2012

The relationship between attitudes toward women as managers and sex-typing of toxic leader behaviors

Lacee Marie Vega-Cartwright

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES TOWARD

WOMEN AS MANAGERS AND SEX-TYPING OF

TOXIC LEADER BEHAVIORS

A Project

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Business Administration

in

Management

by

Lacee Marie Vega-Cartwright

December 2012

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES TOWARD

WOMEN AS MANAGERS AND SEX-TYPING OF

TOXIC LEADER BEHAVIORS

_____

A Project

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

by

Lacee Marie Vega-Cartwright

December 2012

Approved by:

Kathie Pelletier, Committee Chair,   Date
Management

Donald Drost, Committee Member

Breena Coates, Committee Member

Michael Stull, Department Chair

ABSTRACT

This study tested the hypothesis that toxic leader
behavior would be sex-typed as more masculine than feminine
by observers. It was also hypothesized that attitudes
toward women as managers would be related to the sex-typing
of behavior. Previous research has suggested that the
concept of leadership has been distinctly attributed to men
and characterized by masculine, agentic behavior. Role
congruity theory posits that women are devalued as
occupants and potential occupants of the leader role for
exhibiting agentic behavior, especially when observers hold
hostile sexist beliefs towards women. Although examinations
of sex differences in toxic leader behavior have been
scant, results suggest that aspects of toxic leader
behavior may be associated with agentic behaviors typically
attributed to males.

Three hundred undergraduate students were asked to
sex-type toxic leader behaviors and complete the Attitudes
Toward Women as Managers scale. Analysis showed that
observers were more likely to rate a majority of toxic
leader behaviors as being more masculine, partially
supporting Hypothesis 1. Dimensions of toxic leader
behavior associated with masculine ratings included

abusiveness, attack on follower's self esteem, lack of integrity, laissez-faire, and threat to followers' security. Excessive criticism and social exclusion were rated as more feminine than masculine. Although there were significant differences between participant sex and attitudes toward women managers, the attitudes were positive overall. There were small, but significant correlations between observers' toxic leader behavior ratings and their attitudes toward women as managers, thus providing limited support for Hypothesis 2. Dimensions of toxic leader behavior with significant negative correlations included attack on follower's self esteem and divisiveness. Implications for leaders and organizations are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

When I began this journey a couple years ago I was told that completing a thesis in our MBA program was impossible. "Our program just doesn't have the support system to allow students to complete a thesis. Don't attempt it, don't even think about it," I remember being told on one occasion. Instead of putting the idea out of my head, the push back just fueled the desire to achieve this goal even more. The challenges, although overwhelming at times, just made me more determined to see this work come to fruition. It may not have gone exactly as planned and isn't exactly what I initially set out to do, but here it is, a tangible, physical product of my hard-headedness. My success in completing this endeavor would not have been possible without a group of people around me just as determined and hard-headed as myself.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Kathie Pelletier, for being just as determined as I was, and many times more so, to finish this journey. Without her unwavering guidance and support throughout this process I don't believe I would have ever seen a successful ending. She is a trusted mentor and friend who guided me, not only through the trials and tribulations of this

process, but also through critical issues in my personal life. Her encouragement and support buttressed my growth, academically and professionally.

Dr. Breena Coates became a member of my committee by default as the prior chair of the management department when I began the research process. I was lucky to have her as department chair given her background with female leadership issues. She not only offered support (emotional and mental) and encouragement concerning this research but actively pursued opportunities for me to meet and socialize with other researchers studying female leadership. I was even luckier, however, that after she ended her service as department chair she agreed to act as a full member of my committee even though she was no longer required to do so.

Dr. Donald Drost provided a valued male opinion on this research. He enthusiastically supported this effort and was accommodating and flexible given the many changes to this research and the shortened time frame during the final stages.

I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to Dr. Pelletier, Dr. Drost, Dr. Coates and Dr. Donna Garcia of the psychology department for allowing me access to their students. Not only did they allow me into their classrooms

but also to use precious class time to administer my survey to their students.

One of the challenges of completing a thesis in a professional program is the lack of research methodology and statistics courses that provide the necessary theoretical background for devising and testing hypotheses. Dr. Pelletier mentored me through the process and Dr. Janet Kottke of the psychology department was instrumental in preparing me for statistical analysis and interpreting results. I am extremely grateful to Dr. Kottke for her one-on-one review of the statistical methods used in this research.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank Laurie Estrada, administrative support coordinator for the management department, for coordinating the printing of the surveys used in this research.

My final acknowledgement is to my wonderful and supportive family. I thank my daughters, Elyse and Eleyna, for inspiring me everyday with their curiosity, intelligence, and love. My parents, Paul and Teana, and my brother Keenan, were always available and eagerly willing to watch the girls when I needed a quiet afternoon to read,

an evening to write, or sitter when I had to head to campus for a meeting.

More than anyone, I wish to express my appreciation and gratitude to my biggest supporter in this and in life, my husband Anthony. After a 10-12 hour day at work he would come home and put in another couple of hours so that I could attend class, study, and work on this project. When my carpal tunnel held up my progress, he jumped in and helped with the majority of the data entry from the surveys. When an interview I had waited for was scheduled at the same time as a class I was going to survey, he changed his work schedule and administered my survey to students. He is the most wonderful partner a person could have and if it were up to me, his name would be alongside mine on my degree. He certainly deserves a lot of the credit for my accomplishments.

In conclusion, to the person who first told me that this was an impossibility the first time I asked about it (and then told me the same several times after). Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

At one of her first meetings with her senior staff,

Carly Fiorina, the newly appointed CEO of Hewlett Packard,

established her leadership with an exertion of her power

that was perceived as threatening and authoritarian

(Johnson, 2008). She was focused solely on numbers and the

bottom line, traits that were revered and admired in other

(mainly male) top leaders. She routinely laid off employees

because they had not achieved their financial targets. Her

leadership approach was reviled almost immediately upon her

arrival at Hewlett Packard.

Meanwhile, at Enron, Kenneth Lay and Jeffrey Skilling

built a culture that was ruthless in its pursuit of profit.

The bottom 15% of employees was systematically and

regularly fired, regardless of whether that 15% was

profitable. All that mattered in Skilling's "rank and yank"

system was that the "yanked" employees were in the bottom

15% in comparison to their peers (Spector & Lane, 2007). As

Enron stock plummeted and employees' retirement savings

were evaporating, followers still believed in Kenneth Lay

and continued to sink their money into Enron stock (Lipman-Blumen, 2005b).

As Fiorina explained, "In the chat rooms around Silicon Valley, from the time I arrived until long after I left HP I was routinely referred to as either a 'bimbo' or a 'bitch' . . . I watched with interest as male CEOs fired people and were hailed as 'decisive'. I was labeled 'vindictive'" (Dowd, 2006, p. 2).

Both Fiorina and Lay eventually met their ends with their respective companies. Their leadership styles proved to be toxic failures. Even though they met the same outcome (ousted from their leadership positions), why was their similar toxic focus on the bottom line not rewarded or punished in the same way? At the height of the Enron scandal, Kenneth Lay was still the darling of Wall Street and admired by his employees. Carly Fiorina met resistance soon after she began leading Hewlett Packard. Are men and women evaluated differently for exhibiting the same behaviors, especially if those behaviors are toxic?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to add to the existing body of research on harmful leadership with a specific

focus on the construct of toxic leadership. Few studies

have examined the phenomenon of toxic leadership, and

empirical research on possible sex differences within this

area is sparse. The research questions this study seeks to

answer include: Is toxic leader behavior perceived as more

masculine or feminine? What is the relationship between an

observer's attitudes toward women as managers on

perceptions of the masculinity or femininity of toxic

behavior?

The implications for this study are that there is a

potential that toxic behavior is sex-typed, and that an

observer's attitudes toward women as managers may be

correlated with this sex typing of behavior. Research on

sex differences in leadership behavior has previously shown

devaluation of women who exhibit prototypically male leader

behavior (Heilman, 2001, Eagly & Karau, 2002). If toxic

leader behavior is indeed sex-typed as masculine, as is

leader behavior in general, there is a potential that women

may also be devalued more harshly than men when behaving in

a toxic manner. In effect, women will be devalued for not

conforming to the prescriptions of their sex role or their

leader role. Men might be given a "free pass" to continue

on their destructive paths, while women might be readily

3

ousted from their positions of authority. Conversely, if toxic leader behavior is sex-typed as more feminine, there is a potential that destructive female leaders may have an advantage over male toxic leaders. The male toxic leader would be judged more harshly for his behavior and removed from his authority position while the female would be given more leniency for the same transgressions.

Although the behaviors and characteristics of toxic leaders are not desirable for either sex, if they are more attributable to one sex over another, there is a potential that the other sex may be treated differently for exhibiting the same behavior. One group may be punished more severely than another for the same indiscretions. The advantaged group's behavior may be ignored or even rewarded, while the other may be harshly punished through demotion or termination.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Leadership is a well-researched, yet elusive, topic. The concept of leadership is highly complex and does not fit neatly into one overarching theory (Bennis, 2007). At best, leadership is highly contextual and is dependent on other factors besides the leader. Bennis (2007) describes leadership as a triad consisting of the "leader or leaders, followers, and the common goal" (p. 3). Similarly, Yukl (2010) characterizes the major research approaches to leadership in much the same manner, asserting that the key variables within the field of leadership are the characteristics of the leader, the follower, and the situation. In this scenario, follower perceptions of a leader are just as important as the leader's abilities. Historically, leadership was at first studied, "in the bad old days", through the examination of the lives of "great men" (Bennis, 2007, p. 2). Virtually all of our leaders in politics, business and the military were men, and these great men were studied in terms of their traits (Yukl, 2010). Trait research examined leader effectiveness based

on "physical characteristics (e.g., height, appearance),

aspects of personality (e.g., self-esteem, dominance,

emotional stability) and aptitudes (e.g., general

intelligence, verbal fluency, creativity)" (Yukl, 2010, p.

192). However, when this trait approach failed to produce

replicable results, researchers searched for other ways to

examine the leadership phenomenon. Behavioral research

became the preferred method of trying to understand the

leadership effectiveness concept.

Theories of Harmful Leadership

Although there are notable examples of "good"

leadership, our own experiences highlight that they are

vastly overshadowed by instances of harmful leadership. The

majority of research on leadership has focused primarily on

the positive stories of male leaders, and behaviors and

traits of real or hypothetical leaders; consequently, we

have enabled this positive leadership paradigm. Leadership

is a more complex process than can be explained through a

purely positive lens. Rarely is a leader endowed with a

perfect combination of characteristics and abilities, avid

followers and an ideal situation. It is when complications

arise that the greatest learning can be achieved in

understanding the multifaceted leadership concept and improving oneself in his or her role as a leader. With these thoughts in mind, the next section will provide a brief overview of the evolution of research within the realm of harmful leadership. Sex differences, when identified, within each theory of harmful leadership will also be discussed.

Dark Side of Leadership

The first glimpses into the dark side of leadership were through the examination of personality or character traits. The development of research in harmful leadership mirrors the development of leadership as a research field emerging from the "great man approach" of characteristic and trait studies to behavioral-based research (Yukl, 2010). Finkelstein (2003, p. 263, as cited in Burke, 2006) states that the character of a leader is the "single most important indicator of potential executive failure" and is "the one that is hardest to precisely define." Not surprisingly, research into the dark side of leadership began with studies on charismatic leadership which became of interest during the time of Hitler (Conger, 1990). The historical influence on the traits of the dark side of

leadership is evident by its two most often studied areas: leader charisma and narcissism.

Charisma. Max Weber ([1924], 1947, as cited in Conger & Kanungo, 1988) is credited with linking charisma as a desirable leader trait with the concept of "charismatic authority" (p.13). The leader's charismatic authority is distinguished by a faith in the excellence of his or her character over traditional rules or positions (Conger, 1988, p. 13). Leading with a sense of purpose and morality, charismatic leaders create a strong emotional bond with their ardent and enamored followers (Bass, 1988, p. 40). Charismatic leaders are most apt to appear during times of crisis where their vision "will fulfill the unmet emotional needs of their completely trusting, overly dependent, and submissive followers" (Bass, 1988, p. 40-41). Although charismatic leaders may begin on a path of righteousness, the power afforded them can easily lead to abuses of power.

Conger (1989, p. 137) states "when the charismatic leader's actions become too exaggerated, or lose touch with reality or his followers' needs, or become a means for pure personal gain, they may harm the leader and the organization itself." He explains further that when leaders, especially the charismatic, become so bound to

their own cult of personality; they tend to make several key mistakes that eventually lead to their downfall. The dark side of charismatic leaders begins to emerge when their vision becomes clouded by furthering their personal agendas more so than the welfare of the people and companies they are charged with leading. Of the many character flaws that Conger (1989) lists as potential contributors in the downfall of the charismatic leader, the most important for understanding the relationship of negative leaders and their followers is their failure to manage their associations with others, especially subordinates. The dark side of the charismatic leader may become increasingly autocratic to the point the leader feels the need to become overly involved with the minute details of his or her subordinates' projects. The follower, enamored with the leader, becomes yet another sycophant who further reinforces the leaders destructive leadership behavior. The devaluation of the follower by the negative charismatic leader subsequently leaves followers on "an emotional roller coaster," where being in and out of the graces of the leader prevents them from staying on course with what is best for the organization rather than the leader (Conger, 1989, p. 157).

Sex Differences in Charismatic Leadership Studies. Few

studies have explored sex differences in perceptions of

charisma. Kulich, Ryan and Haslam (2007) examined sex

effects under the theory of the "romance of leadership",

which posits that perceptions of charisma and leadership

ability are influenced by company performance or other

contextual factors (Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985).

Using a Goldberg Paradigm type design, the researchers had

participants evaluate fictional leaders on their perceived

charisma and leadership ability and manipulated the

leaders' sex and company performance prior to and after

appointment to CEO. Participants were also asked to

allocate a fictional performance-based bonus to each

leader. The researchers found that company performance

after appointment had a significant positive effect on a

leader's perceived charisma and leadership ability that was

significant for both male and female leaders.

However, performance-based pay allocations did not

hold equal between sexes. Female leaders' performance-based

pay was mediated by their perceived charisma and leadership

ability such that there was no significant difference

between performance-based pay allocations for women who

improved or worsened company performance during their

tenure. Male leaders, conversely, were evaluated based on their organization's performance directly, without regard to their perceived charisma or leadership ability (Kulich et. al., 2007). This finding indicates that women may be under rewarded for achieving the same success as men, or be over rewarded for underperforming. They are evaluated more critically on their personal characteristics and/or abilities than are men. The researchers indicate that men who lead successful companies are deemed as "naturally" great leaders, whereas women are scrutinized to a greater extent simply because they are occupying the "unnatural" role of leader (Heilman, 2001).

Narcissism. The term "narcissism" is derived from the Greek myth about a young man so vain that he fell in love with his own reflection (Maccoby, 2007). Leaders exhibiting narcissistic character traits project an image of high self-esteem and focus their power on serving their own needs above others' needs and interests (Lubit, 2002; Ouimet, 2010). Lubit (2002) describes destructive narcissists as those who are characterized by grandiose visions of themselves, a sense of entitlement, and a complete disregard for followers and others. Narcissistic leaders will abuse organizational resources to further

their own agendas. They will concentrate resources on furthering their grandiose visions. The vision of the destructive narcissist revolves around thrusting themselves above others to obtain a position of admiration of which they feel entitled (Oiumet, 2010; Higgs, 2009; Maccoby, 2007).

Although a healthy self-esteem allows one to recover quickly from failures and setbacks, an extreme of high or low self-esteem can be debilitating when seeking to lead subordinates in a constructive manner (Lubit, 2002). When those in leadership positions possess narcissistic character traits, subordinates suffer. Followers are demeaned and devalued, and their contributions are ignored unless they serve the leader's purpose (Lubit, 2002). Self-preservation becomes the followers' main purpose; subordinates focus on ingratiating themselves with the leader to the detriment of the work that needs to be accomplished for the organization (Lubit, 2002).

Sex Differences in Perceptions of and Reactions to Narcissism. Carroll, Hoenigmann-Stovall, and Whitehead (1996) examined narcissism through the context of entitlement and self-absorption. Entitlement behaviors center around the narcissist's expectation of favors

12

without reciprocity. Self-absorption behaviors included spending inordinate amounts of time looking at or admiring oneself and believing in one's own exceptionalism (Emmons, 1984).

Participants viewed scripted video interactions of a female or male engaging in self-absorption or entitlement behaviors during a telephone conversation. After viewing the scripts, participants completed surveys that assessed their mood (i.e., positive and negative affectivity), willingness to interact with the person in the video (i.e., rejection or acceptance of target), and their rating of the person's psychological dysfunction. Male and female participants reacted more negatively to videos of entitlement and self-absorption characteristics when enacted by the female character. Across all measures, the observers had a significantly higher negative affect ("anger, contempt, disgust, guilt, fear"), higher rejection of the target, and higher ratings of perceived psychological dysfunction.

The difference in reactions to female narcissists suggests that the higher ratings of rejection could be attributed to the participants' belief that she was deviating from the norms associated with her sex role

(e.g., women should be humble and be concerned with others rather than themselves) (Carroll, Corning, Morgan, & Stevens, 1991; Carroll et al., 1996).

Tyrannical Leadership

Within the same vein as the dark side of leadership, Ashforth (1994) put forth the construct of petty tyranny in organizations. A petty tyrant is the negative leader "who lords his or her power over others" (Ashforth, 1994, p. 755). According to Ashforth (1994), the petty tyrant engages in six distinct dimensions of tyrannical leadership including:

> Arbitrariness and self-aggrandizement (favoritism, abuse of power for personal enrichment), belittling subordinates (public criticism of followers), lack of consideration (oblivious to the welfare of others), a forcing style of conflict resolution (unwillingness to accept others' viewpoints), discouraging initiative (makes decisions without subordinate input; prefers subordinates who are dependent on him or her), and non-contingent punishment (intensely critical without merit). (p. 757)

In summation, petty tyrants are those who "use their power and authority oppressively, capriciously, and perhaps vindictively" (Ashforth, 1997, p. 126).

Ashforth's (1994) preliminary empirical work on tyrannical leadership emphasizes that petty tyrants are born out of both the individual and the situation. The leaders' personal "beliefs about the organization, subordinates and others" (p.757) impacts whether they lead through tyranny. An example of this would be McGregor's (1960) Theory X. Theory X managers lead with the belief that employees are inherently lazy and lack sufficient motivation to complete work without being controlled and coerced into achievement of management objectives. Situational factors include "macro and micro organizational level factors and/or organizational stressors" that may affect the way a manager handles situations with employees (Ashforth, 1994, p. 757). If a manager works in an environment where tyrannical behaviors, such as hypercritical public berating of employees, are encouraged, a leader will be more apt to use these tyrannical methods.

Most notably, Ashforth (1994) was instrumental in arguing that tyrannical leadership is not simply an abdication of effective leadership characteristics, but

15

comprises the presence of certain traits of the leader and the leadership situation. An ineffective leader, he posits, possesses a characteristic or resides in a certain environment that is conducive to his or her poor leadership style (Ashforth, 1994). Researchers have yet to examine sex differences in tyrannical leadership. Ashforth's (1994, 1997) assessment that leader characteristics and environment actively contribute to ineffective leadership heavily influenced the most well-researched harmful leadership concept: abusive supervision.

Abusive Supervision

Tepper (2000, p. 178) defines abusive supervision as "subordinates' perceptions of the extent to which their supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviors, excluding physical contact." Although this definition could be applied beyond the idea of leadership to include those people with a narrower sphere of influence, the literature has suggested that the construct is highly relevant to those in leadership positions with organizations.

Tepper (2007) notes that there are three important features of abusive supervision. Subjectivity, in the form of the subordinates' or third party observers' personal

16

beliefs and characteristics, heavily influences whether a supervisor's actions are deemed abusive. Abusive supervision does not manifest in a single event; the abuse must be "subordinate-directed hostility.that is sustained over extended periods of time" (Tepper, 2007, p. 265). Lastly, the hostility of the supervisor must be applied willfully to qualify as abusive supervision. Whether the intended outcome is to cause harm or inspire is not defined in the construct, but there must be willful intent to direct hostility at the subordinate.

Bies & Tripp (1998) examined the behaviors and characteristics of abusive bosses. Tepper (2000, p. 179) affirmed these behaviors as "manifestations of abusive supervision". Abusive supervisors act as micromanagers who are obsessed with minute details and perfection (Bies & Tripp, 1998). These obsessions include the need to know the exact whereabouts of their employees down to the minute, setting unattainable performance standards and being unforgiving of performance failures (Bies & Tripp, 1998). In conjunction with setting unattainable performance standards, the abusive supervisor also typically fails to explain what constitutes success for a given task (Bies & Tripp, 1998). Setting priorities with an abusive supervisor

proves quite difficult as every request made to a subordinate is to be completed with urgency (Bies & Tripp, 1998). Sudden and inexplicable mood swings characterized by explosive tantrums (Tepper, 2000) were a regular experience. Abusive supervisors often devalue their employees through the use of public criticism, inconsiderate conduct, arbitrary decision-making and blatant hypocrisy (Bies & Tripp, 1998). Power is exerted over followers through coercion (Tepper, 2000), the use of punishment in retaliation to those with dissenting opinions, and stealing credit for other's ideas (Bies & Tripp, 1998). Although abusive supervision is well-researched, no studies have examined sex differences in follower perceptions of abusive supervisors.

Workplace Bullying

Closely related to abusive supervision is research on workplace bullying. Although workplace bullying is not limited to the leader-subordinate dyad, it most often occurs at the senior and middle management level (Rayner and Cooper, 1997). Namie and Namie (2000, p.1) define workplace bullying as the "repeated, health-harming mistreatment of a person by one or more workers that takes the form of verbal abuse; conduct or behaviors that are

18

threatening, intimidating, or humiliating; sabotage that prevents work from getting done; or some combination of the three." According to Rayner and Hoel (1997), several behaviors that are illustrative of workplace bullying include threats to professional status (criticism of opinions and effort, public humiliation); threats to personal standing (using derogatory names, rudeness, age discrimination); isolation (acting as a physical or social barrier to others and opportunities, limiting access to information); overwork (setting unrealistic timetables for projects, interrupting work, exacting unnecessary stress); and destabilization (lack of acknowledgment of contributions, assignment of tasks beneath abilities, making success impossible, not letting past mistakes go).

Sex Differences in Workplace Bullying. According to the Workplace Bullying Institute (2010), men are more likely to engage in bullying than women (62% versus 38%). Overall, women are more likely to be bullied than men (58% versus 42%) and bullying is equally likely to be perpetrated by men or women (Workplace Bullying Institute, 2010; Rayner, 1997). Recent trends from 2007 to 2010 show that incidents of bullying of women by women have grown from 71% to 80% (Workplace Bullying Institute, 2010). In

terms of preferred methods of bullying, male perpetrators were more likely to engage in both general victimizing behaviors (degrading, excluding from work group, inflicting detrimental emotional experiences) and work-related bullying (excessive criticism, overwork, assignment of demeaning tasks) than females (Ólafsson & Jóhannsdóttir, 2004).

Destructive Leadership

As defined, destructive leadership moves beyond abusive supervision to include the effects of harmful leadership on organizations as a whole. Einarsen, Aasland and Skogstad (2007, p. 208) propose that destructive leadership is "the systematic and repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor or manager that violates the legitimate interest of the organization by undermining and/or sabotaging the organization's goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and/or the motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of subordinates." Unlike abusive supervision, which focuses on the exhibition of hostility regardless of the outcome, destructive leadership expressly states that the outcomes are detrimental for subordinates and/or the organization.

Destructive leadership behavior also includes all aspects of aggression. Einarsen et al. (2007, p. 209) theorize that Buss' (1961, p. 4) dimensions of aggression all apply to destructive leadership behavior. These dimensions include: "physical versus verbal aggression (assault, derogatory criticism, especially personal attacks), active versus passive aggression (purposively seeking opportunities to attack, giving incomplete information, and direct versus indirect aggression (direct verbal abuse, criticism of the follower through third parties)."

Sex Differences in Aggression. Research on sex differences in aggression has shown that males engage in workplace aggression to a greater extent than females (Baron, Neuman, & Geddes, 1999; Rutter and Hine, 2005; Lee & Brotheridge, 2011). Arnold, Dupre, Hershcovis, and Turner (2011) found that women and men were equally likely to engage in covert forms of aggression (implicit, such as spreading gossip); however, men were more likely to engage in more overt forms of aggression (explicit, such as yelling). These findings also held when direct versus indirect aggression behaviors were examined (Lee & Brotheridge, 2011). Men were more likely to engage in both

21

direct (scapegoating others) and indirect (undermining subordinates) aggression behaviors than women (Lee & Brotheridge, 2011; Rutter & Hine, 2005).

Outcomes Versus Intent. Leader aggression does not require intent to be destructive. In contrast to abusive supervision, the *outcome* of the leader's behavior is more important than *intent*. Thoughtlessness, ignorance and incompetence all qualify as destructive leadership behaviors. Intentions may be hard to discern whereas outcomes are more concrete (Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002; Einarsen et al., 2007). Lastly, the legitimate interest of the organization is a defining difference in the construct of destructive leadership and includes the abuse of subordinates as parts of the organization. Einarsen et al. (2007, p. 210), defines the legitimate interest of an organization as "what is lawful, justifiable, and in the best interest of an organization (as established by internal rules, formal power structures, and procedures)."

Toxic Leadership

Whereas abusive supervision focuses on the perceptions of subordinates, and destructive leadership imposes harm to the organization, toxic leadership expands the net of those affected by harmful leadership to include communities and

societies. A more far-reaching theory, toxic leadership is also more elusive to investigate. Lipman-Blumen (2005c) theorizes that toxic leaders "are not garden-variety authoritarian bosses, nor undependable political leaders, nor overly strict parents, nor even the difficult spouses about whom we all love to complain (p. 29)". Those deemed toxic leaders are in class above and beyond any abusive supervisor or destructive leader; they are "those individuals who, by virtue of their destructive behaviors, and their dysfunctional personal qualities or characteristics, inflict serious and enduring harm on the individuals, groups, organizations, communities and even nations they lead" (Lipman-Blumen, 2005a, p. 2).

Similar to other constructs of harmful leadership, toxic leaders are subjective in the eyes of those they lead. Followers differ in their perceptions of what is toxic and therefore, leaders may be construed as toxic to one follower, but not to another. These perceptual differences may depend on the individual leader and follower relationship, such as whether the follower is considered a member of the entourage or an outsider (Lipman-Blumen, 2005b). They also display differing levels of toxicity in similar and varying situations (Lipman-

23

Blumen, 2005c). One moment a toxic leader may be destructive, yet may be perfectly constructive the next. Lipman-Blumen (2005c, p. 30) explains, "toxic leaders display varying kinds and degrees of toxicity, and the consequences of their actions may generate different types and levels of harm."

The most thought-provoking aspect of Lipman-Blumen's work is the hold that toxic leaders have on us, and their ability to con us into feeling as though we need them. We seek to be a part of their "noble visions" and bask in the light of their "grand illusions" (Lipman-Blumen, 2005b). Toxic leaders attract their followers by making their constituents feel that they are the "chosen ones," a special group worthy of accomplishing a divine task with the leader. Seducing with noble visions has lead many down a path of destruction. One of the most shining examples from the corporate world was the toxic duo of Ken Lay and Jeffrey Skilling. They used their charms and visions to corrupt and manipulate, eventually leaving their followers worse off than when they found them. They created a grand illusion of an exceptional organization with a winner-take-all corporate culture that not only lead followers down the garden path, but also fooled Wall Street and investors.

Why the term 'toxic' to describe these leaders? Toxic carries the connotation of a poison, and much like the venom of a snake, these leaders affect their victims differently through the intensity and duration of the toxic behavior. The Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (2012) alternately defines toxic in its adjective form as "extremely harsh, malicious, or harmful"; these terms summarily describe the behaviors of a toxic leader to their followers and organizations.

Pelletier (2010, p. 380) refined leader toxicity into a typology based on leader characteristics and behaviors. "Attack on followers' self esteem (demeaning, ridiculing)" and "threat to followers' security (physical abuse or threatening to fire employees)" relate to the individual follower's welfare. The toxic leader not only abuses the dyadic relationship with a follower but will also take advantage of group dynamics. Through the use of "social exclusion (excluding members of the work group from organizational functions)", "divisiveness (creating competitive groups within a unit or separating out individual members)" and "promoting inequity (favoritism, cronyism)", the leader further alienates his or her followers and creates a sense of inequity among peers.

Lastly, leader characteristics bring toxic abuse full circle. "Abusiveness (volatile emotions including physical anger and coercion), "lack of integrity (taking credit for successes or blaming others for mistakes, ignoring rules, lying)" and "laissez-faire leadership (lack of engagement, stifling others) all serve to further exacerbate the poisonous effect of toxic leaders.

Theories of harmful leadership have each contributed to a better understanding of the types of behaviors that negatively affect followers. Toxic leadership is the most comprehensive of these theories, encompassing a wide range of behaviors. To aid in our understanding of the context of toxic leader behaviors, Table 1 shows dimensions and characteristics of toxic leader behavior, and behavioral statements collected from the literature. During the review of the literature on harmful leadership, several behaviors not included in Pelletier's (2010) typology were identified that present a more complete picture of the nature of harmful leadership. The additional dimensions and behaviors identified include leader narcissism and excessive criticism of employees. Narcissistic behaviors employing themes of the leaders exploitation of others for the purpose of increasing their own gains and self-enhancement

(i.e., seeing all events in terms of significance to their own careers, using authority of position for personal gain) were grouped under the new dimension of "narcissism". Overly critical behaviors indicating the leader was acting excessively critical of subordinates (i.e., being critical of employee's work when performed well, seeming displeased with employees work for no apparent reason) were grouped under the new dimension of "excessive criticism".

As evidenced by the exhaustive list of harmful leader behaviors, characteristics, and behavioral statements in Table 1, toxic leadership ranges from minor inconveniences for the follower, to serious emotional and physical abuse. In conclusion, as the previous review of destructive leadership has highlighted, research in this area has expanded from the study of one-dimensional traits to comprehensive models of behavior.

Table 1

Dimensions of Toxic Leader Behavior, Characteristics and Behavioral Statements

| Dimension | | |
Behavioral Characteristics	Behavioral Statements	
Abusiveness		
Coercing	Coercing employees to accept his or her ideas	
Displaying anger	Exhibiting excessive anger towards employees	
	Expressing anger at an employee when he/she is mad at another	
	Raising voice when his/her point does not appear to be accepted by employees	
	Shouting at employees	
	Yelling when a deadline is missed	
Emotional volatility	Reacting with hostility when approached by employees	
	Throwing a tantrum when goals are not met	

Dimension		
Behavioral Characteristics		Behavioral Statements
Attack on follower's self esteem		
	Demeaning/marginalizing, or degrading	Asking, "Is this the best you can do?"
		Expressing rudeness to employees and others
		Hanging a "wall of shame" bulletin board to post employee blunders as a display of humor
		Ordering work to be done beneath an employee's level of competence
		Removing or replacing an employee's key area of responsibility with trivial or unpleasant tasks
		Reprimanding employees when they make a mistake
		Saying to an employee "you just don't understand the problem"
		Telling employees that they are incompetent
	Mocking	Mocking employees as a display of humor
		Telling employees to work and not think
	Ridiculing	Making insulting or humiliating remarks about an employee's attitudes or private life

Dimension		
Behavioral Characteristics		Behavioral Statements
		Publicly ridiculing an employee's work
		Reminding employees of past mistakes and failures
		Subjecting employees to excessive teasing and sarcasm
		Telling employees that their thoughts or feelings are stupid
Divisiveness		
Inciting employee to chastise another		Encouraging good performers to put pressure on poor performers
		Making negative comments about an employee to others
Ostracizing employee		Ignoring or excluding employees
		Telling an employee in public that he or she is not a team player
Pitting one employee or workgroup against another		Creating contests between two employees where winning involves marginalizing the work of the other

Dimension		
Behavioral Characteristics		Behavioral Statements
		Preventing employees from interacting with their coworkers
Excessive criticism		
		Being critical of employee's work when performed well
		Criticizing employees persistently
		Excessively criticizing employees
		Excessively monitoring an employee's work
		Frequently reprimanding employees without explanation
		Seeming displeased with employees work for no apparent reason
Lack of integrity		
Being deceptive		Lying about the organization's performance at a company meeting
		Lying to employees to get his or her way
		Making false statements about the competitor

Dimension		
	Behavioral Characteristics	Behavioral Statements
		Spreading gossip or rumors about employees
		Taking credit for an employee's work
	Bending the rules to meet goals	Asking an employee to falsify productivity figures to meet a goal
		Bending the rules to achieve productivity goals
		Rewarding employees for bending rules to get a job done
	Blaming others for leader's mistakes	Blaming others for the leader's mistakes
		Breaking promises that he/she makes
		Scapegoating employees
	Lack of transparency	Failing to disclose the reasons behind organizational decisions
	Untrustworthy	Invading employee's privacy
		Not sticking to the plan of action

32

Dimension		
Behavioral Characteristics		Behavioral Statements

Dimension	Behavioral Characteristics	Behavioral Statements
Laissez-faire		
	Being rigid	Demanding to get his or her way
		Insisting on doing things the old way
	Ignoring comments/ideas	Failing to respond to concerns of employees
		Ignoring employees' comments
	Lack of empathy	Assigning tasks with unreasonable deadlines
	Stifling dissent	Refusing to take no for an answer
Narcissism		
	Exploiting others	Exploiting others for their own gain
		Seeing all events in terms of significance to their own careers
		Undermining competitors for promotion
	Self-enhancement	Being highly defensive when criticized
		Excessively self-promoting and attention-seeking

Dimension	
Behavioral Characteristics	Behavioral Statements
	Harboring unfounded beliefs that others want to hurt them
	Using authority or position for personal gain
Promoting inequity	
Exhibiting favoritism	Administering organizational policies unfairly
	Giving resources only to departments whose functions make the leader look good
	Inviting a select few to an important meeting
	Playing favorites among subordinates
Ostracizing employee	Acknowledging some coworkers' contributions to a project but not all members of the project team
	Withholding information that would affect an employee's performance

Dimension		
	Behavioral Characteristics	Behavioral Statements

Social exclusion

| | Excluding individuals from social functions | Greeting some coworkers and ignoring others |
| | | Inviting specific employees to social events (e.g., golfing, company parties) and excluding others |

Threat to followers' security

	Forcing people to endure hardships	Asking employees to work late to help a coworker complete a major project
		Exposing employees to an unmanageable workload
		Making employees work until the job is done, even if it means they must work all night
		Pressuring an employee not to claim something they are entitled to (vacation, sick leave, holiday, etc.)
		Threatening to deny an employee's vacation request if a deadline is missed

35

Dimension		
	Behavioral Characteristics	Behavioral Statements
	Threatening employees' job security	Demoting an employee without giving a good reason for the decision
		Hinting or signaling that an employee should quit their job
		Making an employee feel as though his or her job is in jeopardy
		Threatening to terminate an employee, even if the statement is made in a joking manner
	Using physical acts of aggression	Intimidating employees with finger-pointing
		Invading an employee's personal space
		Shoving or blocking an employee
		Slamming a fist on the table to emphasize a point
		Threatening violence or physical abuse

Note. Adapted from Pelletier, K. L. (2010). Leader toxicity: An empirical investigation of toxic behavior and rhetoric. *Leadership, 6*(4), 373.

Sex Differences in Leadership

A goal of this study is to determine if certain toxic leader behaviors will be perceived by observers to be more characteristic of women than men. Many researchers have examined differences in the evaluation of male and female leaders (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, & Reichard, 2008); however, few have looked at perceptions of toxic leader behaviors as being more stereotypical of males or females. In this section, a review of sex differences in leadership and evaluations of women leaders are discussed.

Think-Manager, Think-Male

Leadership, from a sex perspective, has been well studied in terms of evaluations of women as leaders and potential occupants of the leader role. Schein's (1973, 1975) early work on sex differences in leadership examined characteristics of men, women, and successful managers to assess whether sex role stereotypes affected people's expectations of women as managers. In her studies, females were perceived to be less similar in characteristics of successful managers than males. The characteristics of successful managers that were seen as more male included: "emotionally stable, aggressive, leadership ability, self-

37

reliant, (not) uncertain, vigorous, desires responsibility, (not) frivolous, objective, well-informed, and direct" (Schein, 1973, p. 98).

Studies under the "think-manager, think-male" paradigm have continued to support the theory that men possess the privilege of occupying the leadership role in society's collective mind. Research since Schein's early studies has shown that women, due to stereotypical beliefs about women, men, and the leadership role, have been devalued as potential occupants of the leader role and in their evaluations once they are put into a leader role (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Role Congruity Theory

Eagly & Karau (2002) theorize that women are devalued as leaders as a result of prejudices and sexism that form when an "incongruity" exists between people's expectations about women and leaders (p. 575). The devaluation of women tends to be a function of hostile or benevolent sexism. According to Eagly and Karau (2002), people holding hostile sexist beliefs are likely to devalue women when they deviate from their expected sex role (i.e., when they are in leadership positions or in predominantly masculine occupations). Benevolent sexism occurs when women are

perceived favorably when they are in roles that are aligned with their sex (e.g., homemakers, nurses). Hostile sexism is relevant to this study; if observers view the role of leader as masculine, women who are in a leadership position will be perceived as deviating from society's expectations of what constitutes an acceptable role for women. Women, if they possess the qualities (e.g., dominant, aggressive, forceful, decisive) desired in a leader, are devalued for not conforming to the norms of their sex role. However, if they fulfill expectations of their sex role (e.g., kind, compassionate, nurturing), they are perceived as weak and/or ineffective leaders (Glick & Fiske, 1996). These contradictory pressures exact an extra burden on female leaders that is non-existent for male leaders. Eagly and Karau's (2002) role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders states that a:

> Perceived incongruity between the female sex role and leadership roles leads to two forms of prejudice: (a) perceiving women less favorably than men as potential occupants of leadership roles, and (b) evaluating behavior that fulfills the prescriptions of a leader role less favorably when it is enacted by a woman. (pg. 573)

As stated earlier, the prejudices theorized in role congruity theory stem from stereotypical beliefs about sex roles. Sex roles have two types of expectations about how men and women should behave: *descriptive norms* and *injunctive norms* (Cialdini & Trost, 1998; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Descriptive norms involve expectations of what a person in a (sex) group actually does (e.g., women are emotional) and injunctive norms concern expectations of what a person of a certain (sex) group *should* do (e.g., the ideal woman should be a homemaker) (Cialdini & Trost, 1998; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Beliefs about sex norms typically revolve around our ideas about *communal* and *agentic* attributes (Bakan, 1966; Eagly, 1987, Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Communal and Agentic Behaviors

Societal beliefs have dictated that men and women are viewed as possessing certain characteristics. Female leaders potentially suffer from prejudices that arise from the communal and agentic perceptions that are formed about women and the leader role (Eagly & Karau, 2002). It is theorized that beliefs about the attributes of women and men are categorized into "communal" and "agentic" characteristics (Bakan, 1996; Eagly, 1997; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Women, typically perceived as communal, are expected

40

to be well-suited for caregiving and nurturing roles.

Expected behaviors center on a concern for people and are

highlighted through characteristics of "affection,

helpfulness, kindness, sympathy, sensitivity, and

gentleness, passivity (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p. 574).

Men, alternately, are perceived as more agentic and

are expected to be "assertive, controlling, and confident"

(Eagly & Karau, 2002, p. 574). These expectations are

aligned with societal beliefs about the ideal leader –

"aggressive, ambitious, dominant, forceful, independent,

self-sufficient, and self-confident" (Eagly & Karau, 2002,

p. 574; Schein, 1973).

Historically, men have dominated leadership roles, and

stereotypes of their behavior are perceived as requirements

for fulfilling a leadership role successfully (Eagly &

Karau, 2002). The association of agentic (e.g., male)

characteristics as ideal leader characteristics has changed

slightly over time but remains strong (Keonig, Eagly,

Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011). If women fulfill their sex

role expectations by behaving in communal ways, they are

seen as not having the agentic qualities required of the

leadership role. Conversely, if women lead agentically as

prescribed by the leader role, they are seen as failing in

their communal roles as women because they are not behaving in a caring or nurturing manner. Women in leadership positions must balance communal and agentic behaviors to try to fulfill both their sex role and the prescription of the leader role (Eagly & Karau, 2002). If women are perceived as failing in either role, research has shown that women are not only devalued as leaders, but that they may not even be permitted to rise to leadership roles (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Toxic Leadership as Masculine-Oriented

Although a plethora of research has shown that successful leadership has been strongly linked to agentic characteristics and masculinity (Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Raistikari, 2011; Schein, 1973), few studies have directly examined links between destructive leadership and sex stereotypes. Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, & Reichard (2006) examined sex stereotyping of leadership prototypes and found that the agentic dimension of tyranny was more strongly associated with male leaders than female leaders. In their construct, tyranny was operationalized to include characteristics such as "being loud, conceited, dominant, domineering, pushy, power-hungry, demanding, obnoxious, manipulative, conceited and selfish" (Johnson et al., 2006,

42

p. 41). These characteristics derive from Bakan's (1966) description of agency as focused on exerting control and power over others (Johnson et al., 2006).

Hypothesis 1

Based on research that has shown men to engage in workplace aggression (overt, direct, and indirect; Baron et al., 1999; Rutter & Hine, 2005; Arnold et al., 2011, Lee & Brotheridge, 2011) and bullying behaviors more so than women (Namie & Namie, 2000; Ólafsson & Jóhannsdóttir, 2004) the following hypothesis is put forth:

> H1: Overall, respondents will perceive toxic leader
>
> behaviors to be more masculine than feminine.

Attitudes Toward Women as Managers

This study seeks to not only understand if toxic leader behaviors are perceived as attributable to one sex over the other, but also whether attitudes toward female managers influences the sex-typing of those behaviors. The prejudices, as a function of hostile sexism, that lie within role congruity theory may manifest into negative attitudes toward female leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002). As discussed earlier, these prejudices are based on stereotypes about the female sex role and the leader role. Women are less likely to be seen as potential leaders

43

because the leader role is deemed as a masculine domain, and after attaining a leadership role, their behavior is not seen as feminine. Previous research has shown that agentic behavior is more readily attributable to male leaders over female leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 2001; Koenig et al., 2011) and has hinted that tyrannical behavior is also more linked to male leaders (Johnson, et al., 2006).

If agentic behaviors, and by extension toxic behaviors, are attributed more readily to men, one would more likely attribute toxic behaviors to a male leader than a female leader as stated in Hypothesis 1. However, if a person holds negative attitudes toward a female leader, those attitudes may affect his or her perception of whether a toxic behavior is more likely to be performed by a male or female leader. Those with a negative attitude toward women as managers are less likely to see females as potential occupants of the leader role. If they are presented with a female leader, the second hypothesis of role congruity theory will likely be activated: they will be less likely to evaluate her positively in the leader role. If an observer already feels that a female is an inappropriate choice for the leadership role, they may also

44

perceive that the female will be more likely to fail in that role (Heilman, 2001). Toxic leader behaviors, by their very nature, are characteristics of failed leadership or undesirable qualities in an otherwise productive leader. The female leader, who is already assumed to be more likely to fail in the leadership role since the leadership role is not aligned with sex role expectations, may be more likely thought of as exhibiting destructive behavior by those who hold negative attitudes toward women as managers (i.e., those who ascribe to more traditional ideas of sex and leader roles).

Heilman's (1983, 1995) Lack of Fit Model, which postulates that the perceived fit between a candidate's attributes and a job's requirements determines an observer's performance expectations about the candidate, delineates how attitudes toward women as managers may affect the sex-typing of behaviors. If observers do not perceive a fit between a candidate's attributes and the observers' perceptions of the characteristics necessary for a job, the observers will expect performance failure. Heilman (2001) states that the greater the degree of sex stereotyping or the extent to which the job is sex-typed as masculine, the worse the perceived fit and the more

45

negative the expectations about the candidate will be. Those who hold more negative attitudes, or more stereotypical views, will therefore expect failure more readily from female leaders over male leaders and see male leaders as more likely to lead successfully. This bias in evaluating leaders would more readily trigger the observer to associate failed leadership with women rather than men when sex-typing toxic leader behavior.

In essence, negative attitudes toward women may make a person more likely to believe that a female is more likely to exhibit toxic leader behaviors, as they believe that women are less likely to be effective in the leadership role. The sex-typing of negative leadership behaviors may be more readily attributed to a female by those who hold negative attitudes toward women as managers because they already consider women an inappropriate choice for the leadership role without consideration of other factors. Consequently, women may be perceived to be more likely to fail or exhibit undesirable leadership behavior.

Hypothesis 2

Based on the devaluation of female leaders for enacting agentic behaviors, especially by those holding hostile sexist beliefs towards women (Eagly & Karau, 2002;

46

Glick & Fiske, 1996), and the finding that the greater

degree of stereotyping by observers (negative attitudes

toward women as managers) exacerbates negative performance

expectations (Heilman, 2001), the following hypothesis is

put forth:

H2: Attitudes toward women as managers will be

related to the sex-typing of toxic leader

behaviors.

Specifically, those with less favorable attitudes

toward women as managers will assign feminine

ratings of toxic leader behavior more so than

masculine ratings.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Methodology

Participants

A convenience sample of 330 undergraduate students

enrolled in upper-division business and psychology courses

at a public state university in Southern California were

recruited for this study. The size of this sample is

similar to comparable studies that asked participants to

rate a leader behavior or characteristic as more masculine

or feminine (Koenig et al., 2011). In Koenig et al.'s

(2011) meta analysis, 47 of 51 studies had sample sizes

with less than 300 participants. Further, a post hoc power

calculation indicated that the size of the sample yielded

sufficient power (> .80) to reduce the potential for Type

II error (i.e., failure to reject a false null hypothesis).

Data Screening

Of the 330 students who participated in the research,

21 had no work experience and were excluded from the

analysis. After removing those who lacked job experience,

the data were screened for normality and univariate

outliers. The presence of outliers was determined using

48

standardized scores for all toxic dimensions across all participants (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Nine outliers were removed from the analysis using the criterion of Z greater than |±3.29|, (i.e., $p <$ .001). The outliers were participants who rated items on the extreme ends of the scale or were inconsistent in their ratings. Extreme answers included participants who rated all items as "highly masculine (1)", "masculine or feminine (4)" or "highly feminine (7)" with no variation in their responses. Other outliers included those who rated several behaviors as masculine whereas the majority of participants had rated those same behaviors as feminine, and vice versa.

Demographics

Of the 300 participants, 187 (62.3%) were female and 113 (37.7%) were male. Ages of the participants ranged from 19 to 62 years of age, with an average age of 24.7 (SD = 6.75). Work experience of participants ranged from 1 month to 42 years and 1 month with an average of 6.79 years (SD = 6.06). One hundred and ninety-seven students were enrolled in business courses (65.7%) and 103 were enrolled in psychology courses (34.3%). Over 75% of the participants identified themselves as either "Hispanic or Latino"

(39.8%) or "White" (35.8%). See Table 2 for the racial

breakdown of the participants.

Table 2

Racial Demographics

Race	Percent of Participants
Asian	7.7%
Black or African American	6.0%
Hispanic or Latino	39.8%
Middle Eastern	1.7%
Native Hawaiian or Other	0.3%
White	35.8%
Other (did not specify)	0.3%
Multiracial	8.0%
Preferred not to specify	0.3%

Demographic differences between participant sex and
race on attitudes toward women as managers were evaluated.
There was a significant difference in attitudes toward
women as managers based on participant sex (t_{298} = -10.214,
p < .01). Female participants reported more favorable
attitudes toward women as managers (M_f = 5.68) than male (M_m
= 5.00). This difference is not surprising given studies

50

that have found similar differences (Brenner & Beutell, 2010; Lewis, 2010; Sincoff, Owen, & Coleman, 2009; Terborg et al., 1977). In this sample, although the differences in attitudes toward women as managers were significant, both male and female participants assigned more favorable ratings than unfavorable.

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if there were significant differences in attitudes toward women as managers based on respondents' race. There were no significant differences in attitudes based upon race, $F(8,290) = 1.34$, $p = .220$.

Procedure

Faculty were contacted via email to solicit their agreement to administer the survey to their students. The surveys were administered according to the faculty member's instructions (e.g., in-class, outside of class, after an exam, etc.) using paper surveys. At the instructor's discretion, students were given extra credit in their respective courses for participation. All participants were treated in accordance with the American Psychological Association's ethical guidelines (American Psychological Association, 2010). Each student who participated received an informed consent form in accordance with the California

State University, San Bernardino Institutional Review Board's procedure prior to completing the surveys (see Appendix A). They were informed that their responses were anonymous. Upon completion of the survey, participants also received a debriefing form that explained the nature of the study and how the results would be used (see Appendix B).

Measures

Toxic Leader Behavior Assessment. An 84-item scale was developed by incorporating leader behavioral statements from several widely used measures that assess perceptions of destructive and toxic leadership behavior (see Appendix C). The behavioral statements were derived from the following: Leader Behavior Assessment (Pelletier, 2010), Abusive Supervision Scale (Tepper, 2000), Tyrannical Behaviors (Ashforth, 1994), the Negative Acts Questionnaire - Revised (Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaters, 2009), and the warning signs of Destructively Narcissistic Managers (Lubit, 2002). The behavioral statements were randomly assigned on the survey instrument; however, for reporting purposes, they were grouped using the dimensions of toxic leader behavior discussed previously under the literature review section concerning toxic leadership (see Table 1). Respondents indicated their perception of how feminine or

masculine each behavior was using a Likert-type scale
ranging from 1 = "highly masculine" to 7 = "highly
feminine".

Women as Managers Scale (WAMS). A 21-item scale
developed by Terborg, Peters, Ilgen and Smith (1977)
measuring respondents' stereotypical attitudes toward women
as managers was also administered (see Appendix D). The
WAMS was selected as it is contextually relevant to this
study. The scale measures attitudes toward women as
managers, rather than attitudes toward women in general.
The split-half reliability for this scale is .92 (Terborg,
et al., 1977). The Cronbach's alpha for this study was .80.
Respondents indicated their agreement with each statement
on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree"
to 7 = "strongly agree". Higher ratings indicate more
favorable attitudes toward women as managers.

Data Analysis

To test hypothesis 1, descriptives and frequencies
(i.e., item means and percentage of endorsement of sex for
each item) was employed to characterize behaviors by sex
(i.e., behaviors deemed to be masculine or feminine). In
addition to assessing descriptives and frequencies, a One-
sample *t*-test was used to determine if the sample mean

differed significantly from the expected population mean (i.e., behaviors characterized as being neither masculine or feminine).

To test hypothesis 2, SPSS was used to correlate attitudes toward women with the sex classification of behaviors. Correlation analysis was used as it is an appropriate test to determine if there was a relationship between participants' attitudes toward women and the sex-typing of toxic leader behaviors.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Results

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 predicted that respondents would perceive toxic leader behaviors to be more masculine than feminine. The analysis showed that Hypothesis 1 was partially supported. Participants sex-typed the majority of toxic leader behavior as more masculine than feminine. Table 3 shows the means and percent endorsement for the 84 toxic leader behaviors assessed within the Toxic Leader Behavior Assessment. Means below 4 indicated a more masculine sex-typing of the leader behavior, and means above 4 indicated a more feminine characterization. The toxic leader behaviors in the table are listed in ascending order of their means within their dimension. Toxic leader behaviors that were significantly different ($p < .05$) from a mean rating of "4" (indicating neither a masculine or feminine characterization) are indicated and were identified through analysis of a One-Sample t-test. Although H1 was a directional hypothesis, a two-tailed test was used so that any behaviors that were characterized as feminine would

also be identified. The masculine percentage of endorsement was composed of the respondents who indicated "highly masculine" and "masculine." Similarly, the percentage of endorsement of feminine sex-typing was calculated as the number of respondents who indicated "highly feminine" and "feminine."

Table 3

Masculine and Feminine Leader Behaviors: Means and Percent Endorsement

Dimension Item	M	SD	Masculine Endorse %	Feminine Endorse %	d
Abusiveness					
Shouting at employees	3.11**	1.39	6.4	37.1	.64
Yelling when a deadline is missed	3.16**	1.32	4.3	32.8	.63
Exhibiting excessive anger towards employees	3.26**	1.26	4.6	30.4	.59
Raising voice when his/her point does not appear to be accepted by employees	3.54**	1.50	10.8	26.8	.31
Expressing anger at an employee when he/she is mad at another	3.75**	1.45	13.0	20.7	.17
Coercing employees to accept his or her ideas	3.80**	1.20	8.3	16.4	.17
Reacting with hostility when approached by employees	3.96	1.27	12.3	13.0	.03
Throwing a tantrum when goals are not met	4.43**	1.52	25.5	12.7	.28

Dimension Item	M	SD	Masculine Endorse %	Feminine Endorse %	d
Attack on follower's self esteem					
Telling employees to work and not think	2.55**	1.14	2.7	54.3	1.27
Hanging a "wall of shame" bulletin board to post employee blunders as a display of humor	3.19**	1.34	5.3	33.4	.60
Telling employees that their thoughts or feelings are stupid	3.22**	1.25	3.7	28.9	.63
Mocking employees as a display of humor	3.29**	1.26	3.3	27.8	.56
Subjecting employees to excessive teasing and sarcasm	3.4**	1.43	6.7	28.1	.42
Publicly ridiculing an employee's work	3.49**	1.11	3.7	20.3	.46
Telling employees that they are incompetent	3.52**	1.15	4.0	19.5	.42
Asking, "Is this the best you can do?"	3.56**	1.35	9.0	23.7	.33
Reprimanding employees when they make a mistake	3.72**	1.01	3.3	14.3	.28

Dimension Item	M	SD	Masculine Endorse %	Feminine Endorse %	d
Ordering work to be done beneath an employee's level of competence	3.74**	1.09	4.7	14.0	.24
Expressing rudeness to employees and others	3.86	1.26	9.7	14.7	.11
Making insulting or humiliating remarks about an employee's attitudes or private life	3.97	1.33	12.6	13.3	.02
Removing or replacing an employee's key area of responsibility with trivial or unpleasant tasks	3.99	1.04	8.0	8.3	.01
Saying to an employee "you just don't understand the problem"	4.09	1.24	14.0	11.0	.08
Reminding employees of past mistakes and failures	4.16*	1.31	16.8	11.7	.13
Divisiveness					
Creating contests between two employees where winning involves marginalizing the work of the other	3.39**	1.32	6.0	29.0	.47
Preventing employees from interacting with their coworkers	3.67**	1.37	10.4	21.0	.24

Dimension Item	M	SD	Masculine Endorse %	Feminine Endorse %	d
Telling an employee in public that he or she is not a team player	3.77**	1.25	9.7	15.3	.19
Encouraging good performers to put pressure on poor performers	4.01	1.17	11.4	11.0	.01
Ignoring or excluding employees	4.41**	1.26	21.7	7.0	.32
Making negative comments about an employee to others	4.69**	1.17	25.3	4.7	.59
Excessive criticism					
Frequently reprimanding employees without explanation	3.80**	1.00	5.6	11.0	.20
Criticizing employees persistently	3.84*	1.36	12.0	18.7	.12
Excessively criticizing employees	4.04	1.36	15.3	15.1	.29
Being critical of employee's work when performed well	4.10	1.15	11.7	8.7	.08
Excessively monitoring an employee's work	4.33**	1.30	20.4	10.7	.25
Seeming displeased with employees work for no apparent reason	4.39**	1.19	17.4	5.0	.33

Dimension Item	M	SD	Masculine Endorse %	Feminine Endorse %	d
Lack of integrity					
Asking an employee to falsify productivity figures to meet a goal	3.25**	1.17	3.0	28.1	.64
Rewarding employees for bending rules to get a job done	3.43**	1.17	5.0	21.3	.49
Bending the rules to achieve productivity goals	3.48**	1.12	4.6	20.0	.47
Lying about the organization's performance at a company meeting	3.54**	1.09	4.0	17.5	.42
Taking credit for an employee's work	3.74**	1.17	6.4	16.4	.23
Scapegoating employees	3.83**	1.00	5.0	10.7	.17
Not sticking to the plan of action	3.88	1.17	8.3	13.0	.10
Making false statements about the competitor	3.90	1.25	11.1	14.1	.08
Failing to disclose the reasons behind organizational decisions	3.90	0.92	5.0	7.3	.11
Breaking promises that he/she makes	3.92	0.95	6.7	9.7	.08

Dimension Item	M	SD	Masculine Endorse %	Feminine Endorse %	d
Blaming others for the leader's mistakes	3.97	1.15	10.7	12.0	.02
Lying to employees to get his or her way	3.99	1.17	10.0	10.7	.01
Invading employee's privacy	4.28**	1.18	14.3	6.7	.24
Spreading gossip or rumors about employees	5.63**	1.21	59.6	2.7	1.35
Laissez-faire					
Insisting on doing things the old way	3.16**	1.39	6.0	36.0	.60
Failing to respond to concerns of employees	3.37**	1.09	1.6	22.1	.58
Refusing to take no for an answer	3.57**	1.34	8.7	22.7	.32
Assigning tasks with unreasonable deadlines	3.78**	1.15	7.0	15.4	.19
Ignoring employees' comments	3.82**	1.01	4.7	11.1	.18
Demanding to get his or her way	4.20*	1.35	18.0	13.3	.15

Dimension Item	M	SD	Masculine Endorse %	Feminine Endorse %	d
Narcissism					
Using authority or position for personal gain	3.35**	1.31	5.0	29.1	.50
Undermining competitors for promotion	3.67**	1.03	3.0	14.0	.32
Exploiting others for their own gain	3.72**	1.21	7.3	15.7	.23
Seeing all events in terms of significance to their own careers	3.98	1.08	9.4	8.7	.02
Harboring unfounded beliefs that others want to hurt them	4.29**	1.21	15.7	6.7	.24
Excessively self-promoting and attention-seeking	4.34**	1.46	22.6	12.7	.23
Being highly defensive when criticized	4.57**	1.53	32.4	11.0	.37
Promoting inequity					
Giving resources only to departments whose functions make the leader look good	3.71**	1.19	6.7	16.7	.24
Administering organizational policies unfairly	3.90	0.92	4.3	8.0	.11

Dimension Item	M	SD	Masculine Endorse %	Feminine Endorse %	d
Inviting a select few to an important meeting	3.98	1.30	13.6	13.7	.02
Withholding information that would affect an employee's performance	4.02	1.00	20.8	7.7	.02
Acknowledging some coworkers' contributions to a project but not all members of the project team	4.07	1.05	9.7	8.3	.06
Playing favorites among subordinates	4.23**	1.46	20.3	13.7	.16
Social exclusion					
Inviting specific employees to social events (e.g., golfing, company parties) and excluding others	3.87	1.56	17.1	22.7	.08
Greeting some coworkers and ignoring others	4.79**	1.29	30.0	5.3	.61
Threat to followers' security					
Slamming a fist on the table to emphasize a point	2.17**	1.14	1.6	67.4	1.61
Threatening violence or physical abuse	2.29**	1.14	1.0	60.5	1.50
Shoving or blocking an employee	2.75**	1.29	2.4	46.2	.97

Dimension Item	M	SD	Masculine Endorse %	Feminine Endorse %	d
Making employees work until the job is done, even if it means they must work all night	3.43**	1.16	3.4	23.7	.49
Pressuring an employee not to claim something they are entitled to (vacation, sick leave, holiday, etc.)	3.45**	1.15	4.3	21.7	.48
Threatening to deny an employee's vacation request if a deadline is missed	3.49**	1.06	2.6	18.7	.48
Exposing employees to an unmanageable workload	3.53**	1.14	3.6	19.5	.41
Making an employee feel as though his or her job is in jeopardy	3.55**	1.19	5.3	22.0	.38
Threatening to terminate an employee, even if the statement is made in a joking manner	3.58**	1.21	7.0	19.1	.35
Demoting an employee without giving a good reason for the decision	3.72**	1.06	3.6	13.7	.27
Intimidating employees with finger-pointing	3.82*	1.51	15.4	21.1	.12

Dimension Item	M	SD	Masculine Endorse %	Feminine Endorse %	d
Invading an employee's personal space	3.88	1.33	11.6	16.3	.09
Asking employees to work late to help a coworker complete a major project	3.91	1.05	7.7	12.5	.09
Hinting or signaling that an employee should quit their job	4.01	1.19	12.0	11.3	.01

Note. Percent endorsement included highly masculine and masculine, and highly feminine and feminine.

1 = Highly masculine

4 = Neither masculine or feminine

7 = Highly feminine

*p < .05

**p < .01

Of the 84 toxic leader behaviors, 49 (58.3%) had means below 4, indicating participants characterized the behavior as more masculine. Thirty-five (41.7%) of the toxic leader behaviors were characterized as more feminine. Sixty-one toxic leader behaviors had means that were significant at the $p < .05$ level. Of the items that were statistically significant, 47 (77.0%) behaviors were characterized as more masculine and 14 (23.0%) as more feminine. Overall, the average effect sizes for masculine ($d = .46$) and feminine ($d = .38$) sex-typed behaviors with significance were moderate. Effect size relates to whether the size of the sample was powerful enough to detect differences between the sample and the population.

Five toxic leader behaviors had effect sizes greater than or close to 1. The masculine sex-typed toxic leader behaviors with large effect sizes included telling employees to work not think ($d = 1.27$), slamming a fist on the table to emphasize a point ($d = 1.61$), threatening violence or physical abuse ($d = 1.50$), and shoving or blocking an employee ($d = .97$). The toxic dimension sex-typed as feminine that had the largest effect size was spreading gossip or rumors about employees ($d = 1.35$).

Table 4 presents the results of the One-sample *t*-test, including means, standard deviations, significance levels and effect sizes for the toxic leadership dimensions. Of the 10 dimensions, abusiveness, attack on follower's self esteem, lack of integrity, laissez-faire, and threat to followers' security were rated as more masculine than feminine and the differences were statistically significant. Each of the dimensions sex-typed as masculine had effect sizes ranging from $d = .57$ to $d = 1.23$, with the exception of lack of integrity $(d = .21)$.

Only two dimensions were perceived to be more feminine than masculine: excessive criticism and social exclusion. The effect sizes for each of these dimensions were small, $d = .12$ and $d = .30$, respectively. Three dimensions were found to be non-significant; there were no significant differences in the sex-typing of divisiveness, narcissism, or promoting inequity.

Table 4

Differences in Sex-Typing of Toxic Leader Behavior by Dimension

Dimension	Mean	SD	t	df	sig.	d
Abusiveness	3.63	.66	-9.811	299	.000	.57
Attack on follower's self esteem	3.58	.52	-13.712	299	.000	.80
Divisiveness	3.99	.61	-.336	299	.737	.02
Excessive criticism	4.08	.69	2.050	299	.041	.12
Lack of integrity	3.91	.42	-3.712	299	.000	.21
Laissez-faire	3.65	.58	-10.396	299	.000	.60
Narcissism	3.99	.59	-.341	299	.733	.02
Promoting inequity	3.98	.62	-.500	299	.618	.03
Social exclusion	4.33	1.11	5.153	299	.000	.30
Threat to followers' security	3.40	.49	-21.351	299	.000	1.23

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 posited that attitudes toward women as managers would be related to the sex-typing of toxic leader behaviors. Specifically, those with less favorable attitudes toward women as managers would assign feminine ratings of toxic leader behavior more so than masculine ratings. The analysis showed limited support for Hypothesis 2.

Table 5 shows the correlation between a participant's WAMS score and each toxic leader behavior dimension. Seven of the 10 toxic leader behavior dimensions showed negative and small correlations between WAMS and the feminine sex-typing of toxic leader behavior. Participants who had a more negative view of women as managers (lower WAMS score) were more likely to view that dimension of toxic leader behavior as feminine. Two dimensions, "attack on follower's self esteem" and "divisiveness" had correlations that were statistically significant and thus provided partial support for Hypothesis 2.

Table 5

Correlation of Women as Managers Scale and Sex-Typing of Toxic Leader Behaviors by Dimension

Dimension	Correlation with WAMS
Abusiveness	-.046
Attack on follower's self esteem	-.155**
Divisiveness	-.142**
Excessive criticism	.040
Lack of integrity	-.102
Laissez-faire	-.029
Narcissism	.023
Promoting inequity	-.042
Social exclusion	.113
Threat to followers' security	-.009

*p < .05

**p < .01

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Discussion

The results of this study indicated that participants were more likely to perceive and sex-type toxic leader behavior as more masculine than feminine. Although toxic leader behaviors assessed as more likely to be exhibited by a male leader comprised 58.3% of the total behaviors listed, 77% of the 61 behaviors that were statistically significant were sex-typed as masculine. The toxic leader behavior dimensions of abusiveness, attack on follower's self esteem, lack of integrity, laissez-faire and threat to follower's security were all significant and sex-typed by participants as masculine.

Although no specific hypotheses were made about the toxic leader dimensions, they offer a more parsimonious way to organize discussion of the exhaustive list of behaviors assessed in this research. Hypothesis 1 stated that overall, respondents would perceive toxic leader behaviors to be more masculine than feminine. The support for Hypothesis 1 was consistent with the findings of previous research that has shown men to engage in workplace

72

aggression (Baron et al., 1999; Rutter & Hine, 2005; Arnold et al., 2011, Lee & Brotheridge, 2011) and bullying behaviors more so than women (Namie & Namie, 2000; Ólafsson & Jóhannsdóttir, 2004).

Aggressive behaviors previously associated as more likely to be exhibited by a male included overt (explicit, such as yelling, physical abuse), direct (scapegoating others) and indirect (undermining subordinates) forms (Lee& Brotheridge, 2011; Rutter & Hine, 2005). The aggressive behaviors identified in previous studies as masculine are aligned with the toxic leader behaviors within dimensions participants sex-typed as masculine: abusiveness (emotional volatility), attack on follower's self esteem (demeaning, ridiculing), and threat to follower's security (exposing employees to an unmanageable workload, shoving or blocking an employee, threatening violence or physical abuse).

Bullying behaviors associated with male perpetrators in previous studies included general victimizing (degrading, excluding from work group, inflicting detrimental emotional experiences) and work-related bullying (excessive criticism, overwork, assignment of demeaning tasks; Ólafsson & Jóhannsdóttir, 2004). These behaviors are aligned with the toxic leader behaviors

within dimensions participants sex-typed as masculine: abusiveness (exhibiting excessive anger, shouting at employees, emotional volatility), attack on follower's self esteem (telling employees that their thoughts or feelings are stupid), and lack of integrity (scapegoating employees, blaming others for the leader's mistakes, failing to respond to concerns of employees, assigning tasks with unreasonable deadlines).

As discussed in the literature review, the concept of leadership has been distinctly attributed to men and characterized by masculine, agentic behavior. Aggressiveness, dominance, and forcefulness are agentic characteristic traits and feature heavily in the dimensions participants perceived as more masculine. Role congruity theory and its supporting research have shown that women managers have and continue to be devalued (although this devaluation is decreasing over time) as occupants and potential occupants of the leader role (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992; Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, & Reichard, 2008; Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011). If devaluation occurs when female leaders behave agentically due to the conflict between their sex

74

and leader roles, devaluation may increase when women exhibit toxic leader behaviors.

People holding hostile sexist beliefs are more likely to devalue women for not conforming to their sex role (Eagly & Karau, 2002). For the purpose of this study, negative attitudes toward women as managers was used as the marker of hostile sexist beliefs. Those with negative attitudes toward women as managers tend to view women as inappropriate choices for the leadership role. These beliefs are driven by viewing women as weak or ineffective when they lead with their stereotypical strengths (e.g., being kind, compassionate, nurturing). Conversely, people who hold hostile sexist beliefs about expected gender roles and leadership roles may also devalue women for conforming to the agentic, masculine qualities stereotypical of the leader role (e.g. dominant, aggressive, forceful, decisive) because they are not acceptable qualities for the female sex.

Toxic leader behavior is never considered a desirable leader characteristic, yet if toxic leader behavior is more attributable to the male leader, followers may be more accepting of toxic behavior when exhibited by a male over a female. Female leaders may receive harsher evaluations and

corrective actions for exhibiting the same behavior as their male counterparts. At the worst extreme, male leaders may be rewarded for acting abusively (autocratic and authoritarian) as this behavior is more historically acceptable. The male leader stereotype is characterized as dominant, aggressive, forceful and decisive. Leading in this manner is more forgivable if the leader is a male. The organization may revile women in leadership roles when they enact these same behaviors. As a function of hostile sexism, these behaviors are seen as uncharacteristic for the female sex. A consequence of inequitable corrective action may lead to an otherwise competent female leader being thrust from her position for behaviors that are correctable. A male leader may be offered counseling and training to correct toxic behavior while the female leader may never be given opportunity to correct her behavior.

Participants perceived excessive criticism and social exclusion as more feminine than masculine. Effect sizes were smaller for the feminine rated dimensions with social exclusion being the only feminine dimension with a medium effect size ($d = .30$). An explanation of this may be that certain groups are more sensitive to social exclusion. Hitlan, Clifton, & DeSoto (2006) found that men were more

sensitive (lower psychological health and job satisfaction) to social exclusion in the workplace. The female sex stereotype classifies women as more communal (concerned with the welfare of others and keeping harmony in groups) (Bakan, 1966; Eagly, 1987). Participants (most likely male), who may have been more sensitive to social exclusion in their personal life, may have viewed women as more likely to engage in social exclusion because females are more desensitized to the harmful effects of social exclusion. Females are more likely to experience social exclusion early in their childhood and may become better adjusted to handling exclusion from a social group (Espelage, Mebane, & Swearer, 2004; Hitlan et. al, 2006; Ostrov, Woods, Jansen, Casas, & Crick, 2004).

The finding that excessive criticism and social exclusion were perceived as more feminine is in contradiction to prior research on bullying that found these types of behaviors to be more likely to be exhibited by males (Ólafsson & Jóhannsdóttir, 2004). Trends in bullying have shown that the numbers of women bullying other women have increased over recent years (Workplace Bullying Institute, 2010). Perhaps the uptick in incidents

of bullying by women lead to the differences between this study and prior bullying research.

There was limited support for the correlation between attitudes toward women as managers and the sex-typing of toxic leader behaviors (Hypothesis 2). Correlations for the dimensions of attack on follower's self esteem and divisiveness were significant and had the strongest correlation among the dimensions, but were weak overall. Attack on follower's self esteem (demeaning, mocking, ridiculing) and divisiveness (inciting employees to chastise each other, ostracizing employees, pitting one employee or workgroup against each other) were more likely to be perceived as feminine by those with more negative attitudes toward women as managers. Overall, these two dimensions were not sex-typed as feminine; attack on follower's self esteem was masculine sex-typed and divisiveness was perceived as either a masculine or feminine set of behaviors.

An explanation of the correlation may be that the behaviors associated with attacks on follower's self esteem and divisiveness run counter to stereotypes of women revolving around their communal nature. Observers with negative attitudes toward women as managers hold stronger

sexist beliefs and devalue the communal stereotype of women as an uncharacteristic behavior for a leader. Communal behaviors are centered on a concern for people, and the dimensions assigned to female managers by those holding more negative attitudes toward women as managers may view women in the leadership role less favorably when she exhibits communal behaviors. If a woman is a leader, she is devalued when she behaves "like a woman". She is expected to behave in a masculine, agentic manner, as a leader is expected to act. Perhaps these observers felt that toxic leader behaviors that were more tied to issues involving group harmony and consideration behaviors (e.g., inclusiveness, compassion) were more likely the critical areas where women would fail in their leadership roles.

An interesting finding was the overall positive attitudes toward women as managers by the participants. Although there were significant differences between sexes, respondents generally had positive attitudes towards women as managers. As societal attitudes toward women as managers continue to improve, these changing views can only bode well for future female leaders. As Kulich et al.(2007) found, female leaders were judged more so on their perceived charisma and leadership ability in terms of

performance-based pay allocations than male leaders who were judged solely on their organization's performance. Only when female leaders are judged by factors beyond their sex, ideally by the same performance factors as men, will they have equality with male leaders in terms of evaluation and advancement into leadership.

Limitations of the Study

As with any research endeavor there are limitations to this study. The generalizability of the results of this study to organizations is limited by the sample that was used. The participants were undergraduate students and their responses may not reflect full-time working professionals or other industries. In acknowledgement of this limitation, the author only included participants who had indicated they had work experience.

As the sample was comprised of students in business and psychology, their coursework in these subjects may have included topics such as sexual discrimination and perceptual biases, thereby potentially influencing their WAMS ratings. They might have responded to the WAMS in a socially desirable manner. Future research should incorporate scales that take into account social desirability in respondents' answers.

A third limitation to this study is common when using correlation analyses. Correlation does not imply causation, and results should be interpreted with caution.

Toxic leader behavior dimensions were created to organize the vast listing of behaviors but were not factor analyzed to ensure the groupings were appropriate for the 84 variables. A factor analysis of dimensions, in conjunction with predictions about their sex-typing, could have contributed to a more robust examination of the sex-typing of toxic leader behavior based on categorical groupings.

Future Directions

This study sought to shed light on an unexamined aspect of toxic leader behavior. The existence of sex-typing of toxic leader behaviors opens the door to future research concerning toxic leadership and gender. Future research should examine whether female managers who exhibit toxic leader behavior are devalued to a greater extent than their male counterparts, or vice versa. Further, issues concerning possible differences in reward and punishment of toxic leader behaviors would form a practical implication for future research.

Future studies should also assess participants' levels of experience working with a male or female manager. Those who have worked with only a male leader, or with only a female leader, may be influenced (positively or negatively) based on their experiences.

Conclusion

In 2012, women are still fighting the battle for equal pay for equal work. As important is equal evaluation for equal behavior. Whether that behavior is exemplary or toxic, outcomes of a leader's behavior should be assessed equally regardless of sex-based stereotypes. This study adds to toxic leadership research and sex differences in leadership to help achieve these goals.

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Informed Consent

The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to examine aspects of leadership, leader behaviors, and participant attitudes. This study is being conducted by Lacee Vega-Cartwright, under the supervision of Dr. Kathie Pelletier, Assistant Professor of Management, California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino (Approval ID# 11111).

PURPOSE: The study is designed to examine participant attitudes toward leadership behaviors.

DESCRIPTION: In this study, you will be asked to evaluate organizational leaders' behaviors and to describe your attitudes by completing two surveys.

PARTICIPATION: Please understand that participation is completely voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will in no way affect your current or future relationship with your organization, university or its faculty, students, or staff. You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time without penalty. You also have the right to refuse to answer any question(s) for any reason, without penalty. In order to ensure the integrity

84

of this study, we ask that you not discuss this study with other students or coworkers.

ANONYMITY: All of your responses will be anonymous. No personally identifiable information will be collected. Your name will not be reported or grouped with your responses. All data will be reported in group form only. Your individual privacy will be maintained in all publications or presentations resulting from this study.

DURATION: We expect your participation to take no longer than 15-30 minutes.

RISKS & BENEFITS: There are no foreseeable risks or inconveniences associated with your participation in this study beyond those of daily living. When you have completed the survey, you will receive a debriefing statement that describes the study in more detail. We expect this research to benefit organizational behavior and leadership research by understanding how followers view leaders and their behaviors.

CONTACT: If you have any questions or would like additional information about this research, please contact me via e-mail: vegacarl@csusb.edu. You can also contact my project advisor by phone at 951-537-3752, or by e-mail: kpelleti@csusb.edu.

RESULTS: You may receive results of this study upon completion of the data collection that is estimated to be the end of Fall quarter 2012.

By placing an "X" in the space provided below, I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and that I understand the nature and purpose of the study, and I freely consent to participate. I also acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

Place an "X" here: _____   Date: _____

APPENDIX B

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

Debriefing Statement

Thank you for your participation in our research study examining toxic leader behaviors. The purpose of this study was to determine leader behaviors identified in the literature on destructive and toxic leadership that individuals perceive to be masculine or feminine. We also sought to determine how attitudes toward women as managers influence the choice of behaviors that are identified as either masculine or feminine. This study is being conducted by Lacee Vega-Cartwright in partial fulfillment of her master's project requirement.

Group-level results of this study can be obtained at the end of the Fall quarter of 2012 (no individual level data will be reported). If you would like more information about this study, please feel free to contact Dr. Kathie Pelletier at 909-537-3752 or by e-mail: kpelleti@csusb.edu

Once again, we ask that you not discuss this study with anyone. I want to thank you very much for your participation in this study and for completing the questionnaires.

APPENDIX C

TOXIC LEADER BEHAVIOR ASSESSMENT

Leader Behavior Assessment

Please indicate your perceptions of the leader behaviors
listed below by circling the answer that best describes
your perception. Simply stated, to what extent do you think
each behavior is more likely to be exhibited by a male
(masculine) or female (feminine)?

1 = Highly Masculine

2 = Masculine

3 = Somewhat Masculine

4 = Neither Masculine or Feminine

5 = Somewhat Feminine

6 = Feminine

7 = Highly Feminine

1. Telling employees to work and not think

2. Criticizing employees persistently

3. Making false statements about the competitor

4. Preventing employees from interacting with their
   coworkers

5. Asking an employee to falsify productivity figures to
   meet a goal

6. Playing favorites among subordinates

7.   Pressuring an employee not to claim something they are
     entitled to (vacation, sick leave, holiday, etc.)

8.   Shouting at employees

9.   Asking employees to work late to help a coworker
     complete a major project

10. Using authority or position for personal gain

11. Creating contests between two employees where winning
     involves marginalizing the work of the other

12. Assigning tasks with unreasonable deadlines

13. Not sticking to the plan of action

14. Raising voice when his/her point does not appear to be
     accepted by employees

15. Asking, "Is this the best you can do?"

16. Making an employee feel as though his or her job is in
     jeopardy

17. Exploiting others for their own gain

18. Telling employees that they are incompetent

19. Excessively monitoring an employee's work

20. Demanding to get his or her way

21. Seeming displeased with employees work for no apparent
     reason

22. Ignoring or excluding employees

23. Lying about the organization's performance at a company meeting

24. Telling an employee in public that he or she is not a team player

25. Hinting or signaling that an employee should quit their job

26. Excessively criticizing employees

27. Hanging a "wall of shame" bulletin board to post employee blunders as a display of humor

28. Insisting on doing things the old way

29. Refusing to take no for an answer

30. Publicly ridiculing an employee's work

31. Greeting some coworkers and ignoring others

32. Spreading gossip or rumors about employees

33. Reacting with hostility when approached by employees

34. Breaking promises that he/she makes

35. Invading an employee's personal space

36. Frequently reprimanding employees without explanation

37. Threatening to deny an employee's vacation request if a deadline is missed

38. Seeing all events in terms of significance to their own careers

39. Scapegoating employees

40. Giving resources only to departments whose functions make the leader look good

41. Lying to employees to get his or her way

42. Ordering work to be done beneath an employee's level of competence

43. Rewarding employees for bending rules to get a job done

44. Yelling when a deadline is missed

45. Inviting a select few to an important meeting

46. Being highly defensive when criticized

47. Exhibiting excessive anger towards employees

48. Bending the rules to achieve productivity goals

49. Reprimanding employees when they make a mistake

50. Demoting an employee without giving a good reason for the decision

51. Taking credit for an employee's work

52. Shoving or blocking an employee

53. Exposing employees to an unmanageable workload

54. Slamming a fist on the table to emphasize a point

55. Coercing employees to accept his or her ideas

56. Threatening to terminate an employee, even if the statement is made in a joking manner

57. Encouraging good performers to put pressure on poor performers

58. Telling employees that their thoughts or feelings are stupid

59. Failing to respond to concerns of employees

60. Reminding employees of past mistakes and failures

61. Threatening violence or physical abuse

62. Subjecting employees to excessive teasing and sarcasm

63. Making employees work until the job is done, even if it means they must work all night

64. Mocking employees as a display of humor

65. Being critical of employee's work when performed well

66. Inviting specific employees to social events (e.g., golfing, company parties) and excluding others

67. Ignoring employees' comments

68. Undermining competitors for promotion

69. Expressing rudeness to employees and others

70. Excessively self-promoting and attention-seeking

71. Making negative comments about an employee to others

72. Invading employee's privacy

73. Failing to disclose the reasons behind organizational decisions

74. Administering organizational policies unfairly

75. Saying to an employee "you just don't understand the problem"

76. Withholding information that would affect an employee's performance

77. Acknowledging some coworkers' contributions to a project but not all members of the project team

78. Throwing a tantrum when goals are not met

79. Harboring unfounded beliefs that others want to hurt them

80. Intimidating employees with finger-pointing

81. Expressing anger at an employee when he/she is mad at another

82. Blaming others for the leader's mistakes

83. Making insulting or humiliating remarks about an employee's attitudes or private life

84. Removing or replacing an employee's key area of responsibility with trivial or unpleasant tasks

Adapted from:

Ashforth, B. E. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations, 47(7),* 755-778.

Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and

conceptual model. *Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 207-216.

Lubit, R. (2002). The long-term organizational impact of

destructively narcissistic managers. *The Academy of*

Management Executive, 16(1), 127-138.

Pelletier, K. L. (2010). Leader toxicity: An empirical

investigation of toxic behavior and rhetoric. *Leadership,*

6(4), 373. doi:10.1177/1742715010379308

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision.

Academy of Management Journal, 43(2), 178-190.

APPENDIX D

ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN AS MANAGERS SCALE

People in Business

Considering the numbers from 1 to 7 on the rating scale circle your personal opinion about each statement. Remember, give your personal opinion according to how much you agree or disagree with each item.

1 = Strongly disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Slightly Disagree

4 = Neither agree nor disagree

5 = Slightly agree

6 = Agree

7 = Strongly Agree

1. It is less desirable for women than men to have a job that requires responsibility.

2. Women have the objectivity required to evaluate business situations properly.

3. Challenging work is more important to men than it is to women.

4. Men and women should be given equal opportunity for participation in management training programs.

5. Women have the capability to acquire the necessary skills to be successful managers.

6. On the average, women managers are less capable of

contributing to an organization's overall goals than are men.

7. It is not acceptable for women to assume leadership roles as often as men.

8. The business community should someday accept women in key managerial positions.

9. Society should regard work by female managers as valuable as work by male managers.

10. It is acceptable for women to compete with men for top executive positions.

11. The possibility of pregnancy does not make women less desirable employees than men.

12. Women would no more allow their emotions to influence their managerial behavior than would men.

13. Problems associated with menstruation should not make women less desirable than men as employees.

14. To be a successful executive, a woman does not have to sacrifice some of her femininity.

15. On the average, a woman who stays at home all the time with her children is a better mother than a woman who works outside the home at least half time.

16. Women are less capable of learning mathematical and mechanical skills than are men.

17. Women are not ambitious enough to be successful in the business world.

18. Women cannot be assertive in business situations that demand it.

19. Women possess the self-confidence required of a good leader.

20. Women are not competitive enough to be successful in the business world.

21. Women cannot be aggressive in business situations that demand it.

Demographic Information

1. Gender: Male ___ Female ___

2. Age in years ___

3. Work experience: Years ___ Months ___

4. Race (please check all that apply):

___ American Indian or Alaska Native

___ Asian

___ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

___ Black or African American

___ White

___ Other (specify): ___

Adapted from:

Terborg, J. R., Peters, L. H., Ilgen, D. R., & Smith, F. (1977). Organizational and personal correlates of attitudes toward women as managers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 89-100.

APPENDIX E

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER

Academic Affairs

May 16, 2012   *Office of Academic Research • Institutional Review Board*

Ms. Lacee Vega-Cartwright and Prof. Kathie Pelletier
c/o: Prof. Kathie Pelletier
Department of Management
California State University
5500 University Parkway
San Bernardino, California 92407

Dear Ms. Vega-Cartwright and Prof. Pelletier:

Your application to use human subjects, titled, "Gender Differences in Toxic Leader Behaviro" has been reviewed and approved by the Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of California State University, San Bernardino and concurs that your application meets the requirements for exemption from IRB review Federal requirements under 45 CFR 46. As the researcher under the exempt category you do not have to follow the requirements under 45 CFR 46 which requires annual renewal and documentation of written informed consent which are not required for the exempt review category. However, exempt status still requires you to attain consent from participants before conducting your research.

The CSUSB IRB has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval notice does not replace any departmental or additional approvals which may be required.

Although exempt from federal regulatory requirements under 45 CFR 46, the CSUSB Federal Wide Assurance does commit all research conducted by members of CSUSB to adhere to the Belmont Commission's ethical principles of respect, beneficence and justice. You must, therefore, still assure that a process of informed consent takes place, that the benefits of doing the research outweigh the risks, that risks are minimized, and that the burden, risks, and benefits of your research have been justly distributed.

You are required to do the following:

1) Protocol changes must be submitted to the IRB for approval (no matter how minor) before implementing in your prospectus/protocol. Protocol Change Form is on the IRB website.
2) If any adverse events/serious adverse/unanticipated events are experienced by subjects during your research. Form is on the IRB website.
3) And, when your project has ended.

Failure to notify the IRB of the above, emphasizing items 1 and 2, may result in administrative disciplinary action.

If you have any questions regarding the IRB decision, please contact Michael Gillespie, IRB Compliance Coordinator. Mr. Michael Gillespie can be reached by phone at (909) 537-7588, by fax at (909) 537-7028, or by email at mgillesp@csusb.edu. Please include your application identification number (above) in all correspondence.

Best of luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Sharon Ward, Ph.D

Sharon Ward, Ph.D, Chair
Institutional Review Board

SW/mg

cc: Prof. Kathie Pelletier, Department of Management

909.537.7588 • fax: 909.537.7028 • http://irb.csusb.edu/
5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393

The California State University · Bakersfield · Channel Islands · Chico · Dominguez Hills · East Bay · Fresno · Fullerton · Humboldt · Long Beach · Los Angeles
Maritime Academy · Monterey Bay · Northridge · Pomona · Sacramento · San Bernardino · San Diego · San Francisco · San Jose · San Luis Obispo · San Marcos · Sonoma · Stanislaus

103

REFERENCES

2010 WBI U.S. Workplace Bullying Survey. (n.d.). [Web

   page]. Retrieved from

   http://www.workplacebullying.org/wbiresearch/2010-wbi-

   national-survey/

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication*

   Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th

   ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological

   Association.

Arnold, K. A., Dupré, K. E., Hershcovis, M. S., & Turner,

   N. (2011). Interpersonal targets and types of workplace

   aggression as a function of perpetrator sex. *Employee*

   Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 23(3), 163-170.

Ashforth, B. E. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations.

   Human Relations, 47(7), 755-778.

Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Petty tyranny in organizations: A

   preliminary examination of antecedents and consequences.

   Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 14(2), 126-

   140.

Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of existence: Isolation and*

   communion in western man. Boston: Beacon Press.

Baron, R. A., Neuman, J. H., & Geddes, D. (1999). Social

   and personal determinants of workplace aggression:

104

Evidence for the impact of perceived injustice and the type A behavior pattern. *Aggressive Behavior, 25*(4), 281-296. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1999)25:4%3C281::AID-AB4%3E3.0.CO;2-J

Bass, B. M. (1988). Evolving perspectives on charismatic leadership. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 40-77). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, W. (2007). The challenges of leadership in the modern world: Introduction to the special issue. *American Psychologist, 62*(1), 2 - 5. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.2

Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (1998). Two faces of the powerless: Coping with tyranny in organizations. In *Power and influence in organizations* (pp. 203-13). Sage Publications, Inc.

Brenner, O. C., & Beutell, N. J. (2010). The effect of birth order and gender on American managers' attitudes toward female managers. The Journal of Social Psychology, 129(1), 57-64. doi:10.1080/00224545.1989.9711699

Burke, R. J. (2006). Why leaders fail: Exploring the dark side. In R. J. Burke & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Inspiring leaders* (pp. 237-46). London: Routledge.

Buss, A. H. (1961). *The Psychology of Aggression*. New York:
Wiley and Sons.

Carroll, L., Corning, A. F., Morgan, R. R., & Stevens, D.
M. (1991). Perceived acceptance, psychological
functioning, and sex role orientation of narcissistic
persons. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*.

Carroll, L., Hoenigmann-Stovall, G. I., & Whitehead, G. I.
I. (1996). The interpersonal impact of narcissism: A
comparative study of entitlement and self-absorption
factors. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality, 11*(3),
601-613.

Conger, J. A. (1988). Theoretical foundation of charismatic
leadership. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.),
*Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in
Organizational Effectiveness* (pp. 12-39). San Francisco:
Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J. A. (1989). *The Charismatic Leader: Behind the
Mystique of Exceptional Leadership*. San Francisco:
Jossey-Bass.

Davis, M. H., Capobianco, S., & Kraus, L. A. (2010). Gender
differences in responding to conflict in the workplace:
Evidence from a large sample of working adults. *Sex
Roles, 63*(7-8), 500-514. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9828-9

Dowd, M. (2006, October 11). How Carly lost her gender groove. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from NYTimes.com.

Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

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

Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 111*(1), 3.

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

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-revised. *Work and Stress, 23*(1), 24-44. doi:10.1080/02678370902815673

Emmons, R. A. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of the narcissistic personality inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*(3), 291-300.

Espelage, D. L., Mebane, S. E., & Swearer, S. M. (2004). Gender differences in bullying: Moving beyond mean level

differences. In D. Espelage and S. Swearer (Ed). *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Finkelstein, S. (2003). *Why smart executives fail and what you can learn from their mistakes*. New York: Portfolio.

Gender and Workplace Bullying. (2010). Gender and workplace bullying. [Web page]. http://www.workplacebullying.org/2010/09/05/2010_wbi_gender/

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 491. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491

Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. *Research in Organizational Behavior*.

Heilman, M. E. (1995). Sex stereotypes and their effects in the workplace: What we know and what we don't know. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality; Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*.

Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4),

657-674. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00234

Higgs, M. (2009). The good, the bad and the ugly:

Leadership and narcissism. *Journal of Change Management,*
9(2), 165-178. doi:10.1080/14697010902879111

Hitlan, R.T., Clifton, R., & DeSoto, M.C. (2006). Perceived

exclusion in the workplace: The moderating effects of

gender on work-related attitudes and psychological

health. *North American Journal of Psychology, 8*(2), 217-
235.

Johnson, C. (2008). The rise and fall of Carly Fiorina.

Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 15(2),

188-196. doi:10.1177/1548051808320983

Johnson, S. K., Murphy, S. E., Zewdie, S., & Reichard, R.

J. (2008). The strong, sensitive type: Effects of gender

stereotypes and leadership prototypes on the evaluation

of male and female leaders. *Organizational Behavior &*
Human Decision Processes, 106(1), 39-60.

Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A., & Ristikari,

T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-
analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological*
Bulletin, 137(4), 616-42. doi:10.1037/a0023557

Kulich, C., Ryan, M. K., & Haslam, S. A. (2007). Where is

the romance for women leaders? The effects of gender on

leadership attributions and performance-based pay.

Applied Psychology: An International Review, 56(4), 582-

601.

Lee, R. T., & Brotheridge, C. M. (2011). Sex and position

status differences in workplace aggression. *Journal of*

Managerial Psychology, 26(5), 403-418.

doi:10.1108/02683941111139010

Lewis, K. E. (2010). Then and now: A longitudinal study of

attitudes toward women as managers. International Journal

of Management & Information Systems (IJMIS), 14(5), 23-

29.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005a). The allure of toxic leaders: Why

followers rarely escape their clutches. *Ivey Business*

Journal, 69.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005b). *The allure of toxic leaders: Why*

we follow destructive bosses and corrupt politicians--and

how we can survive them. Oxford University Press, New

York.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005c). Toxic leadership: When grand

illusions masquerade as noble visions. *Leader to Leader,*

2005(36), 29-36.

Lubit, R. (2002). The long-term organizational impact of

destructively narcissistic managers. *The Academy of*

leadership attributions and performance-based pay.
Applied Psychology: An International Review, 56(4), 582-601.

Lee, R. T., & Brotheridge, C. M. (2011). Sex and position status differences in workplace aggression. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 26*(5), 403-418. doi:10.1108/02683941111139010

Lewis, K. E. (2010). Then and now: A longitudinal study of attitudes toward women as managers. International Journal of Management & Information Systems (IJMIS), 14(5), 23-29.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005a). The allure of toxic leaders: Why followers rarely escape their clutches. *Ivey Business Journal, 69.*

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005b). *The allure of toxic leaders: Why we follow destructive bosses and corrupt politicians--and how we can survive them.* Oxford University Press, New York.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005c). Toxic leadership: When grand illusions masquerade as noble visions. *Leader to Leader, 2005*(36), 29-36.

Lubit, R. (2002). The long-term organizational impact of destructively narcissistic managers. *The Academy of*

Management Executive, 16(1), 127-138.

Maccoby, M. (2007). *Narcissistic leaders: Who succeeds and who fails*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies.

Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 78-102.

Namie, G., & Namie, T. (2000). *The bully at work: What you can do to stop the hurt and reclaim your dignity on the job*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.

Ólafsson, R. F., & Jóhannsdóttir, H. L. (2004). Coping with bullying in the workplace: The effect of gender, age and type of bullying. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 32*(3), 319-333.

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

Ostrov, J. M., Woods, K. E., Jansen, E. A., Casas, J. F., Crick, N.R. (2004). An observational study of delivered and received aggression, gender, and social psychological adjustment in preschool. *Early Childhood Research*

Quarterly, 19, 355-371.

Pelletier, K. L. (2010). Leader toxicity: An empirical investigation of toxic behavior and rhetoric. *Leadership, 6*(4), 373. doi:10.1177/1742715010379308

Rayner, C. (1997). The incidence of workplace bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 7*(3), 199-208. Retrieved from

Rayner, C., & Cooper, C. (1997). Workplace bullying: Myth or reality-can we afford to ignore it? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 18*(4), 211-214.

Rayner, C., & Hoel, H. (1997). A summary review of literature relating to workplace bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 7*(3), 181-191.

Rayner, C., Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. (2002). *Bullying at Work: What We Know, Who is to Blame and What Can We Do.* London: Taylor and Francis.

Rutter, A., & Hine, D. W. (2005). Sex differences in workplace aggression: An investigation of moderation and mediation effects. *Aggressive Behavior, 31*(3), 254-270.

Schein, V. E. (1973). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57*(2), 95. doi:10.1037/h0037128

Sincoff, M. Z., Owen, C. L., & Coleman, J. W. (2009). Women
as managers in the united states and china: A cross-cultural study. Journal of Asia-Pacific Business, *10*(1),
65-79. doi:10.1080/10599230802711555

Spector, B. & Lane, H. (2007). Exploring the distinctions
between a high performance culture and a cult. *Strategy &
Leadership, 35*(3), 18-24.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). Using
multivariate statistics (4th ed.). New York: Harper
Collins.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision.
Academy of Management Journal, 43(2), 178-190.

Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work
organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda.
Journal of Management, 33(3), 261-289.

Terborg, J. R., Peters, L. H., Ilgen, D. R., & Smith, F.
(1977). Organizational and personal correlates of
attitudes toward women as managers. *Academy of Management
Journal,* 89-100.

*Toxic - Definition and More From the Free Merriam-Webster
Dictionary.* (n.d.). [Web page]. Retrieved from
http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/toxic

Yukl, G. A. (2010). *Leadership in Organizations*. Upper

Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.