Overcoming Bad Leadership in Organizations

Edited by
Derek Lusk
Theodore L. Hayes

SIOP PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE SERIES

10

Gender and the Dark Side of Leadership

Asia A. Eaton and Barbara Nevicka

The trait perspective of leadership focuses on the personal qualities leaders possess that support or hinder their emergence and effectiveness (Harms et al., 2011). In the last 15 years, a growing body of research has examined "dark-side" traits in leaders, including their costs and benefits for individuals and organizations (e.g., Mathieu et al., 2014). The most commonly studied dark-side traits include narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism, together known as the "Dark Triad" (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). This triad of traits generally reflects the tendency to manipulate, deceive, and exploit for the purpose of furthering one's own interests, with little regard for others.

Narcissism, said to lie at the heart of leadership and its dark side (Kets De Vries & Balazs, 2011; McCleskey, 2013), is characterized by a grandiose, yet fragile, sense of the self, the need for excessive admiration, a sense of entitlement, a lack of empathy, and exploitive and manipulative social relationships (Ames et al., 2006). In this chapter we focus on the grandiose form of narcissism, rather than the vulnerable (or more depressive) form of narcissism, as the former is more strongly related to leadership indicators (Watts et al., 2013). Narcissism in leaders is known for having a wide cascade of negative consequences. These include increased workplace bullying (Tokarev et al., 2017), negative emotions and counterproductive work behaviors in followers (Braun et al., 2016), less collaborative teams (Nevicka et al., 2011b), cultures with lower collaboration and integrity (O'Reilly et al., 2020), lower firm performance when corporate practices are inspired by image maintenance (Petrenko et al., 2016), more volatile firm performance (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007), and higher chances of corporate litigation (O'Reilly et al., 2018).

However, narcissism also has some positive relationships with leadership outcomes. For example, it is positively related to leadership emergence (Brunell et al., 2008; Nevicka et al., 2011a), as narcissists' confidence and extraversion overlap with prototypical leader traits. Narcissism is also

Asia A. Eaton and Barbara Nevicka, *Gender and the Dark Side of Leadership* In: *Overcoming Bad Leadership in Organizations*. Edited by: Derek Lusk and Theodore L. Hayes, Oxford University Press.
 DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780197552759.003.0010

positively related to visionary communication (Galvin et al., 2010), salary (Spurk et al., 2016), and follower-reported leadership effectiveness (at moderate levels of the trait; Grijalva et al., 2015a, and at greater distance from the leader; Nevicka et al., 2018). Company performance has also been positively tied to narcissism at times, perhaps due to narcissists' increased willingness to take risks (Braun, 2017). Taken together, however, the negative outcomes of narcissistic leaders seem to outweigh the potential positive outcomes.

The second dark-side trait, psychopathy, is defined by low empathy and anxiety, a lack of guilt, emotional shallowness, a belief in one's superiority, and a parasitic lifestyle (O'Boyle et al., 2012), often resulting in criminal and antisocial behavior (Anderson & Kiehl, 2014). Identified by some as the most destructive of the dark-side traits (Williams et al., 2010), some negative effects of psychopathy for leaders include employee dissatisfaction (Mathieu et al., 2014), lower leadership effectiveness (Landay et al., 2019), negative correlations with constructive leadership styles (Landay et al., 2019; Mathieu et al., 2014), and positive correlations with passive leadership styles (Mathieu et al., 2014). Nonetheless, psychopathic tendencies are positively related to leadership emergence (Landay et al., 2019).

The third dark-side trait, Machiavellianism (Spain et al., 2014), has been viewed by many as a necessary evil for leadership (Deluga, 2001). Individuals high in Machiavellianism use manipulation and deceit in social dealings for personal gain (O'Boyle et al., 2012). Some negative aspects of leader Machiavellianism include reductions in leaders' moral action and reasoning when leaders are authentic (Sendjaya et al., 2016), a negative relationship with performance in some studies (Bedell et al., 2006; for an exception see Deluga, 2001), and reduced employee work engagement (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012). Meanwhile, Machiavellianism is positively related to leadership position and career satisfaction (Spurk et al., 2016) as well as to charismatic leader behavior (Deluga, 2001).

Much is now known about how the dark-side traits operate in leaders on the whole, but little work has examined how these relationships might be predicted or moderated by other leader characteristics, including social and individual difference factors. For example, Chen (2010) found that narcissistic CEOs from nations where humility is seen as a virtue were less likely than their counterparts to engage in financial misreporting. Other research has found that the emergence of narcissistic leadership depends on self-esteem (for a review see Ouimet et al., 2010), or that abusive supervision can be predicted by leader depression and anxiety (Byrne et al., 2014).

In this chapter, we examine another social variable, leader gender, as it relates to the prevalence of "dark leadership" and the relationship between dark leadership and various social and organizational outcomes. We begin by reviewing what is known about gender and the dark-side traits generally. Then, drawing on evidence for gender differences in the Dark Triad, we turn our attention to how dark-side traits might operate in men and women leaders, specifically. We also review research on followers' perceptions of women and men leaders who possess dark-side traits, and the relationship between follower gender and dark leadership.

Gender and Dark-Side Traits

Most research finds that the dark-side traits are more prevalent among men than women across cultures (e.g., Dowgwillo & Pincus, 2017; Karandikar et al., 2019; Muris et al., 2017). Evidence suggests this may be, at least in part, due to gender role norms and beliefs. In one study, for example, gender differences in dark-side traits were explained by gender differences in femininity (Jonason & Davis, 2018). Specifically, in a sample of college students from Australia and the United States, Jonason and David (2018) found that women's lower levels of dark-side traits could be statistically explained by their greater self-reported femininity on the Bem Sex Role Inventory. These findings make sense in light of social role theory (Eagly, 1987), which associates women and femininity with "communal traits." Communal traits include being cooperative, nurturing, and warm—opposites of the antisocial dark-side characteristics. Men, meanwhile, are more strongly socialized to develop "agentic traits," such as assertiveness, independence, and competitiveness.

In a study by Gluck et al. (2019), gender differences in Dark Triad scores were accounted for by participants' level of sexism. In a sample of adult internet users, differences between women and men in scores on the Dark Triad were explained by men's higher scores on the Hostile Sexism Inventory, which measures negative beliefs about women (e.g., that women are incompetent, manipulative, and emotional; Glick & Fiske, 1997). While this study was correlational and precludes inferences of causality, the findings demonstrate that negative sexist beliefs about women (which are held more strongly by men) and Dark Triad traits (such as greater levels of selfishness, status-seeking, and antisocial behavior) tend to co-occur. This may be due to the

fact that hostile sexism supports the development of dark traits, with men more strongly endorsing women's inferiority, and thus feeling more entitled and being more self-seeking. On the other hand, it could be because those with dark traits tend to embrace sexist beliefs more strongly, with men's higher selfishness leading them to perceive sexist ideology as accurate and/or useful. Finally, it could be due to a third variable such as social power, with those who possess more power (men) both developing more dark-side traits and endorsing more sexist beliefs.

Moving forward, it will be important to examine the emergence of gender role beliefs and Dark Triad traits in men and women over time and through experimentation, to better understand the causal relationship between these variables. It will also be worthwhile to examine the relationship between gender role beliefs and Dark Triad traits across societies, including whether societies with greater cultural sexism also show higher levels of Dark Triad traits and/or a greater disparity in these traits between men and women. Importantly, gender differences in the prevalence of dark-side traits may help men emerge more often as leaders, creating a self-fulfilling effect. That is, maladaptive gender role beliefs may promote dark-side traits, which increase men's leadership emergence and foster the sexist belief that men are better suited for powerful roles. Indeed, leader stereotypes have been consistently found to be masculine (Koenig et al., 2011), which results in men emerging more often as leaders than women (Eagly & Karau, 1991), as well as individuals with more pronounced masculine traits, such as those with higher narcissism (Grijalva et al., 2015a).

Gender and Narcissism

The relationship between gender and each individual dark-side trait (narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism) reveals additional insights relevant for women's and men's leadership. For example, in a meta-analytic review of gender differences in narcissism, Grijalva et al. (2015a) found that gender differences in narcissism were primarily driven by the leadership/authority facet and the exploitive/entitlement facet. The leadership/authority facet reflects the desire for power with items such as "I am a born leader" and "people always seem to recognize my authority," while the exploitive/entitlement facet reflects the belief that one is entitled to power with items such as "I insist upon getting the respect that is due to me." The gender difference

in the endorsement of these facets seems to reflect internalized gender role beliefs, with men describing themselves as being authoritative and deserving of respect. This difference is also consistent with the role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002), in which men are more often recognized and treated as leaders than women due to congruity between the traits associated with their gender role and those associated with typical leadership roles. Men's greater emergence as leaders (Eagly & Karau, 1991), and their greater levels of leadership power, may therefore be related to these internalized gender role beliefs and role congruity.

Importantly, social role theory (Eagly, 1987) suggests that if women's access to and experience with social power equaled that of men, so would their gender-typed traits, including narcissism. This again suggests the potential for a self-fulfilling process in which increasing women's presence in leadership positions would increase the traits and stereotypes that confer power in the first place. Interestingly, some studies found narcissism levels to be increasing across time, specifically for women and not for men (Twenge et al., 2008), which may be indicative of a generational gender shift, with agentic characteristics becoming more acceptable for women (Trzesniewski et al., 2008).

Next, there are indications that narcissism may have less toxic interpersonal outcomes in women than in men. For instance, in a study of primary school children, narcissism in boys was found to predict more intense bullying behaviors, whereas narcissism in girls was related to neither bullying nor social dominance (Reijntjes et al., 2016). Traits like overconfidence may also operate differently in men and women leaders. In a sample of undergraduate workers, Mertins and Hoffeld (2015) found that women's overconfidence was unrelated to their levels of cooperativeness in teams. For men, however, overconfidence inspired increased cooperativeness, related to their more optimistic beliefs about the cooperativeness of other team members.

As with other populations, women leaders generally appear to be less narcissistic than men leaders (Ingersoll et al., 2019). Given the importance of narcissism for leader emergence, this was not a forgone conclusion. For example, it was possible that narcissism was, to some extent, a prerequisite for leadership positions, resulting in highly and similarly narcissistic leaders of all genders (though perhaps fewer women leaders overall). Nonetheless, in samples of leaders working in a Fortune 100 health insurance organization in the United States and Western Europe (Owens et al., 2015), leaders in a high-tech manufacturing company in China (Liu et al., 2017), and CEOs of

companies within the Standard and Poor's 1500 index (Ingersoll et al., 2019), male leaders scored higher on self-reported narcissism than female leaders (for exceptions, see Zhang et al., 2017). Research additionally suggests that narcissism manifests differently among men and women leaders. Drawing on social role and token theories, Ingersoll et al. (2019) found that leader gender moderated the relationship between narcissism and risk-taking, with men CEOs high in narcissism being higher in risk-taking than women CEOs.

Gender and Psychopathy

With regard to gender and psychopathy, men tend to score higher on measures of psychopathy and aggression than women (Spurk et al., 2016), including among samples of adult employees (Eisenbarth et al., 2018). Some outcomes of psychopathy, like aggression, appear to be constant across gender (Borroni et al., 2014). Other correlates of psychopathy differ for men and women. For example, the relationship between psychopathy and moral judgments and decision-making was found to be stronger for men than women (Karandikar et al., 2019; Moore et al., 2020). There is some evidence that the more negative outcomes of psychopathy appear to be less severe in women than in men. For instance, while psychopathy predicted higher criminal conduct for women, the magnitude of the association was stronger for psychopathic males (Vitale et al., 2002). Moreover, unlike for men, psychopathy in women offenders was not found to be related to violent crimes (Rogstad & Rogers, 2008; Warren et al., 2005).

In a study of German managers by Blickle et al. (2018), psychopathy and manager gender were correlated, with men managers showing higher levels of psychopathy. However, other research with Dutch supervisors (Barelds et al., 2018) and a sample of Indonesian school principals and teachers (Nuzulia & Why, 2020) failed to find this relationship. While the mean-level difference in women and men leaders' levels of psychopathy is unclear, there are more consistent differences in how psychopathy functions for women and men in leadership positions. In a meta-analytic review of psychopathy and leadership, Landay et al. (2019) found that psychopathy in men was positively correlated with leadership emergence and effectiveness. In women, however, psychopathy was negatively associated with effectiveness and unassociated with emergence (Landay et al., 2019). In a study of sales representatives in China, the effects of psychopathy

on transactional (i.e., short-term and money-focused) psychological job contracts were stronger for men than women (Pan et al., 2018), again suggesting that men leaders and employees may be more empowered to act on their dark-side traits than women.

Gender and Machiavellianism

Finally, men in general tend to be higher in Machiavellianism than women (Hogue et al., 2013), specifically scoring higher on facets related to antagonism and social dominance (Collison et al., 2021) and desire for control and amorality (Dahling et al., 2009). Men are also higher on work-related malicious emotional manipulation, being more willing to use their emotional skills to make people uneasy at work for their personal benefit (Hyde & Grieve, 2018). As is the case for psychopathy, the influence of Machiavellianism and emotional manipulation on behavior appears to be stronger for men than women. For example, using samples of business and psychology students, Tang and Chen (2008) found that Machiavellianism was correlated with unethical behavior only for male students. In another study, masculine gender roles positively predicted emotional manipulation in both men and women (Grieve et al., 2019). In work by Czibor et al. (2017), Machiavellianism in women was related to anxiety, hypersensitivity, and vulnerability, while among men it was related to opportunism, risk-taking, and confidence. The authors conclude that men and women may use social manipulation for different ends, perhaps as a result of different goals they have been socialized to pursue, such as harm avoidance (in women) versus competition and risk-taking (in men).

In a final study, Machiavellianism was found to be negatively correlated with impulsivity among men, and positively correlated with impulsivity among women (Szabó & Jones, 2019). These findings make sense in light of Czibor et al.'s findings (2017), in which Machiavellianism in men appears to be approach-motivated (pursuit of positive outcomes) and Machiavellianism in women appears to be avoidance-motivated (avoidance of negative outcomes), resulting in more (and less) planning behavior, respectively. Avoidance goals do not have clear end-states, and as such it is difficult for people to detect whether they are making progress, which may lead them to be more disorganized (Elliot et al., 1999). The possibility that other dark-side traits may have different relationships with approach and avoidance

strategies at work based on employee or leader gender should be investigated in future research.

Finally, there is mixed evidence that Machiavellianism is higher among men than women in leadership positions. In a sample of managers of a large public organization in Australia, men leaders had marginally higher levels of Machiavellianism than women (Sendjaya et al., 2016). In another study, no relationship between Machiavellianism and gender emerged in a sample of Dutch managers (Wisse & Sleebos, 2016). In an exception to both of these findings, a study of retail store managers found that men had lower Machiavellianism scores than women (Gable et al., 1990). These results may not be reliable, as there were only 12 women managers in the sample of 60.

Taken together, not only are dark traits, on average, higher among men than women cross-culturally, but the way these traits manifest also appears to be different. Specifically, dark traits in men seem to have a greater influence in their lives and those around them compared to their women counterparts. This may be due to men's greater feelings of agency and power that enable them to act on their personalities and self-interests (Guinote, 2017). According to trait activation theory (Tett & Burnett, 2003), personality traits become activated in response to situational cues that afford them the opportunity to express themselves. As such, it could be the case that gender roles may be enabling the activation of dark-side traits in men and constraining them in women.

Gender and Abusive Supervision

While dark-side traits are the main focus of dark leadership research, there are other ways to measure and understand cruel, selfish, and aggressive leadership. In particular, leaders can demonstrate a form of dark leadership known as "abusive supervision." Abusive supervision is a continued and sustained act of nonphysical hostility used to achieve certain goals (Tepper, 2007). Examples of abusive supervision include criticizing, intimidating, humiliating, or being condescending to followers (in private or in front of others); gossiping about followers; and taking credit for their work (Tepper, 2000). Importantly, followers' perceptions of supervisor behaviors determine whether or not they are abusive.

Research finds inconsistent and sporadic differences between women and men leaders in follower-rated abusive supervision behaviors. Sometimes no

difference in abusive supervision is detected for women versus men leaders (e.g., Stempel & Rigotti, 2018; Wang et al., 2018). Other times, men are rated higher in abusive supervision. For example, in a sample of 172 leader and follower pairs from the United States and Canada, male leaders were rated as higher in abusive supervision than female leaders by their subordinates (Byrne et al., 2014). Given the greater preponderance of most dark-side traits in men, it may seem reasonable that men may be rated as expressing more abusive leadership behaviors than women.

At other times, however, women leaders are rated more highly in abusive supervision than men. For example, in a sample of team leaders in an MBA program in China, women leaders were rated higher on abusive supervision (Li et al., 2016). This may be related to women receiving greater social penalties for gender-incongruent behavior like aggression and antisocial behaviors (Eagly & Karau, 2002). It may also be related to the different pressures facing women leaders. In research by Courtright et al. (2016), female supervisors were more likely than male supervisors to react to experienced family–work conflict with abusive supervision. This was found to be due to women's greater ego depletion, presumably experienced because women, being generally more responsible for the family domain, shift more energy away from work (and toward family) when these roles conflict.

Because abusive supervision is a construct that lives in the minds of employees, it is difficult to know whether gender differences in abusive leadership are due to actual behavioral differences between men and women leaders, or the influence of followers' gender schemas on ratings. We now continue to discuss perceptions of men versus women leaders with dark-side traits as these perceptions relate to the downstream consequences of dark leadership for employees and organizations.

How Dark-Side Traits Are Perceived in Women Versus Men Leaders

Perhaps more important than gender differences in the level and operation of dark-side traits in men and women leaders are differences how women versus men leaders with dark-side traits are seen by others. There is a wealth of literature demonstrating prejudice against women leaders that manifests at all points in the leadership pipeline (e.g., Rudman et al., 2012; Schein et al., 1996). The first hurdle in the pipeline is the "lack of fit" between female

gender role stereotypes, like communality and warmth, and leadership qualities, like agency and independence (Rudman et al., 2012). Specifically, compared to men, women are not seen as typically having the qualities needed for success in leadership roles (Schein et al., 1996). When women do achieve leadership roles and begin to exert influence and authority, however, they face the hurdle of backlash, in which they experience discrimination for behaving counter-stereotypically (Rudman, 1998). In general, the perceived incongruity between the female gender role and typical leadership roles leads people to have more negative attitudes toward women potential leaders, and makes it more difficult for women to become leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

In the case of women leaders with dark-side traits and abusive behaviors, these differences are likely magnified. Women leaders are expected to "take care" while men leaders "take charge" (Prime et al., 2009), and women are expected to be democratic, not autocratic, in their leadership style (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). When women leaders exhibit self-centered, arrogant, and/or power-hungry behaviors, which appear to be incongruent with their stereotypical gender roles, they are more likely to receive backlash compared to their male peers, particularly when being evaluated by men (Gervais & Hillard, 2011).

Supporting a role congruity perspective on employees' perceptions of and reactions to women and men abusive leaders, Wang et al. (2013) found that the negative effect of authoritarian leadership on employee performance was stronger for women than men leaders. This is proposed to be because authoritarian leadership behaviors are congruent with expectations of the male gender role, and thus subordinates with authoritarian leaders discount the authoritarian behaviors of men leaders to a greater extent.

Follower Gender and Perceptions of Women Versus Men Leaders with Dark-side Traits

It appears that follower gender also plays a role in how men and women leaders with dark traits are perceived and experienced. First, a recent meta-analysis finds that women followers are less likely than men followers to rate their supervisors as abusive (Wang et al., 2019). The authors speculate that this is because women are more conditioned to occupying low-power roles. However, this seem to be at odds with the finding that female followers react more negatively to dark leadership and abusive supervision than males.

For example, abusive supervision has a stronger negative relationship with women followers' psychological distress and negative emotions (Atwater et al., 2016; Zhou et al., 2018), self-esteem (Burton & Hoobler, 2006), and intent to leave (Wang et al., 2016). In additional work, abusive leadership was negatively related to company identification for women followers only, reducing their proactive behaviors at work, such as taking charge (Ouyang et al., 2015). Whatever the reason, women employees and women-dominated organizations may be especially negatively impacted by abusive leaders. Research also suggests that organizations with leaders who are the same gender as the typical employee may also be especially negatively affected by abusive supervisors (Park et al., 2018), perhaps because gender similarity between abusive leaders and followers violates expectations for ingroup favoritism.

Follower gender may also influence how followers behave in the face of abusive leadership. In particular, consistent with social role theory (Eagly, 1987), men followers appear to react with more aggression and assertiveness to leaders with dark traits. In work by Capezio et al. (2017), men and women subordinates differentially utilized hard and soft influence tactics toward Machiavellian leaders. Leader Machiavellianism predicted greater subordinate ingratiation (a soft influence tactic directed at increasing liking) for women subordinates and not for men subordinates, and greater follower assertiveness (a hard influence tactic) in men but not in women subordinates. Follower gender also moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and supervisor-directed deviance, with a stronger relationship between abusive supervision and deviance for men as opposed to women (Restubog et al., 2011). Additionally, men followers are more likely to file complaints against abusive supervisors than women followers (Caillier, 2020) and are more likely to quit their job because of negative emotional reactions to abuse (Atwater et al., 2016).

Finally, gender appears to affect how tolerant followers are toward abusive or dark-trait leaders, in terms of showing acceptance of such leaders and in evaluating their leadership effectiveness. In a study with 145 leader/subordinate dyads, men subordinates rated women leaders with higher narcissism as less effective than women leaders with lower narcissism, while their ratings of men leaders were not affected by the leader's narcissism (De Hoogh et al., 2015). Similar results were found in an experimental study of U.S. university students. In this vignette-based research, men participants showed a much higher tolerance for men perpetrators of abusive supervision than women

perpetrators (Arman, 2020), by expressing greater acceptance of these leaders. These results suggest that follower gender affects a differential perception of women and men leaders with dark-side traits. Women followers did not show a gender bias in their ratings of narcissistic and abusive leaders, rating both men and women leaders with dark traits similarly, whereas men followers did show a gender bias by rating men leaders with dark-side traits less negatively than women leaders with dark-side traits.

Future Research on Dark-Side Traits in Women and Men Leaders

The relative dearth of research on gender differences in leaders with dark-side traits provides several fruitful avenues for future directions. While research shows that women leaders are less likely to possess and exhibit dark-side traits than men leaders, one possible suggestion for future research would be to examine whether these dark-side traits take on a different phenotype and manifest themselves differently in women. Society, through gender role stereotypes, exerts pressure on women to express feminine (friendliness, selflessness) rather than masculine (dominance, competitiveness) characteristics (Eagly & Wood, 1999). This may in turn shape narcissistic womens' behavior, such that they suppress masculine dark-side trait behaviors (e.g., aggression, dominance, outward callousness) and instead accentuate stereotypically "feminine" behaviors, but still with self-serving goals, for example through covert aggression, indirect manipulativeness, and paternalistic (benevolent while oppressive; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008) leadership styles. While women leaders with dark-side traits may appear less harmful, long-term damaging consequences may still result as their ultimate goal is self-serving. For example, their controlling-helping behavior may reduce followers' autonomy.

Related to gender role socialization, future research could further examine how others differentially perceive men and women leaders with dark-side traits, and whether being male provides leaders with more latitude to exercise dark-side traits and exhibit abusive supervision. The conflicting findings on leader gender and "abusive supervision" may be especially conditional given that abusive supervision is based on employees' subjective perceptions (Tepper et al., 2017). This means that the relationship between leader gender and abusive supervision depends both on follower characteristics, such as follower gender,

follower sexism, and the interaction of follower gender with leader gender, as well as leader constraints (e.g., family-to-work conflict) and opportunities. Much more work is needed to reveal the reasons women followers generally rate supervisors as less abusive but experience greater negative repercussions when being supervised by an abusive leader. One potential reason may be related to employees' engagement in emotional labor under abusive leaders. In research by Wu (2008), abusive supervision predicted employees' emotional exhaustion through emotional labor. Because women are required to engage in more emotional labor at work than men (e.g., Cottingham et al., 2015), this could explain their greater distress under abusive leaders.

Another interesting research direction would be to examine the impact of power on the activation of dark-side traits in men and women leaders. Previous research found that dark-side traits such as narcissism (Mead et al., 2018) and Machiavellianism (Wisse & Sleebos, 2016) exacerbate the negative effects of power. Gender also has been found to influence how power manifests itself (Foulk et al., 2020). For example, power led men to exhibit more dominant, agentic behavior, such as expanded body posture, whereas power led women to exhibit less indirect and submissive behavior, such as gaze aversion (Gonzaga et al., 2008). Examining gender as a moderator in research on dark-side traits of leaders in future research can help advance theory on gender and dark leadership and permit meta-analyses.

Finally, other moderators that are likely to be relevant to the activation or inhibition of Dark Triad traits in leaders could be considered, such as organizational culture. For example, aggressive organizational cultures (characterized by oppositional, power, and competitive norms; Cooke & Szumal, 2000) may enable leaders with dark-side traits to more easily pursue their manipulative, power-seeking agenda and as such may exacerbate the potential negative effects of these leaders. On the other hand, cooperative organizational cultures may be less tolerant of self-serving and callous behavior in leaders and as such inhibit the expression of dark traits.

Practical Implications for Dark-Side Traits in Women and Men Leaders

In terms of practical implications, given that men exhibit higher levels of dark-side traits than women, with stronger effects on behaviors such as aggression, men leaders with dark-side traits may need to be provided with

more ethical and social training than women leaders with dark-side traits. However, dark-side trait individuals might be reluctant to follow such short-term trainings, as they would be less likely to see a need for it. For example, narcissistic leaders are in general not interested in aspects of the communal domain (e.g., morality), instead focusing on presenting themselves positively in the agentic domain (e.g., dominance, power; Gebauer et al., 2012). As such, it may be more fruitful to invest in longer-term personal development through more concentrated guidance with use of coaching. Coaching could try to foster a greater sense of responsibility, provide a better insight into the leaders' decision-making (Sedikides & Campbell, 2017), and highlight the congruence between the leaders' interests and those of their employees and the organization.

In addition, employees who are supervised by such leaders should be given sufficient support systems in dealing with them. Likewise, ensuring that sufficient checks and balances are put in place and that leaders are held accountable is important when leaders exhibit dark-side traits. During the hiring process, it would be advisable to include some objective selection procedures and ensure rigorous criteria and assessor training for subjective selection procedures (e.g., interviews), considering that dark-side trait characteristics may be more acceptable in men candidates, and may even be seen as positive for the leadership role.

Second, our review suggests that follower characteristics should be considered in interpreting the evaluation and impact of dark leadership and abusive supervision. For instance, men followers, in comparison to women followers, are much more likely to proactively deal with abusive or dark leadership supervision, such as showing assertiveness toward the leader or reporting the behavior of that leader. Therefore, organizations need to ensure that they provide clear, easily accessible, and psychologically safe channels through which all employees can lodge complaints and obtain help when faced with such leaders. Reducing obstacles to seeking help and support for women subordinates is also important because abusive and dark-side trait leaders seem to have a more negative impact upon them in comparison to men subordinates. Finally, given that men followers tend to be more tolerant of dark-side traits in their leaders as well as abusive behavior, organizations need to ensure, when they are evaluating leaders through 360-degree feedback, that they include at least some women subordinates in the evaluation and that they make a critical comparison between ratings by men and women subordinates and follow up on these differences. Thus, to sum up, before

drawing any conclusions about men's and women's level of abusive supervision in organizations, or gender differences in abusive supervision, analysts should take into account the role of followers' characteristics, perceptions, and attributions (Wang et al., 2019), including their gender and gender role beliefs. Similarly, understanding the behavior of abusive supervisors requires taking into account leaders' gender and work context.

References

Ames, D. R., Rose, P., & Anderson, C. P. (2006). The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*(4), 440–450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2005.03.002

Anderson, N. E., & Kiehl, K. A. (2014). Psychopathy: Developmental perspectives and their implications for treatment. *Restorative Neurology and Neuroscience, 32*(1), 103–117. https://doi.org/10.3233/RNN-139001

Arman, G. (2020). Bystander intervention in the context of abusive supervision: Effects of power distance orientation and gender. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 36*(2), 111–124.

Atwater, L., Kim, K. Y., Witt, A., Latheef, Z., Callison, K., Elkins, T. J., & Zheng, D. (2016). Reactions to abusive supervision: Examining the roles of emotions and gender in the USA. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27*(16), 1874–1899.

Barelds, D. P. H., Wisse, B., Sanders, S., & Laurijssen, L. M. (2018). No regard for those who need it: The moderating role of follower self-esteem in the relationship between leader psychopathy and leader self-serving behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, Article 1281. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01281

Bedell, K., Hunter, S., Angie, A., & Vert, A. (2006). A historiometric examination of Machiavellianism and a new taxonomy of leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 12*, 50–72.

Blickle, G., Schütte, N., & Genau, H. A. (2018). Manager psychopathy, trait activation, and job performance: A multi-source study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 27*(4), 450–461. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1475354

Borroni, S., Somma, A., Andershed, H., Maffei, C., & Fossati, A. (2014). Psychopathy dimensions, Big Five traits, and dispositional aggression in adolescence: Issues of gender consistency. *Personality and Individual Differences, 66*, 199–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.03.019

Braun, S. (2017). Leader narcissism and outcomes in organizations: A review at multiple levels of analysis and implications for future research. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 773. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00773

Braun, S., Aydin N., Frey D., & Peus, C. (2016). Leader narcissism predicts malicious envy and supervisor-targeted counterproductive work behavior: Evidence from field and experimental research. *Journal of Business Ethics, 135*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3224-5

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:10.1177/0146167208324101

Burton, J. P., & Hoobler, J. M. (2006). Subordinate self-esteem and abusive supervision. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 13*(3), 340–355. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40604544

Byrne, A., Dionisi, A. M., Barling, J., Akers, A., Robertson, J., Lys, R., Wylie, J., & Dupré, K. (2014). The depleted leader: The influence of leaders' diminished psychological resources on leadership behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly, 25*(2), 344–357. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.09.003

Caillier, J. G. (2020). Abusive supervision in agencies: The role of gender in reporting and complaint success. *International Journal of Public Administration*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2020.1820522

Capezio, A., Wang, L., Restubog, S. L. D., Garcia, P. R. J. M., & Lu, V. N. (2017). To flatter or to assert? Gendered reactions to Machiavellian leaders. *Journal of Business Ethics, 141*(1), 1–11.

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. https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.52.3.351

Chen, S. (2010). The role of ethical leadership versus institutional constraints: A simulation study of financial misreporting by CEOs. *Journal of Business Ethics, 93*(S1), 33–52.

Collison, K. L., South, S., Vize, C. E., Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2021). Exploring gender differences in Machiavellianism using a measurement invariance approach. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 103*(2), 258–266. doi: 10.1080/00223891.2020.1729773

Cooke, R. A., & Szumal, J. L. (2000). Using the Organizational Culture Inventory to understand the operating cultures of organizations. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. M. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Culture & Climate* (pp. 147–162). Sage Publications, Inc.

Cottingham, M. D., Erickson, R. J. & Diefendorff, J. M. (2015). Examining men's status shield and status bonus: How gender frames the emotional labor and job satisfaction of nurses. *Sex Roles, 72*, 377–389. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-014-0419-z

Courtright, S. H., Gardner, R. G., Smith, T. A., McCormick, B. W., & Colbert, A. E. (2016). My family made me do it: A cross-domain, self-regulatory perspective on antecedents to abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 59*(5), 1630–1652.

Czibor, A., Szabo, Z. P., Jones, D. N., Zsido, A. N., Paal, T., Szijjarto, L., Carre, J. R., & Bereczkei, T. (2017). Male and female face of Machiavellianism: Opportunism or anxiety? *Personality and Individual Differences, 117*, 221–229.

Dahling, J. J., Whitaker, B. G., & Levy, P. E. (2009). The development and validation of a new Machiavellianism Scale. *Journal of Management, 35*(2), 219–257. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308318618

De Hoogh, A. H. B., Den Hartog, D. N., & Nevicka, B. (2015). Gender differences in the perceived effectiveness of narcissistic leaders. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 64, 370–380.

Deluga, R. J. (2001). American presidential Machiavellianism: Implications for charismatic leadership and rated performance. *Leadership Quarterly, 12*, 339–363. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00082-0

Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2012). Work engagement and Machiavellianism in the ethical leadership process. *Journal of Business Ethics, 107*, 35–47. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1296-4

Dowgwillo, E. A., & Pincus, A. L. (2017). Differentiating dark triad traits within and across interpersonal circumplex surfaces. *Assessment, 24*(1), 24–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191116643161

Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social-Role Interpretation.* Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(2), 233–256. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.233

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*(5), 685–710. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.5.685

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*(3), 573–598. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573

Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist, 54*(6), 408–423. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.6.408

Eisenbarth, H., Hart, C. M., & Sedikides, C. (2018). Do psychopathic traits predict professional success? *Journal of Economic Psychology, 64*, 130–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2018.01.002

Elliot, A. J., McGregor, H. A., & Gable, S. (1999). Achievement goals, study strategies, and exam performance: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(3), 549–563. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.91.3.549

Foulk, T. A., Chighizola, N., & Chen, G. (2020). Power corrupts (or does it?): An examination of the boundary conditions of the antisocial effects of experienced power. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 14*(4), e12524. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12524

Gable, M., Hollon, C., & Dangello, F. (1990). Relating locus of control to Machiavellianism and managerial achievement. *Psychological Reports, 67*(1), 339–343. https://doi.org/10.2466/PR0.67.5.339-343

Galvin, B. M., Waldman, D., & Balthazard, P. (2010). Visionary communication qualities as mediators of the relationship between narcissism and attributions of leader charisma. *Personnel Psychology, 63*(3), 509–537. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01179.x

Gebauer, J. E., Sedikides, C., Verplanken, B., & Maio, G. R. (2012). Communal narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103*(5), 854–878. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029629

Gervais, S. J., & Hillard, A. L. (2011). A role congruity perspective on prejudice toward Hillary Clinton and Sarah Palin. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 11*(1), 221–240. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-2415.2011.01263.x

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*(1), 119–135. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00104.x

Gluck, M., Heesacker, M., & Choi, H. D. (2019). How much of the dark triad is accounted for by sexism? *Personality and Individual Differences, 154*, 109728.

Gonzaga, G. C., Keltner, D., & Ward, D. (2008). Power in mixed-sex stranger interactions. *Cognition and Emotion, 22*(8), 1555–1568. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.05.019

Grieve, R., March, E., & Van Doorn, G. (2019). Masculinity might be more toxic than we think: The influence of gender roles on trait emotional manipulation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 138*, 157–162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.09.042

Grijalva, E., Harms, P. D., Newman, D. A., Gaddis, B. H., & Fraley, R. C. (2015a). Narcissism and leadership: A meta-analytic review of linear and nonlinear relationships. *Personnel Psychology, 68*(1), 1–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12072

Grijalva, E., Newman, D. A., Tay, L., Donnellan, M. B., Harms, P. D., Robins, R. W., & Yan, T. (2015b). Gender differences in narcissism: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 141*(2), 261–310. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038231

Guinote, A. (2017). How power affects people: Activating, wanting, and goal seeking. *Annual Review of Psychology, 68*, 353–381. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010416-044153

Harms, P. D., Spain, S. M., & Hannah, S. T. (2011). Leader development and the dark side of personality. *Leadership Quarterly, 22*(3), 495–509. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.04.007

Hogue, M., Levashina, J., & Hang, H. (2013). Will I fake it? The interplay of gender, Machiavellianism, and self-monitoring on strategies for honesty in job interviews. *Journal of Business Ethics, 117*(2), 399–411. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-

Hyde, J., & Grieve, R. (2018). The dark side of emotion at work: Emotional manipulation in everyday and work place contexts. *Personality and Individual Differences, 129*, 108–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.03.025

Ingersoll, A. R., Glass, C., Cook, A., & Olsen, K. J. (2019). Power, status and expectations: How narcissism manifests among women CEOs. *Journal of Business Ethics, 158*(4), 893–907. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3730-0

Jonason, P. K., & Davis, M. D. (2018). A gender role view of the dark triad traits. *Personality and Individual Differences, 125*, 102–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.01.004

Karandikar, S., Kapoor, H., Fernandes, S., & Jonason, P. K. (2019). Predicting moral decision-making with dark personalities and moral values. *Personality and Individual Differences, 140*, 70–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.03.048

Kets de Vries, M. F. R., & Balazs, K. (2011). The shadow side of leadership. In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, B. Jackson, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Leadership* (pp. 508–517). Sage.

Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A., & Ristikari, T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological Bulletin, 137*(4), 616–642. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023557

Landay, K., Harms, P. D., & Credé, M. (2019). Shall we serve the dark lords? A meta-analytic review of psychopathy and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 104*(1), 183. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000357

Li, Y., Wang, Z., Yang, L.-Q., & Liu, S. (2016). The crossover of psychological distress from leaders to subordinates in teams: The role of abusive supervision, psychological capital, and team performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 21*(2), 142–153. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039960

Liu, H., Chiang, J. T.-J., Fehr, R., Xu, M., & Wang, S. (2017). How do leaders react when treated unfairly? Leader narcissism and self-interested behavior in response to unfair treatment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(11), 1590–1599. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000237

Mathieu, C., Neumann, C. S., Hare, R. D., & Babiak, P. (2014). A dark side of leadership: Corporate psychopathy and its influence on employee well-being and job satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences, 59*, 83–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.11.010

McCleskey, J. A. (2013). The dark side of leadership: Measurement, assessment, and intervention. *Business Renaissance Quarterly, 8*, 35–55.

Mead, N. L., Baumeister, R. F., Stuppy, A., & Vohs, K. D. (2018). Power increases the socially toxic component of narcissism among individuals with high baseline testosterone.

Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 147(4), 591–596. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000427

Mertins, V., & Hoffeld, W. (2015). Do overconfident workers cooperate less? the relationship between overconfidence and cooperation in team production. *Managerial & Decision Economics, 36*(4), 265–274. https://doi.org/10.1002/mde.2667

Moore, K. E., Ross, S. R., & Brosius, E. C. (2020). The role of gender in the relations among Dark Triad and psychopathy, sociosexuality, and moral judgments. *Personality and Individual Differences, 152*, 6.

Muris, P., Merckelbach, H., Otgaar, H., & Meijer, E. (2017). The malevolent side of human nature: A meta-analysis and critical review of the literature on the dark triad (narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy). *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12*(2), 183–204. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616666070

Nevicka, B., De Hoogh, A. H., Van Vianen, A. E., Beersma, B., & McIlwain, D. (2011a). All I need is a stage to shine: Narcissists' leader emergence and performance. *Leadership Quarterly, 22*(5), 910–925. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.07.011

Nevicka, B., Ten Velden, F. S., De Hoogh, A. H. B., & Van Vianen, A. E. M. (2011b). Reality at odds with perceptions: Narcissistic leaders and group performance. *Psychological Science, 22*, 1259–1264. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417259

Nevicka, B., Van Vianen, A. E., De Hoogh, A. H., & Voorn, B. (2018). Narcissistic leaders: An asset or a liability? Leader visibility, follower responses, and group-level absenteeism. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 103*(7), 703–723. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000298

Nuzulia, S., & Why, F. Y. P. (2020). When the dark shines: The role of dark personality traits in leadership role occupancy and hiring decisions in a collectivistic culture. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 11*(8), 1089–1100. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550619893956

O'Boyle, E. H., Jr., 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. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025679

O'Reilly III, C. A., Chatman, J. A., & Doerr, B. (2020). When "me" trumps "we": Narcissistic leaders and the cultures they create. *Academy of Management Discoveries*. https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2019.0163

O'Reilly III, C. A., Doerr, B., & Chatman, J. A. (2018). "See you in court": How CEO narcissism increases firms' vulnerability to lawsuits. *Leadership Quarterly, 29*(3), 365–378. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.08.001

Ouimet, G. (2010), Dynamics of narcissistic leadership in organizations: Towards an integrated research model. Journal of Managerial Psychology, *25*(7), 713–726. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941011075265

Ouyang, K., Lam, W., & Wang, W. (2015). Roles of gender and identification on abusive supervision and proactive behavior. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 32*(3), 671–691.

Owens, B. P., Wallace, A. S., & Waldman, D. A. (2015). Leader narcissism and follower outcomes: The counterbalancing effect of leader humility. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(4), 1203–1213. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038698

Pan, W., Zhang, Q., Teo, T. S. H., & Lim, V. K. G. (2018). The dark triad and knowledge hiding. *International Journal of Information Management, 42*, 36–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2018.05.008

Park, J. H., Carter, M. Z., DeFrank, R. S., & Deng, Q. (2018). Abusive supervision, psychological distress, and silence: The effects of gender dissimilarity between supervisors

and subordinates. *Journal of Business Ethics, 153*(3), 775–792. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3384-3

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6

Pellegrini, E. K., & Scandura, T. A. (2008). Paternalistic leadership: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management, 34*(3), 566–593. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316063

Petrenko, O. V., Aime, F., Ridge, J., & Hill, A. (2016). Corporate social responsibility or CEO narcissism? CSR motivations and organizational performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 37*, 262–279. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2348

Prime, J. L., Carter, N. M., & Welbourne, T. M. (2009). Women "take care," men "take charge": Managers' stereotypic perceptions of women and men leaders. *Psychologist-Manager Journal, 12*(1), 25–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/10887150802371799

Reijntjes, A., Vermande, M., Thomaes, S., Goossens, F., Olthof, T., Aleva, L., & Van der Meulen, M. (2016). Narcissism, bullying, and social dominance in youth: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 44*(1), 63–74. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-015-9974-1

Restubog, S. L. D., Scott, K. L., & Zagenczyk, T. J. (2011). When distress hits home: The role of contextual factors and psychological distress in predicting employees' responses to abusive supervision. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(4), 713–729. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021593

Rogstad, J. E., & Rogers, R. (2008). Gender differences in contributions of emotion to psychopathy and antisocial personality disorder. *Clinical Psychology Review, 28*(8), 1472–1484. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2008.09.004

Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(3), 629–645. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.629

Rudman, L. A., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan, J. E., & Nauts, S. (2012). Status incongruity and backlash effects: Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice against female leaders. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(1), 165–179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.10.008

Schein, V. E., Mueller, R., Lituchy, T., & Liu, J. (1996). Think manager—think male: A global phenomenon? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17*(1), 33–41. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199601)17:1<33::AID-JOB778>3.0.CO;2-F

Sedikides, C., & Campbell, W. K. (2017). Narcissistic force meets systemic resistance: The energy clash model. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12*(3), 400–421. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617692105

Sendjaya, S., Pekerti, A., Härtel, C., Hirst, G., & Butarbutar, I. (2016). Are authentic leaders always moral? The role of Machiavellianism in the relationship between authentic leadership and morality. *Journal of Business Ethics, 133*(1), 125–139. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2351-0

Spain, S. M., [illegible]