Shady Strategic Behavior: Recognizing Strategic Behavior of Dark Triad Followers

Journal:	*Academy of Management Perspectives*
Manuscript ID	AMP-2017-0005.R3
Document Type:	Symposium
Keywords:	Leadership theories < Theoretical Perspectives, Behavior (General) < Behavior < Individual Level of Analysis < Organizational behavior < Topic Areas, Leadership < Group/team processes < Group Level of Analysis < Organizational behavior < Topic Areas, Group/team processes (General) < Group/team processes < Group Level of Analysis < Organizational behavior < Topic Areas

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Shady Strategic Behavior: Recognizing Strategic Behavior of Dark Triad Followers

Executive overview

The importance of strategic behavior in organizations has long been recognized. However, so far the literature has primarily focused on *leaders'* strategic behavior, largely ignoring *followers'* strategic behavior. In the present paper, we take a follower trait perspective to strategic follower behavior, specifically focusing on how followers' Dark Triad traits (i.e., narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy) influence their strategic behavior. We argue that Dark Triad related strategic follower behavior is likely to have negative effects for fellow organizational members and the organization as a whole. We also present 'red flag' behaviors that may signal followers' tendencies to engage in shady strategic behaviors. Then, we put forward factors that may mitigate or increase the occurrence of shady strategic behaviors of followers scoring high on Dark Triad traits, focusing especially on leader attributes and specifics of the organizational context. Finally, we discuss if and how followers' Dark Triad traits could benefit the organization, and highlight emerging issues in research on strategic follower behavior.

Keywords: Followers; Dark Triad Traits; Strategic Behavior; Leadership Interactions

Shady Strategic Behavior: Recognizing Strategic Behavior of Dark Triad Followers

While more research now acknowledges the role of followers in the leadership process, research to date still often puts emphasis on the reactions of followers towards leader behavior, rather than on followers taking an active role in organizations. For example, theory and research focusing on follower types (e.g., Kellermann, 2007; Thoroughgood, Padilla, Hunter, & Tate, 2012) differentiate followers depending on the way they react towards leader behavior. While types of followers can show more or less active reactions, they still very much relate to 'following' in the traditional sense: The leader is the central figure and the follower is seen as a hindrance, an enabler, or a henchman. The scant research that views followers as more pre-emptive individuals describes followers as 'serving' and eager to contribute to common organizational goals. For example, Campbell (2000, p 56) summarizes the research portraying pro-active followers as going "beyond mere job requirements", to be "actively engaged", to have "integrity", be "principled", and be "guided by higher values".

So far thus, the research on (pro-)active behavior of followers stressed its potential positive character. The question we pursue here looks at its 'darker' flip-side. Specifically, to turn around Campbell's summary, we ask here: "what if followers are guided by the wrong values, lack a moral compass and compassion for others, and use their position as follower to pursue their own goals?" In answering this question, we explore follower strategic behavior, focus on how followers may strategically attempt to achieve their own goals, rather than react to the goals set by the leader. Strategic behavior is of particular importance in organizations because not only is it directly linked to outcomes (e.g., Bruner, Goodnow, & Austin, 1956), but also because it takes into account potential future reactions of others (e.g., Burks, Carpenter, Götte, & Rustichini, 2008). Strategic behavior thus has a distinct temporal and relational as well as goal achievement component. Indeed, leaders and other organizational members can be the target of strategic followers' behavior in the sense that followers may try

to influence them purposefully to achieve their own goals, which could have potentially detrimental consequences for the organization and/or its members.

When focusing on the 'dark side' of followers' behavior from 'an aberrant personality, aberrant behavior' perspective (cf. Wille, De Fuyt, & De Clercq, 2013), it makes sense to consider followers' Dark Triad personality traits (narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). As such, we review and synthesize the literature on Dark Triad personality traits and their behavioral consequences in organizations. So far, research into organizational behavior linked to Dark Triad personality seems to mainly focus on direct negative outcomes of Dark Triad behavior but hardly considers that these behaviors can be used by followers in a strategic manner to achieve their own goals with a potentially longer-term perspective. Therefore, our review specifically highlights the potential of Dark Triad followers to engage in strategic behavior.

Discussing followers' Dark Triad related strategic behavior is relevant for three reasons: (1) Some Dark Triad followers might be keenly interested in being promoted to leader positions (e.g., Dahling, Whitaker, & Levy, 2009; Elliot & Thrash, 2001). Given that those in leadership positions usually have greater power, the position also offers the opportunity to cause greater damage (Wisse & Rus, 2013). This makes the detection of problematic behavior prior to a possible promotion important. (2) Oftentimes, leaders are viewed as the primary persons for developing and executing a strategy, and strategic behavior of followers is less expected. We posit that as a consequence, potential shady strategic behavior of followers may be less closely scrutinized and that organizations may miss out on opportunities to mitigate those destructive influence of Dark Triad followers. In addition to that, the current focus on leaders in the context of Dark Triad personalities in the work place limits our knowledge of these types of behavior across hierarchical levels. (3) We also contend that the strategical means one can employ are a function of one's role within the

organization. To put differently, although the general goals and behavioral tendencies of Dark Triad followers and leaders may not differ, the means they have at their disposal to attain their goals or act in line with their behavioral tendencies differ, and, consequently, their strategic behavior also differs.

In the following, we discuss the unique aspects of each Dark Triad trait to explain their impact on followers' strategic behavior. From each section, we deduct a list of 'red flag' strategic follower behaviors to more clearly indicate what organizations need to look out for. We then discuss how leaders and organizational context variables can play a role in structurally mitigating (or stimulating) self-interested and potentially destructive strategic behavior of followers in organizations. First, however, we discuss what we mean by strategic follower behavior.

STRATEGIC FOLLOWER BEHAVIOR

Strategic behavior involves setting goals, determining actions to achieve these goals, and mobilizing resources to complete these actions (Mintzberg, 1987). Strategic behavior thus is more than merely setting goals; it also entails the planning and execution of behaviors that make realizing these goals possible. Bruner et al. (1956, p. 54) state that "A strategy refers to a pattern of decisions in the acquisition, retention, and utilization of information that serves to meet certain objectives, i.e., to insure certain forms of outcome and to insure against certain others." Although strategic behavior operates primarily on the level of concrete activities, it also requires elaborate decision making. Strategic follower behavior thus includes decision making regarding the goals the follower wants to achieve and action taken to achieve these goals. This is in line with what most goal pursuit models portray (Gollwitzer, 1996). These models usually describe several phases in the goal pursuit process. The first phase is pre-decisional and occurs when preferences are determined and deliberated upon. Then, the person determines the desired preferences for pursuit and when, where, and how to start.

Finally, the person initiates action and continues until the desired outcomes are achieved. Important to keep in mind here is the anticipatory nature of strategic behavior, including taking into account the likely reaction of others. Strategic follower behavior can thus involve any type of behavior that is goal oriented and takes place in the leadership context. An example is for instance an employee who wants to see the travel budget increased, who seeks support for the idea from fellow team members, and then tries to get the team leader to make an appeal to the management team of the organization. Another, totally different example, could be the employee who likes to see herself promoted and therefore ingratiates herself with her supervisor by making jokes, taking dull chores of the supervisor's hands, and agreeing with him or her on important matters.

An issue that is important to consider here is the matter of whether or not strategic follower behavior can be self-serving, toxic, or destructive in nature. We argue here that it can be. Although followers are expected to create value to organizations or to contribute to the accomplishment of shared organizational objectives (see Yukl, 2010; Zoogah, 2014), in reality, followers sometimes fail to pursue shared objectives and instead pursue their own interests (Chappell & Di Martino, 2006). Indeed, the normative expectation of what a follower ought to do does not need to coincide with the actual behavior that is exhibited. In fact, it does not preclude follower goal-oriented behavior that is abusive, harmful to others, or otherwise unethical (Kellerman, 2007; Riggio, Chaleff, & Lipman-Blumen, 2008; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Strategic follower behavior can therefore also be self-serving, counterproductive, political, or destructive. We argue here that particular types of followers are prone to showing this kind of negative strategic behavior, namely those who score higher on Dark Triad personality traits.

Indeed, people's goal striving is influenced by their personality traits, and this includes Dark Triad traits. Trait activation theory (e.g., Christiansen & Tett, 2008) would stipulate that

the Dark Triad traits can be seen as latent propensities to behave in a certain way as a response to trait relevant cues. Given that expressing one's traits is intrinsically satisfying, followers are likely to feel good about expressing their Dark Triad traits in various organizational contexts. The functionalist approach to personality offers a similar viewpoint, as it sees personality as a factor that affects strategies that individuals employ for improving the quality of their lives (Harms, Spain, & Wood, 2014). The functionalist approach further argues that each trait comes with its own pattern of motives, abilities, schemas, set of expectations, as well as perceptual biases, leading people who score high on a certain trait to approach organizational situations in a specific manner (see Harms et al., 2014). As we delineate in the below, followers high in Dark Triad personality traits are likely to have self-serving preferences making them eager to strive for goals that fulfill these intrinsic values or that support their personal self-concept (see Sheldon & Elliot, 1999). Their actions aimed at achieving their self-interested goals can be negative or harmful to others. Depending on the type of Dark Triad personality they possess, their strategic behavior may differ, for instance, as a result of their (competence in) anticipating the future and of others' reactions. In the following, we first discuss in more detail what Dark Triad traits are and then explain how each may affect strategic follower behavior.

DARK TRIAD TRAITS AND STRATEGIC FOLLOWER BEHAVIOR

"Although all 3 of the Dark Triad members are predisposed to engage in exploitative interpersonal behavior, their motivations and tactics vary." (Jones & Paulhus, 2017, p.1)

The Dark Triad is a constellation of three socially aversive, partly overlapping, traits: narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy (Jones & Paulhus, 2014). The three traits are all characterized by the tendency to influence others for selfish gains. They are associated with an instrumental approach to people and organizations and they correlate positively with disagreeableness (Jonason & Webster, 2010). Yet, they can also be distinguished from each

other in various ways. Indeed, each of the three Dark Triad traits can be recognized by its own specific pattern of motives, abilities, perceptions, and employed tactics (Harms et al., 2014; Jones & Paulhus, 2017). Narcissism stands out from the other two Dark Triad traits in terms of a particularly strong sense of entitlement and self-importance, and a high need for power (Paulhus, 2014; Harms et al., 2014). Machiavellianism is characterized by a particularly cynical take on human nature and a calculating and deceitful interpersonal style (Christie & Geis, 1970). Psychopathy – often viewed as the darkest of the Dark Triad (cf. Krasikova, Green, & LeBreton, 2013) – is characterized by a lack of empathy and feelings of remorse, as well as a reckless and manipulative interpersonal style (Cleckley, 1941). Most recent research on the role of the Dark Triad traits in the work context focuses on sub-clinical levels and gradual differences of the traits rather than on the clinical extremes (see for instance Harms & Spain, 2015; Spain, Harms, & LeBreton, 2014).

Importantly, the follower role provides specific opportunities to express Dark Triad traits and these behavioral expressions differ from, for example, the trait expression of leaders. One reason for these differences in trait expression between leaders and followers relates to power differences. In general, followers have less power than leaders do. Compared to those in a leader position, followers have less control over decisions, the allocation of resources, and the administration of rewards and punishments (Yukl & Falbe, 1991; Rus, van Knippenberg, & Wisse, 2010). Previous research has shown that power allows people to act in line with their internal traits (Weick & Guinote, 2008). However, as followers, in general, have less power than leaders, this implies that their behavior is more restricted because of their dependence on others and the need to adhere to the rules set forth by the leader. This, in turn, has consequences for their strategic behavior. First, it might mean that followers have to be more covert in terms of expressing their traits, especially in attempts to influence their leader (Kelner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003). Although strategically influencing the leader may be

particularly helpful in trying to achieve certain goals, followers are subjected more strongly to social constraints when dealing with a person high in power. Trait imbued strategic behavior that involves co-workers may, in this respect, be more easy given followers' equal power position to co-workers. Furthermore, followers typically have fewer resources at their disposal (in terms of decision latitude, contacts, information etc.) than leaders, and thus have fewer options when it comes to expressing their internal traits, and therefore, in a way have to be more strategic about their strategic behavior.

In sum, followers scoring high in Dark Triad traits reflect in specific ways on situations in order to achieve their strategic goals, make certain decisions on how and when to act, and are predisposed to respond to situations in unique ways. We also posit that these behavioral expressions are influenced by their role as followers and the (lack of) power that comes with this role.

Narcissism

> *"Narcissists think that everything that happens around them, in fact, everything that others say and do, is or should be about them" (Babiak & Hare, 2006: 40).*

Narcissism is probably the most well-researched Dark Triad trait with respect to workplace behavior and outcomes (Grijalva & Harms, 2014). Narcissists have a strong sense of entitlement and a constant need for attention and admiration. They are arrogant and consider themselves to be superior to others (Nevicka, Ten Velden, De Hoogh, & Van Vianen, 2011; Raskin & Terry, 1988). The behavior of narcissists is mainly motivated by the goal to protect their grandiose self-views. According to Back and colleagues (2013) narcissists use two different ways to do so, namely, assertive self-enhancement (narcissistic admiration) and antagonistic self-protection (narcissistic rivalry). These strategies are tied to different behaviors: charmingness for admiration (self-assured, dominant, and expressive behaviors), and aggressiveness for rivalry (annoyed, hostile, and socially insensitive

behaviors). These behaviors are linked to interactions with others and how narcissists behave towards others to achieve their goal of protecting their grandiose self-views. This makes them particularly relevant for strategic behavior. In the following, we review what we know about narcissists and their behavior in the workplace and highlight problematic strategic behaviors.

Narcissism and follower strategic behavior in the work context

Narcissists' strategic behavior in terms of goal pursuit and the behavior linked to achieving those goals is not likely to be positive for organizational effectiveness. For example, Chatterjee and Hambrick (2007) investigated the relationship between narcissism and organizational strategy, acquisitions, and organizational performance. They found that narcissistic CEOs "favor bold actions that attract attention". That companies with a narcissistic CEO had more extreme and fluctuating performance than companies with a non-narcissistic CEO, further testifies to the idea that for narcissists attention (almost at any cost) is the main driver of behavior.

Grandiose narcissists "need a stage to shine" (Nevicka et al., 2011) and are likely to make strategic choices that enable them to do so, regardless of the costs to others (related to narcissistic admiration in the sense of Back et al., 2013). As an example of strategic behavior of narcissists that relates to followers, Spain et al. (2014) showed that narcissists only show OCB behavior if it allows them to present themselves favorably, that is, if it is observable by others. So even potentially positive behavior of narcissistic followers may serve the function of pursuing own goals. That also makes it likely that narcissistic followers make very clear choices in terms of which OCB behaviors are strategically useful to them. Overall, when narcissistic followers are confronted with situations that may offer strategic value for them to achieve their goal of preserving their grandiose self-views, they first decide how the situation can benefit them and which following behavior they can show to take advantage of the

situation. Rather than asking how these situations can be addressed for the good of the company, they focus on how the situation affects them personally.

Narcissists appear to have a higher likelihood to be selected as leaders (Grijalva, Harms, Newman, Gaddis, & Fraley, 2015), though this seems to be only the case when they are newer to a team (Ong, Roberts, Arthur, Woodman, & Akehurst, 2016). This chimes with their need to shine and outshine others. Campbell and Campbell (2009) argue that, in the longer term, narcissistic leadership is characterized by overconfident decision making, volatile leadership performance, and poor management. Combining these considerations with findings by Judge, LePine, and Rich (2006) that narcissism is positively related to self-ratings of leadership but that it is negatively related to other ratings of leadership, again highlights the problematic nature of narcissistic leadership. Thus, narcissists over-estimate themselves with regard to their performance which is also problematic in terms of follower behavior. We argue here that in order to keep up their image both to themselves and others, they are more likely to over-claim their influence as well as claim responsibility for others' success. Publically taking credit for someone else's work, in the long run serves the goal of achieving promotion and thus confirming their grandiose self-view. Narcissists also over-rate their own creativity highly where others see no difference between them and non-narcissists in terms of creative performance (Goncalo, Flynn, & Kim, 2010). However, narcissists seem to be good at convincing others that they are creative (Goncalo et al., 2010). Again, this refers to over-claiming and possibly taking undue credit. Interestingly, research has shown that follower narcissism is positively related to supervisor ratings of employee innovative behavior (Wisse, Barelds, & Rietzschel, 2015). Thus, the danger is that narcissistic followers get away with their over-claiming, ultimately to the detriment of actual creativity and innovation.

In general, narcissism is also related to counter-productive work behavior (CWB; see meta-analyses by O'Boyle, Forsyth, Banks, & McDaniel, 2012 and Grijalva & Newman,

2015). Grijalva et al. (2015) found in a large scale online study that particularly the exploitative/entitlement dimension of narcissism is positively related to CWB. As narcissists' sense of entitlement makes them less likely to feel bound by rules, they presumingly do not see anything wrong with their own counter-productive work behavior.

The behaviors outlined above mainly refer to assertive self-enhancement (Back et al., 2013). Alternatively, narcissists could interpret follower situations as threatening to their goal of preserving their grandiose self-views, for example when they receive feedback. In such cases, narcissists may opt for a more aggressive response (Bushman & Thomaes, 2011) related to narcissistic rivalry (Back et al., 2013), such as reacting hostile to the respective leader. Recent research has found that narcissists tend to devalue the source of advice (Kausel, Culbertson, Leiva, Slaughter, & Jackson, 2015). Therefore, a strategic behavior of narcissists could be to undermine the leader as a source of negative feedback to distract from their own mistakes. We argue here that there are situations where narcissists can act for the good of the organization, but the motivation is always their own self-enhancement.

According to Campbell (1999), narcissists are attracted to those who serve as a means to enhance their self-esteem (i.e., "trophy" partners and friends). The same is likely true in organizational contexts, in that narcissists are likely to relate to those that make them feel good (Campbell, Hoffman, Campbell, & Marchisio, 2011). That means that in terms of relationships in the workplace, narcissistic followers will focus on few others in the organization in whose glory they can bask. Therefore, their behavior towards those 'trophies' might differ from their behavior towards others in the organization as it is important to the narcissist not to lose those relationships. Table 1 shows 'red flag' behaviors for each of the Dark Triad traits.

Machiavellianism

"A wise ruler ought never to keep faith when by doing so it would be against his interests."

— *Niccolò Machiavelli, The Prince*

Machiavellians are sly, deceptive, distrusting, and manipulative. They are characterized by cynical and misanthropic beliefs, callousness, a striving for agentic goals (i.e., money, power, and status), and the use of cunning influence tactics (Christie & Geis, 1970). In contrast to narcissists, Machiavellians do not necessarily have to be the center of attention and are satisfied with the role of puppeteer, unobtrusively pulling the strings. They are also not impulsive (in contrast to psychopaths) and rather act in a calculating manner. Machiavellians have the tendency to value expediency over relationships and, as such, have little difficulty to choose personal gain over the interests of others (Sakalaki, Richardson, & Thepaut, 2007; Wilson, Near, & Miller, 1996). In sum, Machiavellians tend to regard others as means to their own ends (Burris, Rempel, Munteanu, & Therrien, 2013). This makes them particularly prone to using strategic behaviors to pursue their own goals and they lie, cheat, and scheme in order to get what they want.

Machiavellianism and follower strategic behavior in the work context

Machiavellians are politically oriented and view the world through a self-interested lens (Christie & Geis, 1970). Typically, Machiavellians are considered to enjoy and excel in strategic behaviors. In fact, in studies on the effects of the three Dark Triad traits, Machiavellianism is most often regarded as linked to strategic action.

Machiavellians' commitment to agentic goals is likely to stimulate them to thoroughly scan the organizational arena for opportunities to maximize their own profits (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999). This increases their chances to identify situations that offer strategic value for them personally. Moreover, Machiavellians are not impulsive and are likely to methodically engage in the process of reflecting on strategic opportunities and the consequences of potential response options. When deciding on a strategic goal, they prioritize goals that maximize their personal benefit (Sakalaki et al., 2007). During this process of reflection, they

tend to regard other organizational members, such as their leader and team members, to be untrustworthy and self-interested individuals (Sakalaki et al., 2007). Given their distrust of others, they may mainly consider options where the influence of others is minimal or can be controlled. Machiavellians are likely to weigh the controllability and feasibility of the potential strategic options and evaluate those options more favorably if they perceive that they could control the situation and if self-interested outcomes are more likely. Thus, in terms of strategic follower behavior, Machiavellians will show strategic behavior that carefully considers both others and the outcome of their behavior while trying to keep this behavior unnoticed.

It has been posited that Machiavellians are unwilling to share knowledge with others because knowledge is a source of competitive advantage that Machiavellians would rather keep to themselves (Liu, 2008). That is, Machiavellians use hiding knowledge as a strategic behavior to further their own advantage in an organization. Moreover, given their lack of communal orientation (Rauthmann & Kolar, 2013a), they would consider lying, cheating, and misrepresenting information if that helps them to control the situation.

Machiavellians also have a higher overall tendency to engage in counterproductive work behaviors, which includes harmful interpersonal acts similar to abuse (Dahling et al., 2009), and bullying at work (Pilch & Turska, 2015). However, Wisse and Sleebos (2016) found that Machiavellianism is positively related to abuse in work teams, only for people occupying a strong and powerful position at work. Apparently, a strong power position allows Machiavellians to safely engage in such behaviors without having to be afraid of repercussions. These findings suggest that Machiavellians may strategically use abusive means to get their way if they feel they can safely do so. In other words, their destructiveness is closely tied to their perceptions of how to further their self-interest: if being destructive helps them to achieve their goals, they do it (see Kessler et al., 2010). Notably, this focus on

self-interest has for instance been used to explain why there is a positive relationship between Machiavellianism and self-related work commitment (career commitment), and a negative relationship between Machiavellianism and other-related work commitment (organizational, supervisor, and team commitment; Becker & O'Hair, 2007; Zettler, Friedrich, & Hilbig, 2011). Again highlighting that Machiavellians are only committed to pursuing their own goals and are strategic in doing so.

Machiavellians are also apt at forming political alliances and cultivating a charismatic image (Deluga, 2001). These are useful competencies, because being able to form coalitions with other organizational members while keeping a charming front adds to the effectiveness of strategic behavior of followers. Several studies focus on Machiavellians' use of behavioral influence tactics. Jonason, Slomski, and Partyka (2012) found that Machiavellianism was associated with an increased use of both hard tactics (e.g., threats and attempts at manipulation) and soft tactics (e.g., ingratiation, offering to exchange a favor, and compromise). Jonason and Webster (2012) found that Machiavellians favor the manipulation of others (see also Table 1) and that they use the tactics of seduction and charm to do so (also see Austin, Farrelly, Black, & Moore, 2007). Again, this points to the idea that Machiavellians use whatever means needed to get their way. In getting their goals on the agenda or in making sure that they reach their strategic goals they use a host of different influence tactics on both their leader as well as on other organizational members, and they are able to reach their goals through negotiation (Christie & Geis, 1970).

This would benefit such followers for instance in negotiations with their leader on salary, promotions, and the acquisition of high status roles. Machiavellians' successful behavior in strategic situations does not seem to stem from superior emotional intelligence, perspective taking or empathy, and emotion recognition; relationships with these variables are commonly found to be absent or negative (Austin et al., 2007; Petrides, Vernon, Schermer, & Veselka,

2011; Jones & Paulhus, 2009). Notably, it seems that particularly more intelligent Machiavellians tend to be successful strategists because they have the ability to match their intentions (Spain et al., 2014).

Psychopathy

"This applies equally to corporate psychopaths; they will often take risks where others would hesitate, and may well win big on occasions, but they care not for the consequences, for themselves or others, when their high risk strategies fail."

(http://www.remorselessfiction.com)

By enjoying the infliction of harm on others, psychopaths are often viewed as the most malevolent ones of the Dark Triad (Paulhus, 2014). They distinguish themselves from narcissists and Machiavellians by deficits in self-control (i.e., impulsivity, antisocial behavior), and affective experience (i.e., callousness, lack of empathy, and feelings of guilt). They are characterized by a short-term focus, a penchant for lying to gain immediate rewards, social disinhibition, recklessness, fearlessness, and bold behavior (e.g., Jones & Paulhus, 2014; Levenson, Kiehl, & Fitzpatrick, 1995). Interpersonally, they can be perceived as charismatic due to their impression management skills (Babiak, Neumann, & Hare, 2010), but often have anti-social tendencies and an erratic lifestyle (Hare, 1999).

Psychopathy and follower strategic behavior in the work context

In the work place, psychopathic traits may have some adaptive outcomes for the psychopaths themselves but often times it is associated with maladaptive outcomes for other people in the organization (cf. O'Boyle et al., 2012). Surprisingly, although they have low regard for others and are more likely to engage in both organizational counterproductive work behavior (CWB) and interpersonal CWB, they are often perceived as charismatic and strategic thinkers (Babiak et al., 2010). So even when their behavior is at odds with being strategic, they are still perceived as such.

In terms of the Dark Triad, psychopaths will likely succeed less than Narcissists and Machiavellians in using strategic follower behavior due to their impulsiveness. However, that does not mean that they would not attempt to do so and can, under certain circumstances (e.g., organizational latitude, susceptible co-workers), be successful in using strategic behaviors even though their strategic decision-making may be less elaborate. Particularly in high velocity organizational environments or with a supervisor who approves of speedy action, their fast and bold decision making (Jones, 2014) might actually have some strategic value. For instance, high velocity organizational environments are characterized by ideas such as “The worst decision is no decision at all”, “We're aggressive. We make things happen.”, and “Big opportunities go by if you don't act quickly” (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 550), in those environments psychopathic followers’ impulsiveness and their reluctance to take into account the consequences of their decisions for others may actually be rewarded (see also Table 1).

Their strong competitive orientation (Ryckman et al., 1990) and strive for dominance (Semenyna & Honey, 2015) predisposes followers scoring high on psychopathic traits to search for situations in which they can outperform others. Indeed, those with higher scores on psychopathic traits enjoy rivalry and pitting the strong against the weak (cf. Miner, 2006). As such, they are likely to make choices that not only make them look superior but also make others look inferior. Their strategic decision-making in terms of the goals they pursue and the means they use to achieve these goals is further characterized by their ruthlessness. They are unlikely to consider the needs and wishes of others and are unafraid of crossing moral boundaries. For instance, Jones (2013) found that psychopathy was positively associated with gambling with someone else’s money (but not with their own money). This also suggests that their fearless, bold, and risky decisions may involve a big risk for others (but less so for themselves).

It has been argued that the prevalence of psychopathy, with numbers ranging from four (Babiak & Hare, 2006) to 21 percent (Brooks & Fritzon, 2016), is higher in top positions than in the general population. Hence, followers with psychopathic traits must do something right in strategic terms to be able to climb the hierarchical ladder successfully. On the one hand, this could be due to psychopathic followers' desire and motivation to gain more power and a higher salary (cf. Boddy, 2011c). On the other hand, in some cases, the qualities of the psychopathic individual align well with the vision and mission of the organization they work in, providing them a strategic advantage in those types of organizations. O'Boyle et al. (2012) discuss, for example, that psychopaths are likely to thrive in organizations that require a rational and emotionless behavioral style, a strong achievement focus, the willingness to take risks, and a charismatic appearance (see also DePaulo, 2010; Yang & Raine, 2008). Even the anti-social and rule breaking tendencies of those with higher psychopathy scores may reflect well on them when it is perceived by others as questioning the status quo instead of being rooted in self-interested motives. In a similar vein, their focus on immediate rewards may lead to a lack of loyalty to their supervisor and a questioning of the authority of the supervisor (Miner, 2006) thereby ignoring any existing power structures. However, this may cause them to appear impressive, rather than egotistic, for co-workers who are dissatisfied with the supervisor. Hence, especially when others are unsatisfied with the situation and/or the leader, followers with higher psychopathic traits may seize the opportunity to break rules and questioning the status quo while gaining recognition from others.

Another strategic behavior psychopaths may make use of is to distract the attention of others away from their own personal agendas. By creating chaos in the organization, as well as in co-workers' personal lives, they can pursue personal agendas without detection (cf. Boddy, 2011a; Cohen, 2016). They do not only enjoy hurting people, they strategically use humiliation and bullying to direct other people's attention away from their hidden selfish

activities (Clarke, 2005; Hare, 1999). Other ways to direct coworkers' attention away from the task at hand is to lure them into an erratic lifestyle (going out often, and/or substance abuse), or seduce them into starting a (short term) romantic relationship. Previous research has also suggested that psychopaths may engage in counterproductive work behaviors as a means to distract coworkers from their work and to pursue their own goals (Wu & LeBreton, 2011; see also Table 1). Hence, psychopaths' typical weaknesses such as their impulsivity, risky decision-making, lack of regard for others and disrespect for authority figures may emerge under certain conditions as strategic strengths.

-- Insert Table 1 about here --

THE ROLE OF THE LEADER AND THE CONTEXT IN STRATEGIC FOLLOWER BEHAVIOR

We have so far focused on individual behaviors that Dark Triad personalities use to pursue their own goals. Now, we turn to the question how leaders and the organizational context can foster or reduce the occurrence of negative strategic behaviors of Dark Triad followers. The notion that followers, leaders, and context together determine the extent to which certain behaviors are likely to surface has been discussed by Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser (2007). In their toxic triangle model, they discuss that the characteristics of the leaders, followers, and environmental context together determine whether destructive organizational behavior takes place. For instance, people with a predisposition to act in a destructive manner are more likely to act accordingly when the context is conducive of such behaviors and when other individuals (e.g., leaders) provide them with the possibility to display destructive behaviors. When the context and others are less permissive, destructive tendencies of people may be reined in more easily. In fact, drawing on trait expression theory (Christiansen & Tett, 2008), we argue that while a trait is unlikely to change, the way in which and the frequency by which it is expressed can be altered. Thus, rather than trying to

change the traits of followers, the focus should be on how to change the manifestation of the trait. In terms of strategic follower behavior, consequently, the issue is how the leader and/or the context can affect the expression of Dark Triad traits in followers.

Leadership styles. In previous research, two leadership styles have been explicitly considered in the discussion about curbing the negative behaviors of Dark Triad employees. Specifically, it has been argued that *transformational leadership* can stimulate Machiavellian followers to engage in positive strategic behavior (contributing ideas, taking initiative, and voicing issues) on behalf of the organization, instead of themselves (Belschak, Den Hartog, & Kalshoven, 2015). In a related study, Belschak and colleagues (2015) show that transformational leaders were able to increase Machiavellian followers' organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) by providing them with more autonomy and enhancing their intrinsic motivation.

In addition to transformational leadership, ethical leadership is relevant for shady strategic follower behavior. Ethical leaders are honest, fair, caring, and principled individuals who frequently communicate with their followers about ethics, set clear ethical standards, and use rewards and punishments to regulate that those standards are abided (Brown & Trevino, 2006). By doing so, they may serve as proactive role models for ethical conduct. Indeed, research on so-called trickle down models has demonstrated that the ethical tone at the top trickles down to lower levels in the organization making the organization as a whole more ethical (Mayer, Kuenzi, Greenbaum, Bardes, & Salvador, 2009). Furthermore, by rewarding and punishing specific behaviors, they may steer the strategic behavior of Dark Triad followers in a more positive direction as Dark Triad personalities have been shown to be sensitive to rewards (Gray & McNaughton, 2000) and, at times, also to punishments (Jonason & Jackson, 2016). Thus, transformational and ethical leadership may hinder the display of unwanted or egocentric strategic behavior of Dark Triad followers.

Leader power. The influence of leadership on strategic follower behavior is, however, also likely to depend on the actual power a leader has. Leader power can influence in how far he or she can manage Dark Triad followers and address their strategic behavior. For example, if leaders do not have reward or punishment power, they are likely to find it more difficult to mitigate Dark Triad follower behavior. In order to do so, they would have to make a case towards their own supervisor, rather than being able to react directly. We assume that Dark Triad followers thrive in a context where their own direct leader has little power and this lack of leader power can add to the breadth of strategic behavior they can and will use.

Leader traits and values. At the same time, leaders' personality and values might make them vulnerable to the influence of strategic follower behavior and add to the extent to which strategic behavior of Dark Triad followers are displayed. For example, leaders with an unclear self-concept, low self-esteem, and/or a strong preference for being liked, may be vulnerable to the strategic actions of followers with higher scores on Dark Triad traits, and may be unable to ward off such behaviors (Thoroughgood et al., 2012). Leaders may also actively choose to provide the opportunity for the self-interested strategic behavior of Dark Triad followers. They may think that by doing so, they increase their chances for personal gain or they may do so because they share congruent values and goals (Thoroughgood et al., 2012).

The possibility of sharing congruent values raises the question of what happens when Dark Triad followers are supervised by Dark Triad leaders. While a positive impact on work behaviors of similar personalities is likely for some traits, such as conscientiousness (e.g., Antonioni & Park 2001), for other traits dissimilarity can be more advantageous in the work context (Kristof-Brown et al. 2005). The effects of similarity in leader and follower Dark Triad traits might also depend on the specific Dark Triad traits. As only one person can be in the limelight, narcissistic followers and leaders might clash (cf. Wisse et al., 2015), so

narcissistic followers may find their strategic behavior obstructed by narcissistic leaders. When Machiavellian employees have Machiavellian leaders, their trust in their leader significantly decreases, and their level of stress significantly increases (Belschak, Muhammad, & Den Hartog, in press). It would be interesting to see how that affects their (success in employing) strategic behaviors. Little is known about the combination of psychopathy in leaders and followers, but from literature on mate choices we known that psychopaths tend to flock together (Jonason, Lyons, & Blanchard, 2015): Apparently they get something out of being close to another psychopath. Organizations need to be aware of these interaction effects between leader and follower traits and leader and follower behavior in order not to let strategic behavior spiral out of control.

Organizational context. In terms of organizational context, several conditions can facilitate or hamper the strategic behavior of Dark Triad followers. Cohen (2016) argues that *(perceived) accountability* is relevant to mitigating the counterproductive behavior of Dark Triad employees as it entails that employees have to justify their behavior(cf. Padilla et al.'s, 2007, argument about 'checks and balances'). For example, Rus, van Knippenberg, and Wisse (2012) found that accountability alleviates the effect of power on self-serving leader behavior, meaning that accountability puts constraints on the expression of behavior in the workplace.

In addition, Cohen argues that organizational *ambiguity* which "[…] often derives from the unclear articulation of required role expectations, work methods, or performance contingencies" (2016: 77) can stimulate Dark Triad trait expressions (also see Padilla et al., 2007). Neves and Schyns (2017), for example, argue that change is a context that can foster negative behavior as it characterized by instability. That is, some processes in organization are by their nature more conducive to the expression of negative behavior.

Furthermore, *climate or culture* (a set of meanings, assumptions, values, and norms that are shared within an organization, Schein, 1992) may affect the extent to which the Dark Triad traits of followers are reflected in their behavior. Cohen argues that an unethical climate sets norms that are in line with the behavior of Dark Triad personality followers (also see Boddy, 2011b). This is in line with our argument above that where leader and follower values are congruent, negative follower strategic behavior is more likely to manifest.

Finally, when followers have the freedom and discretion to act at will in the work place, that is, when they have high job autonomy, they are in a better position to act in line with their Dark Triad traits. From an empirical point of view, it is yet unclear what happens when organizations provide followers with more job autonomy. Oftentimes, job autonomy can be seen as a two edged sword. Indeed, as we discussed in the previous, it has been shown that Machiavellian followers' organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) can be increased by providing them with more job autonomy (see Belschak et al., 2015) suggesting that autonomy does not need to add to the destructive influences of Dark Triad strategic behavior. However, autonomy may also facilitate negative strategic follower behavior. Feeling free to act at as one pleases and without the need to confer with others may also stimulate followers to express their Dark Triad traits strategically.

Moral Reasoning Development in Dark Triad Followers. There is also some indication that organizations may want to pay specific attention to development of moral reasoning in Dark Triad followers, especially since moral reasoning and ethical behavior are positively related (Blasi, 1980; Jones & Ryan, 1997). Campbell et al. (2009) conducted a study with monozygotic and same-sex dizygotic twins and found that differences in higher levels of moral cognition were entirely attributable to environmental factors (e.g., experiences, encounters) and not to genetic factors. Apparently, higher levels of moral reasoning can be developed through experiences, also in those scoring higher on Dark Triad traits. One

obvious way to develop moral reasoning would be to educate people. A meta-analysis by Schlaefli, Rest, and Thoma (1985) showed that various types of intervention programs (group discussion of moral dilemmas, psychological development programs, social studies and humanities courses) effectively stimulate moral reasoning, that treatments of 3 to 12 weeks are optimal, and that programs with adults (24 years and older) produce larger effect sizes than with younger individuals. These findings suggest that organizations could promote moral reasoning in Dark Triad followers by providing ethics training programs. Research on the extent to which higher moral reasoning actually translates to more ethical strategic behavior of Dark Trait followers is, however, needed.

FURTHER EXPLORING NEGATIVE STRATEGIC FOLLOWER BEHAVIOR

Hogan and Hogan (2001) stress that a dark personality of organizational members is related to longer-term problems, however, there is room for a more detailed discussion regarding the bright and the dark side (e.g., Sutton, 2007) of negative personality traits. We suggest that there are situations where strategic behavior of Dark Triad followers can potentially be beneficial to the organization. Such situations may occur when the goals of Dark Triad followers are aligned with the goals of the organization. For instance, in case of such goal alignment, a narcissistic follower could step up to solve an immediate organization crisis (cf. King, 2007), a Machiavellian follower could play an essential role in forming coalitions that benefit the organization, and a psychopathic follower could make or support a bold decision that fosters the organizations functioning or effectiveness.

An interesting discussion here would be around alignment of unethical goals. That is, Dark Triad followers are likely to have few issues to follow unethical leader suggestions if they are in line with their own strategic goals or support an unethical climate. That means that even in situations where Dark Triad follower goals are aligned with organizational goals, the risk is that they result in wider negative implications for society. A concept that is useful to

consider here is narcissistic organizational identification (Galvin, Lange, & Ashforth, 2015), which is defined as "individual's tendency to see his/her identity as core to the definition of the organization" (Galvin et al., p. 163). While Galvin et al. mainly see this identification as related to (narcissistic) people in power, they also acknowledge that narcissistic identification could apply to lower level units in the organization (e.g., teams and departments), even when individuals are not in power positions. We argue here that narcissistic identification is relevant also for followers, related to organizational subunits. This is especially likely as Dark Triad personalities tend to overestimate their abilities (for narcissism: Ames & Kamrath, 2004) and thus likely how influential they are in their groups. Narcissistic identification can lead to a disregard for societal consequences for the (assumed) benefit of the organization and thus aggravates unethical organization behavior (Galvin et al., 2015). Ultimately, Dark Triad personality followers might even be attracted to and strive in unethical organizations.

We have so far looked at how Dark Triad traits may engender shady strategic behavior of individual followers. However, it would be interesting to consider the team context in this regard. Felps, Mitchell and Byington (2006) offer a theoretical model explaining how, when and why 'bad apples spoil the barrel'. Specifically, they discuss how the behaviors of one negative group member (such as Machiavellians can be) can have powerful, detrimental influence on fellow team members and groups. They argue that the negative behaviors of one individual can elicit perceptions of inequity, negative feelings, and reduced trust in team members. These perceptions and feelings can, in turn, lead to defensive behavioral reactions (e.g. outbursts, mood maintenance, withdrawal), and negatively influence important group processes and outcomes (e.g. cooperation, creativity, performance). Interestingly, there is the possibility that the behavior of Dark Triad followers can have a contagious effect (similar to mood contagion, Barsade, 2002) on team members, meaning that other team members might

mimic or copy the negative strategic behaviors of Dark Triad followers. Seeing others act antisocially makes those behaviors more mentally accessible and lowers inhibitions about behaving in a similar fashion. This process is described in Bandura's (e.g., 1997) vicarious learning, where similar others can serve as behavioral model. Contagion processes may be more likely when team members do not observe negative consequences of the displayed behavior, see that Dark Triad followers benefit from their use, or come to believe that such behaviors are normal and in line with company code of conduct. One can easily imagine, for example, that OCB behaviors diminish rapidly in teams that have Dark Triad members, as those team members are unlikely to help others except if it is for their own benefit.

At the same time, team members can guard themselves against contagion if (a) they are less easily influenced by their co-workers (e.g., because they have higher self-esteem, are more resilient, or have better coping skills), (b) create a culture in which selfish acts are punished, and (c) they work towards a more independent task structure, that is, if their work is less influenced by team member high in Dark Triad traits (see Felps et al., 2006; Thoroughgood et al., 2012). Notably, team members themselves may not have, or feel to have, the power needed to change work context conditions in attempts to respond to a negative member. This may be very frustrating and intensify the reactions to bad apple behavior. In such cases group members may look to their leader to punish a deviant group member (Butterfield, Trevino, & Ball, 1996; Felps et al., 2006).

Finally, as pointed out before, Dark Triad traits are overlapping, yet unique, traits. One could pose the question however how a combination of these traits – people scoring high on two or more of the Dark Triad traits (e.g., a narcissistic psychopath) – would affect strategic behavior. Of course, combinations of Dark Triad traits are possible but it is important to note that high scores on either of the three Dark Triad traits are already uncommon (i.e., scores on Dark Triad traits are typically positively skewed, see for instance Stead, Fekken, Kay, &

McDermott, 2012), and that therefore a combination of high scores on multiple Dark Triad traits are even less likely to occur. Nonetheless, we think it would be interesting to investigate how various combinations of Dark Triad traits would affect strategic behavior, especially because the negative impact of either of the traits may be intensified by the co-occurrence with one of the other Dark Triad traits.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, we investigated how Dark Triad personality traits impact strategic follower behavior. We described how follower narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy may stimulate their (pro-)active, self-serving, goal oriented behavior. For each Dark Triad trait, we identified the red flag behaviors that organizations should be beware of and we indicated what can be done to curb the destructive influences of Dark Triad followers. We hope that our considerations are helpful for organizations to address Dark Triad strategic follower behavior.

References

Ames, D. R., & Kammrath, L. K. (2004). Mind-reading and metacognition: Narcissism, not actual competence, predicts self-estimated ability. ***Journal of Nonverbal Behavior***, 28, 187-209.

Antonioni, D., & Park, H. (2001). The effects of personality similarity on peer ratings of contextual work behaviors. ***Personnel Psychology***, 54, 331-360.

Austin, E. J., Farrelly, D., Black, C., & Moore, H. (2007). Emotional intelligence, Machiavellianism and emotional manipulation: Does EI have a dark side? ***Personality and Individual Differences***, 43, 179-189.

Babiak, P. & Hare, R. D. (2006). ***Snakes in Suits***. New York: Harper Collins.

Babiak, P., Neumann, C. S., & Hare, R. D. (2010). Corporate psychopathy: Talking the walk. ***Behavioral Sciences & The Law***, 28, 174-193.

Back, M. D., Küfner, A. C. P., Dufner, M., Gerlach, T. M., Rauthmann, J. F., & Denissen, J. J. A. (2013). Narcissistic admiration and rivalry: Disentangling the bright and dark sides of narcissism. ***Journal of Personality and Social Psychology***, 105, 1013-1037.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy – The Exercise of Control*. New York: Freeman.

Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 47, 644-675.

Becker, J. A., & O'Hair, D.H. (2007). Machiavellians' motives in organizational citizenship behavior. ***Journal of Applied Communication Research,*** 35, 246-267.

Belschak, F. D., Den Hartog, D. N., & Kalshoven, K. (2015). Leading machiavellians how to translate machiavellians' selfishness into pro-organizational behavior. ***Journal of Management***, 41, 1934-1956.

Belschak, F. D., Muhammad, R. S., & den Hartog, D. N. (in press). Birds of a feather can butt heads: When Machiavellian employees work with Machiavellian leaders. ***Journal of Business Ethics***.

Biddle, B. J. (1986). Recent development in role theory. ***Annual Review of Sociology***, 12, 67-92.

Blasi, A. (1980). Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review of the literature. ***Psychological Bulletin***, 88, 1.45.

Boddy, C. R. (2011a). Corporate psychopaths, bullying and unfair supervision in the workplace. ***Journal of Business Ethics,*** 100*,* 367-379.

Boddy, C. R. (2011b). The corporate psychopaths theory of the global financial crisis. ***Journal of Business Ethics,*** 102, 255-259.

Boddy, C. R. (2011c). ***Corporate psychopaths: Organisational destroyers***. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brooks, N., & Fritzon, K. (2016). Psychopathic personality characteristics amongst high functioning populations. ***Crime Psychology Review***, 2, 1-21.

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. ***The Leadership Quarterly,*** 17, 595-616.

Bruner, J. S., Goodnow, J. J., & Austin, J. (1956). ***A study of thinking***. Transaction Publishers

Burks, S. V., Carpenter, J. P., Götte, L., & Rustichini, A. (2008). Cognitive skills explain economic preferences, strategic behavior, and job attachment. ***IZA Discussion Papers***, No. 3609.

Burris, C.T., Rempel, J.K., Munteanu, A. R., & Therrien, P.A. (2013). More, more, more: The dark side of self-expansion motivation. ***Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,*** 39, 578-595.

Bushman, B. J., & Thomaes, S. (2011) When the narcissistic ego deflates, narcissistic aggression inflates. In: W. K. Campbell, & J. D. Miller (eds.), ***The Handbook of Narcissism and Narcissistic Personality Disorder: Theoretical Approaches, Empirical Findings, and Treatments:*** 319-329. New York, US, Wiley.

Butterfield, K. D., Trevino, L. K., & Ball, G. A. (1996). Punishment from the manager's perspective: A grounded investigation and inductive model. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 39, 1479-1512.

Campbell, D. J. (2000). The proactive employee: Managing workplace initiative. ***Academy of Management Executive***, 14, 52-66.

Campbell, J., Schermer, J.A., Villani, V.C., Nguyen, B., Vickers, L., & Vernon, P.A. (2009). A behavioural genetic study of the Dark Triad of personality and moral development. ***Twin Research and Human Genetics***, 12, 132-136.

Campbell, K. W. (1999). Narcissism and romantic attraction. ***Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,*** 77, 1254-1270.

Campbell, K. W. & Campbell, S. M. (2009). On the self-regulatory dynamics created by the peculiar benefits and costs of narcissism: A contextual reinforcement model and examination of leadership. ***Self and Identity,*** 8, 214-232.

Campbell, W. K., Hoffman, B. J., Campbell, S. M., & Marchisio, G. (2011). Narcissism in organizational contexts. ***Human Resource Management Review,*** 21, 268-284.

Chappell, D., & Di Martino, V. (2006). ***Violence at work*** (3rd ed.). Geneva: International Labor Office.

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

Christie, R., & Geis, F. L. (1970). ***Studies in Machiavellianism***. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Christiansen, N. D. & Tett, R. P. (2008). Toward a better understanding of the role of situations in linking personality, work behavior, and job performance. ***Industrial and Organizational Psychology,*** 1, 312-316.

Clarke, J. (2005). ***Working with monsters. How to identify and protect yourself from the workplace psychopath***. Sydney: Random House Australia.

Cleckley, H. (1941). ***The Mask of Sanity*** (1st ed.). St. Louis, MO: C.V. Mosby.

Cohen, A. (2016). Are they among us? A conceptual framework of the relationship between the dark triad personality and counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs). ***Human Resource Management Review,*** 26, 69-85.

Dahling, J. J., Whitaker, B. G., & Levy, P. E. (2009). The development and validation of a new Machiavellianism scale. ***Journal of Management***, 35, 219-257.

Deluga, R. (2001). American presidential Machiavellianism: Implications for charismatic leadership and rated performance. ***Leadership Quarterly***, 12, 339-363.

DePaulo, B. (2010). ***The Psychology of Dexter***. Dallas, TX: BenBella Books.

Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2001). Narcissism and motivation. ***Psychological Inquiry,*** 12, 216-219.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Making fast strategic decisions in high-velocity environments. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 32, 543-576.

Felps, W., Mitchell, T. R., & Byington, E. (2006). How, when, and why bad apples spoil the barrel: Negative group members and dysfunctional groups. ***Research in Organizational Behavior***, 27, 175-222.

Furnham, A., Richards, S.C., & Paulhus, D.L. (2013). The Dark Triad of personality: A 10 year review. ***Social and Personality Psychology Compass,*** 7, 199-216.

Galvin, B. M., Lange, D., & Ashforth, B. E. (2015). Narcissistic organizational identification: Seeing oneself as central to the organization's identity. ***Academy of Management Review***, 40, 163-181.

Glenn, A. L., Koleva, S., Iyer, R., Graham, J., & Ditto, P. H. (2010). Moral identity in psychopathy. ***Judgment and Decision Making****,* 5, 497-505.

Gollwitzer, P. M. (1996). The volitional benefits of planning. In P. M. Gollwitzer & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), **The Psychology of Action: Linking Cognition and Motivation to Behavior**: 287-312. New York: Guilford.

Goncalo, J. A., Flynn, F. J., & Kim, S. H. (2010). Are two narcissists better than one? The link between narcissism, perceived creativity, and creative performance. ***Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin***, 36, 1484-1495.

Gray, J. A., & McNaughton, N. (2000). ***The Neuropsychology of Anxiety: An Enquiry into the Functions of the Septo-Hippocampal System*** (2nd ed.). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Grijalva, E. & Harms, P. D. (2014). Narcissism: An integrative synthesis and dominance complementarity model. ***Academy of Management Perspectives***, 28, 108-127.

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

Hare R. D. (1999). ***Without Conscience: The Disturbing World of the Psychopaths among us****.* Guildford Press: New York.

Harms, P. D. & Spain, S. M. (2015). Beyond the Bright Side: Dark Personality at Work. ***Applied Psychology: An International Review****,* 64, 15-24.

Harms, P.D., Spain, S., & Hannah, S. (2011). Leader development and the dark side of personality**.** ***The Leadership Quarterly****,* 22*,* 495-509.

Harms, P.D., Spain, S.M., & Wood, D. (2014). Mapping personality in dark places. ***Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice***, 7, 114-117.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side. ***International Journal of Selection and Assessment,*** 9, 40–51.

Jonason, P. K., & Jackson, C. J. (2016). The Dark Triad traits through the lens of Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory. ***Personality and Individual Differences*****,** 90, 273-277.

Jonason, P. K., Lyons, M., & Blanchard, A. (2015). Birds of a 'bad' feather flock together: The Dark Triad and mate choice. ***Personality and Individual Differences***, 78, 34-38.

Jonason, P., Slomski, S., & Partyka, J. (2012). The Dark Triad at work: How toxic employees get their way. ***Personality and Individual Differences,*** 52, 449-453.

Jonason, P. K., & Webster, G. D. (2010). The Dirty Dozen: A Concise Measure of the Dark Triad. ***Psychological Assessment***, 22, 420-432.

Jonason, P. K., & Webster, G. D. (2012). A protean approach to social influence: Dark Triad personalities and social influence tactics. ***Personality and Individual Differences***, 52, 521-526.

Jones, D. N. (2013). What's mine is mine and what's yours is mine: The Dark Triad and gambling with your neighbor's money. ***Journal of Research in Personality,*** 47, 563-571.

Jones, D. N. (2014). Risk in the face of retribution: Psychopathic persistence in financial misbehavior. ***Personality and Individual Differences,*** 67, 109-113

Jones, D. N., & Neria, A. L. (2015). The Dark Triad and dispositional aggression. ***Personality and Individual Differences***, 86, 360-364.

Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2009). Machiavellianism. In M.R. Leary, & R.H. Hoyle: ***Handbook of Individual Differences in Social Behavior***: 257-273. New York/London: The Guilford Press.

Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Introducing the Short Dark Triad (SD3): A brief measure of dark personality traits. ***Assessment***, 21, 28-41.

Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2017). Duplicity among the dark triad: Three faces of deceit. ***Journal of Personality and Social Psychology***. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000139.

Jones, J.R., & Ryan, L.V. (1997). The link between ethical judgment and action in organizations: A moral approbation approach. ***Organization Science***, 8, 663-680.

Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Kosalka, T. (2009). The bright and dark sides of leader traits: A review and theoretical extension of the leader trait paradigm. ***Leadership Quarterly***, 20, 855-875.

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

Kellerman, B. (2007). What Every Leader Needs to Know About Followers. ***Harvard Business Review***, December, 84-91.

Kessler, S. R., Bandelli, A. C., Spector, P. E., Borman, W. C., Nelson, C. E., & Penney, L. M. (2010). Re-examining Machiavelli: A three-dimensional model of Machiavellianism in the workplace. ***Journal of Applied Social Psychology***, 40, 1868-1896.

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

Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. ***Psychological Review***, 110, 265-284.

Krasikova, D. V., Green, S. G., & LeBreton, J. M. (2013). Destructive leadership: A theoretical review, integration, and future research agenda. ***Journal of Management****, 39*, 1308-1338.

Kristof-Brown, A., Barrick, M. R., & Stevens, C. (2005). When opposites attract: A multi-sample demonstration of complementary person-team fit on extraversion. ***Journal of Personality***, 73, 935-958.

Levenson, M. R., Kiehl, K. A., & Fitzpatrick, C. M. (1995). Assessing psychopathic attributes in a noninstitutionalized population. ***Journal of Personality and Social Psychology***, 68, 151-158.

Liu, C. C. (2008). The relationship between Machiavellianism and knowledge sharing willingness. ***Journal of Business and Psychology***, 22, 233-240.

Machiavelli, N. (1998). The prince. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Translated and introduction by Harvey C. Mansfield; original work published 1513).

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

Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R. (2009). How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model ***Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes***, 108, 1-13.

Miner, J. B. (2006). Role Motivation Theories. In J. C. Thomas, D. L. Segal, M. Hersen, J. C. Thomas, D. L. Segal, M. Hersen (Eds.), ***Comprehensive Handbook of Personality and Psychopathology: Personality and Everyday Functioning***: 233-250. Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Mintzberg, H. (1987). The strategy concept I: Five Ps for strategy. ***California Management Review***, 30, 11-24.

Neves, P., & Schyns, B. (in press). Destructive uncertainty: The toxic triangle, implicit theories and leadership identity during organizational change. In M. Vakola, and P. Petrou

(Eds.), ***Organizational change: Psychological effects and strategies for coping***. Oxfordshire: Routledge.

Nevicka, B., de Hoogh, A.H.B., van Vianen, A.E.M., Beersma, B., & McIlwain, D. (2011). All I need is a stage to shine: narcissist's leader emergence and performance. ***Leadership Quarterly,*** 22, 910-925.

Ong, C. W., Roberts, R., Arthur, C. A., Woodman, T. and Akehurst, S. (2016), The leader ship is sinking: A temporal investigation of narcissistic leadership. ***Journal of Personality,*** 84, 237–247.

O'Boyle, E. J., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., & McDaniel, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the Dark Triad and work behavior: A social exchange perspective. ***Journal of Applied Psychology***, 97, 557-579.

Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. ***Leadership Quarterly***, 18, 176-194.

Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Toward a taxonomy of dark personalities. ***Current Directions in Psychological Science****, 23*, 421-426.

Paulhus, D. L. & Williams, K. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. ***Journal of Research in Personality,*** 36, 556-568.

Petrides, K. V., Vernon, P. A., Schermer, J. A., & Veselka, L. (2011). Trait emotional intelligence and the Dark Triad traits of personality. ***Twin Research and Human Genetics***, 14, 35-41.

Pilch, I., & Turska, E. (2015). Relationships between Machiavellianism, organizational culture, and workplace bullying: emotional abuse from the target's and the perpetrator's perspective. ***Journal of Business Ethics***, 128, 83-93.

Raskin, R. & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. ***Journal of Personality and Social Psychology***, 54, 890-902.

Rauthmann, J. F., & Kolar, G. P. (2013a). Positioning the Dark Triad in the interpersonal circumplex: the friendly-dominant narcissist, hostile-submissive Machiavellian, and hostile-dominant psychopath? ***Personality and Individual Differences***, 54, 622-627.

Rauthmann, J. F., & Kolar, G. P. (2013b). The perceived attractiveness and traits of the Dark Triad: narcissist are perceived as hot, Machiavellians and psychopaths not. ***Personality and Individual Differences*****,** 54, 582-586.

Riggio, R. E., Chaleff, I. & Lipman-Blumen, J. (2008). ***The Art of Followership***. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Riggio, R. E., & Taylor, S. J. (2000). Personality and Communication Skills as Predictors of Hospice Nurse Performance. ***Journal of Business and Psychology***, 15, 351-359.

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 38, 555-572.

Rus, D. C., Van Knippenberg, D., & Wisse, B. M . (2010). Leader power and leader self serving behavior: The role of effective leadership beliefs and performance information. ***Journal of Experimental Social Psychology****,* 46, 922-933.

Rus, D., Van Knippenberg, D., & Wisse, B. M. (2012). Leader power and self-serving behavior: The Moderating Role of Accountability. ***Leadership Quarterly***, 23, 13-26.

Rykman, R. M., Hammer, M., Kaczor, L. M., & Gold, J. A. (1990). Construction of a Hypercompetitive Attitude Scale. ***Journal of Personality Assessment***, 55. 630-639.

Sakalaki, M., Richardson, C., & Thépaut, Y. (2007). Machiavellianism and economic opportunism. ***Journal of Applied Social Psychology***, 37, 1181-1190.

Schlaefli, A., Rest, J. R., & Thoma, S. J. (1985). Does moral education improve moral judgment? A meta-analysis of intervention studies using the defining issues test. ***Review of Educational Research***, 55, 319-352.

Schein, E.H. (1992). ***Organizational Culture and Leadership*** (2d ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Semenyna, S. W., & Honey, P. L. (2015). Dominance styles mediate sex differences in Dark Triad traits. ***Personality and Individual Differences***, 83, 37-43.

Sheldon K. M., & Elliot A. J. (1999). Goal striving, need satisfaction, and longitudinal well-being: The self-concordance model. ***Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,*** 76, 482-497.

Smith, S. F., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2013). Psychopathy in the workplace: The knowns and unknowns. ***Aggression and Violent Behavior***, 18, 204-218.

Spain, S.M., Harms, P.D., & LeBreton, J.M. (2014). The dark side of personality at work. ***Journal of Organizational Behavior***, 35, 41-60.

Stead, R., Fekken, G. C., Kay, A., & McDermott, K. (2012), Conceptualizing the Dark Triad of personality: Links to Social Symptomatology. ***Personality and Individual Differences***, 53, 1023-1028.

Stevens, G., Deuling, J., & Armenakis, A. (2012). Successful psychopaths: Are they unethical decision-makers and why. ***Journal of Business Ethics,*** 105, 139-149.

Sutton, R. (2007). ***The No Asshole Rule***. New York: Warner Business Books.

Thoroughgood, C. N., Padilla, A., Hunter, S. T., & Tate, B. W. (2012). The susceptible circle: A taxonomy of followers associated with destructive leadership. ***Leadership Quarterly***, 23, 897-917.

Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R., Lowe, K., & Carsten, M. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. ***Leadership Quarterly,*** 25, 83-104.

Weick, M., & Guinote, A . (2008), When subjective experiences matter: Power increases reliance on the ease of retrieval. ***Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,*** 94, 956-970.

Wille, B., De Fuyt, F., & De Clercq, B. (2013). Expanding and Reconceptualizing Aberrant Personality at Work: Validity of Five-Factor Model Aberrant Personality Tendencies to Predict Career Outcomes. ***Personnel Psychology***, 66, 173-223.

Williams, K. M., Nathanson, C., & Paulhus, D. L. (2010). Identifying and profiling scholastic cheaters: Their personality, cognitive ability, and motivation. **Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied**, 16, 293-307.

Wilson, D. S., Near, D., & Miller, R. R. (1996). Machiavellianism: a synthesis of the evolutionary and psychological literatures. ***Psychological Bulletin***, 119, 285-299.

Wisse, B., Barelds, D. P. H. & Rietzschel, E.F. (2015). How innovative is your employee? The role of employee and supervisor dark triad personality traits in supervisor perceptions of employee innovative behavior. ***Personality and Individual Differences,*** 82, 158-162.

Wisse, B., & Sleebos, E. (2016). When the dark ones gain power: Perceived position power strengthens the effect of supervisor Machiavellianism on abusive supervision in work teams. ***Personality and Individual Differences***, 99, 122-126.

Wu, J., & LeBreton, J. M. (2011). Reconsidering the dispositional basis of counterproductive work behavior: The role of aberrant personality. ***Personnel Psychology,*** 64, 593-626.

Yang, Y., & Raine, A. (2008). Functional neuroanatomy of psychopathy. ***Psychiatry,*** *7*, 133-136.

Yukl, G. (2010). ***Leadership in organizations***. Upper Saddle River: Pearson.

Yukl , G., & Falbe, C. M. (1991). Importance of different power sources in downward lateral relations. ***Journal of Applied Psychology***, 76, 416- 423.

Zettler, I., Friedrich, N., & Hilbig, B. E. (2011). Dissecting work commitment: The role of Machiavellianism. ***Career Development International***, 16, 20-35.

Zettler, I., & Solga, M. (2013). Not enough of a 'dark'trait? Linking Machiavellianism to job performance. ***European Journal of Personality, 27***, 545-554.

Zoogah, D. B. (2014). ***Strategic Followership - How Followers Impact Organizational Effectiveness.*** New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Table 1: Strategic Red Flag Behaviors for Each of the Dark Triad Traits

Red flag behaviors	N	M	P	Sample reference
Over-claiming their contribution to the organization, taking credit, when upon close examination their claims do not hold.	x			Goncalo et al., 2010
Showing behavior (e.g., proactivity) in ways that serve to promote themselves (e.g., 'public' OCB).	xx	x		Spain et al. (2014)
Becoming aggressive after negative feedback and devaluing the feedback source.	xx			Bushman and Thomaes, 2011
Treating valued members of the organization (trophies) in different ways than those they do not perceive as adding to their own positive self-views.	xx			Campbell et al., 2011
Demonstrating a self-oriented perspective in combination with the employment of a "choose your battles" mind-set.		xx		Sakalaki et al., 2007
Actively engaging in behaviors that function to control others or minimize their influence.	x	xx	x	Jonason and Webster, 2012

Keeping knowledge to themselves rather than sharing with colleagues.		xx		Liu, 2008
Making use of manipulation tactics to reach strategic goals.		xx	x	Jonason and Webster (2012)
Scheming for personal benefit without taking the perspective of others into account.	x	xx	x	Sakalaki et al., 2007;
Choosing competition over cooperation.		x	xx	Ryckman et al., 1990
Making fast, short-term focused decisions without accounting for the possible negative consequences for others.			xx	Jones and Paulhus, 2014
Making big, bold, and risky decisions that are not held back by moral boundaries and/or organizational rules.	x		xx	Jones, 2014
Questioning authority figures, existing rules, and the status quo to deregulate organizational functioning.			xx	Minor, 2006
Bullying and/or criticizing co-workers to direct their attention towards the interpersonal relationship instead of the tasks at hand.			xx	Clarke, 2005

Seducing co-workers to live a 'wild' life and/or seducing co-workers or supervisors into a romantic relationship.	x	xx	Jonason and Webster, 2012

Note: N = Narcissism, M = Machiavellianism, P = Psychopathy, xx = main behavior, x = secondary behavior

Dear Professor Phan,

Thank you very much for giving us the chance to address the remaining comments on our manuscript entitled "Shady Strategic Behavior: Recognizing Strategic Behavior of Dark Triad Followers" for Academy of Management Perspectives (ID AMP-2017-0005.R2). We appreciate your continuous support, and we are grateful for the reviewers' comments that enabled us to improve the paper. We would be absolutely delighted to see this paper accepted. Please find our responses to the reviewers' comments in the below. We hope that you like how we dealt with the final issues.

Reviewer 2

I feel like the authors have improved the manuscript from the previous versions. Thus, I would like to commend the authors on their efforts. The flow of the paper is much improved and the minor language changes throughout make it easier to read. Below I have some comments regarding some changes that you may wish to make. They are less critical than my comments in previous versions.

Response: Thank you very much for your positive evaluation of our revision.

1. One of the more pressing concerns I have is Table 1, it has come to me that I cannot tell whether these are behaviors that you came up with or if all of them are from literature. Throughout the manuscript, there are few of the behaviors that you have cites for and reference Table 1. I think that adding another column to the table of cites of where each of the examples came from would benefit the table. And it would help authors who are using your manuscript as a template for future research to more easily get information about each behavior and Dark Triad type.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We added the references to Table 1.

2. The flow of the entire section "The role of the leader and the context in strategic follower behavior" is off. The paragraphs by themselves are very specific and have some good examples in each, but the transitions and ties between each paragraph and topic is sometimes lacking. One inconsistency I also see is that sometimes the authors are talking about just the leaders and other times the focus is on the interaction between the leaders and the followers. I would keep everything focused as much as possible on the interaction piece since your paper is focused on follower behavior. So unless something a leader is doing directly affects a follower's Dark Triad behavior, then it shouldn't be discussed.

Response: We have addressed this issue in a number of ways. 1) We made sure that we now only discuss leadership when it directly affects a follower's Dark Triad behavior. 2) We created sub-headings so the structure becomes more clear. We first talk about leadership styles, then about leader power, and end with leader traits and values as potential influences on follower strategic behavior. We think this structure improves the flow of the section. 3) We now added transition sentences between the paragraphs to create a better flow. 4) We have also more clearly separated the sections relating to leader and organisational influences to improve readability.

3. On page 21, lines 19-23, it may be more useful for you to discuss job autonomy here (rather than the paragraph below) in addition to the direct leader having little power. Job autonomy can be unrelated to one's leader.

Response: We added a few sentences on autonomy in general and its effects on strategic follower behaviour. Specifically, we now added:

> *" Finally, when followers have the freedom and discretion to act at will in the work place, that is, when they have high job autonomy, they are in a better position to act in line with their Dark Triad traits. From an empirical point of view, it is yet unclear what happens when organizations provide followers with more job autonomy. Oftentimes, job autonomy can be seen as a two edged sword. Indeed, as we discussed in the previous, it has been shown that Machiavellian followers' organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) can be increased by providing them with more autonomy (see Belschak et al., 2015) suggesting that autonomy does not need to add to the destructive influences of Dark Triad strategic behavior. However, autonomy may also facilitate negative strategic follower behavior. Feeling free to act at as one pleases and without the need to confer with others may also stimulate followers to express their Dark Triad traits strategically. "*

4. On page 26, at the top where you discuss mood contagion and team members being affected especially if they don't see the negative effects of the focal Dark Triad individual take place... Please briefly discuss and cite vicarious learning (many cites to choose from starting with Bandura).

> *Response: Thanks. We added a reference to vicarious learning and a sentence explaining the link. Specifically, we now added: "This process is described in Bandura's (e.g., 1997) vicarious learning, where similar others can serve as behavioral model."*

Reviewer 1

The authors have addressed my concerns well. I don't have additional concerns for the paper.

Response: Thank you very much for your previous comments and your positive evaluation of our revision.