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Abstract

The current study examined the effect of followership on leadership behaviours, and whether leaders’ responses to hostile followership varies as a function of individual differences. This study used a randomized controlled between-subjects experimental design. Participants were assigned to the role of either the “team leader” or a “team member”. As the focal manipulation, participants were assigned to a hostile followership condition or a control condition. In these two conditions, a confederate either antagonized and challenged the leader’s ideas (i.e., hostile followership) or engaged in neutral behaviours (i.e., control condition) throughout a virtually-mediated group decision-making task. Support was found for the moderating role of narcissistic rivalry on the relationship between experimental condition and leader incivility, such that narcissistic rivalry increased the leader’s uncivil reactions to hostile followership in the experimental condition. The results of this study enable insight into the interpersonal and organizational consequences of hostile followership.

*Keywords*: Hostile followership, Leadership, Incivility, Narcissism.
Summary for Lay Audience

Followership behaviour is typically viewed as the biproduct of a single leader’s influence. As a result, the contribution of followers to leadership and organizational outcomes has traditionally been underestimated in the literature. The current study examines the reverse relationship, viewing leadership behaviours as the result of the actions of followers. Specifically, I examined leaders’ responses to hostile followership. Hostile followership is characterized by challenge-oriented behaviours aimed at the leader. Recognizing that leaders are likely to vary in how they perceive, process, and react to being challenged by one of their followers, this study also examined whether the leader’s attachment style and narcissism would buffer or exacerbate the effects of hostile followership.

To assess the influence of a challenging follower on the behaviour of their leader, I conducted an experiment using a group of student participants from The University of Western Ontario. Participants were instructed to use an online chatroom to work together on a group task. Within each group, there was one participant who was assigned to the role of the “team leader”, one participant who was a “team member”, and a third group member who was posing as a participant. In actuality, this third group member was part of the experiment (i.e., a confederate), acting as a hostile team member and challenging the team leader’s ability to lead the group. To assure the subsequent leadership behaviours were the result of the hostile followership manipulation, a control condition was used as a comparator. In this condition, the confederate behaved in a neutral manner, neither aggravating nor being overly helpful to the leader.

Overall, team leaders responded negatively to being challenged by one of their followers. When the confederate was hostile, leaders were rated as being more rude, condescending, and exclusionary towards their followers. These negative reactions to hostile followership were
especially strong if the leader had high levels of antagonistic narcissism. This research contributes to the debunking of conventional knowledge that followers are merely passive recipients of the leader’s influence, demonstrating the ability of followers to influence both group outcomes and negative leadership behaviours.
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Leadership on the Ropes: How Hostile Followership Affects Leadership Behaviour

The topic of leadership has captured the fascination of researchers, practitioners, and the general public for centuries (Barling, Christie, & Hoption, 2011). Traditionally, leadership research has taken a leader-centric approach – focusing on the unilateral influence of a single leader on organizational outcomes (Hollander, 1993; Yukl, 1998). This perspective recognizes the importance of followers to the leadership equation, but almost exclusively casts them as the recipients or moderators of a leader’s influence (Shamir, 2007). Such an unbalanced view of leadership has led to an extensive body of research examining the effects of leader behaviors on follower outcomes (Barling et al., 2011). There remains, however, a dearth of studies investigating the key contributions of followers and followership to the leadership process (Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, & Carsten, 2014). Continuing to neglect the mutual influence of leaders and followers on each other can only serve to perpetuate an incomplete understanding of leadership. Even early leadership researchers understood that leaders do not operate in a vacuum and are therefore susceptible to the influence of their followers (e.g. Fiedler, 1967; House, 1971); so why has followership remained in the shadows for so long?

Uhl-Bien and colleagues (2014) suggest that the lack of attention paid to followership may be owing to a general misunderstanding about the conceptualization of followership and its relation to leadership. Recently there has been a shift in perspective from traditional leader-centric views of leadership to a view that recognizes leadership as a relational process that is co-created by both the leader and the follower (Fairhurst & Uhl-Bien, 2012). These relational views of leadership differentiate between the leader and leadership, with the former being a necessary but not sufficient component of the latter (Hollander & Julian, 1969). Instead, leadership is comprised of three domains: the leader, the follower (or followers), and their dyadic relationship
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(Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Leader-member exchange theory (LMX) has examined the leader-follower relationship at the dyadic level. Although LMX theory has acknowledged the influence of the follower in the leadership equation, the majority of LMX studies still privilege the leader as the driver of these relationships (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014) and focus almost exclusively on follower outcomes (Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer, & Ferris, 2012; Gerstner & Day, 1997). Furthermore, the initiation of the relationship itself is considered to be contingent on the leader’s willingness to form a relationship with each follower based on their time, resources, and interpretation of the follower’s utility (Dienesch & Liden, 1986).

Following behaviour involves deference to another in some way, but this does not mean followers are powerless or passive recipients in the formation of leader-follower relationships. Although leaders are often cast as the gatekeepers of these relationships, followers serve a crucial role in granting someone else the ability to lead by accepting their follower role and allowing themselves to be led (DeRue & Ashford, 2010). When one considers leadership as a process of mutual influence between leaders and followers, it becomes clear that to fully understand the leadership process we must consider followers to a degree that is comparable to that of the leader (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Followership Typologies and the Present Study

About 25 years ago, researchers began to view followers as active agents in their own right, equally deserving of dedicated systematic study (e.g. Hollander, 1992a; 1992b). As a result, several followership typologies have surfaced. The idea that the follower role is more descriptive than prescriptive was championed by Kelley (1992), whose follower typology outlined the different ways in which followers can enact their role. He distinguished followers based on the combination of two orthogonal dimensions ranging from dependent to independent
in their thinking and from passive to active in their behaviour. Despite the typology including the stereotypical passive and dependent followers as well as the blindly obedient “Yes people”, he also described a style of exemplary followership that is characterized by independent thinking and active engagement. Subsequently, Chaleff (1995) championed a taxonomy that classified followers on the basis of two dimensions: low-high support and low-high challenge. Chaleff believed that the most valuable manifestation of followership is a proactive approach exemplified by high support and high challenge followers known as “partners.” To be a partner means knowing when to stand by the leader and having the courage to challenge them on difficult issues. Moreover, research on follower role orientations has shown that followers hold different schemas of followership that ranges from passive to proactive (Carsten, Uhl-Bien, West, Patera, & McGregor, 2010). Similar to the partnership perspective, followers with a proactive role-orientation view their role as being similar to that of a “silent leader” by taking initiative and offering constructive feedback. This conceptualization of proactive followership as a form of quiet leadership challenges preconceived notions about the roles of leaders and followers and raises questions about how leaders respond to proactive followers who engage in prototypical leader behaviour from a subordinate role.

Research has begun to investigate how leaders react to various forms of proactive follower behaviour, however, the findings are mixed (Benson, Hardy, & Eys, 2016; Dulebohn, et al., 2012; Grant, Parker, & Collins, 2009; Sun & van Emmerik, 2014). Although some research suggests that leaders are generally appreciative of followers who are proactive in their roles (e.g. Dulebohn, et al., 2012), follower proactivity involves anticipatory actions that are not prescribed by a leader (Grant & Ashford, 2008). As a result, proactive forms of followership may be misconstrued by leaders as a threat (Frese & Fay, 2001) or an act of insubordination (Falbe &
Yukl, 1992) and may elicit negative leadership reactions (Benson et al., 2016). Extending these findings, the current thesis research aims to evaluate the consequences of an extreme form of proactive challenge-oriented followership: hostile followership. Consistent with the interpersonal circumplex models that position hostility as a potent social behaviour that can disrupt interpersonal interactions (Wiggins, 1979), the current study examines the effect of followership on leadership behaviours, and how individual differences of a leader may moderate their responses to hostile followership. Building upon the traditional leadership literature that has focused on follower outcomes of transformational and laissez-faire leader behaviour (Judge & Piccolo, 2004), this study reverses the lens by examining these leader behaviours, along with leader incivility, as outcomes of hostile followership rather than as antecedents.

**Leadership Behaviour**

Leadership is a foundational topic that has captured a great deal of scholarly attention (Judge, Fluegge-Woolf, Hurst, & Livingston, 2008). Much of this research has examined various leadership behaviours, including transformational leadership, laissez-faire, and leader incivility. Leadership theory has a rich history, but contemporary leadership research has mostly focused on transformational leadership (Barling et al., 2011). Transformational leadership describes a positive form of leadership comprised of four dimensions. The first dimension, idealized influence, centers on a leader’s integrity, foresight, and sense of collective mission. Second, inspirational motivation characterizes leaders who are able to galvanize their followers by giving them the tools to succeed beyond expectations. The third dimension, individualized consideration, involves mentoring followers through supportive and personalized relationships. Finally, intellectual stimulation is manifested in leaders who encourage followers to think for themselves and to challenge the status quo (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Barling et al., 2011). In contrast, laissez-faire leaders are characterized by a more hands-off approach, preferring an
avoidance strategy rather than accepting responsibility (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Finally, incivility - defined as a form of low-level aggression with ambiguous intent to harm (Andersson & Pearson, 1999) - is a topic of growing interest in Industrial/Organizational psychology due to its prevalence and pernicious consequences (Schilpzand, De Pater & Erez, 2016). Uncivil behaviours include rude or discourteous behaviours that typify a general lack of regard for others (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). The current study will examine incivility that is instigated by a leader towards their followers in addition to transformational leadership and laissez-faire.

A number of studies have linked these three leadership behaviours to follower outcomes. For example, given its positive nature, it is not surprising that transformational leadership has been positively linked to several follower outcomes including: job satisfaction (e.g., Braun, Peus, Weisweiler & Frey, 2013; Choi, Goh, Adam & Tan, 2016), perceptions of job meaningfulness (e.g., Arnold, Turner, Barling, Kelloway & McKee, 2004; Frieder, Wang & Oh, 2018; Neilson, Randall, Yarker & Brenner, 2008), creativity (e.g., Al Harbi, Alarifi & Mosbah, 2019; Shin & Zhou, 2003), and pro-environmental behaviours (Robertson & Barling, 2013) among others.

Further, other research has linked transformational leadership to several effective leadership criteria. In particular, meta-analytic data from over 87 studies has shown that transformational leadership is positively related to several effective leadership criteria, including follower satisfaction with leader, follower motivation, and follower perceptions of effective leadership (r ≈ .44 across all criteria for all 87 studies; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). In contrast, laissez-faire leadership behaviour was negatively related to these leadership effectiveness metrics (r ≈ -.37 across all criteria for all 87 studies). When leaders deny responsibility and look the other way instead of taking action, they place the burden of governance over daily work tasks on the shoulders of their followers, resulting in lack of clarity and role ambiguity (Skogstad, Einarsen,
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Torsheim, Aasland, & Hetland, 2007; Skogstad, Hetland, Glaso & Einarsen, 2014). These stressors can have insidious effects on followers, resulting in poor mental health outcomes (Barling & Frone, 2017) and burnout due to unmanageable workloads (Che, Zhou, Kessler & Spector, 2017). Likewise, experiencing incivility from one’s leader can also result in undesirable follower outcomes. Leader incivility is negatively related to employee retention, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction (Spence Laschinger, Leiter, Day, & Gilin, 2009); follower helpfulness, effort, and task performance (Porath & Erez, 2007); and follower intentions to share knowledge (Sharifirad, 2016). Subordinates who are mistreated by their supervisors are also more likely to engage in retaliation toward the supervisor (Kim & Shapiro, 2008; Liu, Kwan, Wu & Wu, 2010). Although employees experience incivility from a number of sources (i.e. coworkers, customers, and supervisors), employees tend to be more sensitive to supervisor-instigated incivility due to the imbalance of formal power (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010; Sliter, Withrow, & Jex, 2015). This power imbalance may also lead employees to interpret supervisor aggression as a signal of their lack of value to the organization, which can negatively impact employee attitudes and behaviours (Kivimäki et al., 2005). In short, existing work has informed our understanding of how leaders affect key follower outcomes, however, very little research has examined the effects of follower behaviour on leader outcomes (Carsten, Uhl-Bien, & Huang, 2017). In particular, an understanding of the effect of hostile follower behaviour (i.e., an extreme form of proactive followership) on various leadership behaviours, including transformational, laissez-faire, and uncivil leadership behaviour is lacking.

**Challenge-Oriented Followership and The Interpersonal Circumplex**

The delivery and nature of the proactive behaviours may be key components to understanding leader reactions to challenge-oriented followership. Notably, Infante and
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colleagues (Infante & Rancer, 1982; Infante & Wigley, 1986; Infante, 1987; Infante & Gorden, 1989) demonstrated that there is a fine line between constructive (assertiveness and argumentativeness) and destructive (hostility and verbal aggression) communication behaviours. This is exemplified in the distinction between argumentativeness (i.e., the tendency to present and defend one’s own positions and attack the positions of others; Infante & Rancer, 1982) and verbal aggressiveness (i.e., the tendency to attack the self-concept of others; Infante & Wigley, 1986). These definitions emphasize that the locus of attack - either positional or personal - is primarily what differentiates these two types of communication (Infante, 1987). Moreover, Infante and Gorden (1989) found that subordinates whose job performance was rated as satisfactory by their supervisor were also rated as more argumentative and less verbally aggressive than subordinates whose job performance was rated as unsatisfactory by their supervisor. It follows that challenge-oriented proactive behaviours such as argumentativeness can only be considered constructive by the receiver if they are accompanied by lubricating factors such as low levels of verbal aggressiveness (Gordon, Infante, & Graham, 1988) or high LMX (; Tepper, Duffy, Henle, & Lambert, 2006). Extending this logic, I suggest that challenge-oriented proactive behaviours that are delivered by a follower in an aggressive or hostile manner may be seen as destructive, and therefore, elicit negative reactions from leaders.

Hostile followership can be conceptualized by the hostile-dominant dimension of the interpersonal circumplex model (e.g., Wiggins, 1979; Kiesler, 1983), which involves behaviours such as acts of anger and aggression, belittling comments, or displays of disdain. According to the interpersonal circumplex model, interpersonal behaviors can be organized along two orthogonal axes: agency and communion (Wiggins, 1979). Agency is described as an attempt to individuate the self from others, and ranges from dominant to submissive behavior. Communion
involves attempts to integrate the self into a group, and ranges from hostile to friendly (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007). Contemporary versions of the model introduced the principle of complementarity, predicting a direct relationship between behaviors motivated by communion but a reciprocal relationship for behaviors with agentic motives. In an interpersonal interaction, hostility invites hostility and friendliness invites friendliness, whereas dominance invites submission and vice versa (Kiesler, 1983). According to the principle of complementarity, a hostile-dominant interpersonal style should invite a hostile-submissive response from the leader. However, hostile followership violates the norms of the predetermined power relationship between leaders and followers, where the leader is the dominant party and the follower is, by definition, supposed to display deference. Therefore, it is possible that the leader will not react in the theoretically expected submissive manner. In support of this conjecture is the work of Orford (1986), who found that people typically respond to hostile-dominant acts with hostile-dominant behavior, rather than the predicted hostile-submissive behaviour.

Although the interpersonal circumplex offers a conceptual basis for understanding the nature of interpersonal hostility, the theory does not account for the power dynamics that are germane to leader-follower relationships. Power frees individuals from conformity pressures, allowing the power holder to act in accordance with their own desires and prioritize self-serving goals over collective goals (e.g., Galinsky, Gruenfeld & Magee, 2003; Galinsky, Magee, Inesi & Gruenfeld, 2006; Keltner, Gruenfeld & Anderson, 2003; Kipnis, 1972). Furthermore, power holders often demonstrate an increased focus on goal-relevant attributes (Guinote, 2017) while showing inattention towards person-relevant attributes (Fiske, 1993) as well as goal constraints (Whitson et al., 2013). It follows that leaders may be more likely to eschew social conventions for smooth interpersonal interactions, as dictated by the interpersonal circumplex models. For
example, the leader may choose to ignore a complimentary response to their followers’
behaviours if that response fails to facilitate goal-attainment or if it runs counter to the leader’s
personal motives. It is also possible that the notion of a complimentary response may not even
register in the mind of the power holder, as they are less likely to take the perspective of their
interaction partner (Galinsky et al., 2006).

Fortunately, power does not necessarily beget corrupt leadership, and some powerful
leaders are still capable of prioritizing group needs over self-serving motives. The characteristics
of the leader may play an important moderating role in the extent to which their positional power
affects their behaviour towards their followers (e.g., Chen, Lee-Chai & Bargh, 2001; Maner &
Mead, 2010). Thus, my thesis integrates insights derived from the circumplex model with adult
attachment theory (e.g., Hazan & Shaver, 1994) and the narcissistic admiration and rivalry
concept (Back et al., 2013) to generate theoretically grounded predictions pertaining to how
leaders will respond to hostile followership.

Attachment Theory and Leadership

Attachment theory is rooted in the study of parent-child relationships (Bowlby, 1969). However, researchers have found that attachment styles shape interpersonal dynamics in a host of contexts, including the workplace (Hazan & Shaver, 1990). With respect to leadership, attachment theory has been applied to a variety of topics, notably, leader-follower relationships (e.g. Davidovitz, Mikulincer, Shaver, Izsak, & Popper, 2007) and propensity for specific leadership styles (e.g., Doverspike, Hollis, Justice, & Polomsky, 1997). Attachment styles reflect an orientation towards others based on working models of the self and others (Bowlby, 1969; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Individuals who are securely attached have a positive view of the self and others. They are emotionally stable and confident that help will be available to them in
times of distress (Brennan & Shaver, 1995; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2015). Secure attachment in leaders is positively related to (a) a preference for a more relational leadership style (i.e., the leader supports their followers and shows concern for their well-being; Doverspike, et al., 1997), (b) socialized charismatic and transformational leadership (Popper, 2002; Popper, Mayseless, & Castelnovo, 2000), (c) an ability to delegate work (Johnston, 2000) and (d) authentic leadership (i.e., leaders who remain true to themselves; Hinojosa, McCauley, Randolph-Seng, & Gardner, 2014). Given a secure leader’s natural propensity toward positive forms of leadership, including transformational leadership and characteristic emotional stability in times of stress, it is likely that leaders with this attachment style will have the ability to deal with the attacks from a hostile follower in a positive way. Accordingly, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 1:** Secure attachment style will moderate the relationship between the hostile followership condition and transformational leadership, such that leaders will only express more transformational leadership in the hostile condition relative to the control condition when they are securely attached.

Those with an avoidant attachment style have a positive self-concept but a negative view of others. Because they believe others are unavailable and unreliable, they attempt to create emotional distance between themselves and others, preferring independence over closeness (Mikulincer, Shaver, & Pereg, 2003). Avoidant attachment style in leaders has been linked to a preference for a more task-oriented leadership style (i.e., the leader focuses on the tasks to be completed in order to meet a certain goal rather than the individuals performing the task; Doverspike et al., 1997) and a decreased likelihood of exhibiting a socialized leadership orientation (Davidovitz, et al., 2007). Leaders’ avoidant attachment style has also been linked to lower levels of leader-member exchange (LMX) quality (Richards & Hackett, 2012). Due to
their natural propensity to put up a wall between themselves and others and focus on tasks rather than people, it is likely that leaders with an avoidant attachment style will prefer to disengage rather than seek a constructive solution to deal with the hostile follower. Therefore, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 2:** Avoidant attachment style will moderate the relationship between the hostile followership condition and laissez-faire leadership behaviour, such that leaders will only express more laissez-faire behaviours in the hostile condition relative to the control condition when they are higher in avoidant attachment.

Finally, anxiously attached individuals have a negative view of both the self and others. Self-doubts about their own worthiness causes these individuals to become overly concerned with receiving affirmation from others (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2015). Attachment anxiety has been found to predict emotional instability and heightened arousal (Fraley, Niedenthal, Marks, Brumbaugh, & Vicary, 2006) and is linked to a greater likelihood to exhibit a personalized leadership orientation (Davidovitz et al., 2007) and abusive supervision (Robertson, Dionisi, & Barling, 2018). Given their inherent emotional instability, hypersensitivity towards rejection, and aggressive leadership tendencies, leaders who are anxiously attached may not have the self-regulatory capabilities to respond to hostile followership in a constructive manner, instead opting for a retaliatory response. As such, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 3:** Anxious attachment style will moderate the relationship between the hostile followership condition and uncivil leader behaviour, such that leaders will only react in a more uncivil manner in the hostile condition relative to the control condition when they have higher levels of anxious attachment.

**Narcissism and Leadership**
Previous research has made important distinctions between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism (Miller et al., 2011). Grandiose or “normal” narcissism is the expression of narcissism most commonly observed in the general population and in social-personality research whereas vulnerable narcissism describes a pathological level of functioning that is typically studied in the context of clinical populations (Miller & Campbell, 2008). Although the examination of both expressions is necessary for the advancement of narcissism research (see Kirzan & Herlache, 2018), the current study focused exclusively on grandiose narcissism (henceforth referred to as “narcissism”).

Much of the fascination surrounding narcissism revolves around the diversity of its cognitive, motivational, and behavioural manifestations. Narcissists are interpersonally skilled and charming but lack empathy for others and often act in aggressive and exploitative ways (Campbell, Hoffman, Campbell & Marchisio, 2011). A key feature of narcissism is an inflated sense of self-importance, which motivates the activation of a range of self-regulatory strategies in order to maintain a bloated self-image (see: Back et al., 2013; Campbell, Brunell & Finkel, 2006; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). One such strategy for maintaining a positive self-image involves the acquisition of status and power. Narcissists are attracted to leadership roles (e.g., Campbell & Campbell, 2009) and tend to be more disparaging toward subordinate roles, responding negatively to occupying such positions (Benson, Christie, & Jordan, 2016). They are also highly motivated to seek out high-status positions (Ziegler-Hill et al., 2018) and display confidence in agentic domains such as intelligence and extraversion (Campell, Rudich & Sedikides, 2002). As a result, narcissists tend to emerge as leaders (Brunell et al., 2008) and frequently occupy positions of power (e.g., Deluga, 1997). However, there is still a great deal of debate as to whether narcissists are effective in the leadership roles they so convincingly attain.
(Campbell et al., 2011). In support of this, a recent review found that although narcissists tend to have positive views of their own leadership ability across studies, other-ratings of narcissistic leadership are far less consistent (Braun, 2017).

Narcissists are typically rated as effective leaders in the early stages of group formation, with their favourability declining as familiarity increases (Ong, Roberts, Arthur, Woodman & Akehurst, 2016). This initial impression of leadership effectiveness may be due to their capacity to display transformational leadership behaviours, namely charisma and the communication of a compelling vision (Galvin, Waldman & Balthazard, 2010; Khoo & Burch, 2008; Ong et al., 2016). It is plausible that narcissistic leaders are actually expressing pseudo-transformational leadership, which involves motivating and inspiring followers as in transformational leadership, but is driven by self-serving motives (Barling, Christie & Turner, 2008). Pseudo-transformational leadership is commonly mistaken for transformational leadership due to these surface level similarities (Christie, Barling & Turner, 2011), and it can be difficult to distinguish between transformational and pseudo-transformational leadership early on in the relationship (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002; Price, 2003).

The self-serving motives of narcissistic leaders may reveal themselves over time, however, the outcomes of these behaviours are not always negative. For example, narcissistic CEOs are more likely to take risks and make bold moves that will draw attention to their leadership prowess. Even though these strategies often fail, reflecting poorly on the leader’s judgement, they can also be successful in securing financial gains for the company (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007). Narcissists can be revered for their visionary thinking and passion but reviled for their lack of connection to their followers, aggressiveness, and failure to accept constructive criticism (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). Further, narcissism has been linked to verbal rudeness...
aggression following ego-threat (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Stucke & Sporer, 2002; Twenge & Campbell, 2003), counterproductive work behaviours (Judge, LePine & Rich, 2006; Penney & Spector, 2002), and supervisor-targeted incivility (Meier & Semmer, 2013). As a result, narcissism has been described as a “mixed bag”, containing both a bright and a dark side (Campbell et al., 2011).

**Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry Concept (NARC)**

The inconsistent connection between narcissism and leadership tendencies highlights the utility of a dual-pathway model delineating the cognitive, motivational, and behavioural pathways of both the “light” and “dark” sides of narcissism. The Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry Concept (NARC, Back et al., 2013) posits that narcissists deploy two different strategies for maintaining a grandiose sense of self. The first of these two pathways, narcissistic admiration, seeks to leverage charisma and charm to maintain a positive self-image. Agentic strategies associated with narcissistic admiration are activated by opportunities to self-promote and impress others (Back et al., 2013). In support of this, individuals with high levels of narcissistic admiration are usually successful in earning early favour with unacquainted peers, when their assertive self-enhancement is most likely to be viewed in a positive manner (Leckelt, Albrecht, Kufner, Nestler, & Back, 2015). Given their propensity to take advantage of social situations that will allow them to be admired by their peers, leaders who are high in narcissistic admiration are more likely to showcase their charm and passion (i.e., transformational behaviours) under relatively neutral conditions (i.e., absence of hostile followership). Narcissistic admiration is also positively related to high and stable levels of state self-esteem (Geukas et al., 2017). These self-protective features of narcissistic admiration should buffer against any extreme negative reactions from being challenged, however, opportunity for self-enhancement is key in
encouraging narcissists to be persistent in their leadership role (Wallace, Ready, & Weitenhagen, 2009). Therefore, it is likely that the expression of transformational behaviours will be muted in the presence of a hostile follower, as this condition provides less opportunity for leaders high in narcissistic admiration to be self-aggrandizing.

Accordingly, I hypothesise:

**Hypothesis 4:** Narcissistic admiration will moderate the relationship between the hostile followership condition and transformational leadership behaviour, such that leaders will only express more transformational leadership in the control condition relative to the control condition when they are higher in narcissistic admiration.

The second pathway, *narcissistic rivalry*, approaches the maintenance of a grandiose self through antagonistic self-protection. That is, rather than actively promoting an elevated self-image, they select a more defensive strategy against potential threats to this image (Back et al., 2013). Narcissistic rivalry can manifest as both passive (i.e., devaluing others) and active (i.e., aggression) intrapersonal reactions, which become salient when faced with a perceived social rival (Back et al., 2013). Individuals who are high in narcissistic rivalry are also prone to fluctuations in self-esteem, reacting in a particularly negative manner to perceived lack of social inclusion (Geukes et al., 2017). Given their shaky self-esteem, motivation to defend their perceived superior status, and aggressive tendencies, leaders with high levels of narcissistic rivalry will likely react in a retaliatory manner to the overt threat of hostile followership. That is, they will try to redress the attack on their grandiose self-image with rude, degrading behaviour towards their followers. As such, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 5:** Narcissistic rivalry will moderate the relationship between the hostile followership condition and uncivil leader behaviour, such that leaders will only react in a
more uncivil manner in the hostile condition relative to the control condition when they are higher in narcissistic rivalry.

Methods

Participants

Participants were University of Western Ontario students who were recruited through the psychology research experience pool. Based on a preliminary power analyses using an alpha of .05 and a conservative effect size ($f^2$) of .04, 191 participants were required to achieve a desired power of .80. Participants received 1.0 course credits for their time. They were also invited to enter their email address into a draw to win one of 30 Tim Hortons gift cards as an incentive to participate in the study. After excluding participants based on failed attention checks and outliers (detailed below), the final sample consisted of 138 (95 female; 43 male) participants ($M_{age} = 18.41, SD = .90$).

Experimental Overview

A randomized controlled between-subjects experimental design with two conditions was used to test the hypotheses. Prior to the experimental task, the proposed moderator variables (i.e., individual difference measures) were assessed as continuous measures. The experiment involved a group decision making task with a leader and two followers that was completed through a virtual interaction (i.e., an online chat room). The leader and one of the followers were student participants, but the second follower was a confederate. Participants assigned to the leader role were told that they are responsible for leading the team through a group-decision making task and making the final decision, while the follower was told they are to assist with the group decision making task as directed by the leader. To increase participants’ engagement with the group decision-making task as well as the likelihood that the group leader would engage in the
leadership behaviours being measured, participants were led to believe that groups who completed the decision-making task correctly would be rewarded with gift cards. Participants were then given a partial debrief at the end of the study and all participants were given the option to enter a draw for one of 30 Tim Hortons gift cards regardless of their group’s performance on the group task. In the experimental condition, the confederate engaged in hostile followership by challenging the leader’s ideas throughout the group decision-making task. In the control condition the confederate acted as a neutral follower, responding with a series of generic statements that were neither ingratiating nor aggravating (see Appendix A for the list statements).

**Procedure and Measures**

Upon coming into the lab in groups of two, participants were led to believe that the purpose of the study was to assess decision-making in virtual teams. To protect the identity of the confederate and control for the possibility that the participants might be previously acquainted, participants were told that they were participating with other students at remote locations across campus, and that the people they came into the lab with were not necessarily members of their team. Participants were provided with a link to the study in Qualtrics and a hard copy of the Letter of Information and Consent to retain for their records. After participants provided informed consent, they were given access to the online questionnaire, which included demographics questions (see Appendix B) and the following pre-measures.

**Adult Attachment.** To assess adult attachment, participants responded to the Experiences in Close Relationships questionnaire (ECR-12; Appendix C; Lafontaine et al., 2015). This 12-item self-report questionnaire assesses the anxious and avoidant dimensions of attachment. Items are presented on a 7-point Likert scale with choices ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7
(Strongly Agree). Sample items include “I worry about being abandoned” (anxiety; $\alpha = .81$) and “I don’t feel comfortable opening up to others” (avoidance; $\alpha = .80$). Secure attachment is determined by a low score on both attachment anxiety and avoidance ($\alpha = .72$).

**Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry.** Both narcissistic admiration and rivalry were assessed using the Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry Questionnaire (NARQ; Appendix D; Back et al., 2013). The scale consists of 18 self-report items administered on a 6-point Likert scale (1 = *not agree at all* to 6 = *agree completely*). Sample items include “I show others how special I am” (admiration; $\alpha = .84$) and “I secretly take pleasure of the failure of my rivals” (rivalry; $\alpha = .83$).

**Role assignment and group decision-making task.** After completing the pre-measures, participants completed a test that would ostensibly determine the role for which they are best-suited (either leader or follower). In actuality, participant answers had no bearing on their assigned role. Following the completion of the bogus psychological test (Appendix E; Hoption, Christie, & Barling, 2012; Benson et al., 2016), participants were randomly assigned the role of “Team Leader” or “Team Member A”. To ensure participants remembered their role, they were asked to identify the role to which they had been assigned (“Please identify to role you have been assigned for this task: (a) Team Leader (b) Team Member A or (c) I don’t know”).

Participants then assumed their assigned role to complete the group-decision making task through a virtual interaction (i.e., an online chat room). A modified hidden profile paradigm (Toma & Butera, 2009; see Appendix G) was used as the group task. Group members were instructed to read a description of a road accident investigation. Thereafter, each participant received three unique clues to help them identify who caused the road accident. Participants were made aware that each group member had a different set of clues. The key feature of the hidden
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Profile task is that the unshared information (i.e., the unique clues) is intended to mislead the participant as to the culprit. The only way to arrive at the correct answer is if all nine clues are shared during the subsequent discussion. Following the administration of the clues, participants were provided with a link to a secure, password-protected, online chatroom (www.chatzy.com) as well as a hard copy of the description of the accident for their reference. Participants were also provided with an alias that was consistent with the role to which they were assigned (e.g. Team Leader and Team Member A) to maintain anonymity while ensuring the participants would be able to identify each group member’s role. Participants were given ten minutes to use the chat room to discuss the details of the case, share their clues, and come to a decision about the identity of the culprit. The researcher kept time and updated the participants of the time at the five- and nine-minute mark.

Manipulation of hostile followership. Hostile followership was manipulated by the confederate using a series of standardized statements (see Appendix A). My conceptualization and operationalization of hostile followership is consistent with the interpersonal behaviors captured by the hostile-dominant quadrant (e.g. cold, cruel, suspicious, resentful, rivalrous, angry and disdainful acts) of the interpersonal circumplex model (e.g. Wiggins, 1979; Kiesler, 1983). To ensure successful manipulation of hostile followership, I created a range of hostile-dominant, neutral, and helpful statements and presented them for review to a group of subject matter experts prior to running the experiment (i.e., I/O psychology graduate students and group dynamics experts). All statements were subsequently to rated in terms of hostility (1 = Not at all hostile, 5 = Extremely hostile). Average ratings of hostility for each hostile-dominant statement were compared to the average hostility ratings of both the neutral and helpful statements. Cohen’s $d$ for these comparisons ranged from 1.90 to 11.52. Example hostile statements include
“I don’t know why I am bothering, you’ll never figure this out” and “Where did you come up with that ridiculous logic?”. To ensure the neutral statements were viewed as benign and unlikely to evoke a strong reaction from participants, the same statements were all rated in terms of helpfulness (1 = Not at all helpful, 7 = Extremely helpful), with the midpoint of the scale representing a statement that was neither helpful nor unhelpful. The average score for each of the neutral statements was compared to the midpoint of the scale, with all Cohen’s $d < 1.0$ for the neutral statements. Example neutral statements include “This task is interesting” and “Sure, that’s one possible solution”.

At the end of the ten minutes, the leader was instructed to submit the answer on behalf of the team. Team Member A was also asked to provide an answer as to who they thought was the culprit. After the final answers were submitted, participants completed the following dependent measures.

**Transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership.** The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X-short (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1995) was used to assess the extent to which the leader engaged in transformational and laissez-faire behaviours over the course of the group decision-making task. Responses range from 0 (Not at all) to 4 (Frequently, if not always). The participant assigned to the role of leader answered the questionnaire based on their perceptions of their own leadership style while the participant assigned to the role of follower assessed the leadership style of the Team Leader. The transformational leadership scale assesses the four subcomponents of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Sample items include: “I go/[The leader] goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group” and “I re-examine/[The leader] re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate. Consistent with other
research that has demonstrated TFL is best measured as a unidimensional construct (e.g., Carless, Wearing & Mann, 2000; Robertson & Barling, 2013) the four subcomponents were averaged to obtain an overall rating of transformational leadership ($\alpha = .95$). Sample items for the laissez-faire leadership scale include “I avoid/[The leader] avoids getting involved when important issues arise” and “I am/[The leader] is absent when needed” ($\alpha = .73$).

**Uncivil leader behaviour.** The Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS; Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001) was used to test perceptions of incivility following the group discussion. This 6-item scale required participants to rate the frequency of uncivil behaviours in the group task on a 5-point Likert scale (0 = not at all; 4 = frequently, if not always). The leader filled out the scale as a self-rating of their own uncivil behaviours and the follower completed the scale rating the leader’s uncivil behaviour (e.g. “I/My leader put down or was condescending to my/their followers”; $\alpha = .58$).

**Manipulation check.** To test the effectiveness of the experimental manipulation, participants rated each group member on the dominance subscale of the peer-rated Dominance-Prestige Scale (Cheng, Tracy & Henrich, 2010). The scale consists of 8-items rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all to 7 = very much). Each participant completed the measure twice, once to rate the other participant and once to rate the confederate. Sample items include “They are willing to use aggressive tactics to get their way” and “They enjoy having control over others” ($\alpha_{\text{Leader-FollowerA}} = .65; \alpha_{\text{Leader-Confederate}} = .90; \alpha_{\text{FollowerA-Leader}} = .74; \alpha_{\text{FollowerA-Confederate}} = .90$).

**Deception check.** Following the completion of the post-task measures, participants were asked an open-ended question to see whether they intuited the hypotheses (e.g., participants were asked to list their thoughts/guesses/ideas about the purpose of this study).

**Data Analyses**
Prior to analyzing the data, preliminary data screening was conducted to determine which participants failed the attention checks (i.e., failed to correctly recall their role as either team leader or team member), and therefore, should be excluded from the dataset. In addition, Z-scores were computed for each of the dependent variables (i.e., ratings of leadership behaviour) to identify potential outliers in the dataset. Participants with Z-scores > |3| were considered outliers (Sincich, 1992). All analyses were computed both including and excluding outliers and failed attention checks to ascertain whether the presence of outliers biased the results or assumptions.

Computing the Z-scores revealed several extreme outliers for the followers’ ratings of leader incivility. Further examination of the incivility distribution indicated a right-skewed pattern of responding with an average score of ~1.3. That is, even in the experimental condition in which the leader is the target of hostile behaviour, the frequency of uncivil behaviours was very low. Given the transient nature of the interaction, the use of an online medium, and the lack of previous acquaintanceship, the low baseline for incivility in this task makes sense (e.g., Kiesler, 1983). With this in mind, extremely high ratings of leader incivility may reflect careless or inaccurate responding.

The initial sample consisted of 73 dyads. Two participants failed to provide a response to the attention check (participant ID codes 058 and 365) and one participant incorrectly identified their role (participant ID code 047). The participant (ID # 058) who did not answer the attention check was not an outlier on any of the measures, and thus, this participant and their dyad partner were retained in the analysis. However, participant 365 (who failed to answer the attention check) and participant 047 (who incorrectly identified their role) were also flagged as outliers based on their responses for ratings of the leader’s incivility (i.e., Z-scores > |3|). The inclusion
of these outliers in the analysis altered the results, leading to the exclusion of the whole dyad for both participants (ID#s 365 and 047) from the analysis. Two more dyads were identified as influential outliers on the incivility outcome variable (i.e., Z-scores > |3|), and therefore, were excluded from the analysis, resulting in 69 remaining dyads. All four of the excluded dyads provided incivility scores that were at least three standard deviations above the average rating for this outcome. As previously mentioned, the low base rate of incivility further justifies the exclusion of these extreme ratings.

To evaluate Hypotheses 1-5, separate moderated multiple regression analyses were conducted using Model 1 in the PROCESS macro version 3 (Hayes, 2018). PROCESS uses ordinary least squares regression to estimate 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals. PROCESS also generates unstandardized regression coefficients, p-values, and simple slopes in moderation models (Hayes, 2018). Each regression model included the experimental condition as a categorical predictor (1 = hostile followership condition, 0 = neutral followership condition), either dimension of attachment style (i.e., secure, anxious, avoidant) or narcissism (i.e., narcissistic admiration, narcissistic rivalry) as a continuous grand-mean centered predictor, their product term (condition*dimension of attachment style/narcissism), and the relevant leadership behaviour as a continuous outcome. Leaders provided their own self-ratings for attachment style and narcissism. However, self-ratings of performance (i.e., leadership behaviour in the group task) tend to be inflated (e.g., Judge et al., 2006; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986; Murphy & Cleveland, 1991). Furthermore, there is typically lower agreement between self- and other-ratings compared to other-other ratings (Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988). Therefore, to reduce bias in the outcome measures, the leadership behaviours used in the analyses were based on the follower-rated measures of leadership only. Significant interactions were probed to determine the
effect of the experimental condition on follower-rated leader behaviour at one standard deviation above the mean, the mean, and one standard deviation below the mean value of the proposed moderator (i.e., dimension of attachment style or dimension of narcissism).

**Results**

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations for all study variables are displayed in Table 1. To determine whether the experimental manipulation was effective, a one-way ANOVA was conducted comparing the participants’ ratings of the confederate’s hostility following the group interaction. Both the leader\((M_{control} = 2.11, SD_{control} = 0.67; M_{experimental} = 4.52, SD_{experimental} = 1.53; F_{leader}(1, 67) = 69.50, p < .001)\) and follower\((M_{control} = 1.99, SD_{control} = 0.84; M_{experimental} = 4.84, SD_{experimental} = 1.29; F_{follower}(1, 67) = 114.94, p < .001)\) rated the confederate as significantly more hostile in the experimental condition compared to control.

Next, three separate one-way ANOVAs were conducted to determine whether the experimental manipulation influenced the dependent variables (i.e., testing the main effects). The results of these analyses revealed a significant overall main effect of condition on incivility, \(F(1, 67) = 16.70, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .20\). That is, followers rated their leaders as more uncivil in the hostile condition \((M = 1.38, SD = 0.41)\) compared to the control condition \((M = 1.07; SD = 0.16)\). The main effect of condition on laissez-faire leadership approached significance \((M_{control} = 1.78, SD_{control} = 0.75; M_{experimental} = 2.21, SD_{experimental} = 1.03; F(1, 67) = 3.82, p = .055)\). There was no main effect of condition on transformational leadership \((M_{control} = 3.36, SD_{control} = 0.75; M_{experimental} = 3.24, SD_{experimental} = 0.99; F(1, 67) = 0.31, p = .582)\).

**Attachment Style as a Moderator of Leader Responses to Hostile Followership**

All parameter estimates from the moderation analyses relevant to the attachment style hypotheses are summarized in Table 2. The expression of transformational leadership in
response to hostile followership did not significantly vary as a function of secure attachment style \((b = 0.26, p = .378, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.32, 0.84])\), failing to provide support for Hypothesis 1. Furthermore, there were no significant main effects of condition \((b = -0.12, p = .572, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.55, 0.31])\) or secure attachment \((b = 0.09, p = .680, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.34, 0.52])\) on transformational leadership. The interaction effect of avoidant attachment with condition in predicting laissez-faire leadership was also not statistically significant \((b = -0.03, p = .902, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.49, 0.43])\). Therefore, the data fail to provide support for Hypothesis 2. Neither avoidant attachment \((b = -0.01, p = .945, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.36, 0.33])\) nor condition \((b = 0.41, p = .077, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.05, 0.88])\) significantly predicted the expression of laissez-faire leadership.

Finally, the overall regression model for anxious attachment style as a moderator of the relation between condition and incivility was significant \((R^2 = 0.20, F(3, 65) = 5.41, p < .01)\). Although followers’ ratings of leader incivility differed across conditions \((b = .32, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = [0.16, 0.47])\), the effect of the experimental condition was not moderated by the leader’s anxious attachment style, contrary to the predictions made in Hypothesis 3 \((b = 0, p = .989, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.14, 0.14])\).

**Narcissism as a Moderator of Leader Responses to Hostile Followership**

The parameter estimates from the secondary set of analyses appear in Table 3. As previously discussed, the effect of the experimental manipulation on leader’s engagement in transformation leadership was expected to vary as a function of narcissistic admiration. The results from the moderation analysis failed to support this prediction, as narcissistic admiration did not significantly interact with the experimental condition in predicting transformational leadership \((b = -0.11, p = .680, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.64, 0.42])\). Additionally, neither condition \((b = -0.01, p = .945, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.36, 0.33])\) nor narcissistic admiration \((b = 0.41, p = .077, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.05, 0.88])\) significantly predicted the expression of laissez-faire leadership.
0.12, \( p = .579 \), 95% CI = [-0.55, 0.31]) nor narcissistic admiration \((b = 0.12, \ p = .531, \ 95\%\ CI = [-0.27, 0.51])\) significantly predicted the expression of transformational leadership.

Finally, it was hypothesized that the leader’s expression of incivility towards their followers in response to being challenged would vary as a function the leader’s level of narcissistic rivalry. In support of Hypothesis 5, the moderating effect of narcissistic rivalry on the relationship between condition and incivility was statistically significant \((b = 0.29, \ p = .038, \ 95\%\ CI = [0.02, 0.56]; \Delta R^2 = .05, F(1, 65) = 4.49)\). Table 4 presents the conditional effect of the manipulation, as a function of narcissistic rivalry levels. Probing the interaction revealed that narcissistic rivalry amplified the differences across conditions: Followers perceived their leader to engage in more incivility in the hostile condition relative to the control condition, but only at average (Mean; \( b = 0.38, \ p = < .001, \ 95\%\ CI = [0.21, 0.54])\) and higher (Mean +1 SD; \( b = 0.58, \ p < .001, \ 95\%\ CI = [0.30, 0.85]\)) levels of narcissistic rivalry (see Figure 1). There were no significant differences in leader incivility across experimental conditions when the leader was lower in narcissistic rivalry (1 SD below the mean; \( b = 0.17, \ p = .126, \ 95\%\ CI = [-0.05, 0.40]\)).

Analyzing the simple slopes revealed a significant positive effect of narcissistic rivalry in the hostile \((b = 0.28, \ p = .022, \ 95\%\ CI = [0.04, 0.52])\) but not control condition \((b = -0.01, \ p = .891, \ 95\%\ CI = [-0.14, 0.12])\).

**Discussion**

Though followers are acknowledged as a necessary component of the leadership process, empirical study of the extent of their impact has been limited by an incomplete understanding of the range of behaviours in which followers can engage. Research on proactive followership has begun to examine the potential consequences of a broader range of follower behaviours, including offering constructive feedback and taking initiative (e.g., Benson et al., 2016;
Dulebohn et al., 2012; Grant et al., 2009; Sun & van Emmerik, 2014). The results of these studies highlight the complicated nature of the leader-follower dynamic, with leaders having mixed opinions on and preferences for proactive followers. As such, it is critical to examine how leaders respond to different forms of proactive followership. Accordingly, this study examined how hostile followership – a challenge-oriented form of proactive followership – affects leadership behaviour.

Drawing from attachment theory and the narcissistic admiration and rivalry concept, this study investigated how a leader’s relational attachment and narcissistic personality impact the way follower hostility is perceived and processed. Counter to initial expectations, attachment style did not significantly moderate the relationship between experimental condition and leader behavioural reactions. Consistent with Hypothesis 5, leaders with higher levels of narcissistic rivalry were particularly likely to react negatively towards their followers in response to being challenged.

Theoretical Implications

At a general level, the results of this study contribute to the burgeoning field of followership by positioning followers as active agents in the leadership process. Previous research has primarily focused on the unilateral influence of the leader on follower behaviours and attitudes while neglecting to examine the reverse relationship (Hollander, 1993; Yukl, 1998). With respect to leader incivility towards followers specifically, research has primarily centered on follower health outcomes and organizational deviance as a direct result of mistreatment from the leader (see Schilpzand, De Pater & Erez, 2016 for a review). In line with recent work by Lian et al. (2014) and Camps et al. (2018), this study demonstrates that followers can play a crucial initiating role in the emergence of counterproductive leadership behaviours. As such, these
results stress the importance of understanding the consequences of follower actions in relation to the leader.

The current findings also highlight how personality differences may impact leader-follower dynamics. Hostile followership was generally met with negative leadership reactions (i.e., leader incivility). However, not all leaders reacted uniformly to being challenged by the hostile follower. Although the results failed to provide support for the role of attachment style and narcissistic admiration, narcissistic rivalry was systematically related to how leaders responded to being challenged by one of their followers. Consistent with Hypothesis 5, narcissistic rivalry increased the leader’s negative reactions to hostile followership in the experimental condition. Therefore, this study suggests that leaders can differ in their capacity to cope with a challenging follower as a function of their personality.

Furthermore, the current research supports the dual-pathway model of narcissism (Back et al., 2013), allowing for a more nuanced understanding of this personality trait that cannot be achieved by measuring it as a unitary construct (e.g., Narcissistic Personality Inventory; Raskin & Hall, 1979). Narcissists have been shown to engage in ego self-protection strategies such as ingroup abandonment (Benson, Jeschke, Jordan, Bruner & Arnocky, 2018) and instigating aggressive behaviours in response to negative evaluations (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Stucke & Sporer, 2002; Twenge & Campbell, 2003). Despite evidence demonstrating narcissists’ tendency to act out after receiving information that threatens their self-image, studies have still shown that narcissists can display an unfettering confidence and cool demeanor in the face of negative feedback (Atlas & Them, 2008; Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2011). This study adds to this growing literature by showing evidence of maladaptive self-protection processes and identifying
narcissistic rivalry as a probable primary mechanism driving the antagonistic behaviours linked to narcissism.

Whereas the antagonistic qualities of narcissistic rivalry worsen over time, narcissistic admiration presents as an initially positive trait whose effects dwindle over time (Leckelt et al., 2015). This study offers an important caveat, pointing to the potential acceleration of the antagonism associated with rivalry in response to being challenged by a group member. Given the short timeframe and limited opportunity for interpersonal interaction, it is also possible that these results underestimate the negative impact of antagonistic forms of narcissistic leadership. Moreover, this study extends the work of Leckelt et al. (2015) by introducing a formal power dynamic in the group. That is, being assigned the role of group leader may carry with it an expectation of deference from other group members. Violating these expectations in the form of hostile followership might diminish the potentially advantageous or harmless aspects of narcissism at zero-acquaintanceship.

This study drew upon interpersonal circumplex models to conceptualize hostile followership. Though a main effect of hostility was not formally hypothesized, the emergence of this effect has implications for the principle of complementarity. Leaders tended to respond to follower hostility by using more hostile tactics such as rudeness towards their followers. These findings support criticisms of these models made by Orford (1986), claiming that circumplex models are inaccurate in predicting the complementarity of behaviours for the hostile half of the circle. Early conceptualizations of the principle of complementarity would have predicted that the hostile-dominant challenges from the follower should be met with a hostile-submissive response from the leader. Examples of such responses include an aloof-introverted (Leary, 1957) or a self-effacing (Wiggins, 1979) response to a critical or degrading comment. However, Orford
(1986) points out the frequency with which hostile-dominance has been reciprocated within interaction partners, suggesting that restoration of status may be underlying these retaliatory responses. This study extends these assertions in its introduction of defined roles. According to Orford, the hostile-dominant behaviour is most likely to be reciprocated if interaction partners have the same status level. In the case where the instigator of hostile-dominance is higher status, hostile-submissive behaviour is more likely to be observed (e.g., Shannon & Guerney, 1973), whereas friendly-dominance is more likely to be observed if the target has higher status (e.g., Mackenzie, 1968). The expression of friendly-dominance from the higher status interaction partner was mainly observed in parent-child relationships or client-therapist (Mackenzie, 1968; Orford, 1986) and may not be appropriate in leader-follower relationships. Instead, the matching of hostile followership with uncivil leadership in this case supports the notion that hostile followership violates expectations of deference and civility, causing the leader to redress the injustice with negative behaviour (Camps et al., 2018).

Limitations & Future Directions

This study is not without its limitations. First, the choice to use an online chat room to examine the effects of hostile followership on leadership behaviour allowed for greater experimental control over gender, race, and familiarity confounds. The use of this medium, however, may have affected the results of this study. According to media richness theory (Daft & Lengel, 1986), the richness of a communication medium is a function of its capacity to handle multiple cues (e.g., verbal and nonverbal cues), offer rapid feedback, and convey personalized information. Richer media are more conducive to the communication of ambiguous or subjective messages whereas leaner media are most appropriate when a straightforward or “black and white” message is being communicated (Daft & Lengel, 1986). With regards to leadership
behaviours specifically, the synchronicity of the chat forum would have allowed for immediate feedback but, because chatrooms are more lean than face-to-face interactions, the more nuanced aspects of leadership may have gone undetected by the follower, thereby lessening the salience of the leader’s leadership style. In addition, online acts of hostility committed via leaner media (i.e., email or text message) are seen as less personal compared to hostility conveyed through richer media channels (i.e., phone calls and video) and are subsequently rated as less harmful by the victim (Slonje & Smith, 2008). Therefore, it is possible that the use of a less rich medium may have dampened the impact of the hostile follower. In contrast, the use of an online chatroom may have emboldened leaders to be more uncivil in response to hostile followership. The anonymity afforded by online mediums has been linked to increased frequency of cyber-bullying (Bartlett, 2015), which may have exacerbated the expressions of incivility from the team leaders. As such, future research should explore what leadership behaviours emerge in response to hostile followership when participants are interacting face-to-face.

The ecological validity of the experiment must also be considered before making any generalizations. Assigning formal roles and directly manipulating hostile followership enhanced experimental control but may have diminished the realism of the task. The high pass-rate for the attention checks suggests that the participants were aware of their role, however, it is unclear if the same pattern of results would be observed if the leader was not randomly assigned or if the interaction had occurred between leaders and followers who were previously acquainted. Therefore, the results of this study should be corroborated using a sample of working adults. A promising line of inquiry would also be to examine the interplay of follower hostility and leader incivility over time. Research has begun to examine how incidents of leader-follower mistreatment can manifest into dysfunctional relationships (e.g., Simon, Hurst, Kelley & Judge,
2015). As such, it is vital to continue to evaluate the long-term ramifications that underscore such interactions in the field.

Although this study examined dyad-specific followership, it should also be noted that leaders usually oversee several followers at once. Research has shown that followers are more able to exert their influence over leaders as a function of group size and in-group agreement (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). Therefore, if followers engage in collective hostility towards the leader this would surely amplify the negative consequences observed from just one follower in the current study. In contrast, if the group of followers believe the hostility of one difficult follower violates the implicit “contract” between leaders and followers, they may engage in collective action and punish the hostile follower. This is especially true if the leader is otherwise well-respected and competent (Price & Van Vugt, 2014).

Finally, due to time constraints, I fell slightly short of my targeted sample size. This may help to explain why attachment style failed to significantly moderate the relationship between experimental condition and leadership behaviour. Moving forward, it would be prudent to collect additional data to increase statistical power prior to drawing any conclusions about the appropriateness of this variable as a moderator.

**Practical Implications**

This study identifies an often ignored antecedent of leader incivility by demonstrating that supervisor-instigated incivility may be a reaction to first being the target of aggression from one’s followers. Organizations should be aware of the influence a difficult follower can have on a leader’s behaviours and assess this in addition to the leader’s actions when investigating incidents of workplace aggression. Leadership training initiatives should also prepare leaders to handle hostile subordinates in a more proactive manner. Organizations can also act to further
support their leaders who may be having difficulty coping with a challenging follower. Recent research has shown that individuals who are high in narcissistic rivalry may have a stifled sense of empowerment, negatively impacting their self-determined behaviours (Helfrich & Dietl, 2019). Of note is the potentially powerful mitigating role of contextual factors in this relationship. Specifically, the negative impact of rivalry was attenuated if employees had a leader who generally ascribed positive traits to their followers (i.e., positive intrinsic follower theories). In this case, instilling a greater sense of control over their behaviour may help to neutralize the retaliatory impulse of leaders who are high in narcissistic rivalry. Taken together, the results of this study provide a more holistic view of negative leader behaviours which may contribute to more informed organizational policies, programs and interventions targeted at workplace incivility and aggression.

This study also highlights the importance of understanding the potential impact of supervisor targeted incivility on the organization. Research has shown that being the target of incivility has more harmful outcomes if the instigator has more power than the target (e.g., Hershcovis & Barling, 2010), which is perhaps why so few studies have examined supervisors as targets of incivility (see Lim & Lee, 2011; Meier & Gross, 2015 for exceptions). However, the consequences of leader-targeted incivility should not be underestimated. In this study, a third-party observer (i.e., Team Member A) provided the incivility ratings for the leader. Indeed, research has shown that narcissists can display both direct aggression (i.e., aggression towards the individual responsible for the frustration) as well as displaced aggression (i.e., bystanders) following negative evaluations (Martinez, Zeichner, Reidy & Miller, 2008). Therefore, it is possible that the effects of follower hostility and subsequent leader incivility extend beyond this
dyad, further perpetuating the incivility spiral and creating a toxic environment for employees (Andersson & Pearson, 1999).

**Conclusions**

In the present research, I examined how hostile followership affects leadership behaviour and the moderating effects of attachment style and narcissism on this relationship. Leaders responded in a more negative manner towards their followers in the hostile condition compared to the control condition. Attachment style failed to significantly moderate the relationship between experimental condition and leader behaviour. Narcissistic rivalry, however, emerged as an especially sensitive reagent for social conflict in organizations, magnifying the effects of follower hostility on leader incivility in the experimental condition. The results of this study highlight the importance of examining the previously neglected influence of followership in the leadership process in addition to identifying additional mechanisms underlying leader incivility. This study also demonstrates the fragility of a narcissistic leader’s self-concept and the potentially explosive consequences of challenging a leader who is high in narcissistic rivalry.
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Table 1  
*Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations, and Reliabilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Condition</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Secure</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>(.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Avoid</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.66**</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anxious</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.73**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Admiration</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rivalry</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TFL</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Laissez-faire</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>(.73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Incivility</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>(.58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: M = Mean; SD = Standard deviation. Experimental Condition = 1; Control Condition = 0. Secure, Avoid, and Anxious correspond to attachment style. Admiration and Rivalry refer to Narcissism. TFL = Transformational Leadership. N = 69 for all variables. Scale reliabilities are on the diagonal (in boldface). *p < .05; **p < .01.
Table 2

Regression Coefficients for the Moderation Analyses Involving Attachment Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1: DV = TFL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure*Condition</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model Summary:** $R^2 = 0.02$, $F(3, 65) = 0.41$, $p = .750$

|                     |          |     |       |       |      |      |
| **Model 2: DV = Laissez-faire** |          |     |       |       |      |      |
| Constant            | 1.78     | 0.17| 10.65 | <.001 | 1.45 | 2.12 |
| Avoidant            | -0.01    | 0.17| -0.07 | .945  | -0.36| 0.33 |
| Condition           | 0.41     | 0.23| 1.80  | .077  | -0.05| 0.88 |
| Avoidant*Condition  | -0.03    | 0.23| -0.12 | .902  | -0.49| 0.43 |

**Model Summary:** $R^2 = 0.06$, $F(3, 65) = 1.26$, $p = .294$

|                     |          |     |       |       |      |      |
| **Model 3: DV = Incivility** |          |     |       |       |      |      |
| Constant            | 1.07     | .06 | 18.78 | <.001 | 0.95 | 1.18 |
| Anxious             | 0        | 0.05| -0.06 | .953  | -0.10| 0.10 |
| Condition           | 0.32     | 0.08| 4.01  | <.001 | 0.16 | 0.47 |
| Anxious*Condition   | 0        | 0.07| -0.01 | .989  | -0.14| 0.14 |

**Model Summary:** $R^2 = 0.20$, $F(3, 65) = 5.41$, $p < .01$

Note: LLCI and ULCI values represent bias corrected 95% confidence intervals. TFL = Transformational Leadership. IV = Condition; Moderator = Attachment Style. All attachment style dimensions are grand mean centered. $N = 69$ dyads.
Table 3

*Regression Coefficients for the Moderation Analyses Involving Narcissism*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 4: DV = TFL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>21.61</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiration</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiration*Condition</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Summary</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(3, 65)$</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 5: DV = Incivil</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivalry</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivalry*Condition</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Summary</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(3, 65)$</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: LLCI and ULCI values represent bias corrected 95% confidence intervals. TFL = Transformational Leadership. IV = Condition; Moderator = Narcissism. All narcissism dimensions are grand mean centered. N = 69 dyads.*
Table 4

*Conditional Effect of Hostile Followership on Follower-Rated Incivility as a Function of Leader Narcissistic Rivalry*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rivalry</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean -1 SD</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean +1 SD</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* SE refers to Standard Error. LLCI and ULCI values represent bias corrected 95% confidence intervals. N = 69 dyads.
Figure 1. Interaction effect of condition and the leader’s narcissistic rivalry on followers’ ratings of leader incivility.
Appendix A

Predetermined Statements

Experimental Manipulation: Challenging Follower

Experimental Condition: Challenging Statements

*Confederate will begin with a few introductory pleasantries*

“Hi, everyone!”

“Let’s work together to figure this out”

*Contribution of unique clue*

“Well, my clue said the guilty person is a man so that ought to help a little. Does anyone else remember their clues and have an idea of who caused the accident?”

“Based on my clues I think it’s Mr. Z”

*Hostile statements*

“I don’t get why you’re suggesting that, it seems completely wrong”

“Why should we even listen to your ideas?”

“Clearly we were randomly given our roles because you don’t know how to lead a group”

“With those types of suggestions, we are never going to solve this”

“I think you must have read your clues wrong because I have no idea where you got that idea from, it’s ridiculous”

“That’s the worst argument I’ve ever heard”

“Okay I’m just saying, shouldn’t you have a handle on this by now? You’re the leader!”

“I don’t know why I am bothering, you’ll never figure this out”

*Disconfirming initial choice*

“Maybe it’s [insert Ms. Y or Mr. X] then?”

*Closing remarks*

“Okay we are almost out of time so what are we thinking as our final answer?”

“Okay”

“Bye everyone”

Control Condition: Neutral Statements

*Confederate will begin with a few introductory pleasantries*

“Hi, everyone!”
“Let’s work together to figure this out”

*Contribution of the unique clue*

“Well, my clue said the guilty person is a man so that ought to help a little. Does anyone else remember their clues and have an idea of who caused the accident?”

“I think it’s Mr. Z”

*Neutral statements*

“This task is interesting”

“If we get this right we will be rewarded”

“That’s definitely something to consider”

“How much time do we have?”

“That’s an interesting idea!”

“Sure, that is one possible solution”

“Okay”

“That’s a unique take on it”

*Disconfirming initial choice*

“Maybe it’s [insert Ms. Y or Mr. X] then?”

*Final minute: Closing remarks*

“Okay we are almost out of time so what are we thinking as our final answer?”

“Okay”

“Bye everyone”
Appendix B
Demographics Questions

**Biographical Informational**

Gender identity:
- Woman
- Man
- You do not have an option that applies to me. I identify as (please specify):
  __________________________________________

Age (years):
- Please specify: ________________________________

Please write your SONA ID in the space below. This information will only be used to ensure you receive course credit.

___________________________________________________
Appendix C

Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR-12; Lafontaine et al., 2015)

The following statements concern how you generally feel in close relationships (e.g., with romantic partners, close friends, or family members). Respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree with it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree slightly</td>
<td>Neutral/mixed</td>
<td>Agree slightly</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel comfortable depending on others
2. I worry that others won’t care about me as much as I care about them
3. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with close others
4. I worry a fair amount about losing my close relationship partners
5. I tell my close relationship partners about everything
6. I worry a lot about my relationships
7. I don’t mind asking close others for comfort, advice, or help
8. I worry about being alone
9. I don’t feel comfortable opening up to others
10. I need a lot of reassurance that close relationship partners really care about me
11. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with others
12. If I can’t get a relationship partner to show interest in me, I get upset or angry
Appendix D
Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry Questionnaire (NARQ; Back et al., 2013)

Please indicate how much the following statements apply to you using a response format ranging from “1 = not agree at all” to “6 = agree completely”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all agree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree completely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am great. 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. I will someday be famous. 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. I show others how special I am. 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. I react annoyed if another person steals the show from me 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. I enjoy my successes very much. 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. I secretly take pleasure in the failure of my rivals 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Most of the time I am able to draw people’s attention to myself in conversations. 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. I deserve to be seen as a great personality. 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. I want my rivals to fail. 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. I enjoy it when another person is inferior to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. I often get annoyed when I am criticized. 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. I can barely stand it if another person is at the center of events. 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. Most people won’t achieve anything. 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. Other people are worth nothing. 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. Being a very special person gives me a lot of strength. 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. I manage to be the center of attention with my outstanding contributions. 1 2 3 4 5 6
17. Most people are somehow losers. 1 2 3 4 5 6
18. Mostly, I am very adept at dealing with other people. 1 2 3 4 5 6
Appendix E

Bogus Psychological Test (Hoption et al., 2012; Benson et al., 2016)

[Preamble]: You are about to participate in a virtual team decision-making task with two other group members. In the group, there will be one leader and two followers. But, before you start working with your group members, we need to determine which of you is best suited to be the team leader.

The following questions are designed to assess your analytical problem-solving and decision-making skills which you will need for your group task. You will have a maximum of 10 minutes to finish the following series of questions. After you are done, you will be assigned the role of Team Leader or Team Member A based on your answers. Please try your best on this next activity to ensure that we get an accurate assessment of your abilities.

Please think carefully about the following analytic questions. Please provide the best possible responses. We will be timing your response.

An intelligence network consists of six spies – F, G, H, J, K, and L. For security reasons, messages can only be sent from:

F to G
G to H and K
H to F, K and L
K to H and J
J to F and L
L to J

A spy who receives a message can in turn relay that message.

If J is eliminated from the network, which of the following spies can no longer send messages to any other spy?

- F
- G
- H
Which of the following is a complete and accurate list of spies who can send a message, either directly or indirectly, to G?

- F
- F, H, J
- F, H, K
- F, H, J, K
- F, H, J, K, L

Which of the following spies CANNOT receive message directly from two other spies?

- F
- G
- H
- J
- K

Please read this paragraph and answer the question below.

A lady was dying of cancer that could not be cured and she had only about six months to live. She was in terrible pain, but she was so weak that a good dose of a pain-killer like morphine would make her die sooner. She was delirious and almost crazy with pain, and in her calm periods, she would ask the doctor to give her enough morphine to kill her. She said she couldn't stand the pain and that she was going to die in a few months anyway.

What should the doctor do? (Please check one.)

- The doctor should give the lady an overdose that will make her die.
- Can't decide.
The doctor should not give the overdose.

The following questions test your problem-solving skills. Please consider them carefully. We will be timing your responses.

In which direction is the bus picture above traveling?

- Left.
- Right.
- Neither left nor right.

A blind beggar had a brother who died. What relation was the blind beggar to the brother who died? “Brother” is not the answer.

Please read this paragraph and answer the questions below.

A man had been sentenced to prison for 10 years. After one year, however, he escaped from prison, moved to a new area of the country, and took on the name of Thompson. For 8 years he worked hard, and gradually he saved enough money to buy his own business. He was fair to his customers, gave his employees top wages, and gave most of his own profits to charity. Then one day, Mrs. Jones, an old neighbor, recognized him as the man who had escaped from prison 8 years before, and whom the police had been looking for.

Should Mrs. Jones report Mr. Thompson to the police and have him sent back to prison? (Please check one.)

- She should report him.
- Can’t decide.
- She should not report him.

The next series of questionnaires are designed to measure various aspects of your personality and common behaviours.
Imagine that you and a friend are walking to university together. You are (click the best response):

- walking ahead of your friend.
- walking behind your friend.
- walking next to your friend.

At what time of the day do you feel the most energetic? Click the best response.

- Morning
- Evening
- Afternoon
- Overnight

What occupation would you prefer?

- Teacher
- Journalist

What occupation would you prefer?

- Accountant
- Actuary

What occupation would you prefer?

- Psychologist
- Physiotherapist

Please respond to the following questions truthfully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Quite often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. When others get stuck, I am able to think of new solutions to problems.
2. When dealing with a new project, I prefer having the freedom to do it my own way rather than be given specific instructions.

3. After I’ve made a decision, I find myself wishing I had chosen differently.

4. My mind tends to drift away when I’m working on something.

5. I feel confident that others will accept my ideas and decisions.

6. When I really need to concentrate, I can tune out my environment.

7. Part of being a good leader is harnessing the strengths of each employee to the best possible job.

8. If I am in leadership position, I state clearly the goals that others should be working towards.

Please respond to the following questions truthfully.

1. When solving difficult problems, working in a group motivates me to try harder, compared to solo work.

2. When working in a team, the potential for error is much higher than when working alone.

3. If I were to become successful, I would feel like such a fake.

4. Teamwork keeps my enthusiasm alive more than individual work does.

5. If I were to become successful, people would only come to me when they needed something (e.g., money)
6. I avoid dealing with difficult situations involving confrontation.

7. I tend to be the leader in a group of friends.

[end of bogus psychological test, new page]

Please wait while your responses are recorded and tabulated.

[new page]
Appendix F
Experimental Manipulation and Attention Check

[Manipulation, participants randomly assigned to role]
Based on the answers we have collected from the participants who will be in your group so far, we are unable to clearly assign roles to everyone for the group task in the second part of the study.

Because of this, we will randomly assign you to a role for the second part of the study. By clicking onto the next page, you will receive your role assignment.

[Half of the participants will receive the Team Leader role assignment]
**Please read the following information carefully.**

You have been assigned the Team Leader role in the group task that we have created for this study. You will have 10 minutes to investigate a road accident with your team. It’s your job to make sure your group stays on task and identifies who caused the road accident in the allotted time frame. You will each have unique clues, so it’s important that you work together to solve the case. HOWEVER, as the team leader, you have the final say. For teams that correctly identify the culprit, each individual group member will receive a ballot entry into a draw for one of thirty $10 Tim Hortons gift cards. Good luck!

[Half of the participants will receive the Team Member role assignment]

**Please read the following information carefully**

You have been assigned the Team Member role in the group task that we have created for this study. You will have 10 minutes to investigate a road accident with your team. It’s your job to make sure your group stays on task and identifies who caused the road accident in the allotted time frame. You will each have unique clues, so it’s important that you work together to solve the case. HOWEVER, the group leader will have the final say. For teams that correctly identify the culprit, each individual group member will receive a ballot entry into a draw for one of thirty $10 Tim Hortons gift cards. Good luck!

Attention Check

Please identify the role you have been assigned for this task:

a) Team Leader
b) Team Member
c) I don’t know
Appendix G

Group task: Modified hidden profile paradigm (Toma & Butera, 2009)

[Instructions provided to participant]: In this task, ALL team members will be asked to read a scenario about a road accident investigation. As a group, the primary goal of this task is to determine who caused the accident. Please click below to read about the accident investigation. You will receive further instructions after reading about the accident investigation.

[next page]

[Description of the accident]: The collision takes place at the St. Georges intersection, on Monday at 7 p.m. The road is narrow and poorly lit. Two cars and one motorcycle are involved. In the first car, Mr. X—who is 53 years old and has held a driving license for 30 years—and his 17-year-old son return home. The father had just drunk several glasses of spirits during a dinner with his friends. In the second car, Mrs. Y, 27 years old and having held a driving license for only 1 year, is going shopping. Her car’s lights are damaged. On the motorcycle, Mr. Z, 28 years old, who has held a driving license for 5 years, is going to meet his sick father who asked him to come rapidly. He is speeding on the N13 road.

ONLY after you have carefully read the description of the accident, please click on the next page, where you will receive 3 unique clues about the accident. You will receive a hard copy of the information you just read before you begin the group task so don’t worry about memorizing the last paragraph.

[next page]

Below are three unique clues to help you identify who caused the road accident. Each of your group members received a different set of clues. Once you have familiarized yourself with the clues, please raise your hand so the research assistant knows you are ready to proceed but don’t skip ahead until they receive confirmation that everyone is ready. You will not be shown these unique clues again but you will receive a hard copy of the paragraph you read on the previous page. While you are waiting, feel free to go over these unique clues a few times and commit them to memory. To enhance the efficiency of the group task, you should also take a moment to make your own guesses about who caused the road accident before chatting you’re your group. Your patience is appreciated!

Unshared Information (Unique Clues)

To member 1, suggesting that the guilty person is Mr. X [italicized text not shown to participants]
The guilty person is driving a car. During police inspection, the guilty car owner was discovered to have a 1.5 level of alcohol. The guilty person admits that he was inattentive at the time of the collision.
To member 2, suggesting that the guilty person is Mrs. Y [italicized text not shown to participants]
The guilty person is less than 30 years old. Due to inexperience, the guilty person wasn’t able to avoid the collision. The guilty person claims that he or she did not see others approaching the intersection.

To Confederate, suggesting that the guilty person is Mr. Z [italicized text not shown to participants]
The guilty person is a man. His father is indirectly responsible for the accident. The guilty person was driving at 110 km/h.

The collision takes place at the St. Georges intersection, on Monday at 7 p.m. The road is narrow and poorly lit. Two cars and one motorcycle are involved. In the first car, Mr. X—who is 53 years old and has held a driving license for 30 years—and his 17-year-old son return home. The father had just drunk several glasses of spirits during a dinner with his friends. In the second car, Mrs. Y, 27 years old and having held a driving license for only 1 year, is going shopping. Her car’s lights are damaged. On the motorcycle, Mr. Z, 28 years old, who has held a driving license for 5 years, is going to meet his sick father who asked him to come rapidly. He is speeding on the N13 road.

WAIT! Please make sure you have read the unique clues carefully and raised your hand so the researcher can confirm the other locations are ready to proceed before clicking Continue:

[Instructions]: You have now been randomly organized into groups of 3. Please enter the chat room using the link below to collaborate with your teammates. You will have 10 minutes to complete the task. The researcher will be keeping time and provide a notification at the 5-minute and 9-minute mark so you can stay on task.

Remember: everyone must work together to identify the culprit, but the leader has the final say. Individual members of teams that correctly guess the culprit will be entered into a draw for one of thirty $10 Tim Hortons gift cards.

Click the link below and enter your alias: Team Leader Purple/Team Member Green/Team Member Orange (Confederate).
Please remember your alias and don’t use any identifying information while in the chat room!

www.chatzy.com

When the task is complete, click Continue

☐ Continue
Appendix H

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5x-short (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1995)

*Please note that only the sample items permitted by the authors have been included below. For more information see https://www.mindgarden.com/16-multifactor-leadership-questionnaire#horizontalTab2. The full measures of transformational leadership and laissez-faire were used in the study, after permission was received from the authors.

**Sample Items from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Form 5X Short**

These questions provide example of the items that are used to evaluate leadership style. The MLQ is provided in both Self and Rater forms. The Self form measures self-perception of leadership behaviors. The Rater form is used to measure leadership. By thinking about the leadership styles as exemplified below, you can get a sense of your own belief about your leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th>0 = Not at all</th>
<th>2 = Once in a while</th>
<th>3 = Fairly often</th>
<th>4 = Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Transformational Leadership Styles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idealized Influence (Attributes)</th>
<th>I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group.</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Behaviors)</td>
<td>I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>I talk optimistically about the future.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>I reexamine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>I help others to develop their strengths.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Avoidant Leadership Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laissez- Faire</th>
<th>I avoid making decisions.</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix I

Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS; Cortina et al., 2001)

Leader Self-Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not at all</strong></td>
<td><strong>Once in a while</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sometimes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fairly often</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frequently, if not always</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I put down or was condescending to my followers
2. I paid little attention to a statement made by or showed little interest in the opinions of my followers
3. I made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks about my followers
4. I addressed my followers in unprofessional terms
5. I ignored or excluded my followers
6. I openly doubted the judgment of my followers

Follower Evaluations of Leader

1. Put down or was condescending to their followers
2. Paid little attention to a statement made by or showed little interest in the opinions of their followers
3. Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks about their followers
4. Addressed their followers in unprofessional terms
5. Ignored or excluded their followers
6. Openly doubted the judgment of their followers
Appendix J
Manipulation Check

[Dominance-Prestige Scales (Cheng, Tracy, & Henrich, 2010)]
*Participants will fill out this measure twice, once for each member of their group

(insert name of target here)

Please indicate the extent to which each statement accurately describes this particular person by writing the appropriate number from the scale below in the space provided.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ____ He/she enjoyed having control over other members of the group.
2. ____ He/she often tried to get his/her own way regardless of what others in the group may want.
3. ____ He/she was willing to use aggressive tactics to get his/her way.
4. ____ He/she tried to control others rather than permit them to control him/her.
5. ____ He/she did NOT have a forceful or dominant personality.
6. ____ Members of the group knew it was better to let him/her have his/her way.
7. ____ He/she did NOT enjoy having authority over other members of the group.
8. ____ Members of your group were afraid of him/her.

(insert name of target here)

Please indicate the extent to which each statement accurately describes this particular person by writing the appropriate number from the scale below in the space provided.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ____ He/she enjoyed having control over other members of the group.
2. ____ He/she often tried to get his/her own way regardless of what others in the group may want.
3. ____ He/she was willing to use aggressive tactics to get his/her way.
4. ____ He/she tried to control others rather than permit them to control him/her.
5. ____ He/she did NOT have a forceful or dominant personality.
6. ____ Members of the group knew it was better to let him/her have his/her way.
7. ____ He/she did NOT enjoy having authority over other members of the group.
8. ____ Members of your group were afraid of him/her.
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