009); emanating from the Gough Adjective Checklist. The tool was used in their study of the relationship between CEO personality, leadership style, and strategic outcomes. Permission to use this assessment was received by the lead author on April 20, 2013. In developing this tool the authors selected a number of adjectives previously associated with the construct narcissism from other published measures; their focus was on the grandiose or overt side of narcissism (Resick et al., 2009). To ensure construct and convergent validity, the authors used a staff of industrial psychology professionals (two with PhD degrees) to validate selected adjectives and compare scores with two other known measures of narcissism: the Hypersensitivity Narcissism Scale and the Narcissistic Personality Inventory; evidence supported both construct and convergent validity and internal reliability of $\alpha = .90$ was also confirmed (Resick et al., 2009). The tool consisted of eight adjectives: arrogant, assertive, boastful, conceited, egotistical, self-centered, show-off, and temperamental; participants were asked to rate the degree to which each term described his or her CEO's behavior using a 7-point scale: (1) *definitely not applicable*, (2) *not applicable*, (3) *somewhat not applicable*, (4) *not distinctive on this trait*, (5) *somewhat applicable*, (6) *applicable* and (7) *definitely applicable* (Resick et al., 2009). In this study, the scale was reduced to a 5-point scale eliminating the selection of *not applicable* and *applicable* resulting in the following selections: (1) *definitely not applicable*, (2) *somewhat not*

applicable, (3) *not distinctive on this trait*, (4) *somewhat applicable*, and (5) *definitely applicable*.

Bullying. The majority of studies conducted on workplace bullying use data gathered directly from the target to measure bullying; but this often includes information regarding witnessing bullying as well (Rayner & Keashly, 2005). It has been suggested measuring witnesses' observations of bullying is the most objective way to establish prevalence (Agervold, 2007). There are generally two approaches used when assessing bullying: a subjective measurement (self-labeling) which focuses on a person's perceived victimization from workplace bullying and is measured by providing participants a definition of bullying and asking if they perceive themselves to be a victim; or an objective measurement (behavioral experience) which focuses on perceived exposure to various bullying behaviors and is measured by providing participants a list of different bullying behaviors and asking them to rate the frequency to which they have been exposed to those behaviors (Notelaers, Einarsen, De Witte, & Vermunt, 2006). Also referred to as an operational classification method, the objective measurement is believed to be more reliable than the subjective measurement because the researcher makes the determination of the presence of bullying rather than the participant (Einarsen, 2000). This study used behavioral experience assessment to measure bullying. This approach has become a widely accepted method to measuring workplace bullying and has been used in a number of bullying studies including: Baillien et al. (2001), Caponecchia et al. (2012), Gholamzadeh and Khazaneh (2012), Hoel et al. (2010), Mathisen et al. (2011), and Salin (2001), among many others.

The leader's observed participation in bullying and observed bullying within the organization was measured using a modified version of the Bullying Behaviors Scale developed by Brotheridge and Lee (2006a). This tool was used in two studies conducted by the authors; the first looked at the relationship between perceived work environment and workplace bullying (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006b) and the second looked at types of bullying and coping strategies (Lee & Brotheridge, 2006). While permission to use this tool is not required, permission to use it in a modified format was received from Dr. Lee on April 29, 2013. This assessment contains an inventory of bullying behaviors which the participants record the frequency to which they have observed the behaviors occurring within a six month period using a 5-point scale: (1) *not at all,* (2) *once or twice,* (3) *now and then,* (4) *about once a week,* and (5) *many times* (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006a). The inventory was derived from several existing scales: Keashley et al. (1994), Quine (1999), and Rayner (1997); it was selected to ensure all aspects of bullying behaviors were captured including indirect personal attacks such as isolation, direct personal attacks such as threats, and work-related attacks such as work overload, withholding information, and inaccurate evaluations (Bartlett & Bartlett, 2001).

The method developed by Leymann (1990) was used to determine if exposure to bullying behaviors met the criteria of bullying; reports of exposure to a bullying act or behavior occurring *about once a week* or *many times a week* were coded as "1_act" and all other frequencies were coded as "0_no act;" when the sum of exposure is greater than 0, bullying is present, when the sum of exposure is equal to 0, bullying is not present

(Leyman, as cited in Notelaers et al., 2006). This approach was used for both the leader's observed participation in bullying and observed bullying within the organization.

Additional demographic information regarding the organization was also collected including: company size (number of employees categorized as *less than 100*, *100 to 250, 250 to 500, 500 to 1000*, and *1,000 or more*), company type (categorized as *private, public, nonprofit*), and industry (categorized as *manufacturing, chemical production, hospitality, health care, government, retail, food service, financial service, engineering services, other*).

Data Analysis

This quantitative study looked at the relationship between three predictor variables: (a) top leader narcissistic behaviors, (b) leader tenure, the (c) presence of antibullying policies, and two criterion variables: (a) observed leader bullying behavior and (b) observed bullying within the workplace. Additional analysis was conducted to explore any relationships between four demographic factors: company size, company revenue, industry, sector, and the two criterion variables: observed leaders bullying behavior and observed bullying within the workplace. Because the criterion variables both consisted of only two values (bully or non-bully), a logistic regression analysis was conducted separately on each dependent variable. Data was analyzed using the statistical program, Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Information received from the on-line survey was imported into SPSS. First, logistic regression was used to determine if there was a relationship between any of the three independent variables and the dependent variable, observed leaders bullying behavior. Pearson correlations were

used to determine the direction of any relationship. Next, a logistic regression was used to determine if there was a relationship between any of the three independent variables and the dependent variable, observed bullying within the workplace. Again, Pearson correlations was used to determine the direction of any relationship. This approach was appropriate because logistic regression was used when studying the relationship between multiple predictor variables and a dichotomous criterion variable (George & Mallery, 2010); additionally, the Pearson correlation was needed in order to determine if the predictor variables have positive or negative influences on the criterion variable (George & Mallery, 2010).

Threats to Validity

This study was focused on determining if there was a statistically significant correlation between three predictor variables and two criterion variables. The intent was not to identify or hypothesize the cause of any significant relationship, it was simply to establish if a relationship existed; therefore, there were no known threats to internal validity in this study. One possible threat to external validity was the actual study, participants may not be truly representative of the population. This issue should be minimized by randomly selecting participants from a cluster of the population rather than a using a convenience sample.

Ethical Concerns

Participants for this study were solicited through professional social media groups and direct email; they all volunteered to participate. There was no treatment methods or interventions used therefore institutional permissions were not required and there were no

ethical concerns regarding recruitment or data collection. The greatest ethical concern for

this study was protecting participants' privacy and confidentiality. Participants accessed

the survey through a link posted in several social media groups or in a direct email.

Because the survey was accessed through a link, the author had no way of knowing the

identity of participants. To protect participants from employers' discovering their

identity, participants were highly urged to refrain from using work-related computers or

other electronic devices when accessing the survey. They were reminded of the sensitive

subject matter associated with the study along with the risk associated with employers

discovering their participation. Participants were not allowed access to the survey

questions unless they provided informed consent by reading the informed consent

statement and clicking on "agree." The statement included an overview of the study, a list

of risks and benefits associated with participation, information regarding confidentiality,

agreement participation is on a voluntary basis and they can withdraw at any point for

any reason without any repercussions or penalties. Additionally, participants were not

able to access survey questions if they did not meet the eligibility requirements: (a)

highest ranking human resources professional in the company, (b) report directly to the

top leader of the organization, (c) be 18 years of age or older, (d) been employed at their

company for six months or longer, (e) the company is headquartered in the United States,

and (f) did not report directly to the researcher conducting the study. All responses were

obtained anonymously and kept secure. Survey data was maintained in a password

protected database that only I can access; the database resides on a computer that is

password protected that only I can access. Additionally, all guidelines established by the

Walden University Internal Review Board (IRB) were strictly followed. IRB approval (#
01-29-14-0171596) was received on January 28, 2014.

Summary

As indicated throughout this paper, workplace bullying is a social problem which
is wide spread and negatively impacts employees and organizations. While researchers
have done a thorough job at providing information regarding the impact bullying has on
those involved, there has been limited research exploring the reason bullying is allowed
to persist within organizations. Establishing a relationship between the top leader's
behavior and workplace bullying, through the use of observer-rated assessments, can
result in further research which may broaden our knowledge on this complex topic. It will
also provide empirical evidence of the need for organizations to utilize assessments in the
selection process when hiring or promoting top leaders. By using HR representatives as
the participants, this study avoided the challenges associated with obtaining top leaders'
participation in a controversial survey yet still provided valuable insight from a key
member of the organization who had special knowledge regarding bullying. Analyzing
data through logistic regression and the Pearson correlation determined not only if there
were relationships between the independent and dependent variables, but also the
directions of any relationships. This information can later be used as a basis for
determining cause. The next chapter will present the final results of the study.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship exists between a leader's observed narcissistic behaviors and the prevalence of bullying within the workplace. The existing body of research associated with workplace bullying primarily focusses on the victim, the environment, and the bully (Bartlett & Bartlett, 2011; Bowling & Beer, 2006; Harvey et al., 2006). This study is different because it looks at the leader's role in creating a bullying environment. There are six research questions proposed in this study:

1. Is there a relationship between the leader's level of observed narcissistic behaviors and his or her observed participation in workplace bullying? It was hypothesized a positive relationship would exist.

2. Is there a relationship between the leader's level of observed narcissistic behaviors and observed workplace bullying within the organization? It was hypothesized a positive relationship would exist.

3. Is there a relationship between the leader's tenure and his or her observed participation in workplace bullying? It was hypothesized a positive relationship would exist.

4. Is there a relationship between the leader's tenure and observed workplace bullying within the organization? It was hypothesized a positive relationship would exist.

5. Is there a relationship between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and the leader's observed participation in workplace bullying? It was hypothesized a negative relationship would exist. And,

6. Is there a relationship between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and observed workplace bullying within the organization? It was hypothesized a negative relationship would exist.

The chapter will begin with a description of the methods used for data collection including recruitment processes and any discrepancies in the process described in Chapter 3. A summary of the participant pool will also be presented including descriptive demographic characteristics and the level to which the participant pool represented the total population. Next, statistical results will be presented which include a statistical analysis for each hypothesis with associated probability values and effect sizes. The chapter will end with a summary of the research question findings.

Data Collection

Data collection for this research took place over a 6-week period. On January 27, 2014, a summary of the dissertation topic along with a link to the survey was posted in three LinkedIn groups targeting high level human resources professionals: (a) VPs of HR; (b) VP of Human Resources, Director of Human Resources, and Chief People Officer Network; and (c) STL HR Executives. After 1week, only 12 participants responded so the same information was posted in two additional LinkedIn groups which targeted a broader HR audience: the SHRM Networking group and HR.com. After another week, only 23 participants had responded. I then emailed a number of personal contacts in the

field of HR and solicited their participation; the email included a summary of the dissertation topic and a link to the survey. I also asked each contact to forward the email to anyone they felt might meet the participation requirements. Additionally, I downloaded my personal connections from LinkedIn and selected anyone with a title indicating he or she may be the top HR professional at his or her company; these contacts were emailed a summary of the research along with a link to the survey. Approximately 500 emails were sent each day until the required number of participants was achieved; over 7,000 emails were sent (including personal and LinkedIn contacts). I also reposted the dissertation summary and survey link in each of the five LinkedIn groups on February 10, 2014 and again on February 17, 2014. The required number of participants was 110; this number was achieved and slightly exceeded on March 10, 2014. The final number of participants that entered the survey was 113. The only deviation from the process stated in Chapter 3 was that I solicited personal contacts (outside of LinkedIn connections) and also asked these contacts to forward the survey email to anyone they felt might be valid participants; these steps were not included in the original collection process.

Due to the structure of the survey, it is almost impossible to determine the overall response rate. It is not known how many LinkedIn group members actually viewed the post and decided not to participate either because they did not meet the criteria or were simply not interested. It is only known how many members there were in each group: 7,057 in VPs of HR; 27,882 in VP of Human Resources, Director of Human Resources, and Chief People Officer Network; 1,126 in STL HR Executives, 73,998 in the SHRM Networking group, and 135,335 in HR.com for a total of 245,398 group members

(LinkedIn.com). The low response rate of only 23 after 2 weeks was disappointing and a bit surprising due to the number of members in each group. Again, it is not possible to determine how many people actually saw the post; some participants may have their account set up so an email is sent to them when a new post is made to a group they are a member of, making it more likely they will see the post, while other members may only view posts if they happen to log into LinkedIn and go into the specific group. It cannot be assumed that every member in each group saw the survey. It is also likely that individuals are members of more than one group. Additionally, the two groups with the greatest number of members, the SHRM Networking group and HR.com, are more likely to include individuals that were not top level HR executives and therefore did not meet the study eligibility requirements. Also, based on LinkedIn's overall demographics, only 54% of LinkedIn members are in the United States (LinkedIn, 2012), indicating a high number of LinkedIn group participants are likely to be located in another country and therefore ineligible to participate in this study.

Just as it was not possible to determine how many responses were a result of the LinkedIn group posts, it was also not possible to know how many responses resulted from the direct emails. The fact over 7,000 emails were sent out and only an estimated 90 people responded (based on a total of 113 participants with a minimum of 23 derived from LinkedIn groups), the response rate comes out to less than 1%. There are a number of possible explanations for the low response rate. First, because the survey was sent to recipients' work emails and in many cases the recipient may not know the author (often LinkedIn connections do not actually know each other they simply connect because they

are in a common discipline), many people may have either deleted the email right away or it may have been caught up in their spam filter. Second, as in the case of the LinkedIn groups, because the study eligibility requirements were very specific, some of the recipients may not have met the criteria. Finally, some may have not been interested in participating in the study due to the nature of the study; specifically, looking at top leader behaviors or bullying within the workplace.

Missing Data

Of the 113 participants, five failed to give consent and were therefore excluded. Additionally, after being asked six questions confirming the participant met the eligibility requirements, only 84 valid participants remained; 17 were not the highest ranking HR professional, 13 did not report directly to the top leader of the organization, and four were not headquartered in the United States.

The problem of missing data is an issue sometimes overlooked by behavioral researchers (Sterner, 2011) and was a concern because it can impact both internal and external validity (Acock, 2005). This issue was addressed in the design of the study. Once a participant provided informed consent and confirmed he or she met the eligibility requirements, every question had to be answered in order to complete the survey. If a questions was skipped, the participant was not allowed to continue with the survey until the question was answered. Unfortunately, despite building this feature into the survey, several participants were able to complete the survey while skipping some questions; this resulted in some missing data. In cases where data was missing, pairwise deletion was used which uses all available data versus listwise deletion which excludes all data from

the participant missing data (Acock, 2005). When dealing with small samples, as in this study, pairwise deletion is the preferred method because it maximizes valid data (Sterner, 2011).

Demographics

Valid participants came from a wide range of organizations both in terms of industry and size. Table 1 displays frequency data for sector with the greatest percentage coming from private firms (53.6%) and the lowest percentage coming from the government sector (0%).

Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages for Sector (N=84)

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
Public	26	30.9	30.9
Private	45	53.6	84.5
NonProfit	13	15.5	100.0
Government	0	0	0

Table 2 displays frequency data for various industries with manufacturing being the most common (44%) followed by healthcare (11%); the remaining 17 industries were less represented ranging from 4.7% to 1.2%.

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages for Industry (N=84)

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
Manufacturing	37	44.0	44.0
Healthcare	11	13.0	57.0
Software & networking	4	4.7	61.7
Chemicals	4	4.7	66.4
Education	3	3.6	70.0
Energy & utilities	3	3.6	73.6
Retail	3	3.6	77.2
Wholesale	3	3.6	80.8
Transportation	3	3.6	84.4
Business services	2	2.4	86.8
Hospitality & leisure	2	2.4	89.2
Construction	2	2.4	91.6
Media	1	1.2	92.8
Operation research	1	1.2	94.0
Human services	1	1.2	95.2
Electronics	1	1.2	96.4
Engineering	1	1.2	97.6
Charity	1	1.2	98.8
Social services	1	1.2	100.0

Medium sized organizations were best represented both in terms of number of employees and annual revenue, as shown in Tables 3 and 4. Just under half of participants worked for companies with 500 to 2,499 employees. Annual revenue ranged from 27% between $201 and $500 million, to 6% between $5 and $10 million, and over $1 billion.

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages for Number of Employees (N=84)

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
Under 500	30	35.7	35.7
500 – 2,499	38	45.2	81.0
2,500 – 4,999	5	6.0	86.9
5,000 or more	11	13.1	100.0

Table 4

Frequencies and Percentages for Annual Revenue (N=84)

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
Under $5 million	9	10.7	10.7
$5 to $10 million	5	6.0	16.7
$11 to $50 million	13	15.5	32.1
$51 to $200 million	19	22.6	54.8
$201 to $500 million	23	27.4	82.1
$501 million to $1 billion	10	11.9	94
Over $1 billion	5	6.0	100.0

The vast range of participants is an indication the total population was well represented. Considering the total population consisted of any business headquartered within the United States, it would be expected to have a mix of business sectors; the only sector not represented in this study was government. Company size was also well represented with total number of employees ranging from under 500 to 5,000 or more and annual revenue ranging from under $5 million to over $1 billion. Finally, participants came from 20 different industries; missing were participants from aerospace,

biotechnology, financial services, insurance, internet business, military, pharmaceuticals, and telecommunication.

Data Analysis

Results from the on-line survey were exported to the analytical software package Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS).   Frequencies and percentages on demographics were calculated then three new variables were created to determine if bullying was present under three conditions: leader to participant, leader to others, and others to others. Responses to the Bullying Behaviors Scale were converted as follows: incidents occurring *about once a week* or *many times a week* were coded as "1_act" and all other frequencies were coded as "0_no act;" when totaled, scores greater than 0 were coded as bullying being present and scores equal to 0 were coded as bullying not present. These new variables became the dependent variables of the study.

Statistical Assumptions

Binary logistic regression was the method used to analyze data. This approach does not assume predictor variables are normally distributed with equal covariance; it also makes no assumptions regarding linearity between the independent and dependent variables (Peng, Lee, & Ingersoll, 2002). When using binary logistic regression it is assumed the dependent variable will be binary (Statistic Solutions, n.d.). In this study, each of the dependent variables were binary and coded as "0_no act of bullying" and "1 = act of bullying."   Also, logistic regression assumes the probability of the event occurring is Y=1; therefore, the predicted event should be coded as 1 (Statistic Solutions, n.d.). In this study, the intent was to predict the act of bullying so the bullying group was coded as

1. Finally, it is assumed observations are independent and not based on dependent sample designs (Nimon, 2011).

Statistical Analysis Findings

Binary logistic regression analysis was conducted for each predictor variable and three dependent variables. The dependent variables were all derived from the same instrument but worded differently based on the construct being assessed. The first dependent variable (DV) was the leader's bullying behavior toward the participant, the second DV was the leader's bullying behavior toward others in the organization (excluding the participant), and the third DV was others bullying behavior towards each other (excluding the leader).

The instrument used to measure the prevalence of bullying was a modified version of the Bullying Behaviors Scale which is an observer rated scale of 43 known bullying behaviors (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006a). Participants were first asked to rate how often their boss exhibited each bullying behavior toward the participant (excluding others); they were then asked to rate how often their boss exhibited the same behaviors towards others in the organization (excluding the participant); finally, they were asked to rate how often others within the organization exhibit the same bullying behaviors towards each other (excluding the leader). Responses of *not at all, once or twice,* and *now and then* were coded as "0_no act;" responses of *about once a week* and *many times a week* were coded as "1_act." The sum of responses was then calculated. When the sum was greater than 0, the act of bullying occurred; when the sum was equal to 0, the act of

bullying did not occur. This approach was used to create each binary DV: "0_no act of bullying" and "1_act of bullying."

Narcissism. The first two research questions pertained to the predictability of the leader's level of observed narcissistic behaviors and the presence of bullying within the workplace. Narcissism was measured using a modified version of the Narcissism Measure which is an observer-rated measure of perceived narcissism (Resick et al., 2009). Participants were asked to rate how often they witness their leader exhibit eight narcissistic behaviors, being: arrogant, assertive, boastful, conceited, egotistical, self-centered, show-off, and temperamental (Resick et al., 2009). A 5-point Likert scale was used to measure how often the leader exhibited these narcissistic traits: (1) *not applicable*, (2) *somewhat not applicable*, (3) *not distinctive on this trait*, (4) *somewhat applicable*, (5) *applicable*. To get an overall variable measuring the presence of narcissistic behaviors, the sum of the eight responses was calculated and those with a total of 0 to 31 were coded as "0_narcissism not present" and those with a total of 32 to 40 were coded as "1_narcissim present." This new dichotomous variable was used as the independent variable.

Research Question 1. The first research question asked if there was a relationship between the leader's observed narcissistic behaviors and his or her observed participation in workplace bullying. The null hypotheses stated there was no statistically significant relationship between the leader's observed narcissistic behaviors and his or her personal engagement in workplace bullying behaviors while the alternate hypotheses stated there was a statistically significant positive relationship between the leader's

observed narcissistic behaviors and his or her personal engagement in workplace bullying behaviors.

To test this hypothesis, the leader's personal participation in bullying was looked at in two ways: (a) the leader's bullying toward the participant, and (b) the leader's bullying toward others. First, binary logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict the probability that the leader would exhibit bullying behaviors toward the participant. The model chi-square was statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 80) = 38.47$, $p < .001$; indicating a relationship exists between the independent variable, observed narcissistic behaviors, and the dependent variable, the leader's bullying behaviors toward the participant. The sensitivity of predication (the percentage of occurrences correctly predicted, that is, the leader would bully the participant) was 74.1% and the specificity of prediction (the percentage of nonoccurrences correctly predicted, that is, the leader would not bully the participant) was 92.5% (Wuensch, 2014). The overall accuracy for the model was 86.3%.

Table 5 shows the logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, odds ratio and confidence intervals for the predictor variable observed narcissistic behaviors. The probability of the Wald statistic is statistically significant, $p < .001$, indicating leaders who exhibit observed narcissistic behaviors are more likely to exhibit bullying behaviors towards the participant.

Table 5

Logistic Regression: Observed Narcissistic Behaviors and Leader's Bullying Toward

Participant

Variable	B	S.E	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)	95% Confidence interval	
							Lower	Upper
Narcissistic behaviors	3.55	.68	27.28	1	.000	35	4.00	42.11
Constant	-1.95	.40	23.19	1	.000	.14		

To further support the findings above, results from a cross-tabulation analysis are

presented in Table 6 and show 83.3% of the times narcissistic behaviors were reported in

the top leader, the leader also exhibited bullying behaviors towards the participant.

Additionally, the likelihood ratio chi-square for this analysis was statistically significant

and consistent with the chi-square derived in the logistic analysis; both were $\chi^2(1, N =$

$80) = 38.47, p < .001$.

Table 6

Cross-tabulation: Observed Narcissistic Behaviors and Leader's Bullying Toward

Participant

Observed narcissistic behaviors		Leader to participant bullying		Total
		Not present	Present	
Not present	Count	49	7	56
	Percentage	87.5%	12.5%	100%
Present	Count	4	20	24
	Percentage	16.7%	83.3%	100%
Total	Count	53	27	80
	Percentage	66.3%	33.8%	100%

Finally, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to further assess the size and direction of the relationship between the predictor and dependent variables. A positive correlation was found between the two variables, $r =$ .686, $N = 80$, $p < .001$; resulting in the null hypothesis being rejected. Results showed a positive correlation between the leader's observed narcissistic behaviors and the leader exhibiting bullying behaviors toward the participant.

Next, binary logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict the probability that the leader would exhibit bullying behaviors toward others. The model chi-square was statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 80) = 39.55$, $p < .001$; indicating a relationship exists between the independent variable, observed narcissistic behaviors, and the dependent variable, the leader's bullying behaviors towards others. The sensitivity of predication was 72.4% and the specificity of prediction was 93.9%. The overall accuracy for the model was 85.9%.

Table 7 shows the logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, odds ratio and confidence intervals for the predictor variable observed narcissistic behaviors. The probability of the Wald statistic is statistically significant, $p < .001$, indicating leaders who exhibit observed narcissistic behaviors are more likely to exhibit bullying behaviors towards others.

Table 7

Logistic Regression: Observed Narcissistic Behaviors and Leader's Bullying Toward

Others

Variable	B	S.E	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)	95% Confidence interval	
							Lower	Upper
Narcissistic behaviors	3.69	.73	25.87	1	.000	40.25	9.69	167.14
Constant	-1.74	.38	20.85	1	.000	.12		

To further support the findings above, results from a cross-tabulation analysis are presented in Table 8 and show 88.5% of the times narcissistic behaviors were reported in the top leader, the leader also exhibited bullying behaviors towards others. Additionally, the likelihood ratio chi-square for this analysis was statistically significant and consistent with the chi-square derived in the logistic analysis; both were $\chi^2(1, N = 80) = 39.55$, $p < .001$.

Table 8

Cross-tabulation: Observed Narcissistic Behaviors and Leader's Bullying Toward Others

Participant

Observed narcissistic behaviors		Leader to others bullying		Total
		Not present	Present	
Not present	Count	46	8	54
	Percentage	85.2%	14.8%	100%
Present	Count	3	23	26
	Percentage	11.5%	88.5%	100%
Total	Count	49	31	80
	Percentage	61.2%	38.8%	100%

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to further assess the size and direction of the relationship between the predictor and dependent variables. A positive correlation was found between the two variables, $r = .694$, $N = 80$, $p < .001$; resulting in the null hypothesis being rejected. Results showed a positive correlation between the leader's observed narcissistic behaviors and the leader exhibiting bullying behaviors towards others in the organization.

Research Question 2. The second research question asked if there was a relationship between the leader's observed narcissistic behaviors and others participation in workplace bullying. The null hypotheses stated there was no statistically significant relationship between the leader's observed narcissistic behaviors and others exhibiting workplace bullying behaviors while the alternate hypotheses stated there was a statistically significant positive relationship between the leader's observed narcissistic behaviors and others' exhibiting bullying behaviors in the workplace. Binary logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict the probability that others within the organization would exhibit bullying behaviors toward each other. The model chi-square was statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 80) = 22.54$, $p < .001$; indicating a relationship exists between the independent variable, observed narcissistic behaviors, and the dependent variable, others bullying behaviors towards each other. The sensitivity of predication was 61.3% and the specificity of prediction was 89.1%. The overall accuracy for the model was 77.9%.

Table 9 shows the logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, odds ratio and confidence intervals for the predictor variable observed narcissistic behaviors. The

probability of the Wald statistic is statistically significant, $p < .001$, indicating when leaders exhibit observed narcissistic behaviors others are more likely to exhibit bullying behaviors towards each other.

Table 9

Logistic Regression: Observed Narcissistic Behaviors and Others Bullying Toward Each Other

Variable	B	S.E	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)	95% Confidence interval	
							Lower	Upper
Narcissistic behaviors	2.56	.60	18.24	1	.000	12.98	4.00	42.12
Constant	-1.22	.32	14.01	1	.000	.29		

To further support the findings above, results from a cross-tabulation analysis are presented in Table 10 and show 81.5% of the times narcissistic behaviors were reported in the top leader, others also exhibited bullying behaviors towards each other. Additionally, the likelihood ratio chi-square for this analysis was statistically significant and consistent with the chi-square derived in the logistic analysis; $\chi^2(1, N = 80) = 22.54$, $p < .001$.

Table 10

Cross-tabulation: Observed Narcissistic Behaviors and Others Bullying Toward Each

Other

| Observed narcissistic behaviors | | Others to others bullying | | Total |
		Not present	Present	
Not present	Count	41	12	53
	Percentage	77.4%	22.6%	100%
Present	Count	5	22	27
	Percentage	18.5%	81.5%	100%
Total	Count	46	34	80
	Percentage	57.5%	42.5%	100%

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to further assess the size and direction of the relationship between the predictor and dependent variables. A positive correlation was found between the two variables, $r = .534$, $N = 80$, $p < .001$; resulting in the null hypothesis being rejected. Results showed a positive correlation between the leader's observed narcissistic behaviors and others exhibiting bullying behaviors towards others.

An additional Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to determine the size and relationship of each observed narcissistic characteristic and the three dependent variables: the leader's bullying behaviors towards the participant, the leader's bullying behaviors towards others, and other's bullying behaviors towards others in the organization. Table 11 shows the results; all eight characteristics were positively correlated and statistically significant, $p < .001$.

Table 11

Pearson Correlation: Observed Narcissistic Behaviors and Bullying

Observed narcissistic behavior		Leader to participant bullying	Leader to others bullying	Others to others bullying
Arrogant	Pearson Correlation	.681	.707	.494
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
Assertive	Pearson Correlation	.322	.389	.315
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
Boastful	Pearson Correlation	.580	.677	.462
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
Conceited	Pearson Correlation	.724	.726	.546
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
Egotistical	Pearson Correlation	.655	.677	.470
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
Self-centered	Pearson Correlation	.665	.706	.526
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
Show-off	Pearson Correlation	.635	.719	.448
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
Temperamental	Pearson Correlation	.578	.675	.479
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000

Tenure. The next two research questions pertained to the predictability of the leader's tenure and the presence of bullying within the workplace. Tenure was categorized as: *1 year or less*, *2 to 5 years*, *6 to 10 years*, *11 to 15 years*, *16 to 20 years*, *21 years or more*. Participants were asked to identify how long their current leader has been employed at the company.

Research Question 3. The third research question asked if there was a relationship the leader's tenure and his or her observed participation in workplace bullying. The null hypotheses stated there was no statistically significant relationship between the leader's tenure and his or her personal engagement in workplace bullying

behaviors while the alternate hypotheses stated there was a statistically significant positive relationship between the leader's tenure and his or her personal engagement in workplace bullying behaviors.

To test this hypothesis, the leader's personal participation in bullying was looked at in two ways: (a) the leader's bullying toward the participant, and (b) the leader's bullying toward others. First, binary logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict the probability that the leader would exhibit bullying behaviors toward the participant. The model chi-square was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 80) = 1.5, p = .221$; indicating a relationship does not exist between the independent variable, leader tenure, and the dependent variable, the leader's bullying behaviors toward the participant. The sensitivity of predication was 0.0% and the specificity of prediction was 100% (Wuensch, 2014). The overall accuracy for the model was 66.3%.

Table 12 shows the logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, odds ratio and confidence intervals for the predictor variable leader tenure. The probability of the Wald statistic is not statistically significant, $p = .226$, indicating leader tenure is not a predictor of the leader exhibiting bullying behaviors towards the participant. The null hypotheses was therefore accepted.

Table 12

Logistic Regression: Tenure and Leader's Bullying Toward Participant

Variable	B	S.E	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)	95% Confidence interval	
							Lower	Upper
Tenure	-.225	.18	1.46	1	.226	.79	.55	1.15
Constant	.243	.78	23.19	1	.756	1.27		

Next, binary logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict the probability that the leader would exhibit bullying behaviors toward others. Again, the model chi-square was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 80) = 1.96$, $p = .161$; indicating a relationship does not exist between the independent variable, the leader's tenure, and the dependent variable, the leader's bullying behaviors towards others. The sensitivity of predication was 6.9% and the specificity of prediction was 91.8%. The overall accuracy for the model was 60.3%.

Table 13 shows the logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, odds ratio and confidence intervals for the predictor variable leader tenure. The probability of the Wald statistic is not statistically significant, $p = .168$, indicating leader tenure is not a predictor of the leader exhibiting bullying behaviors towards others. The null hypotheses was therefore accepted.

Table 13

Logistic Regression: Tenure and Leader's Bullying Toward Others

Variable	B	S.E	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)	95% Confidence interval	
							Lower	Upper
Tenure	-.26	.16	1.92	1	.168	.769	.53	1.12
Constant	.56	.81	.48	1	.489	1.75		

Research Question 4. The fourth research question asked if there was a
relationship between the leader's tenure and others participation in workplace bullying.
The null hypotheses stated there was no statistically significant relationship between the
leader's tenure and others' exhibiting workplace bullying behaviors while the alternate
hypotheses stated there was a statistically significant negative relationship between the
leader's tenure and others' exhibiting bullying behaviors in the workplace. Binary
logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict the probability that others within the
organization would exhibit bullying behaviors toward each other. The model chi-square
was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 80) = 1.39, p = .238$; indicating a relationship
does not exist between the independent variable, leader tenure, and the dependent
variable, others bullying behaviors towards each other. The sensitivity of predication was
6.5% and the specificity of prediction was 91.3%. The overall accuracy for the model
was 57.1%.

Table 14 shows the logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, odds ratio and
confidence intervals for the predictor variable observed narcissistic behaviors. The
probability of the Wald statistic is not statistically significant, $p = .242$, indicating leader
tenure is not a predictor of others exhibiting bullying behaviors towards others. The null
hypotheses was therefore accepted.

Table 14

Logistic Regression: Tenure and Others' Bullying Toward Others

Variable	B	S.E	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)	95% Confidence interval	
							Lower	Upper
Tenure	-.217	.18	1.37	1	.242	.81	.56	1.16
Constant	.513	.80	.41	1	.524	1.67		

Antibullying Organizational Policies. The last two research questions pertained to the predictability of the presence of antibullying organizational policies and the presence of bullying within the workplace. Organizational polices were categorized as either "present" or "not present." Participants were asked to identify if antibullying organizational policies were present within their organization.

Research Question 5. The fifth research question asked if there was a relationship the presence of antibullying organizational policies and the leader's observed participation in workplace bullying. The null hypotheses stated there was no statistically significant relationship between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and the leader's personal engagement in workplace bullying behaviors while the alternate hypotheses stated there was a statistically significant negative relationship between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and the leader's personal engagement in workplace bullying behaviors.

To test this hypothesis, the leader's personal participation in bullying was looked at in two ways: (a) the leader's bullying toward the participant, and (b) the leader's bullying toward others. First, binary logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict the probability that the leader would exhibit bullying behaviors toward the participant.

The model chi-square was statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 80) = 8.35$, $p = .004$; indicating a relationship does exist between the independent variable, the presence of antibullying organizational policies, and the dependent variable, the leader's bullying behaviors toward the participant. The sensitivity of predication was 0.0% and the specificity of prediction was 100% (Wuensch, 2014). The overall accuracy for the model was 66.3%.

Table 15 shows the logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, odds ratio and confidence intervals for the predictor variable leader tenure. The probability of the Wald statistic is statistically significant, $p = .029$, indicating antibullying organizational policies is a predictor of the leader exhibiting bullying behaviors towards the participant. The null hypotheses was therefore rejected.

Table 15

Logistic Regression: Antibullying Organizational Policies and Leader's Bullying Toward Participant

Variable	B	S.E	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)	95% Confidence	interval
							Lower	Upper
Policies	2.33	1.06	4.79	1	.029	10.26	1.27	82.54
Constant	-5.04	2.08	5.86	1	.016	.006		

To further support the findings above, results from a cross-tabulation analysis are presented in Table 16 and show 93.8% of the time antibullying organizational policies were present, the top leader did not exhibit bullying behaviors towards the participant. , others also exhibited bullying behaviors towards each other. Additionally, the likelihood

ratio chi-square for this analysis was statistically significant and consistent with the chi-square derived in the logistic analysis; $\chi^2(1, N = 80) = 8.35, p = .004$.

Table 16

Cross-tabulation: Antibullying Organizational Policies and Leader's Bullying Toward Participant

Anti-organizational policies		Leader to participant bullying		Total
		Not present	Present	
Not present	Count	38	26	64
	Percentage	59.4%	40.6%	100%
Present	Count	15	1	16
	Percentage	93.8%	6.3%	100%
Total	Count	53	27	80
	Percentage	66.3%	33.8%	100%

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to further assess the size and direction of the relationship between the predictor and dependent variable. A negative correlation was found between the two variables, $r = -.291, N = 80, p = .009$; resulting in the null hypothesis being rejected. Results show a negative correlation between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and the leader exhibiting bullying behaviors towards the participant.

Next, binary logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict the probability that the leader would exhibit bullying behaviors toward others. The model chi-square was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 80) = .91, p = .339$; indicating a relationship does not exist between the independent variable, the presence of antibullying organizational

policies, and the dependent variable, the leader's bullying behaviors towards others. The sensitivity of predication was 0.0% and the specificity of prediction was 100%. The overall accuracy for the model was 62.8%.

Table 17 shows the logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, odds ratio and confidence intervals for the predictor variable leader tenure. The probability of the Wald statistic is not statistically significant, $p = .168$, indicating leader tenure is not a predictor of the leader exhibiting bullying behaviors towards others. The null hypotheses was therefore accepted.

Table 17

Logistic Regression: Antibullying Organizational Policies and Leaders' Bullying Toward Others

Variable	B	S.E	Wald	df	p	Exp(B)	95% Confidence interval	
							Lower	Upper
Policies	.59	.63	.86	1	.353	1.81	.52	6.31
Constant	-1.60	1.19	1.80	1	.180	.20		

Research Question 6. The sixth research question asked if there was a relationship between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and others participation in workplace bullying. The null hypotheses stated there was no statistically significant relationship between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and others' exhibiting workplace bullying behaviors while the alternate hypotheses stated there was a statistically significant negative relationship between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and others' exhibiting bullying behaviors in the workplace. Binary logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict the probability

that others within the organization would exhibit bullying behaviors toward each other.

The model chi-square was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 80) = .37, p = .539$;

indicating a relationship does not exist between the independent variable, the presence of

antibullying organizational policies, and the dependent variable, others bullying

behaviors towards each other. The sensitivity of predication was 0.0% and the specificity

of prediction was 100%. The overall accuracy for the model was 59.7%.

Table 18 shows the logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, odds ratio and

confidence intervals for the predictor variable observed narcissistic behaviors. The

probability of the Wald statistic is not statistically significant, $p = .543$, indicating the

presence of antibullying organizational policies is not a predictor of others exhibiting

bullying behaviors towards others. The null hypotheses was therefore accepted.

Table 18

Logistic Regression: Antibullying Organizational Policies and Others, Bullying Toward

Others

Variable	B	S.E	Wald	df	P	Exp(B)	95% Confidence interval	
							Lower	Upper
Policies	.36	.60	.36	1	.543	1.44	.44	4.73
Constant	-1.06	1.12	.88	1	.346	.34		

Demographic Correlations. Information was collected regarding company size,

both in terms of number of employees and total revenue, along with industry and sector.

While no specific research questions or hypotheses were addressed in this study related to

these demographic variables, logistic regression was conducted to determine if a

correlation exists between any of these predictor variables and the three dependent variables.

Revenue. Company size, in terms of annual revenue was determined to be a predictor of the leader's bullying behaviors towards the participant but not the other two variables. The model chi-square was statistically significant, $\chi^2(6, N = 80) = 13.24, p = .039$; indicating a relationship exists between company revenue and the leader's bullying behavior towards the participant. Company revenue was not a predictor of the leader's bullying behaviors towards others, $\chi^2(6, N = 80) = 8.95, p = .176$ or other's bullying behaviors towards others, $\chi^2(6, N = 80) = 11.28, p = .08$.

Number of employees. Company size, in terms of number of employees showed similar results; it was determined to be a predictor of the leader's bullying behaviors towards the participant but not the other two variables. The model chi-square was statistically significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 80) = 16.46, p = .001$; indicating a relationship exists between number of employees and the leader's bullying behavior towards the participant. Number of employees was not a predictor of the leader's bullying behaviors towards others, $\chi^2(3, N = 80) = 4.75, p = .191$ or other's bullying behaviors towards others $\chi^2(3, N = 80) = 3.44, p = .328$.

Industry. Industry was determined to be a predictor of the leader's bullying behaviors towards others but not the other two variables. The model chi-square was statistically significant, $\chi^2(13, N = 80) = 0.029$; indicating a relationship exists between industry and the leader's bullying behavior towards others. Industry was not a predictor

of the leader's bullying behaviors towards the participant $\chi^2(13, N = 80) = 15.86$, $p =$

.257 or other's bullying behaviors towards others, $\chi^2(13, N = 80) = 17.62$, $p = .173$.

Sector. Sector was not a predictor of any of the three dependent variables:

leader's bullying behaviors towards the participant $\chi^2(2, N = 80) = 0.55$, $p = .758$;

leader's bullying behaviors towards others, $\chi^2(2, N = 80) = 2.45$, $p = .293$; and other's

bullying behaviors towards others $\chi^2(2, N = 80) = 2.21$, $p = .331$.

Summary

The intent of this study was primarily to look at the relationship between top

leaders' observed narcissistic behaviors and the presence of bullying within the

workplace. The population selected was top HR representatives reporting directly to the

top leader of U.S. organization. HR leaders were selected because they would be

knowledgeable about the presence of bullying within the organization (Lewis & Rayner,

2003). All business sectors, industries, and company sizes were allowed in the study, the

only restriction was the company needed to be headquartered in the United States. The

diversity of companies represented included three different sectors, 19 industries, number

of employees ranging from under 500 to 5,000 or more, and annual revenue from under

$5 million to over $1 billion. Participants were secured by posting a summary and link to

the survey in several LinkedIn groups servicing the HR field in addition to the author

sending emails directly to personal contacts and LinkedIn contacts.

Binary logistic regression was used to determine if a relationship existed between

the predictor variables and the dependent variables; significance was obtained when the p

value was less than .05. When a relationship was discovered, a cross-tabulation analysis

was conducted to further support the findings and Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to determine the direction of the relationship.

Results for this study found a positive and statistically significant correlation between leaders' observed narcissistic behaviors and all three dependent variables: the leader's bullying behaviors towards the participant, the leader's bullying behaviors towards others, and others behaviors towards others; indicating there is a relationship between the top leader's behavior and the presence of bullying within the workplace. A correlation between tenure and the presence of bullying within the organization was not found. Partial support was found for a relationship between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and bullying within the organization; a correlation was found with the leader's bullying behaviors toward the participant, but not with the leader's bullying behaviors towards others or other's bullying behaviors towards each other. Additionally, company size (both in terms of revenue and number of employees) was found to be correlated with the leader's bullying behavior towards the participant; while industry was correlated with the leader's bullying behaviors toward others. Business sector was not a predictor of any of the three dependent variables.

The purpose of this chapter was to provide detailed information regarding the sampling procedure and data analysis, the next chapter will present interpretations of the findings. It will also evaluate limitations of the study, discuss implications for future research, and explain the impact this study can have on social change.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to further contribute to the existing body of knowledge regarding bullying within the workplace. It took a unique approach by looking at the relationship between the top leader's behaviors and the presence of bullying within the organization. The motivation behind this approach came from the fact that despite being aware of its existence, many employers fail to resolve bullying (Namie, 2007); instead, they allow it to continue and often condone it (Harvey et al., 2006). It was then posited that this willingness to accept bullying may be a result of the culture created by the top leader and the culture may be a result of the top leader's behavior.

The nature of the study was quantitative using modified versions of pre-existing assessments to measure the top leader's observed narcissistic behaviors along with the top leader's bullying behaviors towards the participant, the top leader's bullying behaviors toward others in the organization, and others' bullying behaviors towards others in the organization. Binary logistic regression was used to determine any relationships and Pearson product coefficient was used to determine the direction of any relationship.

The first two research questions addressed the relationship between the leader's observed narcissistic behaviors and the presence of bullying within the workplace, resulting in three null and alternate hypotheses. The alternate hypotheses will be the focus

of this section. H1a stated there would be a positive relationship between the leaders'
observed narcissistic behaviors and his or her bullying behaviors toward the participant;
this hypothesis was supported. H1b stated there would be a positive relationship between
the leaders' observed narcissistic behaviors and his or her bullying behaviors toward
others; this hypothesis was supported. H2 stated there would be a positive relationship
between the leaders' observed narcissistic behaviors and others' behaviors toward each
other; this hypothesis was also supported.

The second two research questions addressed the predictability of leader tenure
and the presence of bullying within the organization, resulting in three null and alternate
hypotheses. H3a stated there would be a positive relationship between the leader's tenure
and his or her bullying behaviors toward the participant; this hypothesis was not
supported. H3b stated there would be a positive relationship between the leader's tenure
and his or her bullying behaviors toward others; this hypothesis was not supported. H4
stated there would be a positive relationship between the leader's tenure and others'
bullying behaviors towards each other; this hypothesis was also not supported.

The last two research questions explored the relationship between the presence of
antibullying organizational policies and the presence of bullying within the organization
again, resulting in three null and alternate hypotheses. H5a stated there would be a
negative correlation between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and the
leader's bullying behaviors toward the participant; this hypothesis was supported. H5b
stated there would be a negative correlation between the presence of antibullying
organizational policies and the leader's bullying behaviors towards others; this hypothesis

was not supported. H6 stated there would be a negative correlation between the presence of antibullying organizational policies and others' bullying behaviors towards others; this hypothesis was also not supported.

Additionally, annual revenue was found to be positively correlated with the leader's bullying behavior towards the participant, but not the leader's bullying behavior towards others or others' bullying behaviors towards each other. Similarly, number of employees was found to be positively correlated with the leader's bullying behavior towards the participant, but not the leader's bullying behavior towards others or others' bullying behaviors towards each other. Also, a correlation was found between industry and the leader's bullying behaviors towards others, but not between the leader's bullying behaviors towards the participant, or others bullying behaviors towards each other. A relationship between business sector and the presence of bullying was not found. .

Interpretation of Findings

This study has contributed to what is known about workplace bullying and further confirmed previous research in the areas of organizational culture, destructive leadership, and narcissism as it pertains to bullying.

From an organizational culture perspective, it could be argued the findings from this study support the concept that the top leader's personality directly influences the culture of the organization. This study found a statistically significant positive correlation between the leader's observed behaviors and the presence of bullying within the organization. Similar studies have also shown a correlation between organizational culture and the top leader's behavior. A study conducted in 2006 by Tsui et al. looked at

the coupling of leadership behaviors (as described by employees) and organizational

culture values; there was a 72% couple rate between leadership and organizational culture

in the first sample and 60% in the second sample. A more recent study conducted by

Giberson et al. (2009) focused on the relationship between top leader personality traits

and organizational cultures. They found agreeableness and emotional stability had the

strongest relationship with organizational culture; specifically, they discovered leader's

scoring low in agreeableness or low in emotional stability created a culture of

competitiveness and performance (Giberson et al., 2009). This study looked at bullying

as an aspect of organizational culture and found a relationship between the presence of

bullying and the leader's observed narcissistic behaviors.

From a leadership perspective, this study supports previous findings that

destructive leadership has a negative influence on the organization. Destructive

leadership occurs when a leader acts in a manner that not only negatively impacts the

well-being of employees, but also negatively impacts the organization (Einarsen,

Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007). This study showed that leaders who exhibited narcissistic

behaviors on a regular basis were more likely to bully others within the organization

(destructive leadership) which also resulted in others bullying each other. As indicated

previously, workplace bullying negatively impacts both employees (Cleary et al., 2009)

and organizations (Tepper et al., 2006). In line with this is a qualitative study that looked

at the impact of negative leadership. Participants were asked to define negative leadership

and explain any consequences associated with it; a number of consequences were

revealed including demotivated employees, poor employee performance, high turnover, and high absenteeism (Schilling, 2009).

When looking at research focused on narcissism and bullying, findings from this study are in line with several previous studies; specifically when looking at the relationship between narcissism and bullying. This study revealed a positive relationship between the leader's observed narcissistic behaviors and the leader's bullying behaviors towards others. This is in line with a 2007 study conducted by Seigner et al.; when describing behaviors associated with bullies, participants listed behaviors also associated with narcissism. Additionally, a study conducted in Canada revealed a positive correlation between narcissism and bullying (Baughman et al., 2012).

Only two studies could be found that looked specifically at the relationship between the top leader and bullying within the workplace. The first was conducted by Thornton in 2004. She surveyed employees from a number of Australian universities and discovered when participants complained about bullying being present in the organization they also described the top leader as aggressive and a bully. The second study was conducted by Cemologlu in 2011; 500 teachers were asked to assess their school principal's leadership style along with their personal exposure to bullying in the workplace. Results revealed a negative correlation between transformational leadership style and bullying; as leaders were less transformational, bullying increased (Cemologu, 2011). Congruency exists between this study and the previous studies because it also shows a direct correlation between the top leader's behavior and the presence of bullying within the workplace.

Personality trait theory, specifically the trait of narcissism, provided the theoretical foundation for this study. This theory suggests people behave in predictable manners as a result of inherit personality traits (Miller & Campbell, 2008). Narcissism was selected because a relationship between this personality trait and bullying had been previously established (Baughman et al., 2012; Crick & Dodge, 1999; Seigner et al., 2007). Additionally, earlier research suggested top leaders often possess narcissistic traits (Kets de Vries, 2004; Lubit, 2002). While this study did not look at the prevalence of narcissistic behaviors among top leaders and therefore does not contribute to the hypothesis that narcissism is a trait commonly found in top leaders, it does provide further support for the connection between narcissistic traits (as exhibited through observable behaviors) and bullying. It also provides support for the theory that top leader behavior directly influences organizational outcomes, as proposed in Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser's toxic triangle of destructive leadership model (2007).

Limitations of the Study

As indicated in a previous chapter, there were a number of limitations to this study including assessment validity and reliability, observer-ratings versus self-ratings, participant pool, survey response rate, and relationship cause.

The first limitation was the two assessment tools used. The Bullying Behaviors Scale was used to assess the participant's perception of bullying behaviors within the workplace. It was used to measure the leader's bullying behaviors towards the participant, the leader's bullying behaviors towards others, and other's bullying behaviors towards each other. This tool consisted of a compilation of bullying behaviors derived

from several assessments with strong validity and reliability however, it had only been used in two studies, both conducted by the same authors (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006b). The assessment used to measure the leader's observed narcissistic behaviors, the Narcissism Measure, was one of the first tools of its type and therefore did not have the proven reliability and validity that other self-rated assessments had; however, a comparison between two popular narcissism scales revealed both construct and convergent validity along with a strong internal reliability (Resick et al., 2009).

The second limitation was the decision to use observer-rated assessments versus self-rated assessments. Self-rated assessments have been the most commonly used type of measures for both narcissism and bullying but due to the nature of this study, it was necessary to rely on observer-ratings. While this could lead to bias in interpreting behaviors, there is support indicating observer-ratings are suitable replacements for self-ratings when measuring both narcissism and bullying (Hogan & Hogan, 2001).

The third limitation was the participant pool selected. Because this study required collecting data on behaviors exhibited by top leaders of organizations, it was anticipated targeting the actual leader would result in poor response rates. This decision was based on previous research which revealed top leaders are reluctant to participate in studies of this type (Cycyota & Harrison, 2006). It was concluded the next best sampling would be HR professionals that reported directly to the top leader. It was assumed these individuals would have direct knowledge of both the leader's behavior and the prevalence of bullying within the workplace. The area of greatest concern was bias; because the participants were being asked to assess their direct boss's behavior, there was concern

participants would not be completely honest in their answers. Previous research has provided evidence that employees are capable of effectively rating their boss's behavior (McEvoy & Beatty, 1989).

The fourth limitation was the low response rate. It was concluded a sample size of 110 was required. The final number of people entering the survey was 113 but only 84 provided consent and met the eligibility requirements, resulting in a lower number of valid participants than desired. Additionally, the response rate was exceptionally low. Information about the survey was posted in five different LinkedIn HR groups with a combined membership of over 245,000. Additionally, over 7,000 emails were sent directly to individuals believed to be the top HR professional. While it is difficult to determine the actual response rate because it is not known how many individuals actually saw the link in LinkedIn or opened the email, it is believed the response rate is likely to be under 1%.

The fifth limitation was the response rate on the presence of antibullying organizational policies. Results from this study revealed 78% of participants reported their company did not have a published antibullying policy; leaving 21% with an antibullying policy in place. These results are higher than a study published by the Workplace Bullying Institute where only 61.9% of those surveyed reported their company as not having an antibullying policy, while 38% reported their company did have some type of antibullying policy (Namie, 2012a). A study conducted in Finland showed an even greater variance; only 34.1% of participants reported their company did not have an antibullying policy, 10.3% were not aware if a policy existed, and 55.6%

reported an antibullying policy was in place (Salin, 2008). Because this study showed a higher response rate for companies not having an antibullying policy in place than previous studies, this may be an indication the participant pool selected was not an accurate representation of the population.

The final limitation is determining cause. This study only set out to determine if a relationship exists between narcissistic behaviors of top leaders and the prevalence of bullying within the workplace and if so, what is the direction of that relationship. It did not try to determine the cause of any relationships.

Recommendations for Future Research

This is the first known study to look at the direct relationship between the top leader's behavior and the presence of bullying within the organization. The fact that support for several of the hypotheses was found is encouraging and provides a basis for further research in this field

Because the study was conducted using observer-rated assessments, an interesting extension to this study would be targeting organizations as participants so the top leader could assess his or her own level of narcissism and all employees could directly assess the level of bullying within the workplace. While observer-rated assessments of leader behavior and bullying are acceptable (Mount et al., 1994; Agervold, 2007), the majority of studies have used self-rated assessments so this would be more in line with previous studies. Additionally, by having the top leader assess his or her own level of narcissism rather than relying on a third party's observation of behaviors, the personality trait narcissism will be the actual construct being measured and may be more meaningful.

Also, by including all employees within the organization versus just one person (the HR professional), a more accurate measure of bullying will be obtained.

Researchers may also look at the relationship between leader personality and other organizational factors known to be related to workplace bullying such as workload (Agervold & Mikkelsen, 2004), job autonomy (O'Moore et al., 2003), task assignments (Einarsen & Raknes, 1997), or job demands (Baillien et al., 2011). While a number of studies have shown these factors are associated with bullying, the cause of why these conditions exist has not been established and therefore needs further exploration. A possible cause could be the personality or behaviors of the top leader.

Future research may also look at correlations between other personality traits within the top leader and the prevalence of bullying. This study only looked at the personality trait narcissism (through observed behaviors). It may be beneficial to use a tool such as the five factor model to assess leader personality since this is a popular and established tool used in leadership research (Johnson & Hill, 2009). This tool measures five personality dimensions (neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, conscientiousness) and each one is further divided into six facets (Costa & McCrae, 2000); creating a more dynamic and comprehensive evaluation of the leader's personality than was represented in this study.

Finally, additional research should be conducted on some of the elements which showed mixed results in this study. The presence of antibullying organizational policies was a predictor of the leader exhibiting bullying behaviors towards the participant, but not towards others within the organization, or others towards each other. This somewhat

conflicts with other studies which have shown a higher prevalence rate of bullying within

organizations void of antibullying organizational policies (Einarsen, 1999; Salin, 2003).

Also, the relationship between company size (looked at separately as number of

employees and total annual revenue) and the prevalence of bullying showed mixed

results. Company size was a predictor of the leader exhibiting bullying behaviors

towards the participant but was not a predictor of the leader exhibiting bullying behaviors

towards others, or others bullying each other. This relationships should be explored

further. Similarly, industry was a predictor of the leader's bullying behaviors towards

others but was not a predictor of the leader's bullying behaviors towards the participant

or others bullying each other. This relationship should also be looked at in a more

comprehensive study.

Implications

There are several implications that can be taken from this study. First, the strong

and consistent correlation found between observed leader narcissistic behaviors and

observed bullying behaviors in the workplace indicate observer-rated assessments are a

viable tool that can be effectively used in workplace bullying research. It would be

beneficial to conduct a similar study using self-rated assessments to determine congruity

among results, but the fact the relationships for each narcissistic behavior were

statistically significant at $p < .001$, suggests this is a valid approach to use. Additionally,

this study provides support for the need to focus on the top leader as a significant

contributor to bullying within the workplace. While there are a number of studies that

look at the manager's role in bullying, none have gone right to the top to see if he or she

has an impact. This study provides empirical evidence that the top leader does influence

bullying within the workplace and most likely impact other factors of organizational

culture.

Finally, the impact this study has on positive social change is significant and

includes both improved employee well-being and enhanced organizational performance.

For employees, bullying has a negative impact on both psychological and physical health

(Cleary et al., 2009), impacting both victims and witnesses (Namie & Namie, 2009). The

negative impacts range from increased stress (Keashly & Harvey, 2005), depression

(Tepper, 2000), and thoughts of suicide (Yilderim & Yilderim, 2007); to high blood

pressure (Hallberg & Strandmark, 2006), digestive problems (D'Cruz & Noronha,

2010b), and heart disease (De Vogli et al., 2007). The problems experienced by

employees in turn negatively impact the performance of the business, particularly

financial performance. In the United States alone, it has been estimated workplace

bullying costs businesses over $23 billion each year (Tepper et al., 2006). This number is

created through a variety of factors including loss of productivity (Peneberg, 2008),

increased turnover (Keashly et al., 1994), and increased insurance costs (Bassman, as

cited in Lutgen-Sandvik & Sypher, 2009).

Now that we know there is a relationship between narcissistic behaviors

exhibited by the top leader and the prevalence of bullying within the workplace, HR

professionals and managers can begin including personality assessments when hiring or

promoting new top leaders. Candidates scoring high in narcissism can either be excluded

from the candidate pool, or at a minimum if the company is aware narcissistic traits are

present, intervention strategies can be implemented up front in order to ensure bullying

does not become a cultural norm. The one issue this research cannot impact is the top

leader's willingness to take actions to prevent bulling within the organization. As

indicated previously, a significant number of businesses fail to adequately address

bullying when made aware of its existence (Harvey et al., 2006). This could be because

the current top leader is high in narcissistic traits and does not see bullying as a problem.

In smaller organizations, there may be nothing HR can do but in larger organizations,

particularly public firms, the board of directors and shareholders of the company should

be made aware of this study and the high costs associated with bullying. Shareholders

have become more focused on chief executive officer (CEO) performance than in the past

(Lucier, Wheeler, & Habbel, 2007). Information such as results from this study, may help

shareholders and board of directors make better decisions when placing someone in the

role of CEO; the ultimate result being improved employee well-being and better

organizational performance.

Conclusion

Bullying in the workplace remains a serious issue for employees and businesses

around the world (International Labour Organzation, 2006). It is estimated in the United

States alone 50% of the workforce either has been or currently is exposed to workplace

bullying in some fashion, either as a victim or a witness (Namie, 2007). Bullying

encompasses a variety of tactics including verbal, nonverbal, and physical (Tracy et al.,

2006). The consequences of bullying are startling and begin with the impact on victims

in terms of both psychological and physical harm (Cleary et al., 2009); moves on to

witnesses, also including psychological and physical harm (Hoel & Cooper, 2000); and ends with the organization in terms of poor performance and high financial costs (Peneberg, 2008; Tepper et al., 2006).

Understanding the conditions which not only create bullying but contribute to its sustainability is crucial to minimizing this social problem. Although there has been a constant flow of research on the topic of workplace bullying over the past several decades, none have focused on understanding why so many top leaders fail to address the problem when they are made aware it exists within their organization (Harvey et al., 2006). This study was based on the idea that top leaders may in fact be the reason so many companies appear to condone bullying as an organizational norm. Specifically, it was hypothesized a leader's personality may be instrumental in the sustainability of bullying. This research study set out to determine if there was a relationship between the top leader's personality (in the form of observed narcissistic behaviors) and the prevalence of bullying within the organization. Results confirmed a strong and positive relationship exists between leaders' exhibiting narcissistic behaviors and their personal participation in bullying along with others within the organization bullying each other. These results confirm the importance of continuing research focused on the top leader's role in the sustainability of bullying. Regardless of how much we understand why bullies bully and why victims become victims, and what organizational factors are likely to result in bullying, the problem will not be solved until we can get top business leaders to make a stand and refuse to tolerate bullying within their organization. The solution would be much simpler if all business leaders believed bullying was an undesirable

behavior but this study revealed that some leaders' innate personality may drive them to exhibit bullying behaviors themselves which in turn results in bullying being an acceptable norm within the rest of the organization. This study has confirmed the resolution of bullying within the workplace must start with the top leader of the organization; it is his or her influence and behaviors that allow bullying to exist and it is his or her behaviors which can stop it.

References

Aasland, M., Skogstad, A., Notelaers, G., Nielsen, M., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The

   prevalence of destructive leadership behaviour. *British Journal of Management,*

   21(2), 438-452. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2009.00672.x

Acock, A. C. (2005). Working with missing values. *Journal of Marriage and Family,*

   67(4), 1012-1028. doi:10.111 l/j.1741-3737.2005.00191.x

Agervold, M. (2007). Bullying at work: a discussion of definitions and prevalence, based

   on an empirical study. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 48*(2), 161-172. doi:

   10.1111/j.1467-9450.2007.00585.x

Agervold, M., & Mikkelsen, E. G. (2004). Relationships between bullying, psychosocial

   work environment and individual stress reactions. *Work & Stress, 18*(4), 336-351.

   doi:10.1080/02678370412331319794

Ali, Z., Nisar, N., & Raza, A. (2011). Impact of personality traits on leadership styles of

   secondary school teachers. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research*

   in Business, 3(3), 610-617.

Allen, R. W., Madison, D. L., Porter, L., Renwick, P. A., & Mayes, B. (1979).

   Organizational politics. *California Management Review, 22*(1), 77-83

Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart,

   & Winsten.

American Psychiatric Association (APA, 2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of*

   mental disorders: Text revision. (Rev. 4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author

Ames, D. R., & Flynn, F. J. (2007). What breaks a leader? The curvilinear relation

between assertiveness and leadership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(2), 307–324. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.2.307

Amernic, J. H., & Craig, R. J. (2010). Accounting as a facilitator of extreme narcissism. *Journal of Business Ethics, 96*(1), 79-93. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0450-0

Andersson, L., & Pearson, C. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(3), 452-471. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.6.1.64

Andreassen, C., Ursin, H., Eriksen, H. R., & Pallesen, S. (2012). The relationship of narcissism with workaholism, work engagement, and professional position. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal, 40*(6), 881-890. doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2012.40.6.88

Ang, R. P., Ong, E. L., Lim, J. Y., & Lim, E. W. (2010). From narcissistic exploitativeness to bullying behavior: The mediating role of approval-of-aggression beliefs. *Social Development, 19*(4), 721-735. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9507.2009.00557.x

Appelberg, K., Romanov, K., Honkasalo, M. L., & Koskenvuo, M. (1991). Interpersonal conflicts at work and psychosocial characteristics of employees. *Social Science & Medicine, 32*(9), 1051-1056. doi.10.1016/0277-9536(91)90162-6,

Aquino, K., & Lamertz, K. (2004). A relational model of workplace victimization: Social roles and patterns of victimization in dyadic relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(6), 1023-1034. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.1023

Archer, D. (1999). Exploring "bullying" culture in the para-military organization.

International Journal of Manpower, 20(1), 94-105. doi:
10.1108/01437729910268687

Ashforth, B. (1997). Petty tyranny in organizations: A preliminary examination of
antecedents and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences,
14*(2), 126-140. doi: 10.1111/j.1936-4490.1997.tb00124.x

Ayoko, O. B., Callan, V. J. & Hartel, C. E. J. (2003). Workplace conflict, bullying, and
counter-productive behaviors. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis,
11*(4), 283-301.

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

Bahreinian, M., Ahi, M., & Soltani, F. (2012). The relationship between personality type
and leadership style of managers: A case study. *Mustang Journal of Business &
Ethics, 3*, 94-111.

Baillien, E., & De Witte, H. (2009). Why is organizational change related to workplace
bullying? Role conflict and job insecurity as mediators. *Economic and Industrial
Democracy, 30*(3), 348-371.doi: 10.1177/0143831X09336557

Baillien, E. Neyens, I., De Witte, H. (2011). Organizational correlates of workplace
bullying in small and medium sized enterprises. *International Small Business
Journal, 29*(6), 610-625. doi: 10.1177/0266242610375774

Baillien, E., Neyens, I., De Witte, H., & De Cuyper, N. (2009). A qualitative study on the
development of workplace bullying: Towards a three way model. *Journal of
Community & Applied Social Psychology, 19*(1), 1-16. doi:10.1002/casp.977

Baillien, E., Rodriguez-Muñoz, A., Van den Broeck, A., & De Witte, H. (2011). Do

    demands and resources affect target's and perpetrators' reports of workplace

    bullying? A two-wave cross-lagged study. *Work & Stress, 25*(2), 128-146.

    doi:10.1080/02678373.2011.591600

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the

    art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 309-328. doi:

    10.1108/02683940710733115

Barry, C. T., Pickard, J. D., & Ansel, L. L. (2009). The associations of adolescent

    invulnerability and narcissism with problem behaviors. *Personality & Individual*

    Differences, 47(6), 577-582. doi: 10.10161/j.paid.2099.05.0222

Bartlett, J. E., & Bartlett, M. E. (2011). Workplace bullying: An integrative literature

    review. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 13*(1), 69-84. doi:

    10.1177/1523422311410651

Bartlett, J. E., Kotrlik, J. W., & Higgins, C. C. (2001). Organizational research:

    Determining appropriate sample size in survey research. *Information Technology,*

    Learning, and Performance Journal, 19(1), 43-50

Bass, B. M. (2007). Concepts of leadership. In R.P. Vecchio (Ed), *Leadership:*

    Understanding the dynamics of power and influence in organizations (pp.3-22).

    Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Bass, B. M. & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, &*

    managerial applications. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Baughman, H. M., Dearing, S., Giammarco, E., Vernon, P. A. (2012). Relationships

between bullying behaviors and the dark triad: A study with adults. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52*(5), 571-575. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.11.020

Benson, M. J., & Campbell, J. P. (2007). To be, or not to be, linear: An expanded representation of personality and its relationship to leadership performance. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment, 15*(2), 232-249. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2007.00384.x

Beswick, J., Gore, J., & Palferman, D. (2006). Bullying at work: A review of the literature. *Health & Safety Laboratory*. Retrieved from http://www.hse.gov.uk/research/hsl_pdf/2006/hsl0630.pdf

Blair, C. A., Hoffman, B. J., & Helland, K. R. (2008). Narcissism in organizations: A multisource appraisal reflects different perspectives. *Human Performance, 21*(3), 254-276. doi:10.1080/08959280802137705

Blais, M. A., & Little, J. A. (2010). Toward an integrative study of narcissism. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 1*(3), 197-199. doi: 10.1037/a0020573

Blickle, G., Schlegel, A., Fassbender, P., & Klein, U. (2006). Some personality correlates of business white-collar crime. *Applied Psychology-An International Review-Psychologie Appliquee-Revue Internationale, 55*(2), 220-233.

Bloisi, W., & Hoel, H. (2008). Abusive work practices and bullying among chefs: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 27*(4), 649-656. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2007.09.001

Boddy, C. (2006). The dark side of management decisions: Organizational psychopaths.

Management Decision, 44(10), 1461-1475. doi: 10.1108/00251740610715759

Boddy, C. (2011). Corporate psychopaths, bullying and unfair supervision in the workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics, 100*(3), 367-379. doi: 10/1077/s10551-010-0689-5

Boddy, C., Ladyshewsky, R. K., Galvin, P. (2010). The influence of corporate psychopaths on corporate social responsibility and organizational commitment to employees. *Journal of Business Ethics, 97*(1), doi: 10.1007/s10550-010-0492-3

Bond, M. (2004). Culture and aggression--from context to coercion. *Personality & Social Psychology Review, 8*(1), 62-78. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0801_3

Bowling, N., & Beehr, T. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5), 998-1012. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.998

Brotheridge, C., & Lee, R. T. (2006a). Bullying Behaviors Scale. doi:10.1037/t00356-000

Brotheridge, C. M, & Lee, R. T. (2006b). Examining the relationship between the perceived work environment and workplace bullying. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Helath: Special Issue on Work and Mental Health, 25*(2), 31-44.

Brown, F. W., & Reilly, M. D. (2009). The Myers-Briggs type indicator and transformational leadership. *Journal of Management Development, 28*(10), 916-932. doi 10.1108/02621710911000677

Brown, M. E., Trevino, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social

learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97*(2), 117-134. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002

Brunell, A. B., Gentry, W. A., Campbell, W. K., Hoffman, B. J., Kuhnert, K. W., & Demarree, K. G. (2008). Leader emergence: The case of the narcissistic leader. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*(12), 1663-1676. doi: 10.1177/014616720832410

Burton, J., & Hoobler, J. (2006). Subordinate self-esteem and abusive supervision. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 18*(3), 340-355.

Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(1), 219-229. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.75.1.219

Campbell, W., & Campbell, S. (2009). On the self-regulatory dynamics created by the peculiar benefits and costs of narcissism: A contextual reinforcement model and examination of leadership. *Self and Identity, 8*(2-3), 214-232. doi: 10.1080/15298860802505129

Campbell, W., Goodie, A. S., & Foster, J. D. (2004). Narcissism, confidence, and risk attitude. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 17*(4), 297-311. doi:10.1002/bdm.475

Campbell, W. K., Hoffman, B. J., Campbell, S. M., & Marchisio, G. (2011). Narcissism in organizational contexts. *Human Resource Management Review, 21*(4), 268-

284. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.10.007

Campbell, W. K., Reeder, G. D., Sedikides, C., & Elliot, A. J. (2000). Narcissism and comparative self-enhancement strategies. *Journal of Research in Personality, 34*(3), 329-347. doi:10.1006/jrpe.2000.2282

Caponecchia, C., Sun, A. Z., & Wyatt, A. (2012). 'Psychopaths' at work? Implications of lay persons' use of labels and behavioural criteria for psychopathy. *Journal of Business Ethics, 107*(4), 399-408. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-1049-9

Carpenter, M. A., Geletkanycz, M. A., & Sanders, W. G. (2004). Upper echelons research revisited: Antecedents, elements, and consequences of top management team composition. *Journal of Management, 30*(6), 749-778. doi: 10.1016/j.jm.2004.06.001

Cemaloglu, N. (2011). Primary principals' leadership styles, school organizational health and workplace bullying. *Journal of Educational Administration, 49*(5), 495-512. doi:10.1108/09578231111159511

Chatman, J. A., & Cha, S. E. (2003). Leading by leveraging culture. *California Management Review, 45*(4), 20-34.

Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2007). It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 52*(3), 351-386. doi:10.2307/20109929

Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2011). Executive personality, capability cues, and risk taking: How narcissistic CEOs react to their successes and stumbles. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 56*(2), 202-237.

doi:10.1177/0001839211427534

Cilliers, F. (2012). A systems psychodynamic description of organisational bullying experiences. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 38*(2), 1-11. doi:10.4102/sajip.v38i2.994

Cleary, M., Hunt, G. E., Walter, G., & Robertson, M. (2009). Dealing with bullying in the workplace: Toward zero tolerance. *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing and Mental Health Services, 47*(12), 34-41. doi:10.3928/02793695-20091103-03

Clements, C., & Washbush, J. B. (1999). The two faces of leadership: considering the dark side of leader-follower dynamics. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 11*(5), 170-176. doi: 10.1108/13665629910279509

Cohen, J. (1992). Statistical power analysis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 1*(3), 98-101

Conger, J. A. (2007). The dark side of leadership. In R.P. Vecchio (Ed), *Leadership: Understanding the dynamics of power and influence in organizations (pp.199-215).* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Costa, P. & McCrae, R. (2000). Overview: Innovations in assessment using the revised NEO Personality Inventory. *Assessment, 7*(4), 325-327. doi:10.1177/107319110000700402

Cowan, R. (2005). Rocking the boat and continuing to fight: Un/productive justice episodes and the problem of workplace bullying. *Human Communication, 12*(3), 283-302.

Cowan, R. (2009). Human resource professionals, power, and policy: New directions in

workplace bullying research. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the NCA 95th Annual Convention*, 1-41

Cowan, R. L. (2011). "Yes, we have an anti-bullying policy, but…:" HR professionals' understandings and experiences with workplace bullying policy." *Communication Studies, 62*(3) 307-327. doi: 10.1080/10510974.2011.553763

Cowan, R. L. (2012). It's complicated: Defining workplace bullying from the human resources professional's perspective. *Management Communication Quarterly, 26*(3), 377-403. doi: 10.1177/0893318912439474

Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1999). 'Superiority'is in the Eye of the Beholder: A Comment on Sutton, Smith, and Swettenham. *Social Development, 8*(1), 128-131. doi: 10.1111/1467-9507.00084

Cycyota, C. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2002). Enhancing survey response rates at the executive level: are employee-or consumer-level techniques effective? *Journal of Management, 28*(2), 151-176. doi: 10.1177/014920630202800202

Cycyota, C. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2006). What (not) to expect when surveying executives: A meta-analysis of top manager response rates and techniques over time. *Organizational Research Methods, 9*(2), 133-160. doi: 10.1177/1094428105280770

D'Cruz, P., & Noronha, E. (2010a). Protecting my interests: HRM and targets' coping with workplace bullying. *The Qualitative Report 15*(3), 507-534. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR15-3/dcruz.pdf

D'Cruz, P., & Noronha, E. (2010b). The exit coping response to workplace bullying: The

contribution of inclusivist and exclusivist HRM strategies. *Employee Relations, 32*(2), 102-120. doi 10.1108/0142545101101007

De Vogli, R., Ferrie, J., Chandola, T., Kivimäki, M., & Marmot, M. (2007). Unfairness and health: Evidence from the Whitehall II study. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 61*(6), 513-518. doi:10.1136/jech.2006.052563

Denison, D. R., & Mishra, A. K. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. *Organization Science, 6*(2), 204-223. doi.org/10.1287/orsc.6.2.204

DeRue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(1), 7-52. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01201.x

Dickenson, K. A., & Pincus, A. L. (2003). Interpersonal analysis of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 17*(3), 188-207. doi: 10.1521/pedi.17.3.188.22146

Duffy, M. (2009). Preventing workplace mobbing and bullying with effective organizational consultation, policies, and legislation. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 61*(3), 242-262. doi:10.1037/a0016578

Duffy, M., Ganster, D., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(2), 331-351. doi:10.2307/3069350

Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower, 20*(1), 16-27. doi: 10.11008.01437729910268588

Einarsen, S. (2000). Harassment and bullying at work: A review of the Scandinavian

approach. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 5*(4), 379-401. doi: 10.1016/S1359-1789(98)00043-3

Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 207-216. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002

Einarsen, S., Matthiesen, S., & Skogstad, A. (1998). Bullying, burnout and well-being among assistant nurses. *Journal of Occupational Health and Safety Australia and New Zealand*, *14*, 563-568.

Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B. I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims, 12*(3), 247-263.

Einarsen, S., Raknes, B. I., & Matthiesen, S. B. (1994). Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: An exploratory study. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist, 4*(4), 381-401.

Ferris, P. (2004). A preliminary typology of organisational response to allegations of workplace bullying: see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 32*(3), 389-395. doi: 10.1080/03069880410001723576

Ferris, P. (2009). The role of the consulting psychologist in the prevention, detection, and correction of bullying and mobbing in the workplace. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 61*(3), 169-189. doi:10.1037/a0016783

Ferris, G. R., Zinko, R., Brouer, R. L., Buckley, M. R., & Harvey, M. G. (2007). Strategic bullying as a supplementary, balanced perspective on destructive leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 195-206. doi:

10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.004

Fevre, R., Robinson, A., Jones, T., & Lewis, D. (2010). Researching workplace bullying: The benefits of taking an integrated approach. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology: Theory & Practice, 13*(1), 71-85. doi:10.1080/13645570802648671

Fossati, A., Beauchaine, T. P., Grazioli, F., Carretta, I., Cortinovis, F., & Maffei, C. (2005). A latent structure analysis of Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition, narcissistic personality disorder criteria. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 46*(5), 361- 367. doi:10.1016/j.comppsych.2004. 11.006

Foster, J. D., Campbell, W. K. & Twenge, J. M. (2003). Individual differences in narcissism: Inflated self-views across the lifespan and around the world. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37*(6), 469-486. doi: 10.1016/S0092-6566(03)0026-6

Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. E., (2009). Building a framework for two internal organizational approaches to resolving and preventing workplace bullying: Alternate dispute resolution and training. *Consulting Psychology Journal, 61*(3), 220-241. doi: 10.1037/a0016637

Furtner, M. R., Rauthmann, J. F., & Sachse, P. (2011). The self-loving self-leader: An examination of the relationship between self-leadership and the dark triad. *Social Behavior and Personality, 39*(3), 369-380. doi:10.2224/sbp.2011.39.3.369

Gabriel, M. T., Critelli, J. W., & Ee, J. S. (1994). Narcissistic illusions in self-evaluations of intelligence and attractiveness. *Journal of Personality, 62*(1), 143-155.

doi:10.1111/1467-6494.ep9406221282

Gardner, S., & Johnson, P. R. (2001). The leaner, meaner workplace: strategies for handling bullies at work. *Employment Relations Today, 28*(2), 23-36. doi: 10.1002/ert.1012

George, D, & Mallery, P. (2010). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple study guide and reference 17.0 update (*10th ed.*).* Boson, MA: Allyn & Bacon

Gholamzadeh, D., & Khazaneh, A. T. (2012). Surveying the relationship between leadership styles, organizational health and workplace bullying. *Journal of Global Strategic Management, 12*, 5-22.

Giberson, T. R., Resick, C. J., & Dickson, M. W. (2005). Embedding leader characteristics: An examination of homogeneity of personality and values in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 1002–1010. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.5. 1002

Giberson, T. R., Resick, C. J., Dickson, M. W., Mitchelson, J. K., Randall, K. R., & Clark, M. A. (2009). Leadership and organizational culture: Linking CEO characteristics to cultural values. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 24*(2), 123-137. doi:10.1007/s10869-009-9109-1

Giga, S. I., Hoel, H., & Lewis, D. (2008). The costs of workplace bullying. *A Partnership Project Funded Jointly by Unite the Union and the Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform.* Retrieved from http://ww.unitetheunion.org /Docs/Research%20-%20cost%20of%20bullying.doc.

Glad, B. (2002). Why tyrants go too far: Malignant narcissism and absolute power.

Political Psychology, 23(1), 1-37

Glendinning, P. (2001). Workplace bullying: Curing the cancer of the American

workplace. *Public Personnel Management, 30*(3), 269-286.

Glisson, C., & James, L. R. (2002). The cross-level effects of culture and climate in

human service teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(6), 767–794. doi:

10.1002/job.162

Glover, D., Cartwright, N., Gough, G., & Johnson, M. (1998). The introduction of anti-

bullying policies: do policies help in the management of change?. *School

Leadership and Managment, 18*(1), 89-105. doi:10.1080/1363243986979

Goldman, A. (2006). Personality disorders in leaders: Implications of the DSMIV-TR in

assessing dysfunctional organizations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(5),

392-414. doi: 10.1108/02683940610673942

Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2010). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences (*8th ed*.).*

Stamford, CT: Wadsworth

Gruber, J. E. (1998). The impact of male work environments and organizational policies

on women's experiences of sexual harassment. *Gender & Society, 12*(3), 301-320.

doi: 10.1177/0891243298012003004

Gustafson, S. B., & Ritzer, D. R. (1995). The dark side of normal: a psychopathy-linked

pattern called aberrant self-promotion. *European Journal of Personality, 9*(3),

147-183.

Hallberg, L., & Strandmark, M. (2006). Health consequences of workplace bullying:

experiences from the perspective of employees in the public service sector.

International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health & Well-Being, 1(2), 109-119. doi:10.1080/17482620600555664

Halinski, R. S., & Feldt, L. S. (1970). The selection of variables in multiple regression analysis. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 7*(3), 151-157. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-3984.1970.tb00709.x

Hambrick, D. C., & Mason, P. A. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review, 9*(2) 193-206.

Hambrick, D. C. (2007). Upper echelons theory: An update. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(2), 334-343. doi:10.5465/AMR.2007.24345254

Hartman, P. (2006). The Five Factor Model: A psychometric, biological, and practical perspectives. *Nordic Psychology, 58*(2), 150-170. doi:10.1027/1901-2276.58.2.150

Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A., & Kinicki, A. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(4), 677-694. doi:10.1037/a0021987

Harvey, M. G., Buckley, M. R., Heames, J. T., Zinko, R., Brouer, R. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2007). A bully as an archetypal destructive leader. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies. 14*(2), 117-129. doi: 10.1177/1071791907308217

Harvey, M. G., Heames, J. T., Richey, R. G., & Leonard, N. (2006). Bullying: From the playground to the boardroom. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 12*(4), 1-11. doi: 10.1177/107179190601200401

Hauge, L., Einarsen, S., Knardahl, S., Lau, B., Notelaers, G., & Skogstad, A. (2011). Leadership and role stressors as departmental level predictors of workplace bullying. *International Journal of Stress Management, 18*(4), 305-323. doi:10.1037/a0025396

Hauge, L., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Relationships between stressful work environments and bullying: Results of a large representative study. *Work & Stress, 21*(3), 220-242. doi:10.1080/02678370701705810

Hauge, L., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2009). Individual and situational predictors of workplace bullying: Why do perpetrators engage in the bullying of others?. *Work & Stress, 23*(4), 349-358. doi:10.1080/02678370903395568

Hautala, T. M. (2006). The relationship between personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Management Development, 25*(8), 777-794. doi 10.1108/02621710610684259

Heames, J., & Harvey, M. (2006). Workplace bullying: A cross-level assessment. *Management Decision, 44*(9), 1214-1230. doi: 10.11008/00251740610707695

Higgs, M. (2009). The good, the bad and the ugly: Leadership and narcissism. *Journal of Change Management, 9*(2), 165-178. doi:10.1080/14697010902879111

Hochwarter, W. A., & Thompson, K. W. (2012). Mirror, mirror on my boss's wall: Engaged enactment's moderating role on the relationship between perceived narcissistic supervision and work outcomes. *Human Relations, 65*(3), 335-366. doi: 10.1177/0018726711430003

Hodson, R., Roscigno, V. J., Lopez, S. H. (2006). Chaos and the abuse of power:

Workplace bullying in organizational and interactional context. *Work & Occupations, 33*(4), 382-416. doi: 10.1177/0730888406292885

Hoel, H., & Beale, D. (2006). Workplace bullying, psychological perspectives and industrial relations: Towards a contextualized and interdisciplinary approach. *British Journal of Industrial Relations, 44*(2), 239-262. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8543.2006.00496.x

Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. L. (2000). Destructive conflict and bullying at work. Retrieved from http://www.rowleyassoc.com/wp-content/uploads/Conflict-Bullying-at-Work.pdf

Hoel, H., Glasø, L., Hetland, J., Cooper, C. L., & Einarsen, S. (2010). Leadership styles as predictors of self-reported and observed workplace bullying. *British Journal of Management, 21*(2), 453-468. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2009.00664.x

Hoel, H., & Salin, D. (2003). Organizational antecedents of workplace bullying. In S Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, and C. L Cooper (Eds), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice* (pp. 154-162). London, England: Taylor and Francis.

Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Ohayv, D. D., & Sanders, G. (1990). Measuring organizational cultures: A qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35*(2), 286–316.

Hogan, R. (1991). Personality and personality measurement. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Ed). *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, (*Vol 2, 2nd ed.*; pp. 873 -919). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psycholigists Press.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side.

    International Journal of Selection & Assessment, 9(1/2), 40

Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General*

    Psychology, 9(2), 169-180. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.9.2.169.

Holtzman, N. S., Vazire, S., & Mehl, M. R. (2010). Sounds like a narcissist: Behavioral

    manifestations of narcissism in everyday life. *Journal of Research in Personality,*

    44(4), 478-484. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2010.06.001

Horowitz, M. J., & Arthur, R. J. (1988). Narcissistic rage in leaders: The intersection of

    individual dynamics and group process. *International Journal of Social*

    Psychiatry, 34(2), 135-141. doi: 10.1177/002076408803400208

Hubert, A. B. (2003). To prevent and overcome undesirable interaction. In S. Einarsen,

    H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the*

    workplace: International perspectives in research and practice (pp. 299-311).

    London, England: Taylor & Francis.

Hutchinson, M., Jackson, D., Wilkes, L., & Vickers, M. H. (2008). A new model of

    bullying in the nursing workplace: Organizational characteristics as critical

    antecedents. *Advances in Nursing Science, 31*(2), E60-E71. doi:

    10.1097/01.ANS.0000319572.37373.0c

International Labour Organization. (2006, June 14). *New forms of violence at work on the*

    rise worldwide. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-

    ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_070505/lang--en/index.htm.

Jaskyte, K. (2010). An exploratory examination of correlates of organizational culture.

Administration in Social Work, 34(5), 423-441. doi:10.1080/03643107.010.
518518

Jóhannsdóttir, H. L., & Ólafsson, R. F. (2004). Coping with bullying in the workplace:
the effect of gender, age and type of bullying. *British Journal of Guidance &
Counseling, 32*(3), 319-333.

John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (1994). Accuracy and bias in self-perception: Individual
differences in self-enhancement and the role of narcissism. *Journal of Personality
and Social Psychology, 66*(1), 206-219. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.66.1.206

Johnson, S. (2009). International perspectives on workplace bullying among nurses: a
review. *International Nursing Review, 56*(1), 34-40.
doi:http://dx.doi.org.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/10.1111/j.1466-7657.2008.00679.x

Johnson, J. L., & Hill, W. R. (2009). Personality traits and military leadership. *Individual
Differences Research, 7*(1), 1-13.

Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2010). Different provocations trigger aggression in
narcissists and psychopaths. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 1*(1),
12-18. doi: 10.1177/1948550609347591

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational
leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(5), 751-765. doi: I0.1037t/0021-
9010.85.5.751

Judge, T., Bono, J., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. (2002). Personality and leadership: A
qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 765-
780. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765.

Kaiser, R. B., & Hogan, J. (2011). Personality, leader behavior, and overdoing it. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 63*(4), 219-242. doi:10.1037/a0026795

Keashly, L. (1998). Emotional abuse in the workplace: Conceptual and empirical issues. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 1*(1), 85-117. doi:10.1300/J135v01n01_05

Keashly, L., & Harvey, S. (2005). Emotional Abuse in the Workplace. In S. Fox, P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 201-235). American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10893-009.

Keashly, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L. M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims, 9*(4), 341-357. Retrieved from http://www.workplacebullying.org/res/articles/LK1994.pdf

Keelan, E. (2000). Bully for you. *Accountancy*, *125*(1281), 56.

Kelly, S. &Waddington, I. (2006). Abuse, intimidation and violence as aspects of managerial control in professional soccer in Britain and Ireland. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 41*(2) 147-164. doi: 10.1177/1012690206075417

Kets de Vries, M. (2004). Organizations on the couch: A clinical perspective on organizational dynamics. *European Management Journal, 22*(2), 183-200. doi: 10.1016/j.emj.2004.01.008

Kets de Vries, M. & Miller, D. (1997). Narcissism and leadership: An object relations perspective. *Human Relations, 38*(4), 583-601.

Kilburg, R. R., & Donohue, M. D. (2011). Toward a "grand unifying theory" of

leadership: Implications for consulting psychology. *Consulting Psychology*

Journal: Practice and Research, 63(1), 6-25. doi:10.1037/a0023053

Kivimäki, M., Elovainio, M., & Vahtera, J. (2000). Workplace bullying and sickness

absence in hospital staff. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 57*(10), 656-

660. doi:10.1136/oem.57.10.656

Kotter, J.P. (2007). What leaders really do. In R.P. Vecchio (Ed), *Leadership:*

Understanding the dynamics of power and influence in organizations (pp.23-32).

Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Krasikova, D. V., Green, S. G., & LeBreton, J. M. (2013). Destructive leadership a

theoretical review, integration, and future research agenda. *Journal of*

Management, 39(5), 1308-1338. doi: 10.1177/0149206312471388

Le, H., Oh, I.-S., Robbins, S. B., Ilies, R., Holland, E., & Westrick, P. (2011). Too much

of a good thing? The curvilinear relationships between personality traits and job

performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(1) 113-133.

doi:10.1037/a0021016

Lee, R. T., & Brotheridge, C. M. (2006). When prey turns predatory: Workplace bullying

as a predictor of counteraggression/bullying, coping, and well-being. *European*

Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15(3), 352-377. doi:

10.1080/13594320600636531

Leonard, B. (2011). Job market improving for HR professionals. Retrieved from

www.shrm.org/hrdisciplines/technology/articles/pages/hrjobmarket.aspx

Lewis, D & Rayner, C. (2003). Bullying and human resource management: A wolf in

    sheep's clothing? In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds),

    Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspective in

    research and practice (pp. 370-382). London, England: Taylor & Francis.

Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and*

    Victims, 5(2), 119-126.

Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European*

    Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2), 165-184.

    doi:10.1080/13594329608414853

Liefooghe, A., & Davey, K. (2001). Accounts of workplace bullying: The role of the

    organization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10*(4),

    375-392. doi:10.1080/13594320143000762.

LinkedIn (2012). Linkedin demogrpahics & statistics – Jan 2012. Retrieved from

    222.slideshare.net/josephsquire/linkedin-demographics-statistics-jan2012.

Loh, J., Restubog, S., & Zagenczyk, T. (2010). Consequences of workplace bullying on

    employee identification and satisfaction among Australians and Singaporeans.

    Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 41(2), 236-252.

    doi:10.1177/0022022109354641

Lord, R., de Vader, C., & Alliger, G. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between

    personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity

    generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(3), 402-410.

    doi:10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.402

Lubit, R. (2002). The long-term organizational impact of destructively narcissistic

managers. *Academy of Management Executive, 16*(1), 127-138.

doi:10.2307/4165819

Lucier, C., Wheeler, S., & Habbel, R. (2007). The era of the inclusive leader. *Corporate

Board*, *28*(166), 1-5.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P., & McDermott, V. (2008). The constitution of employee-abusive

organizations: A communication flows theory. *Communication Theory, 18*(2),

304-333. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2008.00324.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. & Sypher, B. D. (2009). Workplace bullying: Causes, consequences,

and corrections. *Destructive Organizational Communication.* New York, NY:

Routledge Press. Retrieved from http://www.wikiway.net/

images/1/1c/Lutgen_Workplace_Bullying.pdf

Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Tracy, S. J., Alberts, J. K. (2006). Burned by bullying in the

American workplace. *Journal of Management Studies, 44*(6), 837-862. doi:

10.1111/j.1467-6486.2007.00715.x

Maccoby, M. (2000). Narcissistic leaders: The incredible pros, the inevitable cons.

Harvard Business Review, 78(1), 69-77.

Maccoby, M. (2004). *The productive narcissist: The promise and peril of visionary

leadership.* New York, NY: Broadway Books.

MacIntosh, J. (2005). Experiences of workplace bullying in a rural area. *Issues in Mental

Health Nursing, 26*(9), 893-910.doi:10.1080/01612840500248189

Matthews, G., Deary, I. J., & Whiteman, M. C. (2003). *Personality traits.* Cambridge

University Press. Retrieved from

http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/samples/cam041/2003046259.pdf

Mathisen, G., Einarsen, S., & Mykletun, R. (2011). The relationship between supervisor personality, supervisors' perceived stress and workplace bullying. *Journal of Business Ethics, 99*(4), 637-651. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0674-z

Maxwell, S. E. (2000). Sample size and multiple regression analysis. *Psychological Methods, 5*(4), 434-458. doi: IO.I037//I082-989X.5.4.434

McEvoy, G. M., & Beatty, R. W. (1989). Assessment centers and subordinate appraisals of managers: A seven-year examination of predictive validity. *Personnel Psychology, 42*(1), 37-52. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1989.tb01550.x

McHoskey, J. (1995). Narcissism and machiavellianism. *Psychological Reports, 77*(3), 755-759. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1995.77.3.755

McNeal, S. (2007). Healthy narcissism and ego state therapy. *International. Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis, 56*(1), 19-36. doi:10.1080/00207140701672987

Meissner, W. (2008). Narcissism and the self: psychoanalytic considerations. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis and Dynamic Psychiatry, 36*(3), 461-494. doi: 10.1521/jaap.2008.36.3.461

Miller, D., & Dröge, C. (1986). Psychological and traditional determinants of structure. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 31*(4), 539-560

Miller, J., & Campbell, W. (2008). Comparing clinical and social-personality conceptualizations of narcissism. *Journal of Personality, 76*(3), 449-476. doi:

10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00492.x

Miller, J., Dir, A., Gentile, B., Wilson, L., Pryor, L., & Campbell, W. (2010). Searching for a vulnerable dark triad: comparing Factor 2 psychopathy, vulnerable narcissism, and borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Personality, 78*(5), 1529-1564. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00660.x

Miller, D. E., & Kunce, J. T. (1973). Prediction and statistical overkill revisited. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 6*(3), 157-163.

Mitchell, M., & Ambrose, M. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(4), 1159-1168. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1159

Moayed, F. A., Daraiseh, N., Shell, R., & Salem, S. (2006). Workplace bullying: a systematic review of risk factors and outcomes. *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science, 7*(3), 311-327. doi.10.1080/14639220500090604

Moreno-Jiménez, B., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., Salin, D., & Morante, M. (2008). Workplace bullying in southern Europe: Prevalence, forms and risk groups in a Spanish sample. *International Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 13*(2), 95-10. Retrieved from http://www.uam.es/gruposinv/esalud/Articulos /Salud%20Laboral/WORKPLACE%20BULLYING.pdf

Morf, C. C., Wier, C., & Davidov, M. (2000). Narcissism and intrinsic motivation: The role of goal congruence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*(4), 556-563. doi:10.1006/jesp.1999.1421

Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Strauss, J. P. (1994). Validity of observer ratings of the

big five personality factors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(2), 272-280. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.79.2.272

Namie, G. (2003a). *The WBI 2003 report on abusive workplaces*. Retrieved from http://www.workplacebullying.org/multi/pdf/N-N-2003C.pdf

Namie, G. (2003b). Workplace bullying: Escalated incivility. *Ivey Business Journal, 68*(2), 1-6. Retrieved from http://www.workplacebullying.org/multi/pdf/N-N-2003A.pdf

Namie, G. (2007). *The Workplace Bullying Institute 2007 U.S. workplace bullying survey.* Retrieved from http://www.workplacebullying.org/docs /WBIsurvey2007.pdf

Namie, G. (2008). *Employer's response study*. Workplace Bullying Institute. Retrieved from http://www.workplacebullying.org/res/N-N-2008A.pdf

Namie, G. (2010). *The WBI U.S. Workplace Bullying Survey*. Workplace Bullying Institute. Retrieved from http://workplacebullying.org/multi/pdf/ WBI_2010_Natl_Survey.pdf

Namie, G. (2012a). T*he WBI website 2012 instant poll B - Employer workplace bullying policies.* The Workplace Bullying Institute. Retrieved from http://www.workplacebullying.org/multi/pdf/WBI-2012-IP-B.pdf

Namie, G. (2012b). *The WBI website 2012 instant poll C - Aftermath from requesting help from human resources*. The Workplace Bullying Institute. Retrieved from http://www.workplacebullying.org/multi/pdf/WBI-2012-IP-C.pdf

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2004). Workplace bullying: How to address America's silent

epidemic. *Employee Rights and Employment Policy Journal, 8*(2), 315–333.

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2009). U.S. Workplace bullying: Some basic considerations and consultation interventions. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 61*(3), 202-219. doi:10.1037/a0016670

Nevicka, B., Ten Velden, F. S., De Hoogh, A. H. B., & Van Vianen, A. E. M. (2011). Reality at odds with perceptions: Narcissistic leaders and group performance. *Psychological Science, 22*(10), 1259-1264. doi: 10.1177/0956797611417259

Nilesen, D., & Campbell, D. P. (1993). Self-observer rating discrepancies: Once an overrater, always an overrater? *Human Resource Management, 32*(2/3), 265-282

Nimon, K. (2011). Improving the quality of quantitative research reports: A call for action. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *22*(4), 387-394. doi:10.1002/hrdq.20091

Notelaers, G., De Witte, H., & Einarsen, S. (2010). A job characteristics approach to explain workplace bullying. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 19*(4), 487-501. doi:10.1080/13594320903007620

Notelaers, G., Einarsen, S., De Witte, H., & Vermunt, J. K. (2006). Measuring exposure to bullying at work: The validity and advantages of the latent class cluster approach. *Work & Stress, 20*(4), 289-302. doi:10.1080/02678370601071594

O'Boyle, E. R., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., & McDaniel, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the Dark Triad and work behavior: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(3), 557-579. doi:10.1037/a0025679

O'Moore, M., Lynch, J., & Daeid, N. N. (2003). The rates and relative risks of workplace

bullying in Ireland, a country of high economic growth. *International Journal of Management and Decision Making, 4*(1), 82-95.

O'Moore, M., Lynch, J. (2007). Leadership, working environment, and workplace bullying. *International Journal of Organizational Theory and Behavior, 10*(1), 95-117

O'Reilly, C. J., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*(3), 487–516. doi: 10.2307/256404

Ouimet, G. (2010). Dynamics of narcissistic leadership in organizations: Towards an integrated research model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25*(1), 13 - 726. doi: 10.1108/02683941011075265

Padilla, A., Hogan, R., Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 176-194. doi: :10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.001

Paice, E., & Smith, D. (2009). Bullying of trainee doctors is a patient safety issue. *Clinical Teacher, 6*(1), 13-17. doi:10.1111/j.1743-498X.2008.00251.x

Parkins, I., Fishbein, H. D., & Ritchey, P. (2006). The influence of personality on workplace bullying and discrimination. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*(10), 2554-2577. doi:10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00117.x

Parzefall, M., & Salin, D. (2010). Perceptions of and reactions to workplace bullying: A social exchange perspective. *Human Relations, 63*(6), 761-780. doi:10.1177/0018726709345043

Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Interpersonal and intrapsychic adaptiveness of trait self-

enhancement: A mixed blessing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,*

74(5), 1197–1208. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1197.

Paulhus, D. L. (2001). Normal narcissism: Two minimalist accounts. *Psychological*

Inquiry, 12(4), 228-230.

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism,

Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*(6),

556-563. doi.10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6

Paunonen, S. V., Lönnqvist, J. E., Verkasalo, M., Leikas, S., & Nissinen, V. (2006).

Narcissism and emergent leadership in military cadets. *Leadership Quarterly,*

17(5), 475-486. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.06.003

Peeters, M., Cillessen, A. H., & Scholte, R. H. (2010). Clueless or powerful? Identifying

subtypes of bullies in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 39*(9),

1041-1052. doi: 10.1007/s10964-009-9478-9

Pelletier, K. L. (2010). Leader toxicity: An empirical investigation of toxic behavior and

rhetoric. *Leadership, 6*(4), 373-389.doi: 10.1177/1742715010379308

Peneberg, A. L. (2008). Workplace bullying: A management primer. Retrieved from

http://www.workplacebullying.org/press/bnet-penenberg102008.pdf

Peng, C. Y. J., Lee, K. L., & Ingersoll, G. M. (2002). An introduction to logistic

regression analysis and reporting. *Journal of Educational Research*, *96*(1), 3-14.

doi: 10.1080/00220670209598786

Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2002). Narcissism and counterproductive work

behavior: Do bigger egos mean bigger problems? *International Journal of selection and Assessment, 10*(1-2), 126-134

Peterson, R. S., Smith, D. B., Martorana, P. V., & Owens, P. D. (2003). The impact of chief executive officer personality on top management team dynamics: One mechanism by which leadership affects organizational performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 795-808. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.795

Quine, L. (1999). Workplace bullying in NHS community trust: staff questionnaire survey. *BMJ, 318*(7178), 228-232. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/ pmc/articles/pmc27703/

Quine, L. (2001). Workplace bullying in nurses. *Journal of Health Psychology, 6*(10), 73-84. doi: 10.1177/0018726712445100

Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(5), 890–902.

Rayner, C. (1997). The Incidence of Workplace Bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 7*(3), 199-208.

Rayner, C., & Keashly, L. (2005). Bullying at Work: A Perspective From Britain and North America. In S. Fox, P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 271-296). American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10893-011

Reidy, D. E., Zeichner, A., Foster, J. D. and Martinez, M. A. (2008), Effects of narcissistic entitlement and exploitativeness on human physical aggression.

Personality and Individual Differences, 44(4), 865-875.

doi:10.1016/j.paid.2007.10.015

Resick, C. J., Whitman, D. S., Weingarden, S. M., & Hiller, N. J. (2009). The bright-side

and the dark-side of CEO personality: Examining core self-evaluations,

narcissism, transformational leadership, and strategic influence. *Journal of*

Applied Psychology, 94(6), 1365-1381. doi:10.1037/a0016238

Richard, J. & Daley, H. (2003). Bullying Policy. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C.

L. Cooper (Eds), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International*

perspectives in research and practice (pp. 247-258). London, England: Taylor &

Francis.

Ronningstam, E. (2005*). Identifying and understanding the narcissistic personality.* New

York, NY: Oxford University Press.

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

Quarterly, 17(6), 617-633. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.005

Salin, D. (2001). Prevalence and forms of bullying among business professionals: A

comparison of two different strategies for measuring bullying. *European Journal*

of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10(4), 425-441.

doi:10.1080/13594320143000771.

Salin, D. (2003). Bullying and organisational politics in competitive and rapidly changing

work environments. *International Journal of Management and Decision Making,*

4(1), 35-46. Retrieved from https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10227/281/

salin_IJMDM2003_final.pdf?sequence=3

Salin, D. (2008). The prevention of workplace bullying as a question of human resource management: Measures adopted and underlying organizational factors. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 24*(3), 221-231. doi:10.1016/j.scaman.2008.04.004

Sautter, J. A., Brown, T. A., Littvay, L., Sautter, A. C., & Bearnes, B. (2008). Attitude and divergence in business students: An examination of personality differences in business and non-business students. *Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies, 13*, 70-78.

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Schilling, J. (2009). From ineffectiveness to destruction: A qualitative study on the meaning of negative leadership. *Leadership, 5*(1), 102-128.10.1177/1742715008098312

Schmidt, A. A. (2008). *Development and validation of the Toxic Leadership Scale* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 1453699)

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*(3), 437-453.

Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., & Smith, D. B. (1995). The ASA framework: An update. *Personnel Psychology, 48*(4), 747-773. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01780.x

Schneider, B., & Smith, D. B. (2004). Personality and organizational culture. In B. Schneider & D.B. Smith (Eds), *Personality and organization* (pp. 347-369).

Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2012). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly, 24*(1), 138-158. doi.10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.001

Sedikides, C., Campbell, W. K., Reeder, G., & Elliot, A. J. (2002). The self in relationships: Whether, how, and when close others put the self "in its place." *European Review of Social Psychology, 12*(1), 237–265. doi:10.1080/14792772143000076

Sedikides, C., Rudich, E., Gregg, A., Kumashiro, M., & Rusbult, C. (2004). Are normal narcissists psychologically healthy? Self-esteem matters. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*(3), 400–416. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.87.3.400

Seigner, E., Coyne, I., Randall, P., & Parker, J. (2007). Personality traits of bullies as a countributory factor in workplace bullying: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior, 10*(1), 118-132.

Shipper, F., & Wilson, C. L. (1991). *The impact of managerial behaviors on group performance, stress, and commitment.* Presented at Impact of Leadership Conference, Center for Creative Leadership, Colorado Springs, CO.

Skogstad, A., Torsheim, T., Einarsen, S., & Hauge, L. (2011). Testing the work environment hypothesis of bullying on a group level of analysis: Psychosocial factors as precursors of observed workplace bullying. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 60*(3), 475-495. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2011.00444.x

Society for Human Resources Management (SHRM; n.d.). *HR terms*. Retrieved from

http://www.shrm.org/TemplatesTools/Glossaries/HRTerms/Pages/p.aspx

Sperry, L. (2009). Mobbing and bullying: The influence of individual, work group, and organizational dynamics on abusive workplace behavior. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 61*(3), 190-201. doi:10.1037/a0016938

Sperry, L., & Sperry, J. J. (2011). Healthy narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder. *Human Development, 32*(4), 5-11

Statistic Solutions (n.d.). Assumptions of logistic regression. Retrieved from https://www.statisticssolutions.com/academic-solutions/resources/directory-of-statistical-analyses/assumptions-of-logistic-regression/

Statistics Calculators *a* (n.d.). Effect size: Effect size calculator for multiple regression. Retrieved from http://www.danielsoper.com/statcalc3

Statistics Calculators *b* (n.d.). Multiple regression: A-priori sample size calculator for multiple regression. Retrieved from http://www.danielsoper.com/statcalc3

Sterner, W.R., (2011). What is missing in counseling research? Reporting missing data. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 89*(1), 56-62. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00060.x

Strandmark, M. M., & Hallberg, L. M. (2007). Being rejected and expelled from the workplace: Experiences of bullying in the public service sector. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 4*(1-2), 1-14. doi:10.1080/14780880701473359

Stucke, T.S., & Sporer, S.L. (2002). When a grandiose self-image is threatened: Narcissism and self-concept clarity as predictors of negative emotions and aggression following ego threat. *Journal of Personality, 70*(4), 509-532. doi:

10.1111/1467-6494.05015

Taborsky, M. (2010). Sample size in the study of behavior. *Ethology, 116*(3), 185-202. doi: 10.111/j.1439-0310.2010.01751.x

Tepper, B. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(2), 178-190. doi:10.2307/1556375

Tepper, B., Duffy, M. K., Henle, C. A., & Lambert, L. S. (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(1): 101-123.

Tett, R.P. & Guterman, H.A. (2000). Situation trait relevance, trait expression, and cross-situational consistency: Testing a principle of trait activation. *Journal of Research in Personality 34*(4), 397-423/ doi: 10.1006/jrpe.2000.2292

Thoroughgood, C. N., Tate, B. W., Sawyer, K. B., & Jacobs, R. (2012). Bad to the bone empirically defining and measuring destructive leader behavior. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 19*(2), 230-255.doi: 10.1177/1548051811436327

Thornton, M. (2004). Corrosive leadership.(or bullying by another name): A corollary of the corporatised academy. *Australian Journal of Labour Law, 17*(2), 161-184

Tracy, S. J., Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Alberts, J. K. (2006). Nightmares, demons, and slaves: Exploring the painful metaphors of workplace bullying. *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*(2), 148-185. doi: 10.1177/0893318906291980

Tsai, Y. (2011). Relationship between organizational culture, leadership behavior and job satisfaction. *BMC Health Services Research, 11*(1), 1-9. doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-

11-98

Tsui, A. S., Zhang, Z.-X., Want, H., Xin, K. R., & Wu, J. B. (2006). Unpacking the

   relationship between CEO leadership behavior and organizational culture.

   Leadership Quarterly, 17(2), 113–137. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.12.001

Tuckey, M. R., Dollard, M. F., Hosking, P. J., & Winefield, A. H. (2009). Workplace

   bullying: The role of psychosocial work environment factors. *International

   Journal of Stress Management, 16*(3), 215-232. doi:10.1037/a0016841

United States Census Bureau. (2012) Statistics of U.S. Businesses. Retrieved from

   http://www.census.gov/econ/susb/

van Eeden, R., Cilliers, F., & van Deventer, V. (2008). Leadership styles and associated

   personality traits: Support for the conceptualisation of transactional and

   transformational leadership. *South African Journal of Psychology, 38*(2), 253-267.

Vartia, M. (1996). The sources of bullying–psychological work environment and

   organizational climate. *European Journal of Work and Organizational

   Psychology, 5*(2), 203-214.10.1080/13594329608414855

Vartia, M. A. (2001). Consequences of workplace bullying with respect to the well-being

   of its targets and the observers of bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Work,

   Environment & Health, 27*(1), 63-69. doi:10.5271/sjweh.588

Vazire, S., & Funder, D. C. (2006). Impulsivity and the self-defeating behavior of

   narcissists. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*(2), 154-165. doi:

   10.1207/s15327957pspr1002_4

Vega, G., & Comer, D. R. (2005). Sticks and stones may break your bones, but words can

break your spirit: Bullying in the workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics, 58*(1-3), 101-109. doi:10.1007/s10551-005-1422-7

Viding, E., Simmonds, E., Petrides, K. V., & Frederickson, N. (2009). The contribution of callous-unemotional traits and conduct problems to bullying in early adolescence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 50*(4), 471-481. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2008.02012.x

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Measure. *Journal of Management, 34*(1), 89-126. .doi 10.1177/0149206307308913

Whetstone, J. (2005). A framework for organizational virtue: The interrelationship of mission, culture and leadership. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 14*(4), 367-378. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8608.2005.00418.x

Widiger, T. A. (2010). In defense of narcissistic personality traits. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 1*(3), 192-194. doi:10.1037/a0020199

Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*(4), 590-597. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.61.4.590

Wuensch, K. L. (2014). *Binary logistic regression with SPSS*. Retrieved from http://core.ecu.edu/psyc/wuenschk/MV/Multreg/Logistic-SPSS.PDF

Yamada, D. C. (2008). Workplace bullying and ethical leadership. *Journal of Values-Based Leadership. 1*(2) 49-62. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com /sol3/cf_dev/AbsByAuth.cfm?per_id=506047

Yildirim, D. (2009). Bullying among nurses and its effects. *International Nursing Review, 56*(4), 504-511. doi:10.1111/j.1466-7657.2009.00745.x.

Yildirim, A., & Yildirim, D. (2007). Mobbing in the workplace by peers and managers: mobbing experienced by nurses working in healthcare facilities in Turkey and its effect on nurses. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 16*(8), 1444-1453. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2702.2006.01814.x

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper River, NJ: Prentice Hall Inc.

Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist, 62*(1), 6-16. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.6

Zaccaro, S. J., Kemp, C., & Bader, P. (2004). Leader traits and attributes. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, and R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 101–124). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zapf, D. (1999). Organizational, work group related and personal causes of mobbing/bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower, 20*(1/2), 70-85. doi.org/10.1108/01437729910268669

Zellars, K., Tepper, B., & Duffy, M. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(6), 1068-1076. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.6.1068

Curriculum Vitae

Deborah A. Regnaud, SPHR, MBA

Key Skills

- Strong background in training and development
- Experienced with Blackboard
- Proficient in APA formatting
- Exceptional organizer
- Experienced business leader
- Familiar with SPSS
Articulate

- Excellent communicator
- Strong presentation skills
- Analytical and strategic thinker
- Able to manage simultaneous tasks
- Strong background in human resources
- Familiar with e-learning authoring tool

Education

Ph.D in Organizational Psychology (GPA: 4.0)
Walden University, Washington DC
    2014

MBA with minor in Finance (GPA: 4.0)
Lindenwood University, St. Charles, MO
    1999

BS in Business Administration with minor in Human Resources Management (GPA: 3.8)
Lindenwood University, St. Charles, MO
    1996

Selected Accomplishments

Conducted research on workplace bullying. Dissertation project included conducting a quantitative research study on the relationship between observed narcissistic behaviors exhibited by top leaders and the presence of bullying within the workplace. Findings revealed a significant and positive relationship.

Created training and development department. Conceptualized, designed, and implemented a full training and development department supporting a staff of over 600 employees. The project began with training for the sales staff which encompassed both selling and technical skills and evolved to include job related training for all departments, employee on-boarding, and key management and supervisor skills.

Implemented learning management system. Successfully implemented a learning management system which involved determining catalog categories, identifying and training administrators, creating course content, designing learning assessments, and managing enrollment. The system encompassed both classroom and e-learning opportunities for employees at all levels of the organization including: administrators, clerical staff, management, and executives.

Designed customized management training program. Designed and facilitated a customized management program for new managers and supervisors covering eleven core competencies: management, leadership, employee motivation, human behavior, team building, conflict resolution, communication, problem solving, safety, coaching, and performance management.

Memberships

Society for Human Resource Management Association

American Management

Society of Industrial Organizational Psychologists Association

American Psychological

Work Experience

Carboline Company   **2000 - Present**
St. Louis, MO

Vice President of Employee and Customer Relations   3/2014 – Present

- Provide guidance and leadership to the customer service and distribution staff by evaluating work processes and implementing improvements. This is done primarily through regular staff meetings designed to engage employees and solicit ideas for job enhancement and work-flow improvements.
- Meet with key customers to identify unique service requirements and ensure internal systems are in place to meet those needs.
- Provide guidance and leadership to the inventory management team by assisting in identifying effective performance metrics and ensuring open communication takes place with other departments that directly influence inventory levels. Responsible for meeting corporate inventory goals equating to over $40 million.
- Manage customer service and distribution budgets which equate to over $20 million annually combined. This is accomplished through managing labor costs, travel expenses, inventory levels, and general operating expenses.
- Provide guidance and leadership to the human resources, training and development, and facilities department (see below).

Vice President of Human Resources and Corporate Services   4/2000 – 3/2014

- Directly manage the human resources function by ensuring the department is adequately staffed with qualified individuals, holding regular staff meetings to engage the team while discussing and resolving problems, and providing guidance on personnel, legal, benefits, payroll, and other human resources related issues such as compensation, job descriptions, performance problems, organizational policies, and employee engagement.
- Work with the executive team to support corporate strategic initiatives through proper alignment of staffing, providing input on global operations, conducting workforce analyses, ensuring an effective organizational structure, developing succession plans for key positions, and providing guidance on performance goals and incentives for all positions.
- Manage human resources, training and development, recruiting, and facilities, budgets in excess of $10 million annually.
- Lead negotiator for union negotiations with manufacturing unions in Lake Charles, LA and Toronto, Canada. Work with management team of non-union plants in union avoidance techniques to minimize the likelihood of those sites becoming unionized. This is done primarily through management approaches which reward and motivate employees along with implementing structures which mirror union approaches.
- Consult with all departments to identify training needs then work with the training group in the development of training programs including e-learning module content and face-to-face training. Personally create training programs on higher level topics such as leadership, recruiting, employee engagement, and human behavior. Oversee the structure of the company learning management system to ensure the catalog is structured effectively and adequately provide technical support for each department along with soft-skills for managers and employee self-improvement.
- Work with department managers, the finance group, and the recruiting team to ensure all open positions are filled in a timely manner with qualified individuals. This is done through constant reviews of job descriptions and qualifications, consultation with hiring managers, and review of compensation policies. The social media site LinkedIn is used as the primary recruiting method for skilled positions along with industry related websites while the company web-site and job posting sites such as Indeed, Monster, and Careerbuilder are used for non-skilled positions.
- Manage, investigate, and resolve all complaints coming through the corporate hot-line in compliance with Sarbane-Oxley.

Franklin Electronics   **1999 – 3/2000**
St. Charles, MO

Human Resources Manager

- Recruited for all positions in the organization by identifying key competencies, skills, and educational requirements, converting those competencies to a thorough summary of the position which was then used as a basis for an employment advertisement.
- Worked with vendors to negotiate content and price of various insurance policies (such as health, dental and life). Managed the administration of all policies, ensured employees were enrolled, and worked with employees when problems occurred.
- Wrote and implemented all employee policies.

- Designed and implemented a wage/classification program for the manufacturing operation which paid employees based on their knowledge of various processes.
- Designed and implemented various training programs including: management, manufacturing processes, employee motivation, and human behavior.
- Worked with managers and supervisors in dealing with personnel issues to ensure fair and consistent treatment of all employees.

E2 Enterprises **1989 - 1999**
St. Charles, MO

Director of Operations and Human Resources

- Managed the manufacturing department which included scheduling production based on customer needs, assigning tasks to staff, and monitoring the process to ensure deadlines were met.
- Managed the general operations of the business including: purchasing raw materials at the most economic cost yet ensuring on time delivery, monitoring the quality of product to ensure specifications were met and product was working properly, managing inventory to ensure raw materials were available when needed yet inventory turns were maintained at 12 times per year or higher, and working with customers to ensure their demands were met.
- Oversaw all human resource activities including development of policies, hiring, terminations, performance evaluations, payroll, and benefits administration
- Implemented self-directed work teams in both factory and office environments, resulting in reduced overhead, improved service, and enhanced employee morale.
- Conceptualized and developed training programs provided to all staff members in support of self-directed work team approach, allowing the business to function with no supervisors.
- Personally managed the account of the company's top client to ensure all standards were met including quality and on-time delivery.