

The bad, the very bad and the ugly: towards an integrated model of dark leadership

Article

Supplemental Material

Higgs, M., Bulkan, S. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1658-3007 and Ererdi, C. (2025) The bad, the very bad and the ugly: towards an integrated model of dark leadership. Journal of Managerial Psychology. ISSN 0268-3946 doi: 10.1108/JMP-04-2024-0282 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/124234/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.

Published version at: https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-04-2024-0282

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JMP-04-2024-0282

Publisher: Emerald Group Publishing

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the End User Agreement.

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur



CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading Reading's research outputs online

Table 1: Dark Leadership Terminologies and Definitions

Dark Leadership Construct	Definition of Dark Leadership Construct	Related Constructs
Abusive Supervision	Defined as subordinates' perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviours, excluding physical contact. (Tepper, 2000)	Abusive supervisory behaviour (Hanu et al., 2024)
Despotic Leadership	A form of leadership where leaders who distort the mission and goals of the organization and abuse resources by using them to further their own interests. These leaders may secure the acquiescence of subordinates by threatening to and actually employing manifest force. (Aronson, 2001)	
Supervisor Undermining	Explored under the construct of social undermining which refers to the behavior intended to hinder, over time, the ability to establish and maintain positive interpersonal relationships, work-related success, and favorable reputation. Occurs when supervisors intentionally hinder the success or reputation of their subordinates, often through subtle or overt actions. (Duffy et al., 2002)	
Aversive Leadership	Representative behaviors of aversive leadership include (a) engaging in intimidation and (b) dispensing reprimands. (Pearce and Sims, 2002)	
Corrupt Leadership	Involves leaders engaging in unethical or illegal activities for personal gain, undermining organizational integrity and trust. (Anand <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	
Evil Leadership	Involves leaders who commit atrocities, using pain as an instrument of power, causing physical or psychological harm to others. (Kellerman, 2004)	
Insular Leadership	Refers to leaders who minimize or disregard the health and welfare of those outside their immediate group or organization, leading to a narrow focus that can be detrimental in a broader context. (Kellerman, 2004)	
Authoritarian Leadership	Authoritarianism refers to a leader's behavior that asserts absolute authority and control over subordinates and demands unquestionable obedience from subordinates. An authoritarian leader will try to control and promote a subordinate's performance via personal preferences and threat (Cheng et al., 2004).	
Managerial incompetence	Managerial failure is related more to having undesirable qualities than to lacking desirable ones, that is, having the wrong stuff and emphasised Hogan and Hogan's (2001) dark side dimensions e.g., bold-narcissistic, excessively self-confident; exhibits grandiosity and entitlement; unable to learn from mistakes; or mischievous, psychopathic/antisocial, - excessively takes risks and tests limits; bright, manipulative, deceitful, cunning, and exploitive (Hogan and Kaiser, 2005).	Dark triad (Jonason, et al., 2012)
Toxic Leadership	Refers to leaders who engage in destructive behaviors and exhibit dysfunctional personal characteristics, resulting in negative effects on their subordinates and the organization as a whole. (Lipman-Blumen, 2005)	Toxic behaviour (Goldman, 2008) Leader toxicity (Pelletier, 2010) Toxic leadership behaviours (Labrague et al., 2020)
Leader Incivility	Involves leaders displaying rude or discourteous behavior towards subordinates, which can lead to a toxic work environment and decreased employee satisfaction. (Pearson and Porath, 2005)	
Narcissistic Leadership	Narcissistic leadership occurs when leaders' actions are principally motivated by their own egomaniacal needs and beliefs, superseding the needs and interests of the constituents and institutions they lead (Rosenthal and Pittinsky, 2006, p. 629).	Destructive narcissistic behaviour (Godkin and Allcorn, 2011) Dark triad (Jonason et al., 2012) Dark side traits (Furnham et al., 2012) Narcissistic supervision (Hochwarter and Thompson, 2012) Narcissistic CEO (Patel and Cooper, 2014) Supervisor narcissistic rage (Jordan et al., 2020)
Destructive Leadership	Encompasses systematic and repeated behaviour by a leader, supervisor or manager that violates the legitimate interest of the organisation by undermining and/or sabotaging the organisation's goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and/or the motivation, wellbeing or job satisfaction of subordinates (Einarsen et al., 2007).	Toxic triangle (Padilla et al., 2007) Destructive leader behaviour (Thoroughgood et al., 2012) Harmful leader behaviour (Almeida et al., 2022).

Derailed Leadership	Refers to leaders display anti-subordinate behaviours like bullying,	
	humiliation, manipulation, deception or harassment, while	
	simultaneously performing anti-organisational behaviours like	
	absenteeism, shirking, fraud, or theft (Einarsen et al., 2007).	
Tyrannical Leadership	Refers to leaders who behave constructively in terms of organisational	
	oriented behaviour while displaying anti-subordinate behaviours;	
	subordinates and superiors may evaluate the leader's behaviour quite	
	differently. Subordinates may view the leader as a bully, while upper	
	management views him/her favourably (Einarsen et al., 2007).	
Leader Bullying	Leader bullying represents strategically selected tactics of influence by	
	leaders designed to convey a particular image and place targets in a	
	submissive, powerless position whereby they are more easily	
	influenced and controlled, in order to achieve personal and/or	
	organizational objectives (Ferris et al., 2007).	
Pseudo-	Involves leaders advance their own self-interested agendas by	
Transformational	dominating and controlling their followers. In focusing on self-interest,	
Leadership	pseudo-transformational leaders are more interested in becoming	
·	personal idols than in the collective ideals that might benefit their	
	followers (Barling <i>et al.</i> , 2008).	
Negative Leadership		Bad leadership (Schilling and
	behaviours ranging from ineffective to destructive aspects (Schilling,	Schyns, 2015)
	2009). Encompasses various forms of leadership behaviors that have	,
	detrimental effects on followers and organizations, including abusive,	
	toxic, and destructive leadership styles (Schyns and Schilling, 2013).	
Machiavellian Leader	Machiavellianism is indicated by a complex set of characteristics,	
	namely, a tendency to distrust others, a willingness to engage in	
	amoral manipulation, a desire to accumulate status for oneself, and a	
	desire to maintain interpersonal control (Dahling <i>et al.</i> , 2009).	
Corporate Psychopathy	Refers to a leader who is a psychopath works and operates in the	Dark triad (Jonason et al., 2012)
Co.porato : cycopatily	organizational area (Boddy, 2011).	Dark side traits (Furnham et al.,
	organizationat area (Beady, 2011).	2012)
		Organisational psychopath (Boddy,
		2015)
		Psychopathic bullying (Boddy and
		Taplin, 2017)
		Psychopathic leadership (Boddy,
		2017)
Petty Tyranny	Petty tyranny is (a) an aggressive behavior directed towards other	- ,
, . , ,	people in a formally unequal power structure, namely towards	
	subordinates, that (b) crosses the line of what may be considered	
	culturally acceptable behavior (Kant <i>et al.</i> , 2013).	
Exploitative Leadership	Defined as leadership with the primary intention to further the leader's	
	self-interest. Such leaders exploit others by (1) acting egoistically, (2)	
	exerting pressure and manipulating followers, (3) overburdening	
	followers, or, on the other hand, (4) consistently underchallenging	
	followers, allowing no development (Schmid <i>et al.</i> , 2019).	
	Total of a state of the development (Somma State, 2010).	

Table 2. Commonly Employed Theories, and Their Variations for Moderators and

Mediators

Theories	Instances	Moderators	Mediators
		Organisational Context,	Emotional
		Power Distance	Exhaustion,
		orientation, Hostile	Stress, Trust,
Conservation of Resources		attribution bias,	Affective
		Psychological Capital,	commitment
Theory	84	Trust, Resilience	
		Organisational Context,	Emotional
		Power distance	Exhaustion,
		orientation, Hostile	Stress, Trust,
		attribution bias, Conflict, Trust, Resilience,	Organisational identification,
Social Exchange Theory	68	Perceived job mobility	Self-Efficacy, LMX
Toxic Triangle/Toxic	00	Organisational Context,	Stress, Trust
<u> </u>		Organisational Culture	Stress, must
Leadership Theory	29		
Dark Triad, Narcissism,		Organisational Culture	
Machiavellianism,			
Psychopathy	14		
Social Cognitive Theory	11	Hostile attribution bias	Identification
		Power distance	Emotional
		orientation, LMX,	Exhaustion
Affective Events Theory	10	Psychological Capital	
Job Demands-Resources		LMX	
Theory	9		
		Power distance	Trust, Self-Efficacy
		orientation,	
Self-Determination Theory	8	Psychological Capital	
A			Organisational
Attribution Theory	6		identification, LMX
		Perceived mobility, Job	Organisational
		mobility, Co-worker	justice, Affective
		deviance	commitment,
Organisational Justice Theory			Workplace
Organisational Justice Mediy	6		resilience
Social Identity Theory	5		Organisational identification
		Conflict	identification
Ego Depletion Theory	5	Control	

Total 241