



## When 'Me' Trumps 'We': Narcissistic Leaders and the Cultures They Create

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Discoveries</i>
Manuscript ID	AMD-2019-0163.R2
Manuscript Type:	Revision
Keywords:	Culture/Climate Change < Climate, Culture, Personality < Individual Differences, Norms < Interpersonal & Team Processes, Leader Behavior < Leadership, Ethics < Other, Domain-specific culture (e.g., learning culture; absence culture) < Climate, Culture, Person-Environment (PE) Fit (also Person-Org, Job, Team, etc Fit) < Climate, Culture, Values < Individual Differences, Leadership Processes < Leadership
Abstract:	<p>Research has shown that a leader's personality can affect organizational culture. We focus on leader narcissism and examine how it affects two specific organizational culture dimensions - collaboration and integrity. In two field studies and three laboratory studies, our results reveal that people who are more narcissistic are less likely to demonstrate collaboration and integrity in their behavior, and when we examine leaders specifically, we find that those higher in narcissism prefer and lead organizational cultures that are less collaborative and place less emphasis on integrity. In our laboratory studies, we show that narcissists endorse policies and procedures that are associated with cultures with less collaboration and integrity, and that employees follow the culture in determining their own level of collaboration and integrity, suggesting that narcissistic leaders' behavior is amplified through culture. We discuss the potentially enduring impact that narcissistic leaders have in engendering cultures lower in collaboration and integrity to enable future theory-building connecting leader personality to organizational culture.</p>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**When 'Me' Trumps 'We':  
Narcissistic Leaders and the Cultures They Create**

CHARLES A. O'REILLY III  
Stanford University  
Graduate School of Business  
357 Knight Management Center  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305  
Tel: (650) 322-6655  
Email: coreilly@stanford.edu

JENNIFER A. CHATMAN  
University of California, Berkeley  
Haas School of Business  
2220 Piedmont Ave  
Berkeley, CA 94720  
Tel: (510) 642-4723  
Email: chatman@berkeley.edu

BERNADETTE DOERR  
1716 Valley View Ave  
Belmont, CA 94002.  
Email: bernadette.doerr@gmail.com

We thank Huggy Rao, Cameron Anderson, and Jeff Pfeffer for comments on the paper and Megan Gorges and Hope Harrington for help with preparing the manuscript.

## Abstract

Research has shown that a leader's personality can affect organizational culture. We focus on leader narcissism and examine how it affects two specific organizational culture dimensions - collaboration and integrity. In two field studies and three laboratory studies, our results reveal that people who are more narcissistic are less likely to demonstrate collaboration and integrity in their behavior, and when we examine leaders specifically, we find that those higher in narcissism prefer and lead organizational cultures that are less collaborative and place less emphasis on integrity. In our laboratory studies, we show that narcissists endorse policies and procedures that are associated with cultures with less collaboration and integrity, and that employees follow the culture in determining their own level of collaboration and integrity, suggesting that narcissistic leaders' behavior is amplified through culture. We discuss the potentially enduring impact that narcissistic leaders have in engendering cultures lower in collaboration and integrity to enable future theory-building connecting leader personality to organizational culture.

Keywords: Narcissistic Leaders, Organizational Culture, Collaboration, Integrity and Ethics

1  
2  
3 A long tradition of research has linked organizational culture to organizational outcomes  
4  
5 (e.g., Bezrukova, Thatcher, Jehn & Spell, 2012; Hartnell, Ou, Kinicki, Choi & Karam, 2019;  
6  
7 Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Sorensen, 2002). But how is an organization's culture developed?  
8  
9 Schein (1985) suggested that culture is largely set by the leaders of the organization, claiming  
10  
11 that "the only real thing of importance that leaders do is to create and manage the culture (p. 2)."  
12  
13  
14 Researchers have typically defined leadership as "a process of motivating people to work  
15  
16 together collaboratively to accomplish great things" (Vroom & Jago, 2007: 18), suggesting that  
17  
18 leaders exist at many organizational levels. A number of studies have illustrated how leaders'  
19  
20 personality and values can shape their teams' and organizations' culture (e.g., Berson, Oreg &  
21  
22 Dvir, 2008; Kim & Toh, 2019). For example, using the Five Factor Model of personality,  
23  
24 researchers have found that leaders who are high on agreeableness are more likely to lead  
25  
26 organizations with cultures that are more collaborative and clan-like (e.g., Berson et al., 2008;  
27  
28 Giberson, Resick, Dickson, Mitchelson, Randall & Clark, 2009), while leaders who are more  
29  
30 open are more likely to lead organizations with cultures characterized by flexibility and  
31  
32 innovation (O'Reilly, Caldwell, Chatman & Doerr, 2014; Peterson, Smith, Matorana & Owens,  
33  
34 2003). Further, leaders both cultivate and sustain team norms (Hackman & Wageman, 2004;  
35  
36 Taggar & Ellis, 2007), influence how teams address diversity (Homan et al, 2020), and even  
37  
38 leaders without significant formal authority can be highly influential in affecting team and  
39  
40 organizational culture (e.g., Anderson, Spataro & Flynn, 2008).  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 These findings document largely positive associations between leaders' personality and  
48  
49 organizational culture. More recently, however, researchers have become increasingly interested  
50  
51 in the dark side of leader personality and have focused specifically on narcissistic leaders and  
52  
53 their potential negative influence on people and organizations (e.g., Braun, 2017; Grijalva,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Harms, Newman, Gaddis & Fraley, 2015; Palmer, Holmes & Perrewe, 2020; Volmer, Koch &  
4  
5 Goeritz, 2016). For example, accounting studies have shown that leaders who are more  
6  
7 narcissistic are more likely to manipulate earnings, have less effective internal accounting  
8  
9 controls, and be found guilty of fraud (e.g., Buchholz, Lopatta & Maas, 2019; Capalbo, Frino,  
10  
11 Ming, Mollica & Palumbo, 2018; Rijssenbilt & Commandeur, 2013). O'Reilly, Doerr and  
12  
13 Chatman (2018) showed that firms with more narcissistic leaders were more likely to engage in  
14  
15 protracted litigation that they were no more likely to win. In a study of how the financial crisis  
16  
17 affected banks, Buyl, Boone and Wade (2017) showed that firms with narcissistic leaders were  
18  
19 slower to recover after the financial crisis. And, Chatterjee and Pollock (2017) suggested that  
20  
21 narcissistic leaders' need for social approval and domination made them difficult to work with  
22  
23 and negatively influenced both corporate governance and how top management teams  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 functioned.

31         The research in this domain connects narcissistic leaders to a set of negative outcomes  
32  
33 but has not developed an integrated theory of why narcissistic leaders have such a broad  
34  
35 ranging, and mostly negative, impact on the organizations they lead. We suggest that one reason  
36  
37 why leader narcissism is related to this broad range of demonstrated problems is that narcissistic  
38  
39 leaders play a significant role in creating organizational cultures, defined as enduring patterns of  
40  
41 behavior and expectations among organizational members (e.g., Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016).  
42  
43 We argue, further, that though research on narcissism has often examined its individual  
44  
45 manifestations (e.g., Judge, LePine & Rich, 2006), and, when considering leaders,  
46  
47 organizational outcomes (e.g., Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007), it has not systematically  
48  
49 examined how leaders' behavioral manifestations of narcissism influence the norms and cultures  
50  
51 that teams and organizations adopt, which in turn have the potential to amplify narcissistic  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 leaders' behavioral propensities among organizational members. We focus on the role of  
4  
5 narcissism on two fundamental dimensions of organizations, collaboration among members and  
6  
7 integrity. We suggest that two orientations characteristic of narcissists – a reluctance to engage  
8  
9 in collaboration and a propensity to skirt the rules, undermining integrity – infiltrate the cultures  
10  
11 of narcissist-led organizations. We also examine, experimentally, how followers' decisions are  
12  
13 affected when narcissistic leaders deemphasize collaboration and integrity in their behavior and  
14  
15 organizational cultures.  
16  
17  
18

19 Our goals in this paper are first, to demonstrate the basic relationship between narcissistic  
20  
21 personalities and a propensity to engage in lower collaboration and integrity behaviors, and  
22  
23 second, to examine narcissistic leaders to see how this link influences organizational culture and,  
24  
25 ultimately, follower behavior. Based on a series of five studies, we demonstrate narcissists'  
26  
27 behavioral tendencies that support cultures that are lower in collaboration and integrity (Studies  
28  
29 1 and 2) and how companies led by narcissistic leaders are, in fact, associated with cultures that  
30  
31 are lower in collaboration and integrity (Study 3). We then consider the mechanisms underlying  
32  
33 the relationship between leader narcissism and cultures of collaboration and integrity (Study 4)  
34  
35 that, in turn, influence follower behavior (Study 5).  
36  
37  
38  
39

#### 40 **Narcissistic Leaders and Organizational Culture**

41  
42 Researchers have defined organizational culture as “the basic assumptions or beliefs that  
43  
44 are shared by organizational members” (Schein, 1985: 9), and “a system of shared values (that  
45  
46 defines what is important) and norms that define appropriate attitudes and behaviors (how to feel  
47  
48 and behave)” (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1996: 160). From this perspective, culture can be thought of  
49  
50 as a social control system that helps people understand and distinguish between behaviors that  
51  
52 are expected and approved of, and those that are inappropriate and important to avoid. This  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 social control system arises, in part, from organizational leaders' personality, preferences, and  
4 actions. Leaders shape the norms that define an organization's culture through their behavior,  
5 their communication, and the decisions they make about which actions are sanctioned, including  
6 decisions about what is measured and rewarded; what types of people are selected, recruited, and  
7 promoted; and what attitudes and behaviors are communicated and reinforced (e.g., Carroll &  
8 Harrison, 1998). By signaling to employees which norms and values are rewarded and punished,  
9 these actions help define the culture of the organization.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 A leader's personality and values are key sources of these decisions. Researchers have  
20 defined personality as "an individual's characteristic patterns of thought, emotion, and behavior,  
21 together with the psychological mechanisms – hidden or not – behind those patterns that are  
22 consistent over time and across situations" (Funder, 2001:2). Because of a leader's power, vested  
23 in the formal and informal status hierarchies, a leader's personality, as manifested in his or her  
24 characteristic behaviors, can shape subordinates' perceptions of the appropriate ways of  
25 behaving, or the culture of the organization. Thus, a leader's personality acts as a key source of  
26 information about an organization's normative order.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 In support of this perspective, researchers have demonstrated how a leader's personality  
39 can affect organizational culture. For example, Peterson and his colleagues (Peterson et al.,  
40 2003) showed how CEOs' personalities affected their senior teams' norms. CEOs who were  
41 more agreeable had more cohesive teams while those higher on conscientiousness had more  
42 flexible teams. Similarly, Giberson and his colleagues (Giberson et al., 2009) found that leaders  
43 who were higher on agreeableness and extraversion were more likely to lead organizations with  
44 more cohesive cultures, that is, cultures in which members agreed about what was and was not  
45 important. In a Study of 26 CEOs, Berson et al. (2008) found that CEOs who were characterized  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 as more self-directed led more innovative cultures, while those who valued security led more  
4 bureaucratic cultures. And, lower level leaders who were more collaborative cultivated team  
5 norms focused on collaborative problem solving (Taggar & Ellis, 2007).  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Much of the early research on leader narcissism has examined the so-called “bright side”  
11 or positive leader attributes (e.g., Galvin, Waldman & Balthazard, 2010). This research focused  
12 on circumstances in which narcissists’ boldness, self-confidence, and decisiveness could be  
13 advantageous--for example, during periods of crisis or when firms are threatened by disruption  
14 (e.g., Mathieu & St. Jean, 2013; Paunomen et al., 2006). Several studies showed that narcissistic  
15 CEOs were more aggressive in expanding into global markets (Oesterle et al., 2016), investing in  
16 new technology (Gerstner et al., 2013), and making acquisitions (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007).  
17 Unfortunately, subsequent research found that firms headed by narcissistic leaders do not  
18 perform better and that these leaders are more likely to overpay for acquisitions, engage in  
19 financial misreporting, and overinvest in good times and underinvest in the bad (Atkas et al.,  
20 2016; Wales, Patel & Lumpkin, 2013), which can lead to increased returns when the market is  
21 going up, but large losses when the market turns down (Buyl et al., 2017). Based on the growing  
22 evidence of these negative outcomes, Braun (2017, p. 17) concluded that “There are few positive  
23 outcomes of leader narcissism...and many negative consequences.”  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 In exploring this “dark side,” scholars have focused on the potential problems arising  
43 from leaders high in narcissism. For instance, subordinates are significantly more likely to  
44 engage in counterproductive work behaviors, including absenteeism, withholding information,  
45 and even sabotage when their leader is more narcissistic (O’Boyle, Forsyth, Banks & McDaniel,  
46 2012; Grijalva & Newman, 2015). Subordinates working for narcissistic leaders are less  
47 satisfied, more stressed, and less committed to their organizations (Hochwarter & Thompson,  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 2012). Although narcissists seek out and attain leadership positions, there is no evidence that  
4  
5 their subjective views of their own superior level of competence are objectively accurate (e.g.,  
6  
7 Judge, LePine & Rich, 2006; Nevicka, Ten Velden, De Hoogh & Van Vianen, 2011). Chatterjee  
8  
9 and Pollock (2017) noted that narcissistic leaders recruit and promote subordinates who flatter  
10  
11 them rather than those who have real expertise. “Narcissistic CEOs reward those who reinforce  
12  
13 their narcissism and punish those who do not (p. 713).” Though the attributes of narcissists have  
14  
15 been well-documented, research has not explicitly examined how narcissists influence broader  
16  
17 norms in teams and organizations. We explore how narcissists, through their actions, create  
18  
19 cultures that reflect their predispositions.  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 A key question is, which aspects of organizational culture might narcissistic leaders be  
25  
26 most likely to create? This question can be answered by considering the large body of research  
27  
28 on narcissists’ distinctive attributes (e.g., Brown, Budzek & Tamborski, 2010) and the  
29  
30 foundational dimensions of organizational culture (e.g., Chatman et al., 2014) that are most  
31  
32 implicated given those narcissistic attributes. Because we are interested in the organizational  
33  
34 ramifications of narcissism, we focus on narcissists’ social and interpersonal patterns of  
35  
36 expression, their attributes pertaining to grandiosity, arrogance, and their self-serving, self-  
37  
38 enhancing, and disagreeable behavior, rather than on their internal complexity, which is more  
39  
40 clinically than organizationally relevant (Ronningstam, 2010).  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 We identify two cultural dimensions as relevant to narcissistic leadership. First, because  
46  
47 narcissists are overconfident about their own judgment and knowledge, entitled, abusive,  
48  
49 unwilling to take criticism, and interpersonally exploitative, the norms that they would prefer and  
50  
51 cultivate would likely emphasize being more individualistic, less open and less collaborative  
52  
53 (e.g., Campbell, Hoffman, Campbell & Marchisio, 2011; Maccoby, 2007; O’Reilly & Hall,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 2021). In a study of narcissistic leadership, Jones and his colleagues noted that narcissists  
4 maintain “a climate of fear, compliance, and subversion of individual thought and willpower”  
5  
6 (Jones, Lasky, Russell-Gale & le Fevre, 2004: 227). Second, since narcissists have lower  
7  
8 standards of integrity and are more willing to cross ethical boundaries in pursuit of what they  
9  
10 believe is rightfully theirs (e.g., Grijalva & Newman, 2015; Trevino, den Nieuwenboer & Kish-  
11  
12 Gephart, 2014), narcissistic leaders may create cultures that place a lower emphasis on integrity.  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 Before we discuss possible behavioral manifestations that underlie the relationship  
18  
19 between narcissistic leaders and organizational culture, it is useful to point out why these two  
20  
21 culture dimensions, collaboration and integrity, more so than others, are likely to be associated  
22  
23 with narcissistic leaders. Most researchers now agree that culture can be characterized by norms,  
24  
25 described in terms of roughly six dimensions including collaborative, customer-oriented, detail-  
26  
27 oriented, integrity, innovative, results-oriented, and transparent (Chatman & O’Reilly, 2016).  
28  
29 Research has also shown that a leader’s personality, using the Big Five personality  
30  
31 characteristics – extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, and emotionality – is  
32  
33 associated with organizational culture (e.g., Giberson, et al., 2009). For example, leaders who are  
34  
35 more open tend to lead organizations that are more adaptive-innovative, those who are more  
36  
37 conscientious tend to lead organizations that are more detail-oriented, and those who are  
38  
39 agreeable, which can be associated with indecisiveness, tend to lead organizations that are less  
40  
41 results-oriented (O’Reilly et al., 2014).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 When considering narcissistic personalities and what past research has found, there is  
48  
49 little evidence that narcissists lead organizations that are more financially successful than those  
50  
51 led by non-narcissists (Braun, 2017; O’Reilly & Chatman, 2020). Further, there is also little  
52  
53 evidence to suggest that narcissistic leaders are likely to develop more results-oriented or  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 customer-focused organizations. Although narcissists may have bold ideas themselves and are  
4 more insensitive to risk (Brunell & Buelow, 2017; Mathieu & St-Jean, 2013), people led by  
5 narcissists are less likely to take risks because they are concerned that their narcissistic boss will  
6 blame them for failure (e.g., Liu, Chian, Feht, Xu & Wang, 2017), leading to ambiguity about the  
7 relationship between narcissistic leaders and innovation. With regard to detail-oriented cultures,  
8 narcissists are grandiose and so less likely to focus on details themselves, but leaders might  
9 demand that such details may be addressed at lower levels of narcissist-led organizations  
10 (Chatterjee & Pollock, 2017). Since narcissistic leaders are self-interested, they are also likely to  
11 cultivate highly political organizations. This suggests that the link between narcissistic leaders  
12 and other culture dimensions beyond collaboration and integrity may not be directly implicated,  
13 or as directly relevant to narcissistic leaders in the way that integrity and collaboration are.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 One final note is that we focus on cultures with lower collaboration and integrity rather  
29 than framing our discussion around being higher on dimensions representing the opposite of  
30 collaboration and integrity. We do this intentionally because, while organizations certainly  
31 demonstrate varying levels of collaboration and integrity in their cultures, being low on either (or  
32 both) ultimately undermines two basic elements needed for organizing. First, if organizations are  
33 unable to maintain a semblance of collaboration among members, they will bear the costs of  
34 coordinating without reaping the benefits (e.g., Sorensen, 2002). Second, if leaders influence  
35 members to engage in unethical practices by failing to prioritize integrity, those organizations  
36 will be more susceptible to legal consequences and threats to their very survival (e.g., O'Reilly et  
37 al., 2018). We turn next to a discussion of the behaviors and beliefs associated with narcissism  
38 that are likely to be linked to cultures lower in collaboration and integrity.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3           **Narcissistic leaders and less collaborative cultures.** Collaboration is central to  
4  
5 organizing. In fact, the answer to the foundational question, “why organize?” has much to do  
6  
7 with capabilities derived from bringing people together, collaboratively, to do something that no  
8  
9 one person could do alone (e.g., Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). Leaders can enhance or diminish  
10  
11 collaboration within organizations by increasing the extent to which members view one another  
12  
13 as part of a common in-group or as competitors for scarce resources (e.g., De Cremer & Van  
14  
15 Knippenberg, 2002). Teams that emphasize collaboration are more likely to view organizational  
16  
17 membership as a salient identity than are teams in which individualistic norms are emphasized  
18  
19 (Chatman & Flynn, 2001). Further, leaders can instill or undermine collaborative norms through  
20  
21 their actions. For example, a leader can choose to foster competition among subordinates or  
22  
23 decide to reward achievements accomplished by individuals rather than teams. Conversely,  
24  
25 leaders can celebrate team accomplishments to boost collaboration and pro-social behavior (e.g.,  
26  
27 Van Lange, 1999). By doing this, leaders can change reward structures to make individualism or  
28  
29 competition among employees more appealing than collaboration. Collaborative orientations can  
30  
31 also be enhanced by teaching people values, facts, and skills that will promote either cooperation  
32  
33 or internal competition, such as whether reciprocity or sharing information is valued (e.g.,  
34  
35 Chatman, Greer, Sherman, & Doerr, 2019). Most importantly, leaders can frame and interpret  
36  
37 success in terms of the collective or of individuals, and explicitly share credit for organizational  
38  
39 outcomes (e.g., Owens, Wallace & Waldman, 2015).  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47           In considering the evidence linking narcissism and lower collaboration, Grijalva and her  
48  
49 colleagues (Grijalva, Maynes, Badura & Whiting, 2020) showed that NBA teams characterized  
50  
51 by higher levels of narcissism were less coordinated and performed worse over time. In  
52  
53 considering narcissistic leaders’ propensity to favor individualism over collaboration, Maccoby  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (2007) describes how narcissists' self-centered world-view and lack of trust in others leads them  
4 to be abusive toward subordinates and attempt to maintain high levels of control. For instance, he  
5 describes a CEO who explicitly did not want his vice presidents to work together as a team,  
6 because of his concern that if they did work together, they might plot against him (2007, p. 139).  
7  
8 This is similar to research showing that leaders who seek dominance and feel threatened are  
9 more likely to create divisions among subordinates to protect their power by restricting  
10 communication and preventing bonding among subordinates (Case & Maner, 2014).  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Further, given narcissists' propensity to take credit for successful outcomes and to blame  
20 others for their failures, they are likely to model and instill cultural norms focused on individual  
21 achievement rather than collective effort (Bauman, Tost & Ong, 2016; Stucke, 2003). From a  
22 subordinate's perspective, a narcissistic leader who takes credit for others' accomplishments and  
23 blames others for his or her own mistakes can create a highly politicized environment where  
24 subordinates try to curry favor and avoid angering the boss. Reflecting this, several studies have  
25 shown that the people who work for narcissistic leaders are more frustrated and less satisfied  
26 (Blair, Hoffman & Helland, 2008; Tepper, 2007). Other research has shown that narcissistic  
27 leaders frequently derogate others, seeing themselves as more competent, and are often punitive  
28 and vindictive (e.g., Brunell & Davis, 2016; Kausel, Culbertson, Leiva, Slaughter & Jackson,  
29 2015). Because narcissistic leaders reward those who reinforce their narcissism and punish those  
30 who do not, employees are likely to focus on pleasing the boss, working individually, and  
31 avoiding mistakes rather than cooperating with each other and working as a team.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 **Narcissistic leaders and cultures of lower integrity.** The second key cultural attribute  
50 that narcissists may influence is an organization's focus on integrity. For most organizations,  
51 establishing a reputation of integrity and honesty is vital to their very existence and survival  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (e.g., Agle, Nagarajan, Sonnenfeld & Srinivasan, 2006). Research has shown that narcissists are  
4 more likely to transgress ethical boundaries (e.g., Blair et al., 2008; Mumford, Connelly, Helton,  
5 Strange & Osburn, 2001). Because narcissists feel entitled and lack empathy, they believe that  
6 the rules do not apply to them; they do not feel guilty about manipulating others or violating  
7 rules (Campbell et al., 2011). Brown, Sautter, Littvay, Sautter and Bearnese (2010) showed that  
8 more narcissistic students made less ethical decisions than did those who were less narcissistic.  
9 O'Reilly and Doerr (2020) showed that narcissists were more likely to lie, cheat, and steal than  
10 were non-narcissists. Research on social dominance has shown that narcissists are more  
11 prejudiced and less interested in equality (Cichocka, Dhont & Makwana, 2017).  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 In considering narcissistic leaders specifically, a well-developed stream of research has  
25 explored the association of narcissism and counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs), which are  
26 defined as voluntary behaviors that violate significant organizational norms and threaten the  
27 well-being of the organization or its members (e.g., Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Two meta-  
28 analytic studies reviewing more than 250 independent samples have shown that narcissistic  
29 leaders are a key predictor of CWBs, even after controlling for Big 5 personality and other  
30 factors (Grijalva & Newman, 2015; O'Boyle et al., 2012). More recent studies in organizations  
31 have shown that narcissistic CEOs are more likely to engage in earnings manipulations and avoid  
32 paying taxes (Capalbo et al., 2018; Judd, Olsen & Stekelberg, 2015).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

#### 44 **Mechanisms for Creating Cultures Low in Collaboration and Integrity**

45  
46 Leaders serve as role models, signal generators, and resource allocators. Employees  
47 vigilantly attend to leaders' behavior, even to the more mundane aspects such as what leaders  
48 spend time on, the questions they ask or fail to ask, and what gets followed up on and celebrated  
49 (Pfeffer, 1981). Because leaders have power, these words and deeds provide employees with  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 evidence about what counts and what behaviors are likely to be rewarded or punished. They  
4 convey much more to employees about priorities than do printed vision statements and formal  
5 policies (e.g., Guiso, Sapienza & Zingales, 2015). To an important degree, leadership is a  
6 perceptual phenomenon, with followers observing their superiors and making inferences about  
7 their motives (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004). Recognizing this, Podolny, Khurana and Hill-Popper  
8 (2005) argued that leadership is explicitly about the words and actions that create meaning for  
9 employees. Employees could be reluctant to emulate leader behavior directly, however, if such  
10 behavior is not more widely supported within the organization. This is because employees may  
11 believe that leaders are exempted from sanctions for exhibiting questionable behavior, while they  
12 themselves are subject to sanctions for such behavior. Thus, leader behavior, particularly  
13 behavior that is broadly socially undesirable such as being uncooperative or dishonest, is much  
14 more likely to be emulated by employees if it is supported by patterns of behavior more broadly  
15 among members and embedded in an organization's culture. We suggest that leaders who  
16 endorse policies and practices that deemphasize collaboration and integrity will send a signal to  
17 employees and broaden the impact of their own behavior by institutionalizing it within the  
18 organization's culture (Palmer et al., 2020; Schaubroeck et al., 2012).

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Leaders also largely determine the types of people who are selected and promoted within  
41 the organization (e.g., Schneider, Goldstein & Smith, 1995). A large literature has documented  
42 how socialization shapes the experience that new and existing members have, and influences  
43 their perceptions about the culture, their behaviors, and the norms that form and are reinforced  
44 (e.g., Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Chatman, 1991). Others have suggested that the rewards people are  
45 offered for their work and membership, formally and informally, create clarity about which  
46 behaviors to emphasize and what to avoid (e.g., Baron & Hannan, 2002; O'Reilly & Chatman,  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1996). Finally, the people who are retained and promoted, and those who leave voluntarily or are  
4 terminated, affect how those who stay perceive the culture and the norms they adopt (Carroll &  
5 Harrison, 1998). Thus, a narcissistic leader can shape a culture by setting policies and practices  
6 that reflect their preferences and are consistent with their own behavior (e.g., emphasizing  
7 individual achievement over teamwork and failing to implement policies that ensure compliance  
8 with rules and regulations), and the types of people they select and promote (e.g., promoting  
9 based on loyalty rather than expertise).

### 19 **Overview of the Studies**

20  
21 We conducted a set of studies linking leader narcissism to a culture's emphasis on  
22 collaboration and integrity. First, we confirm that people higher in narcissism report that they  
23 engage less in behaviors that reflect collaboration and integrity than do people lower in  
24 narcissism (Study 1). We then examine whether leaders who are more narcissistic intend to  
25 create cultures that reflect less collaboration and lower integrity (Study 2). In Study 3, we  
26 examine field data showing that more narcissistic leaders lead organizations with cultures that  
27 are lower in collaboration and integrity. Having demonstrated the association between  
28 narcissistic leadership and cultures of collaboration and integrity, we then explore the  
29 mechanisms that might create these cultures. In Study 4 we explore how more narcissistic  
30 leaders select policies and practices that result in cultures that place less emphasis on  
31 collaboration and integrity. Finally, in Study 5, we offer preliminary evidence that employees are  
32 more likely to engage in less collaborative and lower integrity behavior when both their leader  
33 and especially their culture support these behaviors. This suggests that culture operates to  
34 increase employee compliance with narcissistic tendencies by institutionalizing narcissistic  
35 leaders' propensity to engage in less collaborative and lower integrity behaviors.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## STUDY 1

### Research Design

An individual's personality shapes their behavior and, in turn, the organizational culture they might create as leaders. As such, it seems reasonable to expect that narcissistic leaders will be more likely to behave in ways that could result in cultures that are lower on collaboration and integrity. Therefore, we first explore the extent to which narcissism is linked to behaviors relevant to personal collaboration and integrity. To do this we collected data from a sample of college-educated adults and assessed the degree to which narcissism was associated with validated measures of leader collaboration (Chatman & Flynn, 2001) and integrity (Moorman, Darnold & Priesemuth, 2013).

### Subjects

To examine the association between narcissism and engaging in behavior relevant to lower collaboration and integrity norms, we recruited 401 subjects from mTurk Prime and paid them \$1.00 for their participation. We screened subjects so that all who participated in the study resided in the U.S., spoke English as their first language, had at least a college degree, and were employed full-time. Subjects were also required to complete several attention-check questions throughout the scenario and were prevented from participating in the study more than once. One subject was dropped based on the attention check items ( $n=400$ ). We also monitored the amount of time that subjects took to complete the scenario Study ( $\bar{x} = 9.16$  minutes,  $s.d. = 4.58$  minutes). We counterbalanced the administration of the experimental treatment and the collection of demographic and personality data to ensure that no order effects occurred.

Fifty six percent of the subjects were male and 4.8% were between 18 and 24 years old, 35.8% were between 25 and 34 years old, 34.8% were between 35 and 44 years old, 13.0% were

1  
2  
3 between 45 and 54 years old, 9.3% were between 55-64 years old, and 2.5% were over 65 years  
4  
5 old. Sixty-nine percent had a bachelor's degree, 25% had a master's and 6% had a PhD or other  
6  
7 professional degree. Eighty-two percent were Caucasian, 8% were African-American, 9% were  
8  
9 Asian-American, and 1% identified as "other." Ninety-four percent of the respondents were  
10  
11 employed by an organization and 6% percent were self-employed. Subjects' average work  
12  
13 experience was more than 15 years, and 86% had managerial responsibilities.  
14  
15

### 16 17 **Independent Variable: Narcissism**

18  
19 To ensure that we were capturing the full range of the construct of narcissism, we used  
20  
21 three separate measures. First, we used Resick, Whitman, Weingarden and Hiller's (2009)  
22  
23 measure that includes eight adjectives descriptive of narcissism (arrogant, assertive, boastful,  
24  
25 conceited, egotistical, self-centered, show-off, and temperamental) that were derived from the  
26  
27 California Personality Inventory measure of narcissism (Gough, 1956). In our survey, these eight  
28  
29 items were randomly interspersed among a larger set of adjectives used to assess the Big Five  
30  
31 personality attributes (Gosling, Rentfrow & Swann, 2003). Respondents were asked to indicate,  
32  
33 on a seven-point scale (1=very inaccurate, 7=very accurate), how well each item described how  
34  
35 they typically behaved. The eight items were averaged to form a scale (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .86$ ). Our  
36  
37 second measure of narcissism was the NPI-16 (Ames, Rose, and Anderson, 2006), a validated,  
38  
39 short-form version of the NPI-40 (Raskin & Terry, 1988). The third measure of narcissism was a  
40  
41 recently developed single-item assessment of narcissism (SINS) (To what extent do you agree  
42  
43 with the statement "I am a narcissist." 1=not very true of me, 7=very true of me). This scale has  
44  
45 been validated across 11 samples, correlates well with other longer measures, and captures the  
46  
47 more pathological aspects of narcissism (Konrath, Meier & Bushman, 2014). The three measures  
48  
49 were significantly correlated with one another (Resick-SINS  $r = .63, p < .01$ ; Resick-NPI-16  $r =$   
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 .54,  $p < .001$ ; NPI-16-SINS  $r = .46$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Consistent with prior research (Brown et al., 2010;  
4  
5 Saulsman & Page, 2004), the narcissism measures were also positively correlated with  
6  
7 extraversion (Resick  $r = .29$ ,  $p < .001$ ; NPI-16  $r = .38$ ,  $p < .001$ ; SINS  $r = .11$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and were  
8  
9 negatively correlated with agreeableness (Resick  $r = -.56$ ,  $p < .001$ ; NPI-16  $r = -.26$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  
10  
11 SINS  $r = -.42$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

## 12 13 14 15 **Dependent Variables**

16  
17 **Collaboration behavior propensity.** We assessed participants' propensity to engage in  
18  
19 collaborative behavior using five items from Chatman and Flynn's (2001) collaborative scale.  
20  
21 Subjects indicated on a 7-point scale (1=disagree strongly, 7=agree strongly) how well a set of  
22  
23 five statements described how they behaved. The five items were: (1) "It is important to maintain  
24  
25 harmony in the team," (2) "There is little need for collaboration among team members" (reverse-  
26  
27 scored), (3) "There should be a high level of cooperation among team members," (4) "People  
28  
29 should be willing to sacrifice their self-interest for the benefit of the team," and (5) "There  
30  
31 should be a high level of sharing among team members" (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.72$ ).  
32  
33

34  
35 **Integrity behavior propensity.** We assessed participants' propensity to engage in  
36  
37 behaviors pertaining to integrity using 14 statements drawn from Moorman et al.'s (2013)  
38  
39 leadership integrity scale, that included items that assessed moral behavior (e.g., "I act to benefit  
40  
41 the common good" and "I treat people with care and respect") and behavioral integrity (e.g., "If I  
42  
43 say something I will do it" and "I practice what I preach") (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.95$ ), using a 7-point  
44  
45 scale (1=disagree strongly, 7=agree strongly).  
46  
47  
48

## 49 **Control Variables**

50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 We controlled for respondents' sex, age, education, race, and work experience, each of  
4 which could influence their propensity to emphasize or de-emphasize collaboration or integrity  
5 in their behavior.  
6  
7  
8

## 9 10 **Results**

11  
12 Table 1 reports the means, standard deviations, and correlations among the variables.  
13  
14 Consistent with previous research, narcissism is higher among males than females (Grijalva et  
15 al., 2015). More narcissistic respondents also report lower levels of collaboration and integrity  
16 behavior. Table 2 reports the regression results showing the associations between narcissism and  
17 collaboration and integrity behaviors. Consistent with our expectations, the results show that,  
18 after controlling for demographics, all measures of narcissism were significantly and negatively  
19 associated with participants' descriptions of behaviors associated with collaboration (NPI,  $\beta = -$   
20  $.22, p < .001$ ; Resick  $\beta = -.28, p < .001$ ; SINS  $\beta = -.21, p < .001$ ) and integrity (NPI,  $\beta = -.23, p <$   
21  $.001$ ; Resick  $\beta = -.35, p < .001$ ; SINS  $\beta = -.28, p < .001$ ). We also conducted a separate analysis  
22 using the 86 percent of respondents who reported that they held a management position (n=342).  
23 We re-ran the equations in Table 2 and the pattern of findings for the smaller managerial sample  
24 was identical to those for the full sample, suggesting that narcissists in management roles engage  
25 in lower collaboration and lower integrity behaviors.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 -----  
43 Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here  
44 -----  
45

## 46 **Discussion**

47  
48 As expected, more narcissistic individuals, including those with leadership experience,  
49 reported engaging in lower levels of collaboration and integrity behaviors, offering indirect  
50 evidence that, as leaders, they may also be less likely to engender a culture that reflects these  
51 cultural norms. Though this study can be criticized for potential common methods bias, since  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 respondents reported on their own narcissism and their own behaviors, it is also the case that the  
4 collaboration and integrity items are likely to elicit socially desirable responses -- with people  
5 reporting higher levels of these behaviors than they actually engage in to look good. The fact that  
6 we found an association between multiple measures of narcissism and systematically lower  
7 levels of collaboration and integrity behaviors is notable. In the next study, we address this  
8 common method issue. We also begin to examine the link between leader narcissism and culture  
9 by collecting others' assessments of focal individuals' levels of narcissism and relate it to the  
10 cultural emphasis focal individuals place on collaboration and integrity.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

## 21 **STUDY 2**

### 22 **Research Design and Sample**

23  
24  
25  
26 Two hundred fifty-nine MBA students from a large west coast university participated in  
27 this study as part of their coursework for a 10-week elective course on leadership. Sixty-five  
28 percent of participants were male; 70.3% were U.S. citizens, 10.4% were East Indian, 6.2% were  
29 Asian, 5.8% were European, 3.1% were Middle Eastern, and 2.3% were Latin American; 50.6%  
30 were White, 39% were Asian, 7.7% were Hispanic, 1.9% were Black, and 0.8% were Native  
31 American. The course included a self-assessment and an evaluator assessment on which we  
32 based our analyses of the relationship between narcissism and organizational culture. Students  
33 were members of one of five classes that were held during fall or spring terms from 2012 to 2016  
34 and taught by the same professor. Three of the classes comprised executive MBA students in a  
35 19-month part-time program and two of the classes comprised a mix of full-time and part-time  
36 executive MBA students. In total, 125 (48%) of the students were enrolled in the full-time degree  
37 program, while 134 (52%) students were working full-time and enrolled in one of the part-time  
38 executive degree programs.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3           Upon enrolling in the course, students were asked to provide the names of at least three  
4 evaluators (current or former co-workers) and were informed that participating in the evaluation  
5 process would be the basis for part of their grade in the course. Evaluators were assured that their  
6 responses were confidential, with only aggregated reports being provided to the focal student.  
7  
8 The average number of raters for each focal participant in the sample was 5.92 (*s.d.*=3.45).  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

## 14 **Variables**

15  
16  
17           **Narcissism.** We used evaluator reports of each focal participant's level of narcissism as  
18 measured by Resick et al.'s (2009) eight-item inventory. We did this to avoid common method  
19 bias and because previous research has shown that evaluators are able to reliably assess others  
20 (Lievens, DeFruyt & Van Dam, 2001; Nuzum, Ready & Clark, 2019). Informants completed an  
21 online personality assessment of the focal student that asked them to: "Read each item and  
22 indicate how accurately (how well) you think it describes [name of focal MBA student]. This  
23 should reflect how [s]he generally or typically behaves or appears" on a scale of 1-7 (1=very  
24 inaccurate, 7=very accurate) ( $\bar{x}$  = 2.77, *s.d.* = 0.78). The eight adjectives were dispersed among a  
25 larger set of adjectives used to assess the Big Five personality attributes (Gosling et al., 2003).  
26 We averaged the eight items to form an overall scale (Cronbach's *a* = .86). This measure of  
27 narcissism is correlated with similar measures of narcissism such as the NPI-16 (Ames et al.,  
28 2006) and the Honesty-Humility scale of the Ashton and Lee (2009) HEXACO personality  
29 inventory.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47           To determine the appropriateness of aggregating each focal student's set of evaluator  
48 narcissism ratings, we computed several metrics of inter-rater reliability and agreement. First, we  
49 calculated an  $r_{wg(j)}$  value for the ratings of each focal student, indicating how highly each focal  
50 student's evaluators agree on their perceptions of that student. We obtained values for all MBAs  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ( $\bar{x} = 0.71, s.d. = .16$ ). All values exceeded the recommended minimum value of 0.70 (Klein et al.,  
4  
5 2000). Second, we calculated an intra-class correlation metric [ICC(2)] to assess the reliability of  
6  
7 the target (within-person) narcissism mean ratings. The ICC(2) value (0.81) exceeded the  
8  
9 recommended minimum value of 0.70. To assess the distinctiveness of target narcissism ratings  
10  
11 across MBA students, or between-group variance, we conducted a within-and-between (WABA)  
12  
13 analysis. Results indicated significant between-group variance (59% of variation accounted for  
14  
15 by between-group factors, 41% within-group;  $F = 7.32, p < .01$ ) (Dansereau, Alutto &  
16  
17 Yammarino, 1984).  
18  
19

20  
21 **Organizational culture.** We asked focal participants to complete the Organizational  
22  
23 Culture Profile (OCP - Chatman et al., 2014). Participants sorted 54 culture attributes into nine  
24  
25 categories from most characteristic to least characteristic of the culture they have created for  
26  
27 others. The OCP uses the Q-sort method to provide a quantitative assessment of an  
28  
29 organization's culture and has been used in a variety of organizations to assess culture and  
30  
31 person-culture fit (e.g., Judge & Cable, 1997). The OCP provides ratings on six orthogonal  
32  
33 dimensions of an organization's culture: Adaptability, Integrity, Collaboration, Results-  
34  
35 orientation, Customer-orientation, and Detail-orientation (Chatman et al., 2014). For this Study,  
36  
37 we focus on Collaboration, which included the attributes team-oriented, cooperative, working in  
38  
39 collaboration with others, and low levels of conflict, and Integrity, which included the attributes  
40  
41 having integrity, high ethical standards, and being honest. The scale scores for collaboration  
42  
43 were:  $\bar{x} = 6.03 (s.d. = 0.86)$  and for integrity were:  $\bar{x} = 6.36 (s.d. = 1.21)$ . Both scales were  
44  
45 reliable and distinctive (collaboration: Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.74$ , WABA  $F = 8.32, p < .01$ ; integrity:  
46  
47 Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.68$ , WABA  $F = 6.55, p < .05$ ).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3           **Control variables.** We controlled for the class and MBA program (full-time, part-time)  
4  
5 in which the focal participant was enrolled since students' typical age and level of work  
6  
7 experience varies for each program, the number of evaluators that rated each focal participant,  
8  
9 since the breadth of their cross evaluation panel could be related to ratings of narcissism, and  
10  
11 participants' gender (0=male, 1=female), race (0=white, 1=non-white), and nationality (0=U.S.,  
12  
13 1=non-U.S.), the latter of which was important to control since norms for collaboration and  
14  
15 integrity vary across cultures.  
16  
17

## 18 19 **Results**

20  
21           Table 3 reports the means, standard deviations, and correlations among the variables.  
22  
23 Table 4 shows the results of regression equations examining the effects of our independent  
24  
25 variable (evaluator-rated narcissism) and our control variables on the dependent variable (self-  
26  
27 reported level of collaboration and integrity in the culture they created for others). The base  
28  
29 equations (models 1 and 3) show that among the control variables, only the MBA program type  
30  
31 influences culture, with part-time students being less likely to report creating collaborative  
32  
33 cultures ( $\beta = -0.15, p < .05$ ). None of the other control variables significantly affected how likely  
34  
35 participants were to focus on collaborative or integrity-based cultures. We expected that people  
36  
37 who are more narcissistic would intend to create organizational cultures that were less  
38  
39 collaborative and place less value on integrity. Models 2 and 4 in Table 4 show that focal  
40  
41 participants rated by their evaluators as more narcissistic were significantly more likely to report  
42  
43 that they created less collaborative ( $\beta = -0.16, p < .05$ ) and lower integrity cultures ( $\beta = -0.20, p$   
44  
45  $< .01$ ).  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 -----  
52           Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here  
53 -----  
54

## 55 **Discussion**

56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 While Study 1 showed that those higher in narcissism were less likely to describe their  
4 behavior as emphasizing collaboration and integrity, Study 2 showed that people who are rated  
5 by others as more narcissistic report creating organizational cultures that emphasize  
6 collaboration and integrity less than those who are less narcissistic. Study 2 was focused on  
7 determining if a link exists between levels of narcissism and the organizational culture a person  
8 creates. And while Study 2 augments the findings for Study 1 by removing common method bias  
9 as an alternative explanation for the link between narcissism and cultures lower in integrity and  
10 collaboration, both studies have limitations in terms of external validity, which would examine  
11 leaders of companies and the cultures they have created. Study 3 introduces evidence that  
12 bolsters the external validity of these results by examining the organizational cultures associated  
13 with more and less narcissistic CEOs of large publicly traded organizations.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 **STUDY 3**

#### 29 **Research Design and Sample**

30  
31 We used the Organizational Culture Profile (Chatman et al., 2014) to collect culture data  
32 from a set of large, publicly traded, high-technology firms headquartered in the U.S. ( $N = 56$   
33 firms,  $N = 880$  respondents). Firms invited to participate met the following criteria: They were  
34 publicly traded, U.S.-headquartered, had primary operations in the high-technology sector  
35 (hardware, software, internet services - SIC 35xx, 36xx, 38xx, 73xx; GIC Sector 45; S&P  
36 Economic Sector 940), and concurrently employed a minimum of 20 alumni from three focal  
37 west coast business schools. Alumni of these business schools provided culture assessments of  
38 their employing organizations using the OCP in 2009. We specified that informants' culture  
39 assessments were confidential and would not be identified to their employers, and that their  
40 organizations would not be identified by name. Eighty-nine percent of the 56 firms were  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 included in the list of the *Fortune 1000*. Informants' average tenure with the focal firm was 7.19  
4 years and 24 percent had worked at their firm for more than 12 years. Twenty-eight percent of  
5 the informants were women. All had earned a bachelor's degree or higher and seventy-four  
6 percent of informants had earned an MBA.  
7  
8  
9  
10

11  
12 In 2010, we again contacted the informants and asked them to complete an online survey  
13 assessing their current CEO's personality. Of the original 880 respondents in the 2009 survey,  
14 648 were contacted in 2010 and 250 employees from 32 companies completed the personality  
15 rating ( $\bar{x} = 7.81$  informants per company,  $s.d. = 4.97$ ), a 39 percent response rate. The sample  
16 was 34% female and their average tenure with the focal firm was 7.22 years. All had earned a  
17 bachelor's degree or higher and 26% had worked at the company for more than 12 years. Given  
18 the relatively long tenure and their managerial positions, respondents were likely to have  
19 experience with their CEOs and thus to be qualified to make judgments of their personality.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 31 **Variables**

32  
33 **CEO narcissism.** To evaluate their CEO, informants completed the measure of  
34 narcissism that we used in Study 1 (Resick et al., 2009). We averaged the eight items to form an  
35 overall scale (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .92$ ). To determine the appropriateness of aggregating narcissism  
36 ratings for each CEO, we computed several metrics of inter-rater reliability and agreement. First,  
37 we calculated an  $r_{wg(j)}$  value for the ratings of each CEO. The  $r_{wg(j)}$  indicates how highly  
38 respondents within the CEO's firm agree on their perceptions of the CEO. We obtained values  
39 for all CEOs ( $\bar{x} = 0.78$ ,  $s.d. = .11$ ). All values exceeded the recommended minimum value of 0.70  
40 (Klein et al., 2000), indicating high within-firm (CEO) agreement. Second, we calculated an  
41 intra-class correlation metric [ICC(2)] to assess the reliability of the CEO (within firm)  
42 narcissism mean ratings. The ICC(2) value (0.92) exceeded the recommended minimum value of  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 0.70. To assess the distinctiveness of CEO narcissism ratings across firms, or between-group  
4 variance, we conducted a within-and-between (WABA) analysis. Results indicated significant  
5 between-group variance (65% of variation accounted for by between-group factors, 35% within-  
6 group;  $F = 9.03, p < .001$ ) (Dansereau et al., 1984).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 We assessed the convergent validity of the narcissism measure in three ways. First, we  
13 collected the CEO's letter to the shareholders for the fiscal year 2009 (number of letters = 25)  
14 and the transcripts of quarterly earnings calls for that year in which the CEO participated  
15 (average number of earnings calls per CEO = 2.38). Previous research has suggested that people  
16 who are more narcissistic use first-person singular pronouns more frequently (DeWall, Buffardi,  
17 Bonser & Campbell, 2011; Koch & Biemann, 2014). To test this, we used the Linguistic Inquiry  
18 and Word Count (LIWC) text analysis program (Pennebaker, Francis & Booth, 2001) and found  
19 that CEO narcissism was positively though modestly correlated with the CEO's use of first-  
20 person singular pronouns ("I") in fiscal year 2009 letters to shareholders ( $r = .27, p < .10$ ), as  
21 well as with use of personal pronouns ( $r = .24, p < .10$ ) in fiscal year 2009 earnings call  
22 transcripts.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 Second, in a study of CEO narcissism and company financial reporting, Ham, Seybert,  
39 and Wang (2017) coded the size of the notarized signatures of CFOs and CEOs in SEC  
40 submissions. In a laboratory experiment using data from 63 undergraduates, they found a  
41 monotonic relationship between standardized signature size and ratings of narcissism using the  
42 NPI-40. They also provided standardized signature sizes for 513 CEOs, which included 24 of the  
43 32 firms in the present Study. Using the signature size data that they provided, we found a  
44 significant positive correlation between standardized CEO signature size and our narcissism  
45 measure ( $r = .51, p < .01$ ), providing further convergent validity for the narcissism measure.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Third, prior research has shown that narcissistic individuals are also more extraverted and  
4 less agreeable (e.g., Brown et al., 2010). Using Big 5 personality ratings of the CEO collected  
5 from the same participants, we found that CEO narcissism was positively correlated with  
6 extraversion ( $r = .50, p < .01$ ) and negatively with agreeableness ( $r = -.83, p < .001$ ).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 **Organizational culture.** As in Study 2, we assessed organizational culture by asking  
13 participants to complete the OCP (Chatman et al., 2014). We focused on collaboration and  
14 integrity in their organization's current culture given our research questions, which included the  
15 same items described in Study 2. Since the OCP offers a comprehensive set of dimensions  
16 beyond just collaboration and integrity, we also calculated associations between narcissism and  
17 other aspects of organizational culture in the results section.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 **Control variables.** Although the sample firms were in the high-technology industry, we  
27 used SIC codes from Compustat to create two dummy variables, Software (variable "Software" =  
28 1) or Mixed ("Mixed Products" = 1) if a company was involved in a mixture of hardware- and  
29 software-oriented production. We also controlled for firm size, using the log of the number of  
30 employees in fiscal year 2009, gathered from Compustat. A CEO's ability to influence the firm's  
31 culture may be affected by several factors. Those who have longer tenure and who hold the role  
32 of Board Chair are likely to have an enhanced ability to affect their organization's culture.  
33 Therefore, we controlled for CEO tenure as the number of full years that the CEO had  
34 consecutively occupied the CEO position in their firm, which we obtained from publicly  
35 available sources and validated using the start dates as reported in ExecuComp ( $\bar{x} = 7.81$  years,  
36  $s.d. = 8.11$ ). We verified whether the CEO was the Board Chair (39%) and/or founder (25%)  
37 from the company website.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

## 53 **Results**

54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Means, standard deviations and correlations are presented in Table 5. Narcissism is  
4  
5 higher for CEOs of larger firms and is negatively correlated with collaboration ( $r = -.43, p < .05$ )  
6  
7 and integrity ( $r = -.24, ns$ ). Table 6 presents the regression results investigating the relationship of  
8  
9 leader narcissism and organizational culture after controlling for industry segment  
10  
11 (software/hardware), firm size, CEO tenure, and Board Chair. CEOs who were more narcissistic  
12  
13 were likely to lead larger firms ( $r = .38, p < .05$ ) and have longer tenure ( $r = .45, p < .05$ ).  
14  
15 Though not displayed in Table 6, we assessed the extent to which CEO narcissism was related to  
16  
17 four other dimensions of organizational culture based on the OCP (Chatman et al., 2014) –  
18  
19 adaptability, results-oriented, customer-oriented, and detail-oriented. The CEOs' level of  
20  
21 narcissism was not significantly associated with any of these four dimensions of culture. CEO  
22  
23 narcissism was, however, modestly negatively associated with collaborative culture ( $\beta = -.30, p <$   
24  
25  $.10$ ) as shown in Table 6, model 2, and significantly so if the CEO was also the founder of the  
26  
27 company ( $\beta = -.34, p < .05$  – model 3) or the Board Chair ( $\beta = -.53, p < .01$  – model 4).  
28  
29 Although the overall equation for Models 5-7, which test the association between CEO  
30  
31 narcissism and a culture of integrity, are not significant, model 8 offers some support for the link  
32  
33 between CEO narcissism and cultures that place a lower value on integrity ( $\beta = -.43, p < .10$ ).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 -----  
41 Insert Tables 5 and 6 about here  
42 -----

## 43 Discussion

44  
45 The results of Study 3 offer additional evidence of a link between narcissistic CEOs and  
46  
47 organizational cultures that are less collaborative and emphasize lower levels of integrity. One  
48  
49 strength of this study is that the organizational culture and CEO narcissism ratings were highly  
50  
51 reliable, provided by multiple employees, and separated in time. A question raised in the study  
52  
53 pertains to the finding that CEOs who had longer tenure also tended to lead organizations with  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 cultures lower in collaboration and integrity. This relationship is hard to interpret because of the  
4  
5 correlation between narcissism and tenure, suggesting that narcissistic leaders may continue as  
6  
7 CEOs longer than their less narcissistic counterparts.  
8  
9

10 Although the results of Study 3 suggest a link between CEO narcissism and firm culture,  
11  
12 they are limited in several ways. First, the firm sample is small, reducing the power of the test  
13  
14 and limiting its generalizability. Second, the link between CEO narcissism and cultures lower in  
15  
16 integrity is less robust than is the negative relationship between CEO narcissism and  
17  
18 collaboration. Third, the study does not offer causal evidence that CEOs explicitly cultivated the  
19  
20 culture that exists. Indeed, the Attraction-Selection-Attrition model (Schneider et al., 1995)  
21  
22 suggests that organizations may recruit leaders that already fit the culture in place. As such,  
23  
24 future research should attempt to examine organizations across generations of leaders and over  
25  
26 time to determine if variation in leaders' narcissism leads to changes in the culture (e.g.,  
27  
28 becoming less collaborative and lower integrity). Further, with reference to the significant  
29  
30 correlation between leader narcissism and leader tenure mentioned above, if there are qualities  
31  
32 about the firm's narcissistic leaders join that make it simultaneously more likely that a  
33  
34 narcissistic leader will be chosen, have longer tenure, and cultivate less collaborative and lower  
35  
36 integrity cultures. Finally, the study does not identify the possible underlying mechanisms that  
37  
38 would explain an association between narcissistic CEOs and less collaborative, and possibly  
39  
40 lower integrity, cultures. Our two experimental studies attempt to address these issues.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

## 47 **STUDY 4**

### 48 **Research Design and Participants**

49  
50 One mechanism that narcissistic leaders might use to develop their organization's culture  
51  
52 is to endorse policies and practices that diminish collaboration and integrity. To examine this  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 possibility we asked subjects to complete a survey of “Organizational Policies and Practices” in  
4  
5 which they indicated: (a) how important or unimportant they believed a set of organizational  
6  
7 policies supporting collaboration and integrity were; (b) how willing they were to recommend  
8  
9 promotion of two job candidates who were low in collaboration and integrity, respectively; and  
10  
11 (c) how willing they would be as a manager to sanction a set of potential violations of  
12  
13 collaboration and integrity norms (e.g., refusing to help a team member, violating company  
14  
15 policy for personal gain). We counter-balanced the experimental materials so that respondents  
16  
17 completed several personality measures, reported their demographic attributes, and completed  
18  
19 the survey of organizational policies and practices containing our dependent variables in random  
20  
21 order and found no significant differences in the subjects’ responses based on the order in which  
22  
23 they completed the study assessments.  
24  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 One hundred and twenty-two subjects were recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk  
30  
31 (mTurk) and paid \$2.00 for their participation. We screened subjects so that all who participated  
32  
33 in the study were at least 18 years old, resided in the U.S., spoke English as their first language,  
34  
35 had at least a high school degree, and were employed full-time. Subjects were also required to  
36  
37 complete several attention-check questions throughout the scenario and were prevented from  
38  
39 participating in the study more than once. We also monitored the amount of time that subjects  
40  
41 took to complete the scenario study and removed subjects who took less than four minutes  
42  
43 (based on pretesting) to complete the Study ( $\bar{x}$  = 7.29 minutes,  $s.d.$  = 1.44 minutes). One  
44  
45 hundred sixteen respondents met all criteria and were included in the experiment (response rate  
46  
47 of 95 percent). Sixty-six percent were male and they averaged 36.4 years old. Seventy-nine  
48  
49 percent were Caucasian, 9% were African-American, 9% were Asian-American, and 3%  
50  
51 identified as “other.” Ninety-six percent were employed by an organization and 4% were self-  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 employed. Subjects' average work experience was 9.45 years and 45% had managerial  
4  
5 responsibilities.  
6

## 7 **Dependent Variables**

8  
9  
10 **Importance of collaboration and integrity policies.** Subjects indicated on a 9-point  
11  
12 scale (1=not at all important, 9=very important) how important it is for an organization to have a  
13  
14 set of eight policies. Three of the policies emphasized collaboration and five focused on integrity  
15  
16 (see Appendix A1). The scales were reliable (collaboration: Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.63$ ; integrity:  
17  
18 Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.77$ ).  
19  
20

21  
22 **Decision to promote low collaboration and low integrity candidates.** Respondents  
23  
24 read the biographical sketches of two employees being considered for promotion (see Appendix  
25  
26 A2) and were asked how likely they would be to recommend promotion on a 9-point scale  
27  
28 (1=not at all likely to promote, 9=very likely to promote). The scenarios described the candidates  
29  
30 as highly qualified in terms of technical competencies and experience. The first scenario  
31  
32 indicated that the candidate "Chris" was often aggressive and less of a team player (low  
33  
34 collaboration). The second scenario indicated that the candidate "Alex" sometimes ignored the  
35  
36 rules, made decisions that could be considered ethically ambiguous, and might not always be  
37  
38 honest in his quest to deliver results (low integrity).  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 **Willingness to sanction violations of company policies.** Respondents evaluated 10  
44  
45 potential violations of company policies and indicated how willing they would be as a manager  
46  
47 to raise the issue with others should they witness the violation, using a 9-point scale (1=not at all  
48  
49 willing, 9=very willing). Three of the violations focused on collaboration and five on integrity  
50  
51 (see Appendix A3). The scales were reliable (collaboration: Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.92$ ; integrity:  
52  
53 Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.85$ ).  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



### Independent Variable - Narcissism

We assessed narcissism using the NPI-16 (Ames et al., 2006). Consistent with previous research (e.g., Krizan & Herlache, 2018), narcissism was positively correlated with extraversion ( $r = 0.35, p < .001$ ) and negatively associated with agreeableness ( $r = -0.30, p < .01$ ).

### Control Variables

We used the same control variables in Study 4 as those in Study 1, sex, age, education, race, and work experience.

### Results

Study 4 examines the relationship between leader narcissism and the likelihood that more narcissistic respondents would endorse policies and actions that result in cultures lower on collaboration and integrity than would those lower on narcissism. Means, standard deviations and correlations are shown in Table 7. In the regression results shown in Table 8, models 1 and 2 support the notion that subjects with higher levels of narcissism are significantly less likely to view as important organizational policies and practices that promote collaboration ( $\beta = -.20, p < .05$ ) and integrity ( $\beta = -.25, p < .01$ ). They also show, in models 5 and 6, that those who are more narcissistic are less willing to sanction those who violate norms of collaboration ( $\beta = -.23, p < .05$ ) and integrity ( $\beta = -.36, p < .001$ ). Model 4 in Table 8, shows that narcissists are more likely to promote a low integrity candidate ( $\beta = .19, p < .05$ ), though the overall equation is not significant ( $F=1.31, n.s.$ ). In contrast to our expectations, more narcissistic candidates were less likely to promote a low collaboration candidate ( $\beta = -.20, p < .05$ ), however, this model (3) is only significant at the  $p < .10$  level.

-----  
Insert Tables 7 and 8 about here  
-----

1  
2  
3 To rule out the possibility that narcissists are more likely to promote candidates  
4 generally, we conducted an additional analysis with 121 new subjects, using the same filters and  
5 covariates described above for Study 4, and describing the two candidates as high (rather than  
6 low) in collaboration and integrity. We found no difference between subjects who were high  
7 versus low on self-reported narcissism and their propensity to promote a candidate high in  
8 collaboration ( $\beta = -.02$ , n.s.), or a candidate high in integrity ( $\beta = -.05$ , n.s.), suggesting that  
9 narcissists are no more or less likely than those lower in narcissism to promote candidates.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

## 19 **Discussion**

20  
21 Culture is shaped by leaders' actions, which are typically manifested in the policies they  
22 adopt and support, the types of people they select and promote, and their willingness to reward  
23 and punish those who either behave in accordance with cultural norms or violate them. The  
24 results of Study 4 show that people who are more narcissistic endorse policies and practices that  
25 are likely to produce cultures that are less collaborative and of lower integrity than are those who  
26 are less narcissistic. The results also suggest that more narcissistic respondents are less willing to  
27 sanction actions that undermine collaboration and integrity. And, narcissists were more likely to  
28 promote a candidate with lower integrity. One finding was less consistent with our general  
29 reasoning: narcissists were less likely to promote less collaborative candidates (or, said  
30 differently, were more likely to promote candidates higher in collaboration) than were those  
31 lower in narcissism, a finding that could indicate that narcissists may believe that less  
32 collaborative people are harder to influence and thus undesirable. Overall, these findings  
33 demonstrate a link between how narcissists act in ways that are likely to produce the cultures of  
34 low collaboration and integrity shown in Studies 1, 2, and 3. In Study 5, we explored how the  
35 cultures created by narcissistic leaders' affect their subordinates' decisions and actions.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## STUDY 5

### Research Design

In Study 5, we sought to better understand the relationship between leader narcissism, cultural levels of integrity and collaboration, and employee behavior, and specifically to examine the combined impact of leader narcissism and culture. We consider the impact of culture, along with leader narcissism, on employee behavior and thus integrate the link established in Studies 1-3 between leader narcissism and cultural levels of collaboration and integrity with the association established in Study 4 between leader narcissism and employee behavior. Specifically, we designed an experimental scenario to test whether more narcissistic leaders in organizations whose cultures emphasize collaboration and integrity less, will also elicit behaviors among subordinates that are lower in collaboration and integrity. Further, following from our argument that followers may be reluctant to simply emulate narcissistic leaders, we examined the relative potency of leader narcissism and cultures deemphasizing collaboration and integrity on follower compliance. As discussed above, we expected that culture would be a more potent force influencing follower decisions than would leader narcissism.

We randomly assigned subjects to one of four conditions. Subjects read a scenario in which we varied the level of the CEO's narcissism (low versus high) and the company's cultural emphasis on collaboration and integrity (low versus high – see Appendix B for a transcript of the scenario and list of the four conditions), and then completed a survey (the same one as in Study 4) of “Organizational Policies and Practices.” Similar to Study 4 but from the perspective of a subordinate manager reporting to the CEO, the survey asked participants to indicate how important or unimportant a set of policies regarding collaboration and integrity were to recommend to the CEO, how willing they were to recommend to the CEO promotion of two job

1  
2  
3 candidates who were good performers but were less collaborative or lower on integrity,  
4  
5 respectively, and how willing they would be as a manager to sanction a set of potential violations  
6  
7 (e.g., violating company policy for personal gain, refusing to help a team member). We counter-  
8  
9 balanced the experimental materials so that respondents completed the same personality  
10  
11 measures as in Study 4, the survey of organizational policies and practices, and questions about  
12  
13 their demographic attributes in different orders. No order effects emerged.  
14  
15

16  
17 We recruited 200 subjects from Amazon's mTurk, and paid them \$5.00 for participating.  
18  
19 We screened subjects so that all who participated in the study were at least 18 years old, resided  
20  
21 in the U.S., spoke English as their first language, had at least a high school degree, and were  
22  
23 employed full-time. Subjects were also required to complete several attention-check questions  
24  
25 throughout the scenario,<sup>1</sup> and were prevented from participating in the study more than once. No  
26  
27 subjects took less than five minutes (based on pretesting) to complete the Study ( $\bar{x} = 19.32$   
28  
29 minutes,  $s.d. = 14.03$  minutes).  
30  
31

32  
33 Subjects were, on average, 36.4 years old, 54% were male, 75% were Caucasian, 10.5%  
34  
35 were African-American, 11% were Asian-American, and 3.5% identified as "other." Ninety-five  
36  
37 percent of subjects were employed by an organization and 5% were self-employed. Subjects'  
38  
39 average work experience was 12 years, and 40% had managerial responsibilities.  
40  
41

## 42 **Dependent Variables**

43  
44 **Willingness to recommend collaboration and integrity policies to the CEO.** Subjects  
45  
46 indicated on a 9-point scale (1=not at all likely, 9=very likely) how likely they would be to  
47  
48 recommend a set of eight policies to the CEO of FastChip, the simulated organization. As in  
49  
50 Study 4 (see Appendix A1), three items emphasized collaboration (scale  $\bar{x} = 3.90$ ,  $s.d. = .84$ ) and  
51  
52

---

53  
54  
55 <sup>1</sup> All subjects met all our conditions, though five participants failed one of the three attention checks. The results did not change  
56  
57 if we included or excluded these participants so we included them in the sample.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 five focused on integrity (scale  $\bar{x}$  = 3.94,  $s.d.$  = .77). The two policy scales were reliable  
4  
5 (collaboration: Cronbach's  $\alpha$  = 0.68; integrity: Cronbach's  $\alpha$  = 0.81).  
6  
7

### 8 **Decision to recommend promoting low-collaboration and low-integrity candidates.**

9  
10 Respondents read the same biographical sketches of two employees being considered for  
11  
12 promotion as in Study 4 (see Appendix A2), then were asked how likely they would be to  
13  
14 recommend promotion of the candidate to the CEO on a 9-point scale (1=not at all likely to  
15  
16 promote, 9=very likely to promote). Again, "Chris" was the low-collaboration candidate ( $\bar{x}$  =  
17  
18 6.73,  $s.d.$  = 1.87) and "Alex" was the low integrity candidate ( $\bar{x}$  = 5.55,  $s.d.$  = 2.34).  
19  
20

21 **Willingness to raise issues to the CEO regarding sanctioning violations of company**  
22 **policies.** We asked respondents to evaluate the same 10 potential violations of company policies  
23  
24 as in Study 4 and indicate how willing they would be as a manager to raise the issue with the  
25  
26 CEO should they witness the violation, using a 9-point scale (1=not at all willing, 9=very  
27  
28 willing). As in Study 4 (see Appendix A3), five of the violations focused on collaboration (scale  
29  
30  $\bar{x}$  = 5.82,  $s.d.$  = 2.17) and five on integrity (scale  $\bar{x}$  = 6.12,  $s.d.$  = 2.00). The two scales were  
31  
32 reliable (collaboration: Cronbach's  $\alpha$  = 0.92; integrity: Cronbach's  $\alpha$  = 0.84).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 **Independent Variable: Leader Narcissism-Cultural Collaboration or Integrity Condition**

39  
40 Because all organizations have leaders and a culture, we created four conditions. Subjects  
41  
42 were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions (Appendix B): (1) high leader  
43  
44 narcissism/low collaboration and integrity culture (51 subjects), (2) low leader narcissism/high  
45  
46 collaboration and integrity culture (49 subjects), (3) high leader narcissism/high collaboration  
47  
48 and integrity culture (50 subjects), and (4) low leader narcissism/low collaboration and integrity  
49  
50 culture (50 subjects). Our main interest was in comparing condition 2 and condition 1.  
51  
52

### 53 **Control Variables**

54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Since participants were randomly assigned to conditions, most attributes should not  
4 influence our results systematically. We, did, however, control for subjects' self-reported  
5 narcissism using the NPI-16 ( $\bar{x} = 4.30, s.d. = 3.81$ ) and the Resick measure ( $\bar{x} = 2.69, s.d. =$   
6 1.10) to ensure that narcissism levels did not account for subjects' decisions. The correlation of  
7 the NPI-16 and the Resick measure of narcissism was  $r = .49 (p < .001)$ , suggesting convergent  
8 validity. We also controlled for subjects' sex to account for possible differences in men's and  
9 women's reactions to cultures varying in collaboration and integrity. Though not included in our  
10 models, narcissism was also positively correlated with hierarchical position of the respondent  
11 (NPI-16:  $r = 0.30, p < .001$ ; Resick:  $r = 0.20, p < .01$ ), indicating that more narcissistic  
12 individuals occupied higher managerial positions.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

### 26 **Manipulation Checks**

27  
28 As part of Study 5, we asked participants to assess the CEO's level of narcissism using  
29 Resick et al.'s (2009) narcissism measure (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .96$ ). As expected, participants  
30 randomly assigned to the high leader narcissism condition perceived the CEO in the scenario as  
31 significantly more narcissistic ( $\bar{x} = 5.6, s.d. = 1.1$ ) than did those in the low narcissism condition  
32 ( $\bar{x} = 3.1, s.d. = 1.6; F = 154.9, p < .001$ ). We also collected responses to two items that offer  
33 some assurance that participants viewed the culture conditions as different. Specifically, we  
34 asked participants, on a 5-point Likert scale, the extent to which they fit the culture and preferred  
35 the culture (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .91$ ). Participants in the high collaboration/high integrity culture  
36 condition viewed the culture described in the scenario as significantly more desirable and a  
37 higher fit for them ( $\bar{x} = 3.6, s.d. = 1.1$ ) than did those in the low collaboration/low integrity  
38 culture condition ( $\bar{x} = 2.7, s.d. = 1.3; F = 27.8, p < .001$ ).  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

### 54 **Results**

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Table 9 reports the means, standard deviations, and correlations among the Study 5  
4 variables. Building on our findings from the previous studies in this paper, and as a step toward  
5 exploring culture as a key mechanism influencing followers, we expected, first, that followers  
6 would be more likely to conform to the cultural orientation toward lower collaboration and lower  
7 integrity in making their policy, promotion, and sanctioning recommendations when the leader  
8 was more narcissistic and the culture was less collaborative and lower integrity. Table 10 shows  
9 ANCOVA tests of whether followers make decisions and recommendations to the CEO that are  
10 lower in collaboration and integrity when the CEO is more narcissistic and when the culture was  
11 less collaborative and lower on integrity (condition 1) compared to when the CEO was lower in  
12 narcissism and the culture was higher in collaboration and integrity (condition 2). Second, we  
13 examined the relative influence of leader narcissism and cultural orientation. Table 11 shows the  
14 ANCOVA results of our tests comparing the influence of leader narcissism and cultural  
15 collaboration/integrity, respectively, on follower behavior across the six dependent variables.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 **The *combined* impact of leader narcissism and cultural orientation on follower**  
34 **behavior.** Table 10 shows results of ANOVAs of follower decisions across the three dependent  
35 variables (policies, promotion, sanctions) when subjects, in the role of a subordinate, were asked  
36 to make recommendations either to a narcissistic CEO leading an organization whose culture  
37 was low in collaboration and integrity or to a CEO who was low on narcissism leading a culture  
38 that was high in collaboration and integrity, what we identify as “congruent” conditions.. For all  
39 three of the dependent variables across the two culture types, followers were more likely to  
40 recommend policies, promotions, and sanctions that were consistent with the leader’s narcissism  
41 and cultural orientation. Specifically, with regard to the *policy* dependent variable, compared to  
42 subjects in Condition 2 (low leader narcissism, high collaborative/integrity culture -  $\bar{x} = 4.11$ ),  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 subjects in Condition 1 (high leader narcissism, low collaboration/integrity culture condition -  $\bar{x}$   
4 = 3.71) were significantly less likely to recommend policies that supported collaboration ( $F =$   
5 5.96,  $p < .05$ ). Compared to subjects in Condition 2 ( $\bar{x} = 4.17$ ), subjects in Condition 1 ( $\bar{x} = 3.78$ ),  
6  
7 were also significantly less likely to recommend policies that supported integrity ( $F = 5.84$ ,  $p <$   
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13 .05).

14  
15 Further, with regard to the *promotion* dependent variable, compared to subjects in  
16  
17 Condition 2 (low leader narcissism, high collaborative/integrity culture -  $\bar{x} = 5.98$ ), subjects in  
18  
19 Condition 1 (high leader narcissism, low collaboration/integrity culture condition -  $\bar{x} = 7.16$ )  
20  
21 were significantly more likely to recommend a candidate (Chris) that was less collaborative ( $F =$   
22  
23 10.52,  $p < .01$ ). And compared to subjects in Condition 2 ( $\bar{x} = 4.39$ ), subjects in Condition 1 ( $\bar{x} =$   
24  
25 5.67), were also significantly more likely to recommend a candidate (Alex) that displayed lower  
26  
27 integrity ( $F = 6.64$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

28  
29  
30  
31 And, with regard to the *sanctions* dependent variable, compared to subjects in Condition  
32  
33 2 (low leader narcissism, high collaborative/integrity culture -  $\bar{x} = 6.92$ ), subjects in Condition 1  
34  
35 (high leader narcissism, low collaboration/integrity culture condition -  $\bar{x} = 5.11$ ) were  
36  
37 significantly less likely to support sanctions for lower collaboration ( $F = 19.01$ ,  $p < .01$ ). And  
38  
39 compared to subjects in Condition 2 ( $\bar{x} = 7.07$ ), subjects in Condition 1 ( $\bar{x} = 5.57$ ), were also  
40  
41 significantly less likely to recommend sanctions for lower integrity ( $F = 16.41$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

42  
43  
44 **The *relative* impact of leader narcissism and cultural orientation on follower**  
45  
46 **behavior.** To explore the relative impact of leader narcissism and cultural orientation on  
47  
48 follower behavior, we conducted ANCOVAs of follower decisions across the six dependent  
49  
50 variables (policies, promotion, sanctions across the two types of cultures). Our design did not  
51  
52 permit a perfect isolation of leader versus culture effects because both were always present at  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 high or low levels in each condition, however, we grouped together the two conditions in which  
4  
5 leaders were high on narcissism (condition 1: high narc/low collaboration-integrity culture, and  
6  
7 condition 3: high narc/high collaboration-integrity culture) and compared this combined  
8  
9 condition independent variable to a variable representing the two conditions in which leaders  
10  
11 were low on narcissism (condition 2: low narc/high collaboration-integrity culture, and 4: low  
12  
13 narc/low collaboration-integrity culture). Similarly, we created a variable in which cultural  
14  
15 emphasis on collaboration or integrity was high by combining conditions 2 and 3 into an  
16  
17 independent variable and comparing it to a variable representing the two low collaboration-  
18  
19 integrity culture conditions (1 and 4).  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Table 11 shows the results of these comparisons. Interestingly, only one of the six  
25  
26 comparisons was modestly significant for the high versus low leader narcissism comparisons.  
27  
28 Specifically, there was a modestly significant difference for integrity, with subjects working for a  
29  
30 CEO who was high on narcissism ( $\bar{x} = 3.84$ ) being slightly less likely to recommend policies  
31  
32 supporting integrity compared to subjects recommending policies to CEOs who were low on  
33  
34 narcissism ( $\bar{x} = 4.04$ ;  $F = 2.82$ ,  $p < .10$ ).  
35  
36  
37

38 In contrast, for the high versus low culture comparison, all six comparisons were  
39  
40 significantly different. Specifically, with regard to the *policy* dependent variable, compared to  
41  
42 subjects in the high collaboration culture ( $\bar{x} = 4.06$ ), subjects in the low collaboration culture ( $\bar{x} =$   
43  
44  $3.74$ ) were significantly less likely to recommend policies that supported collaboration ( $F = 8.02$ ,  
45  
46  $p < .01$ ). Compared to subjects in the high integrity culture ( $\bar{x} = 4.03$ ), subjects in the low  
47  
48 integrity culture ( $\bar{x} = 3.85$ ), were modestly less likely to recommend policies that supported  
49  
50 integrity ( $F = 3.64$ ,  $p < .10$ ).  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Further, with regard to the **promotion** dependent variable, compared to subjects in the  
4 high collaboration culture ( $\bar{x} = 6.21$ ), subjects in the low collaboration culture ( $\bar{x} = 7.24$ ) were  
5 significantly more likely to recommend a candidate (Chris) that was less collaborative ( $F =$   
6  $18.47, p < .01$ ). Compared to subjects in the high integrity culture ( $\bar{x} = 5.18$ ), subjects in the low  
7 integrity culture ( $\bar{x} = 5.90$ ), were also significantly more likely to recommend a candidate (Alex)  
8 that displayed lower integrity ( $F = 5.23, p < .05$ ).  
9

10  
11  
12 And, with regard to the *sanctions* dependent variable, compared to subjects in the high  
13 collaboration culture ( $\bar{x} = 6.48$ ), subjects in the low collaboration culture ( $\bar{x} = 5.18$ ) were  
14 significantly less likely to support sanctions for lower collaboration ( $F = 20.91, p < .01$ ).  
15  
16 Compared to subjects in the high integrity culture ( $\bar{x} = 6.66$ ), subjects in the low integrity culture  
17 ( $\bar{x} = 5.58$ ), were also significantly less likely to recommend sanctions for lower integrity ( $F =$   
18  $16.60, p < .01$ ).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

## 30 **Discussion**

31  
32  
33 Study 5 addressed two questions. First, we examined the combined impact of leader  
34 narcissism and cultural orientation on employee decisions. We found that when a leader is high  
35 on narcissism and the culture is low on collaboration and integrity, employees are significantly  
36 more likely to make decisions that are lower in integrity and collaboration than when the leader  
37 is low on narcissism and the culture is high on collaboration and integrity. Since organizations  
38 invariably have both leaders and cultures, this study begins to substantiate their combined impact  
39 on how employees behave above and beyond the employee's own level of narcissism.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 Second, we explored the possibility that leader narcissism and cultural orientation exert  
51 different levels of influence on employee behavior. Interestingly, shown in Table 11, it is the  
52 culture that appears to be driving employee behavior more than the direct effect of the leader's  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 narcissism. The F-tests in Table 11 show that the difference between cultures that do and do not  
4 emphasize collaboration and integrity significantly influences followers to make decisions that  
5 are consistent with the cultural orientation, with only the integrity culture on policies being  
6 moderately significant. It could be the case that once employees perceive leaders as more  
7 narcissistic, they assume that the culture will be less likely to support collaboration and integrity  
8 and behave accordingly.  
9

10  
11 Our results from Studies 1, 2, and 3 surface the relationship between leader narcissism  
12 and culture, while the results of Study 4 suggest that narcissistic leaders may also directly  
13 influence the decisions and preferences that subordinates express. Study 5 further contributes to  
14 these linkages by raising the possibility that the less collaborative and lower integrity cultures  
15 that narcissistic leaders create may be a potent and lasting source of influence on employee's  
16 decisions and behavior. Indeed, based on the comparative main effects shown in Table 11,  
17 leaders create a culture that may, in turn, exert an even more direct and forceful channel for  
18 affecting employee behavior. Future research should, therefore, explicitly test the possibility that  
19 cultures characterized by lower collaboration and integrity may mediate the relationship between  
20 leader narcissism and employee behavior, particularly over time.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39  
40 -----  
41 Insert Tables 10 and 11 about here  
42 -----  
43

## 44 **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

45  
46 The results of the five studies establish a clear linkage between leader narcissism and  
47 organizational cultures characterized by lower collaboration and integrity. These findings are  
48 consistent with research on the so-called dark side of leadership (Kaiser, LeBreton & Hogan,  
49 2015; Khoo & Burch, 2008) and provide a framework for additional hypotheses and theory  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 generation which can link leader narcissism to specific aspects of organizational culture and  
4  
5 employee behavior. Our first study offers evidence that individuals who are more narcissistic  
6  
7 report engaging in less collaborative and ethical behavior than do those who are less narcissistic.  
8  
9  
10 Study 2 shows that participants rated by others as more narcissistic report creating organizational  
11  
12 cultures that are less collaborative and place less emphasis on integrity than do participants who  
13  
14 are seen by others as less narcissistic. Study 3 offers additional support for this link in  
15  
16 organizations, showing that CEOs who are rated by their employees as more narcissistic lead  
17  
18 organizational cultures that are lower on collaboration and may emphasize integrity less than do  
19  
20 CEOs who are less narcissistic. To explore the mechanisms linking leader narcissism and  
21  
22 cultures of collaboration and integrity, Study 4 reveals that more narcissistic respondents are less  
23  
24 likely to support policies and practices that promote collaboration and integrity and are less  
25  
26 willing to sanction actions that undermine a culture of collaboration and integrity. Finally, to  
27  
28 understand how culture is maintained and cascaded through an organization, Study 5 shows that  
29  
30 when respondents are dealing with a more narcissistic leader in a culture characterized by lower  
31  
32 collaboration and integrity, they are also less likely to collaborate and adhere to high standards of  
33  
34 integrity, regardless of their own level of narcissism, and that they are particularly likely to  
35  
36 follow the culture of their organization as a guide to their own decisions. Taken together, the  
37  
38 results of these five studies offer evidence that can form the basis for future hypothesizing about  
39  
40 the causal mechanisms and consequences of narcissistic leadership and organizational cultures.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Our research offers an initial framework for developing a theory of how leader  
48  
49 personality, and narcissistic leaders in particular, can affect organizational culture. First, while  
50  
51 previous research has suggested how organizational culture is developed (e.g., O'Reilly &  
52  
53 Chatman, 1996; Schein, 1985) and how a leader's actions can cascade into the organization (e.g.,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Bauman et al., 2016; Schaubroeck et al., 2012), our results show that narcissistic leaders, by  
4 virtue of their personality, are likely to prefer and create cultures that specifically undermine  
5 collaboration and blur ethical boundaries. And, while previous studies have suggested a “bright  
6 side” to leader narcissism, our results suggest instead that narcissistic leaders can have a diffuse  
7 but persuasive “dark side” impact on their organizations through the cultures they create, which  
8 can put their organizations at risk (Van Scotter & De Dea Roglio, 2018). These effects can be  
9 driven by leaders at different organizational levels--department, division, business unit or for the  
10 entire organization.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 In their review of the state of research on organizational culture, Chatman and O'Reilly  
23 (2016) note that, although there are a large number of studies of culture, their aggregate impact is  
24 undermined by a lack of consistency in the definition and measurement of the construct. They  
25 further observe that even though many researchers accept Schein's (1985) conception of culture  
26 as having three levels (underlying beliefs and assumptions, norms and values, and artifacts like  
27 language and symbols) that “this consensus has not been translated into a consistent theoretical  
28 framework (p. 218)” that explicates the underlying mechanisms of action. They suggest that the  
29 starting point for a comprehensive theory of culture could be a focus on how norms can act as a  
30 social control system and can affect observable attitudes and behaviors. The current study is a  
31 step in this direction, linking leader personality to normative order and showing how leaders can  
32 affect the culture of an organization and subsequent behavior of its members.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Although we explore a single leader personality trait (narcissism) and only two aspects of  
48 culture (collaboration and integrity), a more general theoretical framework would encompass a  
49 full spectrum of personality traits and cultural norms. It could elaborate on how norms affect the  
50 basis for individuals' underlying commitment (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986) and could also show  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 how these preconditions affect important organizational outcomes like financial performance,  
4 firm reputation, and innovation capacity. Based on the results of Study 5, it would also explore  
5 the relative contributions of personality, leader behavior, enabling mechanisms (e.g., formal  
6 policies and procedures), and cultural norms on the behavior of individuals. It could also pay  
7 attention to how the combination or interaction of these elements influence employee behavior  
8 and organizational outcomes.

### 16 **Managerial Implications**

19 What are the implications of our findings for organizations with cultures that are low on  
20 collaboration? In principle, it is easy to theorize why organizations with more collaborative  
21 cultures might be better able to coordinate activities across the company (e.g., cross-selling,  
22 better technical coordination) and therefore perform better. Prior research supports the value of  
23 collaboration in promoting organizational effectiveness. For example, in a meta-analysis of 84  
24 studies Hartnell and his colleagues (2011) found that in cultures that were more clan-like (that  
25 included an emphasis on collaboration), employees were more satisfied with their jobs, more  
26 committed to the organization, more focused on product quality, and viewed their organization  
27 as more effective. In another study, Hartnell, Kinicki, Lambert, Fugate, and Corner (2016) found  
28 that cultures that were more team-oriented performed better, while Grijalva and her colleagues  
29 (2020) found that teams with higher levels of narcissism had lower levels of collaboration and  
30 performed more poorly. Berson et al. (2008) reported that supportive cultures (which included an  
31 emphasis on relationships) were associated with higher employee job satisfaction and better sales  
32 growth. O'Reilly et al. (2014) found that financial analysts evaluated firms with more  
33 collaborative cultures more positively. Other research also suggests how a collaborative culture  
34 serves as a potential key to firm performance (e.g., Baron & Hannan, 2002).

1  
2  
3 The evidence for how a culture emphasizing integrity affects firm performance is even  
4 more persuasive (Simha & Cullen, 2012). Several studies have shown that more ethical leaders  
5 create more ethical cultures, and both leaders' actions and the cultures they create cascade into  
6 the organization, influencing subordinates' behavior and resulting in higher organizational  
7 citizenship behavior and lower deviance (e.g., Eisenbeiss, van Knippenberg & Fahrbach, 2015;  
8 Mayer, Kuenzi, Greenbaum, Bardes & Salvador, 2009; Trevino et al., 2014). Consistent with  
9 this, Guiso and his colleagues (2015) found that a firm's stated values about integrity and  
10 collaboration did not predict firm performance, but firms whose leaders were seen by employees  
11 as having higher integrity had higher market-to-book valuations. Recent studies in accounting  
12 and finance have shown that narcissistic leaders are more likely to manipulate earnings reporting  
13 (Capalbo et al., 2018; Ham et al., 2017), engage in tax avoidance (Olsen & Stekelberg, 2016),  
14 and put their firms at greater audit risk (Judd et al., 2015). Thus, it appears that narcissistic  
15 leaders not only create lower integrity cultures, but that such cultures negatively affect firm  
16 performance. Taken together, our studies suggest that managers who wish to avoid creating less  
17 collaborative and lower integrity cultures and sub-cultures within their organizations might be  
18 well-advised to develop practices that allow them to avoid hiring and promoting narcissistic  
19 leaders (O'Reilly & Chatman, 2020).

### 20 21 22 **Study Limitations and Implications for Future Research**

23  
24 Using multiple methods and samples, our studies provide a remarkably consistent picture  
25 of the effects of narcissism on organizational culture. The studies, individually and as a set, have  
26 some clear limitations, however. First, although Study 2 included 259 MBA students, more than  
27 half of whom were managers and employed full-time, we could only assess their own reports of  
28 the types of organizational culture they had created, not the cultures that those experiencing their  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 cultures might report. It is possible that circumstances such as strong industry regulation or  
4  
5 strong board governance might constrain narcissistic leaders from implementing their preferred  
6  
7 cultures, weakening the effects of both high and low leader narcissism. Second, while the results  
8  
9 of Study 3, examining high-tech CEOs, were largely consistent with the MBA sample, it was  
10  
11 cross-sectional, precluding our ability to attribute the cultures in place to the actions of that CEO.  
12  
13 Further, although the number of raters of the CEO's personality was reasonable (n=250), the  
14  
15 number of firms was small (n=32), limiting the power of the findings. Additionally, we focused  
16  
17 on firms in a narrow industry segment and although this focus allows us to control for industry  
18  
19 variations, it may also limit the generalizability of our findings. Third, while the online samples  
20  
21 consisted of working adults, the choices they made about policies, promotions, and sanctions  
22  
23 were hypothetical and not actual behavior, so we cannot be sure that these choices would occur  
24  
25 in an organizational context.  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 Further, our results were not completely consistent across the studies. One possible  
32  
33 reason for this is that respondents' willingness to identify cultures as low on collaboration, and  
34  
35 even more so, as low on integrity, may vary by the setting in which they participated. In  
36  
37 particular, in our only study of actual organizations (Study 3), the relationship between leader  
38  
39 narcissism and integrity was the weakest and least consistent, while it was the strongest in  
40  
41 Studies 1 and 5, scenario studies. Two factors might account for this. First, it is likely that  
42  
43 employees of a "real" organization feel more inhibited about depicting their organization as low  
44  
45 on integrity, particularly given the negative consequences of such disclosures. Second, unlike  
46  
47 teamwork that is salient to individuals on a frequent basis, integrity is a less frequent and less  
48  
49 visible outcome to most organizational participants. As such, violations are less likely to be  
50  
51 observed and commented upon.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Several avenues for future research and theory building seem promising. First, to reduce  
4 the reliance on small samples (either laboratory or field data) and enhance the power and validity  
5 of any tests, future research should strive to use longitudinal data with large samples, both of  
6 leader personality and organizational culture. From a theory-building perspective, the possibility  
7 that a CEO's narcissism lags his or her tenure as CEO, and that causality works both in the  
8 direction of culture causing certain CEOs to be selected as well as CEOs determining the culture,  
9 makes it critical to conduct research over time. Conventional measurement approaches make this  
10 difficult, especially for cross-organization culture comparisons and for the assessment of  
11 personality of senior leaders who have neither the time nor the inclination to fill out surveys.  
12 Fortunately, several emerging measurement approaches and data sets may allow this using data  
13 from existing sources like Glassdoor and Facebook (e.g., Sull, Sull & Chamberlain, 2019). For  
14 example, Malhotra and his colleagues (Malhotra, Reus, Zhu & Roelofsen, 2018) used language  
15 coding from transcripts (e.g., earnings calls and assessment data) to code personality data for  
16 CEOs across a large sample of firms. Popadak (2013) used data from Glassdoor and other online  
17 sources to assess and compare cultures across organizations and found that firms with lower  
18 collaboration and integrity also had less rigorous corporate governance regimes and reported  
19 lower profitability. These techniques, as well as other emerging approaches to assessing  
20 organizational culture (Chatman & Choi, 2020) permit researchers to gather large-sample data  
21 and conduct more definitive studies of CEO personality, organizational culture, and their impact  
22 on firm performance over time frames that allow for clearer inferences about causality.

## 23 **Conclusion**

24 Our goal was to explore the relationship between narcissistic leaders and organizational  
25 culture. In a study of leadership and power, Macenczak and his colleagues concluded, "Since  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 those high in narcissism often seek high positions of power, this can be a dangerous combination  
4  
5 if left unchecked” (Macenczak, Campbell, Henley & Campbell, 2016: 119). Our findings support  
6  
7 this conclusion by showing that narcissistic leaders are significantly more likely to prefer and  
8  
9 create cultures that undermine collaboration and integrity, attributes that are almost always  
10  
11 beneficial for organizations. By focusing primarily on leader attributes, previous research has  
12  
13 overlooked the potentially insidious impact of such leaders on the enduring patterns of behavior  
14  
15 among employees, who are likely to make decisions that are consistent with the culture of the  
16  
17 organization. In this way, narcissistic leaders may leave a residue on organizations through  
18  
19 creating policies, hiring and promotion criteria, and sanctioning some, but not other, behaviors  
20  
21 that create cultures lower in collaboration and integrity. These cultures may outlast a narcissistic  
22  
23 leader’s tenure and, as such, narcissistic leaders may leave a lasting, and negative, legacy on the  
24  
25 organizations they lead.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## REFERENCES

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Agle, B. R., Nagarajan, N. J., Sonnenfeld, J. A., & Srinivasan, D. 2006. Does CEO charisma matter? An empirical analysis of the relationships among organizational performance, environmental uncertainty, and top management team perceptions of CEO charisma. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49: 161-174.
- Ames, D. R., Rose, P. & Anderson, C. P. 2006. The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40: 440-450.
- Anderson, C., Spataro, S. E., & Flynn, F. J. 2008. Personality and organizational culture as determinants of influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 702-710.
- Ashforth, B. E. & Saks, A. M. 1996. Socialization tactics: Longitudinal effects on newcomer adjustment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39: 149-178.
- Ashton, M. C. & Lee, K. 2009. The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91: 340-345.
- Atkas, N., de Bodt, E., Bollaert, H. & Roll, R. 2016. CEO narcissism and the takeover process: From private initiation to deal completion. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 51: 113-137.
- Baron, J. N. & Hannan, M. T. 2002. Organizational blueprints for success in high-tech start-ups: Lessons from the Stanford Project on emerging companies. *California Management Review*, 44: 8-36.
- Bauman, C. W., Tost, L. P. & Ong, M. 2016. Blame the shepherd not the sheep: Imitating high-ranking transgressors mitigates punishment for unethical behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 137: 123-141.
- Bennett, R. J. & Robinson, S. L. 2000. Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85: 349-360.
- Berson, Y., Oreg, S. & Dvir, T. 2008. CEO values, organizational culture and firm outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29: 615-633.
- Bezrukova, K., Thatcher, S. M., Jehn, K. A. & Spell, C. S. 2012. The effects of alignment: Examining group faultlines, organizational cultures, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97: 77-92
- Blair, C. A., Hoffman, B. J. & Helland, K. R. 2008. Narcissism in organizations: A multisource appraisal reflects different perspectives. *Human Performance*, 21: 254-276.

- 1  
2  
3 Braun, S. 2017. Leader narcissism and outcomes in organizations: A review at multiple levels of  
4 analysis and implications for future research. *Frontiers in Psychology*,  
5 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00773>  
6  
7  
8 Brown, R. B., Budzek, K. & Tamborski, M. 2010. On the meaning and measure of narcissism.  
9 *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35: 951-964.  
10  
11 Brown, T. A., Sautter, J. A., Littvay, L., Sautter, A. C. & Bearnese, B. 2010. Ethics and  
12 personality: Empathy and narcissism as moderators of ethical decision making in business  
13 students. *Journal of Education for Business*, 85: 203-208.  
14  
15  
16 Brunell, A. B. & Buelow, M. T. 2017. Narcissism and performance on behavioral decision-  
17 making tasks. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 30: 3-14.  
18  
19  
20 Brunell, A. B. & Davis, M. S. 2016. Grandiose narcissism and fairness in social exchanges.  
21 *Current Psychology*, 35: 220-233.  
22  
23  
24 Buchholz, F., Lopatta, K. & Maas, K. 2019. The deliberate engagement of narcissistic CEOs in  
25 earnings management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 155: 1-24.  
26  
27  
28 Buyl, T., Boone, C. & Wade, J. B. 2017. CEO narcissism, risk-taking, and resilience: An  
29 empirical analysis in U.S. commercial banks. *Journal of Management*, 45: 1372-1400.  
30  
31  
32 Campbell, W. K., Hoffman, B. J., Campbell, S. M. & Marchisio, G. 2011. Narcissism in  
33 organizational contexts. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21: 268-284.  
34  
35  
36  
37 Capalbo, F., Frino, A., Ming Y.L., Mollica, V. & Palumbo, R. 2018. The impact of CEO  
38 narcissism on earnings management. *Abacus*, 54: 210-226.  
39  
40  
41  
42 Carroll, G. R. & Harrison, J. R. 1998. Organizational demography and culture: Insights from a  
43 formal model and simulation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43: 637-667.  
44  
45  
46  
47 Case, C. R., & Maner, J. K. 2014. Divide and conquer: When and why leaders undermine the  
48 cohesive fabric of their group. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*: 107: 1033-1050.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53 Chatman, J. A. 1991. Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public  
54 accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36: 459-484.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60 Chatman, J. A., Caldwell, D. F., O'Reilly, C. A., & Doerr, B. 2014. Parsing organizational  
culture: How the norm for adaptability influences the relationship between culture consensus and  
financial performance in high-technology firms. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35: 785-  
808.  
Chatman, J. & Choi, A. (2020). Measuring Organizational Culture: Converging on Definitions  
and Approaches to Advance the Paradigm. To appear in C. Newton & R. Knight (Eds.)

1  
2  
3 **Handbook of research methods for organizational culture.** Edward Elgar Publishing:  
4 Cheltenham, UK.

5  
6  
7 Chatman, J. A. & Flynn, F. J. 2001. The influence of demographic heterogeneity on the  
8 emergence and consequences of cooperative norms in work teams. *Academy of Management*  
9 *Journal*, 44: 956-974.

10  
11 Chatman, J. A., Greer, L. L., Sherman, E., & Doerr, B. 2019. Blurred lines: How the collectivism  
12 norm operates through perceived group diversity to boost or harm group performance in  
13 Himalayan mountain climbing. *Organization Science*, 30: 235-259.

14  
15  
16 Chatman, J. A. & O'Reilly, C. A. 2016. Paradigm lost: Reinvigorating the study of  
17 organizational culture. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36: 199-224.

18  
19 Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. C. 2007. It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers  
20 and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52:  
21 351-386.

22  
23  
24 Chatterjee, A. & Pollock, T. G. 2017. Master of puppets: How narcissistic CEOs construct their  
25 professional worlds. *Academy of Management Review*, 42: 703-725.

26  
27 Cichocka, A., Dhont, K. & Makwana, A. P. 2017. On self-love and out-group hate: Opposite  
28 effects of narcissism on prejudice via social dominance orientation and right-wing  
29 authoritarianism. *European Journal of Personality*, 31: 366-384.

30  
31  
32 Dansereau, F. Alutto, J. A., & Yammarino, F. J. 1984. *Theory testing in organizational*  
33 *behavior: The variant approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

34  
35  
36 De Cremer, D., & Van Knippenberg, D. 2002. How do leaders promote cooperation? The  
37 effects of charisma and procedural fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 858.

38  
39 DeWall, C. N., Buffardi, L. E., Bonser, I. & Campbell, W. K. 2011. Narcissism and implicit  
40 attention seeking: Evidence from linguistic analyses of social networking and online  
41 presentation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51: 57-62.

42  
43  
44 Eisenbeiss, S. A., van Knippenberg, D. & Fahrbach, C. M. 2015. Doing well by doing good?  
45 Analyzing the relationship between CEO ethical leadership and firm performance. *Journal of*  
46 *Business Ethics*, 128: 635-651.

47  
48  
49 Epitropaki, O. & Martin, R. 2004. Implicit leadership theories in applied settings: Factor  
50 structure, generalizability and stability over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 8: 293-310.

51  
52 Funder, D. C. 2001. Personality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52: 197-221.

1  
2  
3 Galvin, B. M., Waldman, D. A. & Balthazard, P. 2010. Visionary communication qualities as  
4 mediators of the relationship between narcissism and attributions of leader charisma. *Personnel*  
5 *Psychology*, 63: 509-537.

6  
7  
8 Gerstner, W., Koenig, A., Enders, A. & Hambrick, D. C. 2013. CEO narcissism, audience  
9 engagement, and organizational adoption of technological discontinuities. *Administrative*  
10 *Science Quarterly*, 58: 267-291.

11  
12  
13 Giberson, T. R., Resick, C. J., Dickson, M. W., Mitchelson, J. K., Randall, K. R. & Clark, M. A.  
14 2009. Leadership and organizational culture: Linking CEO characteristics to cultural values.  
15 *Journal of Business Psychology*, 24: 123-137.

16  
17  
18 Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann, W. B. 2003. A very brief measure of the big five  
19 personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37: 504-528.

20  
21 Gough, H. 1956. *The California Personality Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting  
22 Psychologists Press.

23  
24  
25 Grijalva, E., Harms, P. D., Newman, D. A., Gaddis, B. H. & Fraley, R. C. 2015. Narcissism and  
26 leadership: A meta-analytic review of linear and nonlinear relationships. *Personnel Psychology*,  
27 68: 1-47.

28  
29  
30 Grijalva, E., Maynes, T. D., Badura, K. L. & Whiting, S. W. 2020. Examining the “I” in team: A  
31 longitudinal investigation of the influence of team narcissism composition on team outcomes in  
32 the NBA. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63: 7-33.

33  
34  
35 Grijalva, E. & Newman, D. A. 2015. Narcissism and counterproductive work behavior (CWB):  
36 Meta-analysis and consideration of collectivist culture, Big Five personality, and narcissism’s  
37 facet structure. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 64: 93-126.

38  
39  
40 Grijalva, E., Newman, D. A., Tay, L., Donnellan, M. B., Harms, P. D., Robins, R. W. and Yan,  
41 T. 2015. Gender differences in narcissism: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141:  
42 261-310.

43  
44  
45 Guiso, L., Sapienza, P & Zingales, L. 2015. The value of corporate culture. *Journal of*  
46 *Financial Economics* 117: 60-76.

47  
48  
49 Hackman, J. R., & Wageman, R. 2004. When and how team leaders matter. *Research in*  
50 *Organizational Behavior*, 26: 37-74.

51  
52  
53 Ham, C., Seybert, N. & Wang, S. 2017. Narcissism is a bad sign: CEO signature size,  
54 investment, and performance. *Review of Accounting Studies*, 23: 234-264.

55  
56  
57 Hartnell, C. A., Kinicki, A. J., Lambert, L. S., Fugate, M. & Corner, P. D. 2016. Do similarities  
58 or differences between CEO leadership and organizational culture have a more positive effect on  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 firm performance? A test of competing predictions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101: 846-  
4 861.

5  
6  
7 Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y. & Kinicki, A. J. 2011. Organizational culture and organizational  
8 effectiveness: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 96: 677-694.

9  
10  
11 Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y. & Kinicki, A. J., Choi, D., & Karam, E. P. 2019. A meta-analytic test  
12 of organizational culture's association with elements of an organization's system and its relative  
13 predictive validity on organizational outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 104: 832-850.

14  
15 Hochwarter, W. A. & Thompson, K. W. 2012. Mirror, mirror on my boss's wall: Engaged  
16 enactment's moderating role on the relationship between perceived narcissistic supervision and  
17 work outcomes. *Human Relations*, 65: 335-366.

18  
19  
20 Homan, A. C., Gündemir, S., Buengeler, C., & van Kleef, G. A. 2020. Leading diversity:  
21 Towards a theory of functional leadership in diverse teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.  
22 Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000482>

23  
24  
25 Jones, R., Lasky, B., Russell-Gale, H. & le Fevre, M. 2004. Leadership and the development of  
26 dominant and counter-cultures: A narcissistic perspective. *Leadership & Organization  
27 Development Journal*, 25: 216-233.

28  
29  
30 Judd, J. S., Olsen, K. J. & Stekelberg, J. M. 2015. *CEO narcissism, accounting quality, and  
31 external audit fees*. SSRN Paper # 2605172.

32  
33  
34 Judge, T. A. & Cable, D. M. 1997. Applicant personality, organizational culture, and  
35 organization attraction. *Personnel Psychology*, 50: 359-394.

36  
37  
38 Judge, T. A., LePine, J. A. & Rich, B. L. 2006. Loving yourself abundantly: Relationship of the  
39 narcissistic personality to self- and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task  
40 and contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 763-776.

41  
42  
43 Kaiser, R. B., LeBreton, J. M. & Hogan, J. 2015. The dark side of personality and extreme leader  
44 behavior. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 64: 55-92.

45  
46  
47 Kausel, E. E., Culbertson, S. S., Leiva, P. I., Slaughter, J. E. & Jackson, A. T. 2015. Too arrogant  
48 for their own good? Why and when narcissists dismiss advice. *Organizational Behavior and  
49 Human Decision Processes*, 131: 33-50.

50  
51  
52 Khoo, H. S. and Burch, G. S. 2008. The 'dark side' of leadership personality and  
53 transformational leadership: An exploratory study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44:  
54 86-97.

55  
56  
57 Kim, Y. J. & Toh, S.S. 2019. Stuck in the past? The influence of a leader's past cultural  
58 experience on group culture and positive and negative group deviance. *Academy of  
59 Management Journal*, 62: 944-969.  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Klein, K. J., Bliese, P. D., Kozlowski, S. W., Dansereau, F., Gavin, M. B., Griffin, M. A.,  
4 Hofmann, D. A., James, L. R., Yammarino, F. J., & Bligh, M. C. 2000. Multilevel analytical  
5 techniques: Commonalities, differences, and continuing questions. In ***Multilevel theory,***  
6 ***research, and methods in organizations***, Klein, K. J., & Kozlowski, S. W. (Eds.). San  
7 Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 512-553.  
8  
9  
10 Koch, I., & Biemann, T. 2014. Signs of narcissism of CEOs: Validating a widely used measure.  
11 In ***Academy of management proceedings***, vol. 2014: 16134. Briarcliff Manor, NY: Academy of  
12 Management.  
13  
14 Konrath, S., Meier, B. P. & Bushman, B. J. 2014. Development and validation of the single item  
15 narcissism scale (SINS). ***PLOS One***, 9: 1-15.  
16  
17  
18 Kotter, J. P. & Heskett, J. L. 1992. ***Corporate culture and performance***. New York: Free Press.  
19  
20  
21 Krizan, Z., & Herlache, A. D. 2018. The narcissism spectrum model: A synthetic view of  
22 narcissistic personality. ***Personality and Social Psychology Review***, 22: 3-31  
23  
24 Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. 1967. ***Organization and environment: Managing***  
25 ***differentiation and integration***. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.  
26  
27  
28 Lievens, F., DeFruyt, F., & Van Dam, K. 2001. Assessors' use of personality traits in  
29 descriptions of assessment centre candidates: A five-factor model perspective. ***Journal of***  
30 ***Occupational and Organizational Psychology***, 74: 623-536.  
31  
32 Liu, H., Chian, J. T., Feht, R., Xu, M. & Wang, S. 2017. How do leaders react when treated  
33 unfairly? Leader narcissism and self-interested behavior in response to unfair treatment. ***Journal***  
34 ***of Applied Psychology***, 102, 1590-1599.  
35  
36  
37 Maccoby, M. 2007. ***Narcissistic leaders: Who succeeds and who fails***. Boston, MA: Harvard  
38 Business School Press.  
39  
40  
41 Macenczak, L. A., Campbell, S., Henley, A. B. & Campbell, W. K. 2016. Direct and interactive  
42 effects of narcissism and power on overconfidence. ***Personality and Individual Differences***, 91:  
43 113-122.  
44  
45  
46 Malhotra, S., Reus, T. H., Zhu, P. & Roelofsen, E. M. 2018. The acquisitive nature of  
47 extraverted CEOs. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 63: 370-498.  
48  
49  
50 Mathieu, C. & St-Jean, E. 2013. Entrepreneurial personality: The role of narcissism. ***Personality***  
51 ***and Individual Differences***, 55: 527-531.  
52  
53  
54 Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M. & Salvador, R. 2009. How does ethical  
55 leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model. ***Organizational Behavior and Human Decision***  
56 ***Processes***, 108: 1-13.  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Moorman, R. H., Darnold, T. C. & Priesemuth, M. 2013. Perceived leader integrity: Supporting  
4 the construct validity and utility of a multi-dimensional measure in two samples. *Leadership*  
5 *Quarterly*, 24: 427-444.  
6

7  
8 Mumford, M. D., Connelly, M. S., Helton, W. B., Strange, J. M. & Osburn, H. K. 2001. On the  
9 construct validity of integrity tests: Individual and situational predictors of test performance.  
10 *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9: 240-257.  
11

12  
13 Nevicka, B., Ten Velden, F. S., De Hoogh, A. H. & Van Vianen, A. E. 2011. Reality at odds  
14 with perceptions: Narcissistic leaders and group performance. *Psychological Science*, 22: 1259-  
15 1264.  
16

17  
18 Nuzum, H., Ready R. E. & Clark, A. L. 2019. Comparability of self- and other-rated personality  
19 structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 31: 741-750.  
20

21  
22 O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C. & McDaniel, M. A. 2012. A meta-analysis of the  
23 dark triad and work behavior: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,  
24 97: 557-579.  
25

26  
27 Olsen, K. & Stekelberg, J. M. 2016. CEO narcissism and corporate tax sheltering. *Journal of the*  
28 *American Tax Association*, 38: 1-22.  
29

30  
31 O'Reilly, C. A., Caldwell, D. F., Chatman, J. A. & Doerr, B. 2014. The problems and promise of  
32 organizational culture: CEO personality, culture, and firm performance. *Group & Organization*  
33 *Management*, 39: 595-625.  
34

35  
36 O'Reilly, C. A. & Chatman, J. A. 1986. Organizational commitment and psychological  
37 attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior.  
38 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 492-499.  
39

40  
41 O'Reilly, C. A. & Chatman, J. A. 1996. Culture as social control: Corporations, cults and  
42 commitment. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18: 157-200.  
43

44  
45 O'Reilly, C. A. & Chatman, J. A. 2020. Transformational leader or narcissist? How grandiose  
46 narcissists can create and destroy organizations and institutions." *California Management*  
47 *Review*, 62: 5-27.  
48

49  
50 O'Reilly, C. A. & Doerr, B. 2020. Conceit and deceit: Lying, cheating and stealing among  
51 grandiose narcissists. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 154: 109627.  
52

53  
54 O'Reilly, C. A., Doerr, B. & Chatman, J. A. 2018. See you in court: How CEO narcissism  
55 increases firms' vulnerability to lawsuits. *Leadership Quarterly*, 29: 365-378.  
56

57  
58 O'Reilly, C. A. & Hall, N. 2021. Grandiose narcissists and decision making: Impulsive,  
59 overconfident, and skeptical of experts—but seldom in doubt. *Personality and Individual*  
60 *Differences*, 168: in press.

1  
2  
3 Oesterle, M., Elosge, C. & Elosge, L. 2016. Me, myself and I: The role of narcissism in  
4 internationalization. *International Business Review*, 25: 1114-1123.

6  
7 Owens, B. P., Wallace, A. S., & Waldman, D. A. 2015. Leader narcissism and follower  
8 outcomes: The counterbalancing effect of leader humility. *Journal of Applied*  
9 *Psychology*, 100: 1203-1215.

11  
12 Palmer, J. C., Holmes, R. M. & Perrewe, P. L. 2020. The cascading effects of CEO dark triad  
13 personality on subordinate behavior and firm performance: A multilevel theoretical model.  
14 *Group & Organization Management*, 45: 143-180.

16  
17 Paunomen, S., Lonnqvist, J., Verkasalo, M., Leikas, S. & Nissinen, V. 2006. Narcissism and  
18 emergent leadership in military cadets. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17: 475-486.

19  
20 Pennebaker, J. W., Francis, M. E., & Booth, R. J. 2001. *Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count*  
21 *(LIWC): LIWC2001*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Publishers.

23  
24 Peterson, R. S., Smith, D. B., Matorana, P. V. & Owens, P. D. 2003. The impact of Chief  
25 Executive Officer personality on top management team dynamics: One mechanism by which  
26 leadership affects performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 795-808.

27  
28 Pfeffer, J. 1981. Management as symbolic action: The creation and maintenance of  
29 organizational paradigms. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 3: 1-52.

31  
32 Podolny, J. M., Khurana, R. & Hill-Popper, M. 2004. Revisiting the meaning of leadership.  
33 *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 26: 1-36.

34  
35 Popadak, J. A. 2013. *A corporate culture channel: How increased shareholder governance*  
36 *reduces value*. SSRN working paper.

37 [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2345384](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2345384)

39  
40 Raskin, R. & Terry, H. 1988. A principal component analysis of the Narcissistic Personality  
41 Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
42 *Psychology*, 54: 898-904.

43  
44 Resick, C. J., Whitman, D. D., Weingarden, S. M. & Hiller, N. J. 2009. The bright-side and the  
45 dark-side of CEO personality: Examining core evaluations, narcissism, transformational  
46 leadership, and strategic influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94: 1365-1381.

48  
49 Rijssenbilt, A. & Commandeur, H. 2013. Narcissus enters the courtroom: CEO narcissism and  
50 fraud. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 117: 413-429.

51  
52 Ronningstam, E. 2010. Narcissistic personality disorder: A current review. *Current Psychiatry*  
53 *Reports* 12: 68-75.

- 1  
2  
3 Saulsman, L. M. & Page, A. C. 2004. The five-factor model and personality disorder empirical  
4 literature: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 23: 1055-1085.  
5  
6  
7 Schaubroeck, J. M., Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., Kozlowski, S. W., Lord, R. J., Trevino, L. K.,  
8 Demotakis, N. & Peng, A. 2012. Embedding ethical leadership within and across organizational  
9 levels. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55: 1053-1078.  
10  
11 Schein, E. A. 1985. *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.  
12  
13 Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W. & Smith, D. B. 1995. The ASA framework: An update.  
14 *Personnel Psychology*, 48: 747-773.  
15  
16  
17 Simha, A. & Cullen, J. B. 2012. Ethical climates and their effects on organizational outcomes:  
18 Implications from the past and prophecies for the future. *Academy of Management Perspectives*,  
19 31: 20-34.  
20  
21  
22 Sorensen, J. B. 2002. The strength of corporate culture and the reliability of firm performance.  
23 *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47: 70-91.  
24  
25  
26 Stucke, T. S. 2003. Who's to blame? Narcissism and self-serving attributions following  
27 feedback. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 17: 465-478.  
28  
29  
30 Sull, D., Sull C. & Chamberlain, A. 2019. Measuring culture in leading corporations. *MIT Sloan  
31 Management Review Report*, June.  
32  
33  
34 Taggar, S., & Ellis, R. 2007. The role of leaders in shaping formal team norms. *The Leadership  
35 Quarterly*, 18: 105-120.  
36  
37  
38 Tepper, B. J. 2007. Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis and research  
39 agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33: 261-289.  
40  
41  
42 Trevino, L. K., den Nieuwenboer, N. A. & Kish-Gephart, J. J. 2014. (Un)Ethical behavior in  
43 organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65: 635-660.  
44  
45  
46 Van Lange, P. A. 1999. The pursuit of joint outcomes and equality in outcomes: An integrative  
47 model of social value orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77: 337-349.  
48  
49  
50 Van Scotter, J. R. & De Dea Roglio, K. 2018. CEO bright and dark personality: Effects on  
51 ethical misconduct. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 164: 451-475.  
52  
53  
54 Volmer, J., Koch, I. K. & Goeritz, A. S. 2016. The bright and dark side of leaders' dark triad  
55 traits: Effects on subordinates' career success and well-being. *Personality and Individual  
56 Differences*, 101: 413-418.  
57  
58  
59 Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American  
60 Psychologist*, 62: 17-24.

1  
2  
3  
4 Wales, W. J., Patel, P. C. & Lumpkin, G. T. 2013. In pursuit of greatness: CEO narcissism,  
5 entrepreneurial orientation, and firm performance variance. *Journal of Management Studies*,  
6 50: 1041-1069.  
7  
8  
9  
10

## 11 **AUTHOR BIOS**

12  
13  
14 **Charles O'Reilly** is the Frank E. Buck Professor of Management at the Graduate School of  
15 Business at Stanford University. His research focuses on leadership, organizational culture,  
16 demography and diversity, executive compensation, and organizational innovation and change.  
17

18  
19 **Jennifer Chatman** is the Cortese Distinguished Professor of Management, the Co-Director of  
20 the Berkeley Culture Initiative, and the Associate Dean of Learning Strategies at UC Berkeley's  
21 Haas School of Business. In her research, she focuses on leveraging culture for strategic success  
22 and how group norms interact with group diversity to influence behavior.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**TABLE 1**  
**Study 1: Descriptive Statistics and Zero-Order Correlations**

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1 Sex <sup>a</sup>	--															
2 Age <sup>b</sup>	-.*	--														
3 Education <sup>c</sup>	.12	***	--													
4 Race <sup>d</sup>	.03	.18	--													
5 Employment <sup>e</sup>	-.*	-.**	-.*	--												
6 Experience <sup>f</sup>	.12	.15	.05	-.*	--											
7 Agreeableness	.01	.14	.03	.06	-.*	--										
8 Conscientiousness	-.*	.82	.11	-.**	-.*	-.*	--									
9 Extraversion	.07	.21	.04	.01	.02	.20	-.*	--								
10 Neuroticism	-.***	.21	.05	.05	.03	.24	.38	-.*	--							
11 Openness	.04	.01	.03	.02	.01	.03	.10	.02	-.*	--						
12 Narcissism (NPI-16)	-.*	.15	.04	.03	.00	.14	.37	.40	.15	-.*	--					
13 Narcissism (Resick)	.00	.10	.05	.02	.12	.07	.34	.19	.28	.23	-.*	--				
14 Narcissism (SINS)	.21	.17	.05	.06	.04	.18	.26	.04	.38	.10	.10	-.*	--			
15 Collaboration	.21	.19	.03	.03	.11	.18	.56	.37	.29	.29	.01	.54	-.*	--		
16 Integrity	.17	.22	.01	.00	.06	.23	.42	.28	.11	.16	.05	.46	.63	-.*	--	
<i>Mean</i>	.17	.25	.07	.05	.05	.27	.42	.42	.06	.19	.25	.28	.39	.34	.67	--

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

<i>SD</i>	0.50	1.13	0.60	0.99	0.24	1.55	1.25	1.23	1.68	1.52	1.23	3.80	1.08	1.34	0.77	0.72
-----------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$

<sup>a</sup> 0=female, 1=male

<sup>b</sup> 1=18-24 years old, 2=25-34 years old, 3=35-44 years old, 4=45-54 years old, 5=55-64 years old, 6=65+ years old

<sup>c</sup> 0=Associate degree, 1=Bachelor's degree, 2=Master's degree, 3=Doctoral or professional degree

<sup>d</sup> 1=Caucasian, 2=African-American, 3=American Indian or Alaska Native, 4=Asian-American, 5=Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 6=Other

<sup>e</sup> 0=Not employed, 1=Self-employed, 2=Employed by an organization

<sup>f</sup> 0=Not employed, 1=Self-employed, 2=Employed by an organization

**TABLE 2**  
**Study 1 Regression: Links Between Self-Assessed Narcissism and Self-Reported Collaboration and Integrity Behaviors**

	Leader Collaboration			Leader Integrity		
	1 $\beta$ (SE)	2 $\beta$ (SE)	3 $\beta$ (SE)	4 $\beta$ (SE)	5 $\beta$ (SE)	6 $\beta$ (SE)
1 Sex	-.05 (.08)	-.04 (.08)	-.06 (.08)	-.10 * (.07)	-.08 † (.07)	-.11 * (.07)
2 Age	.03 (.06)	.01 (.06)	.02 (.06)	.05 (.05)	.02 (.05)	.03 (.05)
3 Education	.02 (.06)	.02 (.06)	.01 (.06)	.06 (.06)	.06 (.06)	.04 (.06)
4 Race	-.01 (.04)	-.01 (.04)	-.03 (.04)	-.01 (.04)	-.01 (.03)	-.03 (.03)
5 Employment Experience	-.09 (.16)	-.12 (.15)	-.10 * (.16)	-.04 (.14)	-.07 (.14)	-.05 (.14)
6 Experience	.16 * (.04)	.16 * (.04)	.16 † (.04)	.17 * (.04)	.17 * (.04)	.16 * (.04)
7 Narcissism (NPI-16)	-.22 *** (.01)	--	--	-.23 *** (.01)	--	--
8 Narcissism (Resick)	--	-.28 *** (.04)	--	--	-.35 *** (.03)	--
9 Narcissism (SINS)	--	--	-.21 *** (.03)	--	--	-.28 *** (.03)
F	7.54 ***	9.50 ***	7.18 ***	9.59 ***	14.64 ***	11.45 ***
d.f.	7,392	7,392	7,392	7,392	7,392	7,392
Adjusted $R^2$	.10	.13	.10	.13	.19	.16

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ , †  $p < 0.10$

TABLE 3  
Study 2: Descriptive Statistics and Zero-Order Correlations

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1 Gender <sup>a</sup>	--																			
2 MBA Program <sup>b</sup>	.03	--																		
3 Nationality <sup>c</sup>	.07	.10	--																	
4 Race <sup>d</sup>	.01	.08	.19 <sup>**</sup>	--																
5 Number of Raters	.04	.04	.12	.04	--															
6 Year of MBA Program	.01	.40 <sup>***</sup>	.03	.06	.25 <sup>***</sup>	--														
7 Agreeableness <sup>e</sup>	.04	.10	.02	.07	.03	--														
8 Conscientiousness <sup>e</sup>	.17 <sup>**</sup>	.17 <sup>**</sup>	.16 <sup>**</sup>	.14 <sup>*</sup>	.14 <sup>*</sup>	.26 <sup>***</sup>	.24 <sup>***</sup>	--												
9 Extraversion <sup>e</sup>	.10	.02	.03	.04	.02	.02	.09	.12	--											
10 Neuroticism <sup>e</sup>	.16 <sup>*</sup>	.15	.05	.01	.15 <sup>*</sup>	.16 <sup>*</sup>	.39 <sup>***</sup>	.35 <sup>***</sup>	.15 <sup>*</sup>	--										
11 Openness <sup>e</sup>	.02	.08	.03	.01	.01	.10	.25 <sup>***</sup>	.05	.40 <sup>***</sup>	.15 <sup>*</sup>	--									
12 Narcissism <sup>e</sup>	.08	.14 <sup>*</sup>	.06	.04	.15 <sup>*</sup>	.18 <sup>**</sup>	.53 <sup>***</sup>	.43 <sup>***</sup>	.33 <sup>***</sup>	.49 <sup>***</sup>	.05	--								
13 Collaboration <sup>f</sup>	.01	.16 <sup>*</sup>	.05	.04	.02	.08	.05	.03	.06	.01	.06	.14 <sup>*</sup>	--							
14 Customer-Oriented <sup>f</sup>	.05	.12	.07	.13 <sup>*</sup>	.07	.00	.04	.12	.03	.02	.00	.05	.15 <sup>*</sup>	--						
15 Detail-Oriented <sup>f</sup>	.00	.07	.03	.03	.04	.06	.16 <sup>**</sup>	.15 <sup>*</sup>	.16 <sup>*</sup>	.11	.03	.04	.04	.01	--					
16 Innovative <sup>f</sup>	.02	.25 <sup>***</sup>	.02	.03	.10	.05	.04	.09	.11	.02	.14 <sup>*</sup>	.08	.11	.05	.21 <sup>**</sup>	--				
17 Integrity <sup>f</sup>	.03	.13 <sup>*</sup>	.11	.05	.04	.05	.03	.08	.08	.03	.05	.20 <sup>**</sup>	.12	.22 <sup>**</sup>	.01	.19 <sup>**</sup>	--			
18 People-Oriented <sup>f</sup>	.13	.01	.02	.07	.09	.18 <sup>*</sup>	.05	.14	.08	.02	.01	.03	.38 <sup>***</sup>	.16	.31 <sup>***</sup>	.13	.12	--		

43  
44  
45  
46  
47



19	Results-Oriented <sup>f</sup>	.11	.17 <sup>**</sup>	.08	.06	.11	.01	.12	.14*	.10	.10	.00	.08	.24 <sup>***</sup>	.04	.14*	.24 <sup>***</sup>	.17 <sup>**</sup>	.31 <sup>***</sup>	--	
20	Transparency <sup>f</sup>	.14	.04	.03	.03	.05	.09	.12	.07	.06	.08	.06	.10	.07	.05	.15*	.01	.03	.00	.02	--
	<i>Mean</i>	0.35	0.52	0.30	0.61	5.92	2014.08	5.23	5.84	4.76	2.58	5.43	2.77	6.03	5.28	5.46	5.59	6.36	5.79	5.66	4.77
	<i>SD</i>	0.48	0.50	0.46	0.49	3.45	1.77	0.89	0.91	1.16	0.94	0.74	0.78	0.86	1.16	0.99	0.90	1.21	1.10	0.92	0.87

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$

<sup>a</sup> 0=male, 1=female

<sup>c</sup> 0=U.S., 1=non-U.S.

<sup>e</sup> Cross evaluated

<sup>b</sup> 0=full-time, 1=part-time

<sup>d</sup> 0=white, 1=non-white

<sup>f</sup> Self-reported culture created for others

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

**TABLE 4**  
**Study 2 Regression: Linking Cross-Evaluated Narcissism to Organizational Culture (MBA Sample)**

	Collaboratio n 1 $\beta$ (SE)	Collaboratio n 2 $\beta$ (SE)	Integrit y 3 $\beta$ (SE)	Integrit y 4 $\beta$ (SE)
Gender (0=male, 1=female)	0.01 (0.11)	0.00 (0.11)	-0.04 (0.16)	-0.05 (0.16)
MBA Program (0=full-time, 1=part-time)	-0.15 * (0.12)	-0.17 * (0.12)	0.13 † (0.17)	0.11 (0.17)
Nationality (0=U.S., 1=non-U.S.)	-0.06 (0.12)	-0.05 (0.12)	-0.09 (0.17)	-0.08 (0.17)
Race (0=white, 1=non-white)	0.02 (0.11)	0.03 (0.11)	0.04 (0.16)	0.05 (0.16)
Number of Raters	0.02 (0.02)	0.00 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.05 (0.02)
Year of MBA Program	-0.02 (0.04)	-0.04 (0.04)	0.00 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.05)
Cross-Evaluated Narcissism	--	-0.16 * (0.07)	--	-0.20 ** (0.10)
F	1.28	2.05 *	1.33	2.57 *
d.f.	6,251	7,250	6,251	7,250
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.04

\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ , †  $p < 0.10$  (two-tailed).

**TABLE 5**  
**Study 3: Descriptive Statistics and Zero-Order Correlations**

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
1 Firm Size <sup>a</sup>	--																		
2 Software <sup>b</sup>	.08	--																	
3 Mixed Products <sup>c</sup>	.15	-.***	--																
4 CEO Tenure <sup>d</sup>	.07	.75	.11	--															
5 CEO Founder <sup>c</sup>	.05	.07	.15	.76	***	--													
6 CEO Board Chair <sup>c</sup>	.35	.19	.17	.02	.02	--													
7 Agreeableness	-.*	-.*	-.*	-.*	-.*	.19	--												
8 Conscientiousness	.38	.07	.18	.39	.38	.19	--												
9 Extraversion	.30	.21	.20	.18	.12	.02	.42	--											
10 Neuroticism	.24	.11	.01	.35	.25	.08	-.*	-.*	--										
11 Openness	.32	.02	.31	.52	.57	.14	-.***	-.***	.50	**	--								
12 CEO Narcissism	.18	.08	.11	.38	.48	.00	.07	.19	.19	.14	--								
13 Adaptability	.38	.03	.04	.45	.31	.23	.83	.60	.50	.85	.05	--							
14 Collaboration	.01	.13	.04	.18	.18	.14	-.*	.06	.09	.18	.66	.11	--						
15 Customer-Oriented	.06	.34	.54	.57	.56	.04	.53	.24	.23	.66	.16	.43	.11	--					
16 Detail-Oriented	.20	.07	.14	.28	.34	.07	.13	.17	.10	.25	.34	.20	.24	.32	--				
17 Integrity	.08	.23	.29	.14	.24	.15	.42	.24	.12	.32	.11	.32	.02	.39	.12	--			
18	.05	.12	.22	.28	.28	.08	.25	.19	.10	.32	.20	.24	.27	.40	.21	.24	--		

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

18 Results-Oriented																			
	.33	.28	.47**	.19	.08	.26	.39*	.07	.03	.25	.39*	.20	.24	.34	.05	.11	.34	--	
<i>Mean</i>	9.75	0.44	0.63	7.81	0.25	0.39	4.21	5.84	4.92	3.06	5.05	3.67	0.07	-0.05	-0.11	0.05	0.20	0.15	
<i>SD</i>	1.28	0.50	0.49	8.11	0.44	0.50	1.25	0.63	1.31	1.13	0.94	1.14	0.67	0.69	0.53	0.48	0.50	0.44	

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$   
 a Natural log of the number of employees in 2009  
 b 0=hardware, 1=software  
 c 0=no, 1=yes  
 d Number of years

**TABLE 6**  
**Study 3: Regression Linking Cross-Evaluated Narcissism to Organizational Culture (CEO Sample)**

	Collaboration				Integrity			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	$\beta$ (SE)	$\beta$ (SE)	$\beta$ (SE)	$\beta$ (SE)	$\beta$ (SE)	$\beta$ (SE)	$\beta$ (SE)	$\beta$ (SE)
Firm Size (number of employees)	0.24 (0.08)	0.18 (0.08)	0.15 (0.08)	0.30 (0.10)	0.23 (0.08)	0.20 (0.08)	0.19 (0.08)	0.39 (0.09)
Software (0=hardware, 1=software)	-0.19 (0.29)	-0.12 (0.26)	-0.13 (0.26)	-0.22 (0.31)	-0.15 (0.28)	-0.12 (0.28)	-0.12 (0.28)	-0.24 (0.29)
Mixed Products (0=no, 1=yes)	-0.69 ** (0.30)	-0.60 ** (0.27)	-0.59 ** (0.27)	-0.71 ** (0.31)	-0.35 (0.29)	-0.31 (0.30)	-0.30 (0.30)	-0.38 (0.29)
CEO Narcissism	-0.48 ** (0.09)	-0.30 † (0.09)	-0.34 * (0.08)	-0.53 ** (0.10)	-0.30 (0.09)	-0.22 (0.10)	-0.24 (0.09)	-0.43 † (0.09)
CEO Tenure (# of years)	--	-0.38 * (0.01)	--	--	--	-0.17 (0.01)	--	--
CEO Founder (0=no, 1=yes)	--	--	-0.37 ** (0.21)	--	--	--	-0.16 (0.23)	--
CEO Board Chair (0=no, 1=yes)	--	--	--	-0.10 (0.24)	--	--	--	-0.30 (0.22)
F	6.83 **	8.27 **	8.46 **	5.21 **	1.10	1.00	1.00	1.24
d.f.	4,27	5,26	5,26	5,25	4,27	5,26	5,26	5,25
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.43	0.54	0.55	0.41	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.04

\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ , †  $p < 0.10$  (two-tailed).

TABLE 7  
Study 4: Descriptive Statistics and Zero-Order Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
1 Sex <sup>a</sup>	--																		
2 Age <sup>b</sup>	-	--																	
3 Race <sup>c</sup>	.02	-	--																
4 Employment <sup>d</sup>	.10	.17	-	--															
5 Experience <sup>e</sup>	.12	.05	.19*	-	--														
6 Agreeableness	-	.81***	.18	.03	--														
7 Conscientiousness	.07	.09	.01	.02	.12	--													
8 Extraversion	.04	.14	.11	.12	.17	.37***	--												
9 Neuroticism	.00	.16	.08	.04	.20*	.14	.37***	--											
10 Openness	.21*	.10	.00	.10	.06	.39***	.47***	.29**	--										
11 Narcissism (NPI-16)	.05	.07	.04	.15	.11	.28**	.36***	.35***	.37***	--									
12 Narcissism (Resick)	.19*	.15	.09	.04	.10	.30**	.14	.35***	.14	.15	--								
13 Collaboration Policies	.11	.12	.05	.00	.14	.55***	.23*	.25**	.15	.04	.72***	--							
14 Integrity Policies	-.25**	.11	.00	.10	.20*	.30**	.24**	.14	.01	.28**	.24**	.21*	--						
15 Low Collaboration Promotion	.24*	.11	.01	.08	.23*	.42***	.30**	.07	.08	.35***	.29**	.41***	.53***	--					
16 Low Integrity Promotion	.01	.07	.02	.17	.09	.26**	.14	.03	.16	.16	.18	.28**	.11	.34***	--				
17 Collaboration Issues	-	.16	.11	.03	.19*	.09	.01	.30**	.03	.04	.18	.22*	.09	.17	.03	--			
18 Integrity Issues	.19*	.16	.05	.09	.23*	.17	.02	.01	.02	.07	.28**	.27**	.26**	.28**	.02	.19	--		
	.18	.25**	.01	.08	.35***	.19*	.07	.06	.01	.06	.39***	.37***	.16	.35***	.23*	.23*	.74***	--	

<i>Mean</i>	0.66	2.36	1.52	1.96	3.00	5.50	5.72	3.91	2.59	5.60	5.06	2.88	7.01	7.18	7.53	5.49	6.44	6.62
<i>SD</i>	0.47	0.96	1.21	0.20	1.48	1.33	1.25	1.77	1.56	1.29	4.21	1.21	1.30	1.35	1.42	2.02	1.90	1.77

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$

<sup>a</sup> 0=male, 1=female

<sup>b</sup> 1=18-24 years old, 2=25-34 years old, 3=35-44 years old, 4=45-54 years old, 5=55-64 years old

,6=65+ years old

<sup>c</sup> 1=Caucasian, 2=African-American, 3=American Indian or Alaska Native, 4=Asian-American,

5=Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 6=Other

<sup>d</sup> 1=0-4 years, 2=5-9 years, 3=10-14 years, 4=15-19 years, 5=20-24 years, 6=25+ years

<sup>e</sup> 0=not employed, 1=self-employed, 2=employed by an organization

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

**TABLE 8**  
**Study 4: Regression Linking CEO Narcissism to Policy Recommendations, Promotion Recommendations, and Willingness to Sanction**

	Policies		Promotions		Sanctions	
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Collaboration <i>β (SE)</i>	Integrity <i>β (SE)</i>	Collaboration <i>β (SE)</i>	Integrity <i>β (SE)</i>	Collaboration <i>β (SE)</i>	Integrity <i>β (SE)</i>
Sex	-0.18 * (0.25)	-0.16 † (0.26)	0.04 (0.28)	-0.90 (0.41)	-0.12 (0.37)	-0.07 (0.32)
Age	-0.17 (0.21)	-0.25 † (0.21)	0.00 (0.23)	0.03 (0.34)	-0.14 (0.30)	-0.13 (0.26)
Education	-0.09 (0.33)	0.08 (0.33)	-0.20 * (0.37)	0.00 (0.53)	0.09 (0.48)	-0.10 (0.41)
Race	-0.02 (0.10)	-0.04 (0.10)	0.03 (0.11)	0.09 (.16)	0.03 (0.15)	0.00 (0.13)
Employment	-0.09 (0.58)	-0.04 (0.60)	0.15 (0.66)	0.05 (0.95)	-0.04 (0.86)	-0.07 (0.74)
Experience	0.31 * (0.13)	0.39 * (0.14)	0.09 (0.15)	-0.18 (0.22)	0.31 * (0.20)	0.41 ** (0.17)
Narcissism (NPI-16)	-0.20 * (0.03)	-0.25 ** (0.03)	-0.20 * (0.03)	0.19 * (0.05)	-0.23 * (0.04)	-0.36 *** (0.04)
F	2.76 *	3.39 **	1.90 †	1.31	2.79 *	5.73 ***
d.f.	7,108	7,108	7,108	7,108	7,108	7,108
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.10	0.13	0.05	0.02	0.10	0.22

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ , †  $p < 0.10$  (two-tailed).



**TABLE 9**  
**Study 5: Descriptive Statistics and Zero-Order Correlations**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
1 Sex <sup>a</sup>	--																			
2 Age <sup>b</sup>	-.01	--																		
3 Race <sup>c</sup>	.01	.06	--																	
4 Employment <sup>d</sup>	.04	.05	.03	--																
5 Experience <sup>e</sup>	-.04	.87***	.01	.06	--															
6 Work Role <sup>f</sup>	.12	.14	.07	.35***	.18**	--														
7 Agreeableness	-.14	.23**	.05	.02	.21**	.04	--													
8 Conscientiousness	-.03	.16*	.08	.18*	.19**	.04	.45***	--												
9 Extraversion	.06	.09	.12	.14*	.07	.21**	.16*	.16*	--											
10 Neuroticism	-.18	.13	.07	.10	.12	.14	.45***	.49***	.32	--										
11 Openness	.12	.03	.08	.08	.07	.14	.26***	.20**	.39***	.33	--									
12 Narcissism (NPI-16)	.19**	.17*	.02	.07	.11	.30***	.26***	.01	.33***	.04	.13	--								
13 Narcissism (Resick)	.16**	.22**	.04	.03	.18*	.20**	.49***	.32	.14	.25***	.03	.49***	--							
14 Collaboration Policies	-.04	.02	.08	.09	.01	.06	.04	.16*	.05	.06	.09	.03	.05	--						
15 Integrity Policies	-.12	.08	.15*	.01	.11	.03	.02	.10	.03	.02	.02	.07	.01	.70***	--					
16 Low Collaboration Promotion	.12	.01	.05	.06	.02	.09	.10	.10	.07	.00	.01	.10	.07	.07	.06	--				
17 Low Integrity Promotion	.11	.01	.02	.10	.09	.06	.06	.01	.01	.07	.05	.03	.10	.12	.14*	.35***	--			
18 Collaboration Issues	.01	.10	.07	.01	.12	.03	.00	.14*	.04	.01	.12	.10	.03	.31***	.32***	.17*	.04	--		

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

19 Integrity Issues	.01	.11	.08	.06	.13	.01	.06	.20**	.01	.07	.05	.15*	.11	.23**	.24**	.10	.02	.83***	--
<i>Mean</i>	0.54	2.40	1.59	1.95	3.20	2.34	5.45	5.41	3.60	2.79	5.34	4.30	2.69	3.90	3.94	6.73	5.55	5.82	6.12
<i>SD</i>	0.50	1.08	1.23	0.23	1.65	0.75	1.35	1.33	1.57	1.55	1.26	3.81	1.10	0.84	0.77	1.87	2.34	2.17	2.00

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$

<sup>a</sup> 0=male, 1=female

<sup>b</sup> 1=18-24 years old, 2=25-34 years old, 3=35-44 years old, 4=45-54 years old, 5=55-64 years old, 6=65+

<sup>c</sup> 1=Caucasian, 2=African-American, 3=American Indian or Alaska Native, 4=Asian-American, 5=Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 6=Other

<sup>d</sup> 1=0-4 years, 2=5-9 years, 3=10-14 years, 4=15-19 years, 5=20-24 years, 6=25+ years

<sup>e</sup> 0=not employed, 1=self-employed, 2=employed by an organization

<sup>f</sup> 1=individual contributor, 2=team member, 3=manager, 4=director, 5=c-level executive

**TABLE 10**  
**Study 5: ANCOVA Linking Combined CEO Narcissism and Company Culture to Policy Recommendations, Promotion Recommendations, and Willingness to Sanction**

	Policies		Promotions		Sanctions	
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	High Collab.	High Integrity	Low Collab. (Chris)	Low Integrity (Alex)	High Collab.	High Integrity
<i>Condition:</i>	$\bar{x}$ (SE)	$\bar{x}$ (SE)	$\bar{x}$ (SE)	$\bar{x}$ (SE)	$\bar{x}$ (SE)	$\bar{x}$ (SE)
C2: Low Leader Narcissism + High Collaboration-Integrity Culture	4.11 (0.12)	4.17 (0.10)	5.98 (0.29)	4.39 (0.35)	6.92 (0.27)	7.07 (0.25)
C1: High Leader Narcissism + Low Collaboration-Integrity Culture	3.71 (0.13)	3.78 (0.12)	7.16 (0.23)	5.67 (0.34)	5.11 (0.30)	5.57 (0.27)
F	5.96 *	5.84 *	10.52 **	6.64 *	19.01 **	16.41 **
d.f.	4,95	4,95	4,94	4,95	4,95	4,95
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.02	0.04	0.10	0.03	0.14	0.16
Partial eta-squared for corrected model	0.06	0.07	0.14	0.07	0.18	0.20

\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ , †  $p < 0.10$  (two-tailed). Entries are variable means (+standard errors).

Sex and self-rated narcissism were included as covariates but were never significant.

TABLE 11

Study 5: ANCOVA Relative Effects of Leader Narcissism and Organizational Culture on Policy Recommendations, Promotion Recommendations, and Willingness to Sanction

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

		Policies		Promotions		Sanctions	
		1	2	3	4	5	6
		High Collab.	High Integrity	Low Collab. (Chris)	Low Integrity (Alex)	High Collab.	High Integrity
<i>Condition:</i>		$\bar{x}$ (SE)	$\bar{x}$ (SE)	$\bar{x}$ (SE)	$\bar{x}$ (SE)	$\bar{x}$ (SE)	$\bar{x}$ (SE)
	Low Leader Narcissism <sup>1</sup>	3.94 (0.09)	4.04 (0.07)	6.66 (0.20)	5.27 (0.24)	6.08 (0.22)	6.32 (0.21)
	High Leader Narcissism <sup>2</sup>	3.86 (0.08)	3.84 (0.08)	6.80 (0.17)	5.81 (0.22)	5.58 (0.21)	5.91 (0.19)
	Low Collaboration-Integrity Culture <sup>3</sup>	3.74 (0.09)	3.85 (0.08)	7.24 (0.17)	5.90 (0.22)	5.18 (0.22)	5.58 (0.20)
	High Collaboration-Integrity Culture <sup>4</sup>	4.06 (0.08)	4.03 (0.08)	6.21 (0.20)	5.18 (0.24)	6.48 (0.20)	6.66 (0.19)
	F (narcissism)	0.31	2.82 †	1.19	1.97	0.97	1.64
	F (culture)	8.02 **	3.64 †	18.47 **	5.23 *	20.91 **	16.60 **
	d.f. (narcissism)	3,195	3,195	3,194	3,195	3,195	3,195
	d.f. (culture)	3,195	3,195	3,194	3,195	3,195	3,195
	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> (narcissism)	-0.01	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01
	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> (culture)	0.03	0.02	0.09	0.03	0.09	0.08

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

Partial eta-squared for corrected model (narcissism)	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03
Partial eta-squared for corrected model (culture)	0.04	0.03	0.10	0.05	0.08	0.09

\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ , †  $p < 0.10$  (two-tailed). Entries are variable means (+standard errors). <sup>1</sup> Condition 2 and Condition 4. <sup>2</sup> Condition 3 and Condition 1. <sup>3</sup> Condition 1 and Condition 4. <sup>4</sup> Condition 2 and Condition 3. Sex and self-rated narcissism were included as covariates but were never significant.

**APPENDIX A**  
Organizational Policies and Practices Survey

**A1. Policies<sup>2</sup>:** “Different organizations take different approaches to implementing policies and practices. We are interested in your views about which policies and practices you believe are most useful for organizations. Below are a number of policies and practices. We are interested in how important or unimportant you think it is for an organization to have policies, systems, and procedures to promote each of the following. Please indicate how important you think each of these would be on the 9-point scale (1 = not at all important, 5 = neutral, 9 = very important).”

Item	Scale
1. Having a company ethics policy (+)	Integrity
2. Policies that discourage making fun of others at work (+)	Collaboration
3. A strong conflict of interest policy (+)	Integrity
4. Having a system to report ethics violations (+)	Integrity
5. Explicit rewards and recognition for promoting teamwork (+)	Collaboration
6. Policies to ensure pay equity between men and women (+)	Integrity
7. Policies to promote a supportive work environment (+)	Collaboration
8. Having a Corporate Social Responsibility program (+)	Integrity

---

<sup>2</sup> The three sections were presented in different orders to subjects to avoid order effects.

1  
2  
3 **A2. Promotion Recommendation:** “Below are brief descriptions of two employees who are  
4 being considered for promotion. The two employees have equal experience and professional  
5 qualifications. Please assess their promotion potential; that is, if they were working for you in  
6 this organization, how likely would you be to recommend that they be promoted? Please indicate  
7 on the 9-point scale (1 = not at all likely to promote, 5 = neutral, 9 = very likely to promote).”  
8  
9

10  
11 **Chris:** One of Chris’s former supervisors  
12 noted, “Chris is one of the best young  
13 managers I have ever been privileged to  
14 work with. His work ethic, attention to  
15 detail, and ability to think creatively about  
16 complex problems ensures that he can be  
17 trusted with any task imaginable.” A peer  
18 evaluator wrote that “He is one of the  
19 most dedicated young professionals I have  
20 seen. He always delivers 100 percent  
21 effort.” Other commenters singled out his  
22 competitiveness and persistence in  
23 delivering results. Chris himself echoed  
24 this saying that “I love to win and won’t  
25 give up. For me, being the best at what I  
26 do is what drives me.” Perhaps because of  
27 this drive to win, his 360 reviews also  
28 suggested that his aggressiveness  
29 sometimes made him less of a team player  
30 than others. His competitiveness also  
31 could result in conflict with others—  
32 although commenters were quick to note  
33 that he was always polite in his  
34 interactions.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Alex:** A review of his previous performance  
evaluations shows that Alex has always  
been in the top 5 percent of his cohort in  
performance and potential. Previous bosses  
routinely praised him for his outstanding  
job performance and willingness to do  
whatever it takes to deliver for the client.  
One supervisor noted that “He has an  
incredible desire to perform at the highest  
level, constantly looks for ways to improve,  
and never quits.” He finished by saying that  
he was sorry to lose Alex from his team and  
would be happy to have him work for him  
again. Others commented on his  
adaptability, initiative and ability to  
simplify complex problems into manageable  
tasks. His 360-feedback also observed that  
in his drive to succeed, Alex could also  
sometimes ignore the rules and make  
decisions that might be considered ethically  
ambiguous. One anonymous reviewer  
wondered whether Alex might not always  
be completely honest in order to always  
deliver outstanding results.

**A3. Sanctions:** Sometimes people in organizations make choices that violate organization or company policies and procedures. These choices may undermine or even harm the organization or others. There is always room for disagreement about how important these transgressions might be.

Below are a set of potential violations. If someone in your organization were to engage in these activities, how willing would you be as a manager to raise the issue if with others (formally or informally)? Please indicate on the 9-point scale (1 = not at all willing to raise the issue, 5 = neutral, 9 = very likely to raise the issue).

Item	Scale
Act rudely toward a coworker	Collaboration
Conduct personal business on company time	Integrity
Publicly embarrass another coworker	Collaboration
Show up late with no excuse	Integrity
Discuss confidential company information with an unauthorized person.	Integrity
Lose their temper with a coworker	Collaboration
Bend the rules to make the numbers	Integrity
Refuse to help a fellow team member	Collaboration
Violate company policy for personal gain	Integrity
Withhold information from a colleague for personal gain	Collaboration



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

## APPENDIX B

### Study 5 Scenario and Conditions

#### B1. Study 5 Organizational Scenario:

“Below we describe a specific organization, FastChip Inc., a medium-sized, publicly traded company that performs reasonably well relative to the industry. We provide information about the company and its CEO, R.L. Terrell. After reading about the organization and its CEO, we would like you to make several decisions as though you were a manager working in this organization.

- 13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53
- A. Narrative profile of CEO with high and low narcissism<sup>3</sup>:** Business journalists have described R.L. Turrell as a charming *extrovert/introvert* with a strong sense of *self-confidence/self-esteem* who is often *aggressive/quiet* in pursuing his goals. He likes to be *the center of attention/unassuming* in public settings. Other observers have noted that he has been *risk taking/cautious* in his approach, leading some to label him as an *impulsive/deliberate* decision maker. On occasion, this has led him to *push the boundaries/be very careful* of ethical transgressions. Former coworkers have noted that he routinely *ignores/listens to* feedback from others. When his views are challenged, they note that he is typically *angry and vindictive/calm and collected* in response. Others, who wished to remain anonymous, also described how he often *takes credit/acknowledges* for others’ accomplishments and is *manipulative/honest* when dealing with others.
- B. Narrative profile of organization with high and low integrity/collaboration:** The CEO of FastChip, R.L. Terrell, is the driving force of FastChip Inc.’s corporate culture. He is proud of Fast Chip Inc.’s reputation in the industry as an *individualistic/collaborative* organization. At FastChip Inc., *individual effort and initiative/cooperation and teamwork* are highly valued and rewarded, and *competition/cooperation* among individuals and departments is considered to be the best road toward innovation and success. Employees are encouraged to take *short cuts/take the long road* and *[/not]* to push up against compliance and legal requirements. The company tends *[/not]* to push the limits ethically *but/and* has never been found to violate the law. Internal *competition/cooperation* is high as employees strive to perform, and members are *unlikely/likely* to share information with one another. Both employees and outsiders categorize FastChip Inc. as having a very *individualistic/collaborative* culture.”

---

54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

<sup>3</sup> Note that leader and culture sections (as well as policy recommendations, promotion recommendations, and violation sanctions and narcissism surveys) were counter balanced to avoid order effects.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**B2. Study 4 Conditions:**

<b>Condition Number</b>	<b>Leader Narcissism</b>	<b>Culture Condition</b>	<b>Congruence</b>
<b>1</b>	High Narcissism	Low Cooperation and Integrity	Congruent
<b>2</b>	Low Narcissism	High Cooperation and Integrity	Congruent
<b>3</b>	High Narcissism	High Cooperation and Integrity	Incongruent
<b>4</b>	Low Narcissism	Low Cooperation and Integrity	Incongruent