The Consequences of “Dark” Leadership: Perspective of Generation Z

The paper examines the relationship between the Dark Triad personality traits and leadership outcomes from the perspective of Generation Z. A quasi-experiment with hypothetical leaders' scenarios as stimulus was applied in this empirical research.

Keywords: dark triad, leadership outcomes, Generation Z, quasi-experiment.

Šiame tyrime atskleidžiamos sąsajos tarp tamsiosios triados asmenybės savybių ir vadovavimo pasekmių remiantis Z kartos atstovų nuomone. Kaip tyrimo metodas pasirinktas kvaziekperimentas, kuriame buvo naudojami scenarijai (stimulinė medžiaga), aprašantys hipotetinius vadovus.

Raktiniai žodžiai: tamsioji triada, vadovavimo pasekmės, Z karta, kvaziekperimentas.

Introduction

The leader is seen as one of the most important figures in the organization responsible for its success. However, can every leader be successful? Since the beginning of research on leadership (more than 100 years ago), a lot of different leadership models and theories have been developed. All of them strived for the main aim – to define an effective leader (Northouse, 2009). However, we still lack clear and unambiguous recommendations of how leaders could become more effective in the future, especially, considering a new generation of employees and their opinion about the leader they would like to follow.

Research on personality traits experiences a period of Renaissance in the context of effective leadership, e.g., extraversion, consciousness, openness to experience were found to be positively related to leadership effectiveness (Derue, Nahr-gang, Wellman, Humphrey, 2011; Spain, Harms, Lebreton, 2013). However, the majority of researchers (and practitioners) are concerned about the positive side of the leader's personality and its effect on different leadership outcomes such as leader effectiveness, satisfaction with a leader or extra efforts of employees. But what about the negative personality traits of leaders? For the last decade, researchers started paying more attention to the “dark”

Tadas VADVILAVIČIUS – Organizational psychology Master student, Department of Psychology, Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania. Address: Jonavos str. 66, Kaunas, Lithuania. Phone: +370 636 31992. Email: tadas.vadvilavicius@stud.vdu.lt

Aurelija STELMOKIENĖ – Doctor of social sciences, associate professor at the Department of Psychology, Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania. Address: Jonavos str. 66, Kaunas, Lithuania. Phone: +370 37 327824. Email: aurelija.stelmokiene@vdu.lt

side of personality when D. L. Paulhus and K. M. Williams (2002) presented the Dark Triad model of personality. After that, leadership is no longer understood only as a positive construct. However, there is still lack of empirical data about relationships between the Dark triad and leadership. Moreover, recent years have become a real struggle for human resource managers and team leaders because they had to face a new group of employees – Generation Z. There is little information about this specific employee group in the workplace, especially about their attitudes and beliefs. So, if we take into account that some leaders might be “dark” – do they matter for Generation Z employees?

Therefore, **the research object** in this article is the perception of “dark” leadership outcomes from the perspective of Generation Z.

The aim of the research is to analyse the effect of the “dark” side of the leader’s personality on leadership outcomes from the perspective of Generation Z.

The research methods. A quasi-experiment research design was applied to reach the aim of this investigation. Scenarios developed by the authors of this article were used as stimulus material in the research. A multifactorial leadership questionnaire (Bass, Avolio, 2004) was used to assess leadership outcomes, while Dirty dozen (Jonason, Webster, 2010) was used to assess the leader’s Dark Triad traits.

Generation Z – new challenges in the workplace?

“Post millennials”, “iGeneration”, “Facebook generation” or “Lost generation”, that is how the newest employees’ generation

entering workplaces all around the world, is being called (Fratriciová, Kirchmayer, 2018). They are better known as Generation Z. It is mostly agreed that Generation Z (further – Gen-Z) is a generation of persons, born from mid-90’s till 2010 (we chose this period because it is mostly used in the literature although different years or even names for this generation may be found) (McCrindle, Wolfinger, 2009; Csobanka, 2016). Gen-Z raise a lot of questions and very often are defined as challenges for leaders and HR specialists, who do not know how to work with this specific group of employees (Wiedmer, 2015; Bencsik, Horváth-Csikós, Juhász, 2016). Therefore, researchers are invited to study Gen-Z attitudes about leadership and to share their recommendations with organizations (Anderson, Baur, Griffith, Buckley, 2017).

Gen-Z is considered to be the least researched employees’ generation (Dolot, 2018), thus we may highlight only a few characteristics of Gen-Z that is already known from other studies. The main characteristic of Gen-Z is the use of electronic devices: smartphones, laptops, smart TV’s, etc. (Wiedmer, 2015; Turner, 2015). Because of such an active use of technologies, members of Gen-Z are considered not to know how to communicate “face to face” and to lack interpersonal skills (Bejtkovsky, 2016). However, they use different communication devices and platforms, e.g., Facebook, Skype, Instagram, etc., in order to keep in touch with their friends, schoolmates and even co-workers (Turner, 2015; Wiedmer, 2015). V. Targamadzė et al. (2015) highlights that Gen-Z members have high self-interest and self-esteem, lack of interest for others and seek for independence.

It is obvious, Gen-Z employees like to act individually and are not very keen on team playing. In the workplace, Gen-Zs like to be in charge of something, want to feel satisfied with their jobs and are oriented to achieve their personal goals (Ozkan, Solmaz, 2015; Chillakuri, Mahanandia, 2018; Bencsik et al., 2016). Quite often they choose careers of their own interest and even change job if it does not fill their needs e.g., work-family balance (Bencsik et al., 2016). Gen-Z members are not afraid of changes. On the contrary, Gen-Zs see changes as a necessity and even like to be in charge while handling them (Bencsik et al., 2016; Ozkan, Solmaz, 2015).

T. Wiedmer (2015) states that Gen-Z employees do not need directive leaders, because they can find all the necessary information and instructions on how to do the tasks by themselves. It is believed that members of Gen-Z admire leaders who are warm, encouraging, good listeners and reward employees for achievements (Singh, Dangmei, 2016; Ozkan, Solmaz, 2015; Wiedmer, 2015). Gen-Z employees want to be independent and make their own decisions. They seek a job they love and need recognition from a leader in the organization. But what if the culture of an organization is not like that? What if the leader tends to manipulate, has a lack of remorse and empathy and could be called a “dark” leader? As was mentioned, there is a lack of knowledge about Gen-Z attitudes towards leaders in general and also the major gap is about attitudes towards “dark” leaders who supposed to be a real problem for organizations and employees. GenZ is the future (and nowadays even present) of labour force for every organization that is why studying their attitudes and beliefs is important for both research-

ers and practitioners. After all, employees behave according to their attitudes and their behaviour is related to the particular outcomes of an organization.

“Dark” leadership – the role of the Dark Triad personality

Typically, researchers and practitioners concentrate on the positive side of leadership. There are many books, articles, presentations, Ted talks, etc., that report about “being a good leader”. But what about “not being a bad leader?”. In the last few decades, interest in the “dark side” of personality has increased. The best-known personality model that describes the “dark side” of personality is Dark triad personality model (Paulhus, Williams, 2002). Three personality traits are defined in the model: Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy (Paulhus, Williams, 2002). Machiavellianism is related to manipulation while seeking personal goals, narcissism is associated with a grandiose sense of self-importance, high egoism, and psychopathy is linked to the impulsivity, unethical behaviour and emotional shallowness (Muris, Meesters, Timmermans, 2013; Kapoor, 2015; Jones, Figueredo, 2013). In addition, all three traits have common characteristics such as a lack of empathy, higher aggression, and the pursuit of power (Jonason, Webster, 2010; Zeigler-Hill, VoNk, 2015).

P. K. Jonason, S. Slomski and J. Partyka (2012) state that the pursuit of power is one of the main goals of Dark triad personalities. That is why the Dark Triad personalities quite often take leading positions (Krick et al. 2016). As leaders, the Dark Triad personalities (or “dark” leaders) are

described as aggressive, prone to exploit subordinates and break rules, showing a lack of involvement (Krick et al. 2016; Myung, Choi, 2017). These leader characteristics can lead to worse job performance, unproductive job behavior, lower job satisfaction and higher stress level of employees (Furnham, Trickey, Hyde, 2012; Wisse, Sleafos, 2016). The authors have already stated that Dark triad personality is negatively associated with leadership effectiveness, although these statements are hypothetical because they lack empirical evidence (Volmer, Koch, Görtz, 2016).

Perhaps, it would be logical to say that “dark” leadership is always associated with undesirable outcomes, but there is also another side of the Dark Triad. The Dark Triad leaders could be described as charismatic, fearless, and good at creating a positive first impression (Chung, Charles, 2016). They feel confident in the negotiation process; they are good entrepreneurs and always seek to win (Jauk et al., 2016). In addition, while able to manipulate others, Dark triad leaders may be useful for stimulating others to work faster, more efficiently, etc. (Sendjaya et al., 2016). Looking from the other (more subtle) angle, it is known that each Dark triad trait has its own positive side. Leaders who, for example, possess a higher level of Machiavellianism show better time management skills, can be seen as reliable co-workers or leaders, can easily motivate other people while using different influence tactics (Forsyth, Banks, McDaniel, 2012; Jonason, Slomski, Partyka, 2012). Leaders who possess a higher level of narcissism are described as charismatic, ambitious, they easily inspire others to follow their vision (Ehrich, Ehrich, 2014; Forsyth,

Banks, McDaniel, 2012). Finally, leaders who possess a higher level of psychopathy are able to make rational (most of the time risky) decisions, are able quickly to adapt to different situations and even adapt situations to their own needs (Boddy, 2010; Boddy, 2006). Despite this small “bright” side, “dark” leaders are mostly associated with negative leadership outcomes. However, which leadership outcomes should be studied in the context of “dark” leadership?

Outcomes of “dark” leadership

During the long period of research, many different leadership outcomes have been studied. N. J. Hiller et al. (2011) completed wide leadership literature review and distinguished 4 major leadership outcome domains and the 10 individual criteria subsumed within them, e.g., effectiveness (e.g., leadership effectiveness, performance rating), attitude (e.g., emotion, motivation), behaviour (e.g., group process, organizational citizenship behaviour) and cognition (e.g., perceptual). After the research Hiller and colleagues (2011) stated, that attitude is one of the most popular outcomes in leadership literature followed by leadership effectiveness. However, one model has already become the most popular in leadership research to test leadership outcomes (van Knippenberg, Sitkin, 2013). The full-range leadership model (FRLM) developed by B. J. Avolio and B. M. Bass (2004) includes three leadership outcomes from different earlier mentioned domains: leadership effectiveness, extra efforts, and satisfaction with a leader.

The scale of leadership effectiveness in FRLM assesses if subordinates see a leader as effective in organization; the scale of extra efforts evaluates if a leader is perceived to be able to influence followers to do more than they are expected to do; the scale of satisfaction with a leader assesses if subordinates are satisfied with their leader's methods of working with others (Avolio, Bass, 2004). Despite the popularity of FRLM, there is still a lack of empirical data about the relationships between leadership outcomes and "dark" leadership.

Researchers and practitioners agree that everyone in the organization benefits from effective leadership and suffers from ineffective or destructive leadership (Gaddis, Foster, 2015). But what are these benefits or damages in particular, and what aspects of leadership lead to them the most? GLOBE research program identified universal impediments (e.g., being asocial, irritable, dictatorial) and facilitators (e.g., being trustworthy, visionary, charismatic, inspirational and effective team-builder) of leadership effectiveness in the sample of 62 cultures (Javidan et al., 2006). With reference to B. H. Gaddis and J. L. Foster's (2016) research, emotionally volatile, mistrustful and insensitive leaders tend to perform poorly in managerial roles. However, leaders who command attention and draw others to them are rated with higher performance indices.

While talking about the particular aspects of "dark" personality, Machiavellianism is related with more directive leadership, lower employees' job satisfaction and employee's exploitation (Dahling, Whitaker, Levy, 2009; Wisse, Sleafbos, 2016; Furtner, Maran, Rauthmann, 2017). Narcissism is associated with unethical be-

haviour in the workplace and ineffective, authoritarian leadership (Ehrich, Ehrich, 2014; Furtner et al., 2017). Psychopathic leaders create a toxic work environment with a higher rate of conflicts, employees' harassment, low job satisfaction (Boddy, 2010). Research also indicates that psychopathy is negatively related to leadership effectiveness, leadership satisfaction and extra efforts (Mathieu et al., 2014). It can be seen, the results about the "dark" characteristics of a leader and leadership outcomes are controversial.

It also seems that nowadays employees care more about the leader as a person than about his/her competences (Gaddis, Foster, 2015), so intrapersonal characteristics of a leader matter a lot, e.g., satisfaction with a hostile, antisocial leader is low. Besides, when subordinates perceive the manipulative intention of a leader, their willingness to demonstrate contextual performance activities declines (Lin et al., 2017).

Nevertheless, the same "dark" personality traits can lead both to success and failure in leadership (Spain et al., 2013; Smith et al. 2018). Quite often it depends on the work context, e.g., the raters'/employees' perception. Therefore, in this current research, the main aim is to investigate the relationships between the leader's Dark Triad personality and leadership outcomes, described in FRLM, from the Generation Z perspective.

Research hypothesis:

1. From the Generation Z perspective, the leader's Dark Triad traits are negatively related with leadership outcomes:

1.1. From the Generation Z perspective, leadership effectiveness is negatively related with leader's Dark Triad traits;

- 1.2. From the Generation Z perspective, satisfaction with a leader is negatively related with the leader's Dark triad traits;
- 1.3. From the Generation Z perspective, subordinates' extra efforts are negatively related to the leader's Dark Triad traits.

Research methods

Participants and procedure. In the research, participated 110 people (82% of them were females). They were members of GenZ (18-24 years old, $M=21.20$, $SD=1.52$). Almost half of the participants (48%) studied during the research (40.9% were studying social science). The majority of GenZs (75%) had work experience (from 1 to 84 months). They were invited to participate in the research via Facebook platform and through e-mails (administrators of different faculties in universities helped to send an invitation to students). During the research, participants were asked to answer sociodemographic questions, read 1 out of 5 scenarios that they chose randomly (they had to choose a number in order to show that they were not a robot; scenarios were assigned automatically to the particular number), and

rate the leaders in scenarios with Dirty Dozen and Multi-factorial leadership questionnaires. Confidentiality of their individual answers in the research was assured.

Methods. A quasi-experiment research design (with scenarios as stimulus) was used in the research. For the research, authors created five scenarios that represented hypothetical leaders with different patterns of the Dark Triad traits' expression. Scenarios were: 1) "The bad leader" scenario with highly expressed all three Dark triad traits (Machiavellianism high, psychopathy high and narcissism high); 2) "The good leader" scenario (Machiavellianism low, psychopathy low and narcissism low); 3) "The Machiavellian leader" (Machiavellianism high, psychopathy low and narcissism low); 4) "The Psychopathic leader" (Machiavellianism low, psychopathy high and narcissism low) and 5) "The Narcissist leader" (Machiavellianism low, psychopathy low and narcissism high). Scenarios described a casual leader's X work-week (scenarios were gender-neutral). FRLM (Bass, Avolio, 2004) was used as a theoretical background to describe the common situations of leader behaviour, while the Dark triad personality model was used as a theoretical background to describe the leader's Dark Triad

Table 1. A fragment of scenarios

Scenario	Situation
"The good leader"	"Leader reviews project's interim report and notices a few mistakes. Leader invites the staff member who is responsible for the project, shows him the mistakes and starts a mutual discussion about the ways how to solve the problem"
"The bad leader" / "The narcissistic leader"	"Leader reviews project's interim report and notices a few mistakes. Leader invites the staff member who is responsible for the project and starts a monologue on how to solve the problem. While speaking leader tries to get an approval from the staff member that his/her ideas are good and waits for a praise"

Source: A. Stelmokienė and T. Vadvilavičius (2019).

Table 2. Inter-rater agreement for the evaluation of the Dark Triad traits in different scenarios

Leader's scenario	Awg index	
	Pilot study	Main study
“The bad leader”	0.73 (n=8)	0.86 (n=6)
“The good leader”	0.93 (n=6)	0.83 (n=8)
“The Machiavellian leader”	0.87 (n=11)	0.94 (n=8)
“The Narcissistic leader”	0.92 (n=9)	0.87 (n=10)
“The Psychopathic leader”	0.91 (n=6)	0.92 (n=8)

traits (an example in Table 1). To learn more about the development of scenarios used in this research, see A. Stelmokienė and T. Vadvilavičius (2019).

Scenarios were tested in a pilot study to make sure they met reliability and validity criteria. So, 40 psychology bachelor and master students from Vytautas Magnus University, Vilnius University and Lithuanian University of Health Sciences university participated in the pilot study. After it, scenarios were improved and tested again in the main study. Data of 40 participants from all the sample (110 people) was randomly chosen using computerized software. Reliability and validity testing procedures were run again. Results showed that improved scenarios had high reliability (Awg index more than 0,80) (see Table 2). They also confirmed expected construct validity (see Table 3): results

revealed that the expression of all Dark triad traits was the highest in “The bad leader” scenario and the lowest in “The good leader” scenario. “The Machiavellian leader” was rated as the most Machiavellian; “The Psychopathic leader” as the most psychopathic and “The Narcissistic leader” was rated significantly higher for narcissism.

The 12-item Dirty Dozen scale was used to assess the leader's Dark triad traits (Jonason, Webster, 2010). It measures general Dark triad traits expression and includes three subscales: Machiavellianism (e.g., “the leader tends to manipulate others to get his way”), Psychopathy (e.g., “the leader tends to lack remorse”) and Narcissism (e.g., “the leader tends to want others to admire him”). Participants were asked to indicate how much do they agree with the statements about

Table 3. Evaluation of the Dark Triad traits' expression in different scenarios

Leader's scenario	Chi-square test	
	Pilot study	Main study
“The bad leader”	$\chi^2=18.79^*$, df=4	$\chi^2=24.79^*$, df=4
“The good leader”	$\chi^2=5.25^*$, df=4	$\chi^2=4.50^*$, df=4
“The Machiavellian leader”	$\chi^2=15.62^*$, df=4	$\chi^2=21.03^*$, df=4
“The Narcissistic leader”	$\chi^2=8.81$, df=4	$\chi^2=17.24^*$, df=4
“The Psychopathic leader”	$\chi^2=21.43^*$, df=4	$\chi^2=28.83^*$, df=4

* $p < 0.05$

Table 4. Means, standard deviations, and correlations between the main variables

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Dark triad	5.16	1.38						
2. Machiavellianism	5.05	1.62	.94**					
3. Psychopathy	4.76	1.79	.91**	.81**				
4. Narcissism	5.67	1.38	.83**	.71**	.60**			
5. Satisfaction with a leader	1.72	1.22	-.68**	-.57**	-.73**	-.49**		
6. Extra efforts	1.84	1.22	-.62**	-.55**	-.66**	-.42**	.81**	
7. Leadership effectiveness	1.85	1.06	-.67**	-.61**	-.69**	-.48**	.83**	.84**

** $p < 0.01$

the described leader on a seven-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Cronbach Alpha coefficients were as follows: for the general Dark Triad scale – 0.930; for Machiavellianism – 0.831; for Psychopathy – 0.823; for Narcissism – 0.797.

Leadership outcomes were assessed with a Multifactorial leadership questionnaire (MLQ, Avolio, Bass, 2004). MLQ consists of 45 items about leader behaviour that are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (from 0 = 'never' to 4 = 'always'). MLQ is mostly used to assess leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire), but it also assesses three leadership outcomes: extra efforts of subordinates (Cronbach α in this study=0.885), satisfaction with a leader (Cronbach α =0.771) and leadership effectiveness (Cronbach α =0.869) (MLQ manual, Avolio, Bass, 2004).

Results

In order to test the relationship between the Dark Triad traits and leadership outcomes, two types of statistical procedures were applied. Firstly, correlations between

the perceived Dark Triad traits of hypothetical leader and leadership outcomes were measured (see Table 4). Results revealed, that from the Generation Z perspective, the Dark Triad traits of hypothetical leaders were significantly negatively related to satisfaction with a leader, leadership effectiveness and extra efforts: higher expression of the Dark Triad traits were related with lower leadership effectiveness, less satisfaction with a leader and fewer extra efforts. These results confirm the theoretical assumptions presented in the literature analysis. Besides, the strength of the relationship between variables analysis (Blalock, 1972) confirmed that negative correlations between leadership effectiveness and narcissism were significantly weaker in comparison with correlations between leadership effectiveness and psychopathy ($t=2.84$; $p<0.01$) or whole dark triad ($t=2.45$; $p<0.01$). The same tendency was true for extra efforts and satisfaction with a leader. So, narcissism was evaluated as a significantly better trait for a leader from the worst in the context of leadership outcomes. These results partially confirm that leaders with expressed higher narcissism are perceived as more effective leaders (Owens, Wallace,

Fig. 1. Mean ranks of leadership outcomes in different scenarios

Waldman, 2015) at least compared with leaders who possess higher Machiavellianism and/or higher psychopathy.

Secondly, leadership outcomes in different scenarios were compared (see Figure 1). Results revealed that “The good leader” scenario was associated with the highest level of all leadership outcomes. “The narcissistic leader” scenario was associated with higher scores of leadership effectiveness and extra efforts when compared with “The Machiavellian leader” (respectively Mean Difference (MD)=0.88, $p<0.005$ and MD=0.86, $p<0.04$) and “The psychopathic leader” (respectively MD= 1.11 and MD= 1.33, both $p<0.001$) scenarios. Besides, Gen Zs were less satisfied with “The psychopathic leader” in comparison with “The Machiavellian leader” and “The narcissistic leader” (respectively MD= -1.30, $p<0.001$ and MD= -0.84, $p<0.03$).

So, the results of the research confirmed that Gen Z members were not satisfied with leaders who possessed the Dark triad traits, they were not willing to

make extra efforts and evaluated leadership effectiveness with low scores.

Conclusions

Leadership is one of the most popular research objects in the fields of organizational psychology and management. During a long period of research, different perspectives about effective leadership have emerged (Northouse, 2009). However, the majority of researchers focused their attention only on the positive side of leadership from the leader-centred view. Follower centric perspective and Dark traits of a leader came to stage only before less than ten years. It was acknowledged that employees’ attitudes towards leaders: their behaviour and traits, really mattered (Oc, Bashshur, 2013). Moreover, Generation Z employees are starting their careers in organizations and the lack of understanding of how this specific group perceives leaders create daily challenges at work (Anderson et al., 2017).

Therefore, the aim of this research was to evaluate the relationships between “dark” leadership and leadership outcomes from the perspective of GenZ. To do that, the authors conducted a quasi-experiment and assessed relationships between Dark triad personality traits (Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy) of hypothetical leaders and three leadership outcomes (leadership effectiveness, extra efforts and satisfaction with a leader) from Full-range leadership model.

As it was expected (with reference to Mathieu et al., 2014, Furtner et al., 2017; Boddy, 2010) the research revealed significant negative relationships between hypothetical leaders’ the Dark Triad traits and satisfaction with a leader, leadership effectiveness and extra efforts: GenZ representatives were less satisfied with “dark” hypothetical leaders, poorly rated their effectiveness and were not planning to make extra efforts for such leaders. Results also confirmed that those leaders, who possessed the lowest levels of Dark triad traits, gathered the highest scores in all leadership outcomes. So, dark personality traits are really harmful to leadership from the GenZ view.

Finally, a comparison between “The Machiavellian”, “The Narcissistic” and “The Psychopathic” leaders revealed that GenZ rated “Narcissistic” leaders with highest scores in two leadership outcomes: leadership effectiveness and extra effort, while “The Psychopathic” leaders got lowest scores in leadership satisfaction. Analysis of the particular Dark triad traits showed that GenZ’s were more willing to show extra efforts when a leader was narcissistic in comparison of The Machiavellian and psychopathic leader. The same

tendency was for the evaluation of leadership effectiveness. It seems that narcissism is the best among the worst (Dark triad) and the research results are in line with Ehrlich, Ehrlich (2014) and Furtner et al. (2017) insights about the positive side of narcissistic leaders. It could be that grandiose sense of self-importance in Narcissists is more associated with leadership position and is more tolerated by GenZ.

Besides, it was confirmed that psychopathic leader could be named as the worst type of a leader, leastwise when evaluating satisfaction with a leader. C. R. Boddy (2010) and C. Mathieu with colleagues (2014) proposed the same view of a psychopathic leader who creates a toxic environment. So, it seems that manipulation from Machiavellian leaders and even high egoism from a narcissistic leader is better than psychopathy related to impulsivity and unethical behaviour.

Implications and limitations

These findings are a nice contribution to leadership literature while it was one of the first attempts to show the relationships between Dark triad and leadership outcomes from the Full-range leadership model using a quasi-experiment research design. Results confirmed theoretical statements that the Dark Triad leaders are ineffective. The quasi-experiment showed causal relationships between leader traits and leadership outcomes.

These results can also be applied to practice. Firstly, HR specialists who are working in recruitment should pay more attention to personality traits of potential leaders/managers, and especially – the Dark Triad traits. If organizations want

high satisfaction with a leader and extra efforts from their employees, especially GenZ's, they should recruit those leaders/managers who possess low levels of Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy. Secondly, practitioners can apply these findings in leadership training sessions. HR specialists should train leaders/managers how to act and react properly while working with members of GenZ, e.g., do not be directive or harass employees, react in a calm manner, try to be supportive, etc. Finally, practitioners should consider the evaluation of leaders' traits when assessing leadership effectiveness. With reference to the research results (the Dark Triad traits were related to lower leadership effectiveness), the Renaissance of Trait theory in leadership research is worthy of attention from practitioners, as well.

Like all research, this one is not without limitations. The first limitation of it is that only the perception of employees

was employed to assess "dark" leaders' effectiveness. Future research should try to adapt 360° assessment and include objective leadership effectiveness criteria, e.g., profit or number of turnovers. The second limitation is related to the design of the research. Although quasi-experiment that enables to reveal causality effect was employed, scenarios with hypothetical leaders were used as a simulation material. It is recommended to use experiment design in organizations with real stimulus (e.g., actors or even real leaders). Also, this quasi-experiment may not show a long-lasting effect of working directly under "dark" leader supervision because in this study participants just read a scenario about one leader and assessed him/her. Finally, with reference to the follower centred perspective, not only traits of a leader but also traits of assessors (Gen Z) should be included in future research while predicting assessment of leadership outcomes.

References

1. Anderson, H. J., Baur, J. E., Griffith, J. A., Buckley, M. R. (2017). What Works for You may not Work for (Gen) Me: Limitations of Present Leadership Theories for the New Generation // *The Leadership Quarterly*. Vol. 28, No.1, pp. 245–260. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.08.001
2. Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M. (2004). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). – Mind Garden.
3. Bejtkovský, J. (2016). The Employees of Baby Boomers Generation, Generation X, Generation Y and Generation Z in Selected Czech Corporations as Concoisseurs of Development and Competitiveness in their Corporation // *Journal of Competitiveness*. Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 105–123. doi: 10.7441/joc.2016.04.07
4. Bencsik, A., Horváth-Csikós, G., Juhász, T. (2016). Y and Z Generations at Workplaces // *Journal of Competitiveness*. Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 90–106. doi: 10.7441/joc.2016.03.06
5. Boddy, C. R. (2006). The Dark Side of Management Decisions: Organisational Psychopaths // *Management Decision*. Vol. 44, No. 10, pp. 1461–1475. doi: 10.1108/00251740610715759
6. Boddy, C. R. (2010). Corporate Psychopaths and Organizational Type // *Journal of Public Affairs*. Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 300–312. doi: 10.1002/pa.365
7. Chillakuri, B., Mahanandia, R. (2018). Generation Z Entering the Workforce: The Need for Sustainable Strategies in Maximizing their Talent // *Human Resource Management*

- International Digest. Vol. 26, No. 4, pp. 34–38. doi: 10.1108/HRMID-01-2018-0006
8. Chung, K. L., Charles, K. (2016). Giving the Benefit of the Doubt: The Role of Vulnerability in the Perception of Dark Triad Behaviours // *Personality and Individual Differences*. Vol. 101, pp. 208–213. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2016.05.059
 9. Csobanka, Z. E. (2016). The Z Generation // *Acta Technologica Dubnicae*. Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 63–76. doi: 10.1515/atd-2016-0012
 10. Dahling, J. J., Whitaker, B. G., Levy, P. E. (2009). The Development and Validation of a New Machiavellianism Scale // *Journal of Management*. Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 219–257. doi: 10.1177/0149206308318618
 11. Derue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N. E. D., Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and Behavioral Theories of Leadership: An Integration and Meta-Analytic Test of Their Relative Validity // *Personnel Psychology*. Vol. 64, No. 1, pp. 7–52. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01201.x
 12. Ehrich, J. F., Ehrich, L. C. (2014). Profile of a Narcissistic Leader: Coffee's for Closers Only. In *The Contribution of Fiction to Organizational Ethics* // Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 81–102, doi: 10.1108/S1529-209620140000011004
 13. 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*. Vol. 97, No. 3, pp. 557–579. doi: 10.1037/a0025679
 14. Fratričová, J., Kirchmayer, Z. (2018). Barriers to Work Motivation of Generation Z // *Journal of Human Resource Management*. Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 28–39. Internet access: <https://ideas.repec.org/a/cub/journl/v21y2018i2p28-39.html> [accessed July 15, 2019].
 15. Furnham, A., Trickey, G., Hyde, G. (2012). Bright Aspects to Dark Side Traits: Dark Side Traits Associated with Work Success // *Personality and Individual Differences*. Vol. 52, No. 8, pp. 908–913. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2012.01.025
 16. Furtner, M. R., Maran, T., Rauthmann, J. F. (2017). Dark Leadership: The Role of Leaders' Dark Triad Personality Traits // *Annals of Theoretical Psychology*. Vol. 15. Leader Development Deconstructed, pp. 75–99. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-64740-1_4
 17. Gaddis, B. H., Foster, J. L. (2015). Meta-analysis of Dark Side Personality Characteristics and Critical Work Behaviors among Leaders Across the Globe: Findings and Implications for Leadership Development and Executive Coaching // *Applied Psychology*. Vol. 64, No. 1, pp. 25–54. doi: 10.1111/apps.12017
 18. Hiller, N. J., DeChurch, L. A., Murase, T., Doty, D. (2011). Searching for Outcomes of Leadership: A 25-year Review // *Journal of Management*. Vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 1137–1177. doi: 10.1177/0149206310393520
 19. Jauk, E., Neubauer, A. C., Mairunteregger, T., Pemp, S., Sieber, K. P., Rauthmann, J. F. (2016). How Alluring are Dark Personalities? The Dark Triad and Attractiveness in Speed Dating // *European Journal of Personality*. Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 125–138. doi: 10.1002/per.2040
 20. Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., De Luque, M. S., House, R. J. (2006). In the Eye of the Beholder: Cross Cultural Lessons in Leadership from Project GLOBE // *Academy of Management Perspectives*. Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 67–90. doi: 10.5465/AMP.2006.19873410
 21. Jonason, P. K., Webster, G. D. (2010). The Dirty Dozen: A Concise Measure of the Dark Triad // *Psychological Assessment*. Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 420–432. doi: 10.1037/a0019265
 22. Jonason, P. K., Slomski, S., Partyka, J. (2012). The Dark Triad at Work: How Toxic Employees Get their Way // *Personality and Individual Differences*. Vol. 52, No. 3, pp. 449–453. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2011.11.00
 23. Jones, D. N., Figueredo, A. J. (2013). The Core of Darkness: Uncovering the Heart of the Dark Triad // *European Journal of Personality*. Vol. 27, No. 6, pp. 521–531. doi: 10.1002/per.1893
 24. Kapoor, H. (2015). The Creative Side of the Dark Triad // *Creativity Research Journal*. Vol. 27, No.1, pp. 58–67. doi: 10.1080/10400419.2014.961775
 25. Krick, A., Tresp, S., Vatter, M., Ludwig, A., Wihlenda, M. (2016). The Relationships Between the Dark Triad, the Moral Judgment Level, and the Students' Disciplinary Choice // *Journal of Individual Differences*. Vol. 37, No.1, pp. 24–30. doi: 10.1027/1614-0001/a000184
 26. Lanz, M., Sorgente, A., Tagliabue, S. (2018). Inter-rater Agreement Indices for Multiple Informant Methodology // *Marriage & Family Review*. Vol. 54, No. 2, pp. 148–182. doi: 10.1080/01494929.2017.1340919
 27. Lin, C. S., Huang, P. C., Chen, S. J., Huang, L. C. (2017). Pseudo-transformational Leadership is in the Eyes of the Subordinates // *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol. 141, No. 1, pp. 179–190. doi: 10.1007/s10551-015-2739-5

28. Mathieu, C., Neumann, C., Babiak, P., Hare, R. D. (2014). Corporate Psychopathy and the Full-Range Leadership Model // *Assessment*. Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 267–278. doi: 10.1177/1073191114545490
29. McCrindle, M., Wolfinger, E. (2009). *The ABC of XYZ: Understanding the Global Generations. The ABC of XYZ*. – Sydney: UNSW Press
30. Muris, P., Meesters, C., Timmermans, A. (2013). Some Youths have a Gloomy Side: Correlates of the Dark Triad Personality Traits in Non-clinical Adolescents // *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*. Vol. 44, No. 5, pp. 658–665. doi: 10.1007/s10578-013-0359-9
31. Myung, J. K., Choi, Y. H. (2017). The Influences of Leaders' Dark Triad Trait on Their Perception of CSR // *Asian Journal of Sustainability and Social Responsibility*. Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 7–21. doi: 10.1186/s41180-017-0013-8
32. Northouse, P. G. (2009). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Seventh edition. – Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc.
33. Oc, B., Bashshur, M. R. (2013). Followership, Leadership and Social Influence // *Leadership Quarterly*. Vol. 4, No. 6, pp. 919–934. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.10.006
34. O'Neill, T. A. (2017). An Overview of Interrater Agreement on Likert Scales for Researchers and Practitioners // *Frontiers in Psychology*. Vol. 8, No. 777. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00777
35. Ozkan, M., Solmaz, B. (2015). The Changing Face of the Employees–Generation Z and their Perceptions of Work (A Study Applied to University Students) // *Procedia Economics and Finance*. Vol. 26, pp. 476–483. doi: 10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00876-X
36. Paulhus, D. L., Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of Personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and Psychopathy // *Journal of Research in Personality*. Vol. 36, No. 6, pp. 556–563. doi: 10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6
37. 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*. Vol. 133, No. 1, pp. 125–139. doi: 10.1007/s10551-014-2351-0
38. Singh, A. P., Dangmei, J. (2016). Understanding the Generation Z, the Future Workforce // *South-Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*. Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 1–5. Internet access: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305280948_UNDERSTANDING_THE_GENERATION_Z_THE_FUTURE_WORKFORCE [accessed July 20, 2019].
39. Smith, M. B., Hill, A. D., Wallace, J. C., Recendes, T., Judge, T. A. (2018). Upsides to Dark and Downsides to Bright Personality: A Multidomain Review and Future Research Agenda // *Journal of Management*. Vol. 44, No. 1, pp. 191–217. doi: 10.1177/0149206317733511
40. Spain, S. M., Harms, P., LeBreton, J. M. (2014). The Dark Side of Personality at Work // *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. Vol. 35, No. S1, pp. S41–S60. doi: 10.1002/job.1894
41. Stelmokienė, A., Vadvilavičius, T. (2019). Development of Dark Triad leaders' Scenarios for Leadership Psychology Research // *International Journal of Psychology: A Biopsychosocial Approach*. Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas. *In press*.
42. Targamadžė, V., Girdzijauskienė, S., Šimelionienė, A., Pečiuliauskienė, P., Nauckūnaitė, Z. (2015). Naujoji (Z) karta- prarastoji ar dar neatrastoji? Naujosios (Z) kartos vaiko mokymosi procesų esminių aspektų identifikavimas. – Vilnius: Specialiosios pedagogikos ir psichologijos centras.
43. Turner, A. (2015). Generation Z: Technology and Social Interest // *The Journal of Individual Psychology*. Vol. 71, No. 2, pp. 103–113. doi: 10.1353/jip.2015.0021
44. Van Knippenberg, D., Sitkin, S. B. (2013). A Critical Assessment of Charismatic—Transformational Leadership Research: Back to the Drawing Board? // *The Academy of Management Annals*. Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 1–60. doi: 10.5465/19416520.2013.759433
45. Volmer, J., Koch, I. K., Göritz, A. S. (2016). The Bright and Dark Sides of Leaders' Dark Triad Traits: Effects on Subordinates' Career Success and Well-being // *Personality and Individual Differences*. Vol. 101, pp. 413–418. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.046
46. Wiedmer, T. (2015). Generations do Differ: Best Practices in Leading Traditionalists, Boomers, and Generations X, Y, and Z // *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*. Vol. 82, No. 1, pp. 25–51. Internet access: <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1P3-3971765321/generations-do-differ-best-practices-in-leading-traditionalists> [accessed July 15, 2019].
47. Wisse, B., Sleebos, E. (2016). When the Dark Ones Gain Power: Perceived Position Power Strengthens the Effect of Supervisor Machiavellianism on Abusive Supervision

in Work Teams // *Personality and Individual Differences*. Vol. 99, pp. 122–126. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2016.05.019

48. Zeigler-Hill, V., VoNk, J. (2015). Dark Personality Features and Emotion Dysregulation // *Journal*

of Social and Clinical Psychology. Vol. 34, No. 8, pp. 692–704. doi: 10.1521/jscp.2015.34.8.692

The paper submitted: July 8, 2019

Prepared for publication: December 20, 2019

Tadas VADVILAVIČIUS, Aurelija STELMOKIENĖ

„TAMSIOSIOS“ LYDERYSTĖS PASEKMĖS: Z KARTOS POŽIŪRIS

S a n t r a u k a

Darbuotojai yra pagrindinis organizacijos sėkmės įrankis, o vadovai yra vertinami kaip patys svarbiausi organizacijos nariai, kurie turėtų užtikrinti efektyvų šių „sėkmės įrankių“ veikimą. Per ilgą vadovavimo tyrinėjimų istoriją buvo sukurta daugybė skirtingų teorinių vadovavimo perspektyvų, tačiau dažniausiai pagrindinis kiekvienos teorinės perspektyvos tikslas buvo apibrėžti, kas yra efektyvus vadovavimas. Vis dėlto iki šiol vis dar trūksta aiškių ir nedviprasmiškų rekomendacijų, kaip vadovai ateityje galėtų tapti efektyvesni, ypač atsižvelgiant į naujos Z kartos darbuotojus ir jų nuomonę apie vadovus, kuriais jie norėtų sekti. Z kartos atstovai tikisi, jog vadovai bus šilti, padrąsinantys, geri klausytojai ir apdovanojantys darbuotojus už jų pasiekimus. Tačiau ne visi vadovai yra tokie. Kai kurie iš jų gali būti „tamsieji“. Per pastaruosius 10 metų tamsiosios triados asmenybės modelis (Paulhus, Williams, 2000) tapo vienu iš populiariausių asmenybės modelių, paaiškinančių tamsiąją asmenybės pusę. Tyrėjai atskleidžia, kad Makiavelizmas, narcisizmas ir psichopatija (tamsiosios triados bruožai) gali būti siejami su neigiamais lyderystės rezultatais, pvz., žemesniais darbo rezultatais, neproduktyviu elgesiu darbe, mažesniu pasitenkinimu darbu ir didesniu darbuotojų stresu. Visgi empirinių duomenų apie ryšį tarp tamsiosios triados ir vadovavimo pasekmių, aprašomų Pilno diapazono vadovavimo modelyje (Avolio, Bass, 2004), trūksta.

Šio tyrimo tikslas buvo įvertinti ryšį tarp vadovų tamsiosios triados asmenybės savybių ir vadovavimo pasekmių (papildomų pavaldinių pastangų, pasitenkinimo vadovu, vadovavimo efektyvumu), aprašytų Pilno diapazono vadovavimo modelyje, iš Z kartos darbuotojų perspektyvos. Siekiant įgyvendinti tyrimo tikslą buvo atliktas kvaziekperimentas, kuriame, kaip stimulinę medžiagą, buvo taikomi hipotetiniai vadovų aprašantys scenarijai. Perskaitę atsitiktinai pateiktą vieną iš penkių scenarijų, Z kartos atstovai (110 tiriamųjų) pildė Multifaktorinį vadovavimo klausimyną (Bass, Avolio, 2004) ir Tamsiojo tuzino

klausimyną (Jonason, Webster, 2010) apie scenarijuje aprašyto vadovo vadovavimo pasekmes ir tamsiosios asmenybės bruožus.

Rezultatai patvirtino teorines prielaidas, kad aukšta vadovų tamsiosios triados asmenybės savybių išraiška yra susijusi su mažiau papildomų darbuotojų pastangų, žemesniu vadovavimo efektyvumo vertinimu ir mažesniu pasitenkinimu vadovu. Taigi, Z kartos atstovų požiūriu, tamsios triados asmenybės savybės yra tikrai kenksmingos vadovavimo kontekste. Be to, rezultatai atskleidė, kad vadovai, pasižymintys aukštesniu narcisizmo lygiu, yra vertinami kaip efektyvesni ir labiau skatinantys papildomas darbuotojų pastangas, lyginant su vadovais, pasižyminčiais didesniu Makiavelizmo ar psichopatijos išreikštumu. Tuo tarpu vadovai, pasižymintys aukštesniu psichopatijos lygiu, yra vertinami kaip mažiausiai skatinantys darbuotojų pasitenkinimą vadovu, lyginant su vadovais, pasižyminčiais aukštesniu Makiavelizmo ar narcisizmo lygiu.

Tyrimo metu gauti rezultatai yra nemenkas indėlis į gausią vadovavimo literatūrą, kadangi tai yra vienas iš pirmųjų bandymų atrasti ryšį tarp vadovų tamsiosios triados asmenybės bruožų ir vadovavimo pasekmių, aprašomų Pilno diapazono vadovavimo modelyje, taikant kvaziekperimentinį tyrimo planą. Taip pat šis tyrimas atskleidžia, kaip Z kartos atstovai, kurie jau pradeda įsiliesti į darbo rinką, suvokia „tamsųjį“ vadovavimą. Tyrimo rezultatuose taip pat pateikiamos rekomendacijos, kaip su Z kartos darbuotojais neturėtų elgtis „tamsieji“ vadovai, siekiantys padidinti pasitenkinimą vadovavimu, paskatinti papildomas darbuotojų pastangas ir pagerinti suvokiamo vadovavimo efektyvumo vertinimą. Ateities tyrimuose siūloma išbandyti eksperimentinį planą realiomis sąlygomis, o ne taikant stimulinę medžiagą apie hipotetinius vadovus, bei į analizę įtraukti ne tik vadovo bruožų vertinimą, bet ir vertintojų (Z kartos) bruožų įvertinimą, siekiant kompleksiškai prognozuoti galimas vadovavimo pasekmes.