Bogdan Pietrulewicz*

The Interpersonal Pollution and its Effect on Group Members' Well-Being, and on Culture of Unity in Organizational Context

ABSTRACT

The new concept of "interpersonal pollution" and its antecedents and effects, i.e. on organizational members' health and well-being and on organizational outcomes are investigated. Building upon this work this presentation proposes a model and tentative definition of a broader construct, i.e. "organizational pollution", and identifies its potential antecedents and explores its impact on humans' health and well-being and organizational outcomes. In particular our model explores the roles played by leaders' and members' dark personalities and lack of environmental concern, by unethical leadership, by both the characteristics of the community and the organization, including the latter's physical and ethical environment, and finally their link to organizational pollution. This new model implications for organizational and environmental psychology are discussed.

KEYWORDS: interpersonal pollution, well-being, unethical leadership behaviours.

INTRODUCTION

The effect of environmental pollution is often delayed and thus distant in time and space from the decision makers. As corporate decision makers are not usually directly and immediately affected

* Correspondence regarding the paper should be sent to: Bogdan Pietrulewicz, Kazimierz Wielki University in Bydgoszcz, Poland, e-mail: psychologiaukw@hotmail.com

by the consequences of their decisions causing environmental pollution, this delay in effect creates difficulties for corporate decision makers to adequately grasp the cause and effect relationship of their activities and pollution in the environment. Hence this delayed effect creates cognitive distortions in decision makers' moral evaluations. According to Biela (1984) and Pietrulewicz (1984) many corporate decision makers lack a moral awareness of their actions in causing environmental pollution and they are lax in taking moral responsibility for their actions.

We also proposed some situational and environmental factors that might cause this delayed effect. For instance when environmental pollution problems arise, industrial and environmental activists seem to concern themselves mainly with problems in the process and, except when used as examples, only rarely do they seem be concerned with the individuals who are affected by the polluted environment. This can contribute to creating that delayed effect too. It is interesting to note that whilst he was considering his thesis. Finally Pietrulewicz (1984) also supported his claims of situational and environmental factors' effect on pollution by referring to Urie Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979). Bronfenbrenner, a Moscow born and American educated developmental psychologist, drew Pietrulewicz 's attention to the large number of environmental and societal factors influencing child development. In his Vygotsky-like ecological system's theory, Bronfenbrenner (1979) suggests that an individual's development is reflective of five environmental systems each containing roles, norms and rules shaping psychological development. First the *«microsystem»* refers to the institutions and groups that most immediately and directly impact the child's development including: family, school, religious institutions, neighborhood, and peers. The person's own biology may also be considered part of the microsystem; thus the theory has been recalled "Bio-Ecological Systems Theory." Meanwhile the *«mesosystem»* represents the interconnections between the microsystems, for example the

interactions between the family and teachers. The «*exosystem*» involves links between a social setting in which the individual does not have an active role and the individual's immediate context. For example, a parent's or child's experience at home may be influenced by the parent's other experiences at work. Then the «*macrosystem*» describes the cultures and subcultures that impact one's attitudes and evolves over time. Because each successive generation may change this macrosystem, this can lead to the development of a new and unique macrosystem. Finally Bronfenbrenner's «*chronosystem*» includes the events that impact the child's life, for example a divorce or the increase in opportunities for women to pursue a career. Since its publication in 1979, Bronfenbrenner's theory has greatly influenced the way many psychologists approach the study of human beings and their environment.

ENVIRONMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY
AND ORGANIZATIONAL POLLUTION

Environmental psychology is a science which studies the relationship between human behavior and the environment (Evans, 1982; Stokols, Altman, 1987; Lévy-Leboyer, 1988; Lévy-Leboyer, Duron, 1991; Lévy-Leboyer, Bonnes, Chase, Ferreira-Marques, Pawlit, 1996; Gifford, 2007; 2014; Zarola, Santos, 2010). According to Paradis et al. (2014) environmental psychology should be looking at both the natural and built environments, physical and social environments, and both real and virtual environments, as well as both studying more specific environments such as home, school, public parks, inner city and certainly the various work environments, indeed as suggested by Gifford (2014). Bronfenbrenner, who ten years after his death is still prominent in the field of human development, had suggested that human beings create

the environments that, in turn, shape their own development (Bronfenbrenner, 2005). Influenced by these person-environment perspectives, Paradis et al. (2014) focused on the organizational environment and more particularly on pollution in the workplace. Although not alone, Paradis et al. (2014) suggested that one can think of two broad kinds of pollution: physical pollution and human pollution (see Turk, Turk, Wittes, 1972). In brief physical pollution can arise from physical aspects such as harmful substances found in the air, in the water or in the building itself (e.g. rodents, mould, bacteria, chemical pollutants and radioactivity). Additionally, there are other physical aspects as excessive noise, poor lightning, spatial crowding, inappropriate temperature and certain odors which can be perceived as pollutants.

Meanwhile the authors also discussed another source of pollution that can be found in the workplace and which can also be detrimental to employees and ultimately to the organization, i.e. interpersonal pollution (Paradis et al. (2014). These authors define interpersonal pollution as being «a broader more global concept» that includes various types of both blatant and subtle organizational maltreatments. These interpersonal pollutants may range from the darker forms of leadership behavior on through to harassment, be it sexual, physical or psychological (Carroll, 2006) and can include psychological harassment's predecessors: incivility (Cortina, Magley, Williams, Langhout, 2001; Dion, 2009) and blatant antisocial behavior (Babiak, Hare, 2007). Paradis et al (2014) went on to conclude that interpersonal pollution includes all those social attitudes and behaviors that can contaminate a workplace environment and which can have a crucial negative impact on the employee's performance and well-being. Note some authors such as Sarine (2012) and Cammalleri (2012) had alluded to a similar concept, something they called social pollution. However Sarine's concept of social pollution refers more specifically to discrimination caused by any implicit biases towards a worker,

whilst Cammalleri's concept refers more specifically to undeclared work being imposed on the worker.

Next we need to turn our attention to those variables that potentially contribute to this interpersonal pollution including the characteristics of both leaders and followers, of the job itself and of the work environment. The first of these, leaders' traits and behaviours and more specifically at dark supervision and leadership behaviours, are addressed in the following section.

DARK SUPERVISION AND LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOURS

Although millions of employees are subjected to unethical behaviours perpetrated by their supervisors (Andersson, Pearson, 1999; Tepper et al., 2006; Tepper, Henle, 2011; ECR, 2014), the research in this area has traditionally focused on its counterpart: ethical supervisory behavior and ethical leadership. Only recently researchers have started to pay attention to so-called dark supervision and in leaders' behaviours *per se* (see Ünal et al., 2012; Hershcovis, 2011; Tepper, Henle, 2011; Brown, Mitchell, 2010; Tepper, 2007), i.e. when exploring the causes and effects of these supervisory and leadership behaviours. Some of these researchers have studied overt and physical types of dark supervisory behaviours such as sexual harassment, physical violence and overt hostility (Tepper, 2007). Still other researchers, often having implied that the more common manifestations of destructive supervisor behaviour involve non-physical actions, have studied behaviours such as angry outbursts, public ridiculing, scapegoating subordinates and the taking credit for a subordinate's work (see Keashly, Trott, MacLean, 1994). Indeed Tepper (2007) went on to point out that, whilst many of these latter researchers use labels such as «petty tyranny» (Ashforth, 1994), «supervisor aggression» (Schat, Desmarais, Kelloway, 2006), and a supervisor's «undermining» attitudes and behaviours (Duffy, Ganster, Pagon,

2002), most of the work conducted to date use the term «abusive supervision» (Tepper, 2000; Tepper, Duffy, Henle, Lambert, 2006). However, still other criteria have arisen in this literature. For instance, Einarsen, Aasland and Skogstad (2007) looked at what they deemed to be destructive leadership. They defined the concept of destructive leadership as the systematic and repeated behaviour by a leader, supervisor or manager that violates the legitimate interest of the organization by undermining and/or sabotaging the organization's goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and/or the motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of his/her subordinates (Einarsen, Aasland, Skogstad, 2007).

Recently Ali Ünal at Rudgers University has reiterated a critique of this «dark» supervisory behavior literature, i.e. its lack of grounding in universal ethical theories (Ciulla, 1995; Ünal et al., 2012). It is interesting to note that Biela (1984) and Pietrulewicz (1986) had in fact grounded his own thinking in Kant's philosophy of morality whereas most of the later scholars looking into unethical supervision, have implicitly used more intuitive, lay-type ethical criteria when proposing their models and defining and measuring their constructs (Ciulla, 1995). Unfortunately the practice of using intuitive, a-theoretical criteria, seems to have contributed to the emergence of a more fragmented and poorly integrated concepts and measures in this literature (see Tepper, 2007, for a review). Meanwhile Ünal et al. (2012) also noted that ethical leadership research, even though growing rapidly, lacks an explicit consideration of «normative» foundations. Drawing on four major normative theories commonly applied to ethical dilemmas found in the business world, i.e. justice, rights, utilitarianism and virtue ethics, Ünal et al. (2012) sought to derive new standards for analyzing the constructs and measures of unethical supervision. They categorized the various definitions underlying unethical supervisory constructs and scale items, and then went on to identify the dimensions of unethical supervision found in these four theories. Their analysis suggest that some behaviours

are currently understudied or completely missed in the existing literature. In particular they note that the emphasis has been on the violation of rights to dignity and autonomy (ex Behnke, 2005) as well as on distributive and procedural justice type problems (ex McFarlin, Sweeney, 1992; Usamani, Jamal, 2013).

Ünal et al. (2012) also note, as did Brown and Mitchell (2010), that ethical and unethical leadership have formed two separate streams, with the former focusing on exemplary ethical leader behaviour and the latter on supervisory behavior literature to unethical leadership, Brown and Mitchell (2010) suggest that all of these darker supervisory behaviours are unethical (Brown, Mitchell, 2010) and thus fit under the broader umbrella of unethical leadership. They also point out that unethical leadership is more than just the behavior of a leader but that unethical leaders can also encourage the deviant behavior in their followers (Brown, Mitchell, 2010). Thus, they define unethical leadership as the behavior of organizational leaders that violate moral or legal standards, and promote such acts in their followers. Meanwhile, grounded in the four normative theories discussed above, Ünal et al. (2012) also propose a definition of unethical supervision. They define unethical supervision as supervisory behavior that violates normative standards as opposed to the absence of exemplary ethical behavior. Their definition assumes a hierarchical relationship in which the supervisor has the formal authority over the subordinates and involves the use of power and authority in an inappropriate manner or for an improper purpose. When comparing the Ünal et al. (2012) definition, with the definition of unethical leadership proposed by Brown and Mitchell (2010), one can start seeing some similarities between these two definitions. A related issue underlined by Ünal et al. (2012) is the misunderstanding of the relationship between unethical and ethical leadership. The question is if are they independent constructs each varying from low to high or, are they the opposite ends of one continuum varying from unethical to ethical? Note that in

their article, Ünal et al. (2012) assume that these are independent constructs because according to them, the commission of unethical behavior (e.g., per Tepper 2007, on abusive supervision) is not usually synonymous with the omission of ethical behavior (e.g., per Brown, Treviño, 2006, on ethical leadership) antisocial and negative supervisory behavior, in comparing the dark side.

AN INTERACTIVE MODEL TO EXPLORE ANTECEDENTS OF UNETHICAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOURS

In his 1957 presidential address, Lee Cronbach called on psychologists to adopt a new paradigm: the coordination of both individual differences and environmental effects. (Cronbach, 1957; see Hunt, 1975). Since then the preferred approach in applied psychology is to measure those individual differences or personal dispositions in terms of personality traits (Raja, Johns, 2010; Stumpp, Muck, Hulsheger, Judge, Maier, 2010), in particular those based on the various five factor models (FFM; see Goldberg, 1980; Costa, McRae, 1985). Goldberg's model of personality (1992), and his readily available open source measures and data, is popular among researchers (Plaisant et al., 2010; Martel, 2010). In one version people have only to describe themselves on a series of bipolar adjectives measuring the five key traits known under the acronym "OCEAN" (Tivendell et al., 2013). Although their use is still relatively scarce, we are now also seeing a growing interest in traits that describe the darker side of the personality (Hogan, Hogan, 2001; Paulhus, Williams, 2002; Lebel, 2015). Kaiser, LeBreton, Hogan (2015) define the darker side of personality as the way we behave when we feel stressed, tired and less alert, and by the way we are being perceived by others. According to some this research area falls within the DSM-V's classification of personality troubles, but the symptoms are less acute (Schyns, 2015). So far a number of different traits can be found in the

measures of the darker side of personality, including Narcissism, Hubris, Social Dominance and Machiavellianism (see Judge, Piccolo, Kosalka, 2009). For their part, Paulhus and Williams (2002) use a three trait taxonomy of these socially undesirable traits, which they call the dark triad, and now the majority of research uses these three: Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and Psychopathy (Paulhus, Williams, 2002; Furnham, Richards, Paulhus, 2013; Paulhus, 2014).

Paulus's approach for identifying dark traits was focused on those pathologies that are characterized by motives to elevate the self and to harm others (Paulhus, Williams, 2002), whereas Hogans' approach was to focus on the dark side as negative characteristics that emerge when individuals let down their guard (Hogan, Hogan, 2001). For Paulhus and Williams (2002) the first of these three traits is *Machiavellianism,* which is described by referring to Machiavelli's The Prince (Machiavelli, 1513), a ruler known for his cold nature and manipulative acts. The second is the subclinical trait of *Narcissism* which, it is argued, seems to be increasingly present in our society (Raskin, Hall, 1979; Raskin, Terry, 1988). People with a Narcissist personality tend to want to dominate others by most any means, to see themselves as superior, to impose their presence, to constantly vie for a higher status and to always be the center of attention (Paulhus, Williams, 2002). Finally the third is *Psychopathy*, a trait often measured using an adaptation of Robert Hare's scale (Hare, 2003; Hare, Neumann, 2008), that researchers use to differentiate clinical from subclinical psychopaths. (Note that recently Paulhus (2014) has added a fourth trait, the everyday sadistic personality, but its usefulness as well as its reliability and validity are still being tested).

Next, we need to explore the research using these dark personality traits and studying their effect on both leadership in general and on organizational outcomes.

LEADERS' DARK PERSONALITY, ITS EFFECT ON LEADERSHIP
AND ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOMES

Personality traits and leadership have a long history, but recently a number of studies have pointed towards dark personality as a possible culprit in the ongoing problems with failed leadership in organizations (Bentz, 1967; 1985a; 1985b; 1990; Burke, 2006; Dotlitch, Cairo, 2003; Hogan, 1994; Hogan, Hogan, 2001; Kets de Vries, Miller, 1984; Leslie, Van Velsor, 1996; Lombardo, Ruderman, McCauley, 1988; McCall, Lombardo, 1983). For example rather consistent reasons for executives derailment have been postulated, some of which overlap strongly with dark personality, especially those problems involving interpersonal relationships (Spain, Harms, Lebreton, 2013). These include a description of the leader as being insensitive, manipulative, demanding, authoritarian, self-isolating, aloofness, critical, arrogance, melodrama, volatility, excessive caution, habitual distrust, mischievousness, eccentricity, passive resistance, perfectionism, and eagerness to please (Van Velsor, Leslie, 1995; Lombardo, McCauley, 1994; Dotlitch, Cairo, 2003). However, in a recent meta-analysis, Gaddis and Foster (2015) seemed to have also found a significant and negative relationship between leader dark side personality and leaderhip behaviours that are critical for success, and indeed this effect could be found across several countries! Evidently more research must be done.

Meanwhile Hogan and colleagues (Arneson, Milliken-Davies, Hogan, 1993; Hogan, Hogan, 2001; Hogan, Raskin, Fazzini, 1990) and others (Benson, Campbell, 2007; Torregiante, 2005), found negative relations between dark side personality measures (HDS) and leader performance and it seem that this effect goes above and beyond the usual FFM measures' effect. Other studies find complex nonlinear relationships where low to moderate scores on dark-side measures are unrelated to managerial performance but high scores are associated with lower performance (Benson,

Campbell, 2007). However Hogan a postulated that these complex relationships could be explained in part by the work context. It seems that the context is an important determinant of whether dark personality traits will play a positive or a negative role in determining leadership effectiveness outcomes (Padilla, Hogan, Kaiser, 2007). Much of the above research, but not all, involved looking at a leader's Machiavellian or Narcissistic trait (ex Deluga, 2001; Chatterjee, A., Hambrick, D.C. (2007), and some of the negative consequences of his or her leadership.

However to date, these traits' influences on leader behaviours and outcomes, remains unclear (Campbell, Hoffman, Campbell, Marchisio, 2011; Judge et al., 2009). Several researchers had found that leader narcissism was negatively related to integrity and ratings of interpersonal performance (Blair, Hoffman, Helland, 2008; Helland, Blair, 2005; Kets de Vries, Miller, 1985; Mumford, Connelly, Helton, Strange, Osburn, 2001). Meanwhile Van Dijk and De Cremer (2006) found that narcissistic managers were more self-serving than their counterparts, with an inclination to allocate scarce organizational resources to themselves, and even to the extent as being linked to white-collar crimea (Blickle, Schlegel, Fassbender, Klein, 2006). Moreover Judge, LePine and Rich (2006) suggest that narcissistic leaders may be prone to enhance self-ratings of leadership attractiveness and influence, and that these same leaders are generally viewed negatively by others, which then results in lower job performance and fewer examples of organizational citizenship among subordinates. Narcissism has also sometimes been found to relate to counterproductive work behaviors (Judge et al., 2006; Penney, 2002; Penney, Spector, 2002), which share similarities with unethical leader behaviors.

On the other hand, some research indicates that narcissistic leaders may be effective at least as it appears superficially. For example, Deluga (1997) found that narcissistic American presidents were deemed more charismatic and their performance was rated higher than non-narcissistic presidents. Grijalva, Harms,

Newman, Gaddis, and Fraley (in press; cited in Schyns, 2015) conducted a meta-analysis of narcissism that suggests that there is a relationship between narcissism and leadership emergence, but not with leadership effectiveness. This appears to be consistent with the bright and dark side of narcissism: for instance at first, narcissists seem confident but in the longer run, this turns into entitlement (Campbell, Hoffman, Campbell, Marchisio, 2011). Nevertheless, O'Reilly, Doerr, Caldwell, and Chatman (2014) found that narcissistic CEOs receive better compensation and their compensation was more discrepant with their members' than non-narcissistic CEOs. Lastly, we should note that still other research has found no link between narcissism and leader effectiveness (Chatterjee, Hambrick, 2007; Judge et al., 2006; Resick, Whitman, Weingarden, Hiller, 2009).

Recently, Hoffman et al. (2013) investigated the link between leader narcissism and follower perceptions of ethical leadership and leader effectiveness, including the potential moderating role of ethical context. They found no significant associations between leaders' narcissism and follower perceptions of both ethical and effective leadership. But, in this study, Hoffman et al. (2013) did find ethical context to be a moderator of the influence of narcissism on follower perceptions of leadership. Results indicate that the negative effect of narcissism on followers' ratings of leadership increases as the organization's climate becomes more ethical. That is, when the organizational climate demands ethical behavior, narcissists are perceived as less ethical and less effective. In contrast, in less ethical contexts, the adverse consequences of leader narcissism on follower perceptions of leadership were reduced. Specifically, in less ethical contexts, narcissism manifested a positive but no significant relationship with follower ratings of ethical and effective leadership. Thus, Hoffman et al. (2013) point to the importance of reinforcing an ethical context and to the importance of leader selection.

Meanwhile some studies show that Machiavellian leaders can be proficient at forming political alliances and cultivating a charismatic image (Deluga, 2001; Judge et al., 2009). In a study of 39 U.S. presidents, ratings of Machiavellianism were positively associated with not only charisma but also rated performance (Deluga, 2001). Machiavellian leaders also tended to serve more years in elected office and have a greater number of legislative achievements (Simonton, 1986). On a less positive note Judge et al. (2009) describe Machiavellian leaders as seeking control over followers, they cite McHoskey (1999) as saying they use tactics of impression management, and they cite Becker and O'Hair (2007) of avoiding motives of organizational concern and prosocial values. Judge et al. (2009) also suggest that these leaders have a natural talent for influencing people, for being able to talk others into doing things for the leader's personal benefit, for sometimes clearly abusing their power in an organization and for being less willing to adhere to formal procedures or to ethical and moral standards, but instead for being concerned with maximizing opportunities to craft their own personal power. Machiavellian leaders seem also to be rated as more abusive by their subordinates than low Machiavellians (Kiazid et al., 2010). More recently, Den Hartog and Belschak (2012) suggest that Machiavellians leaders may authentically display ethical leader behaviors if they perceive this is a useful way to reach their goals even though they privately hold less moral beliefs. Thus, they argue that the positive impact of ethical leadership on engagement will be reduced for those leaders for who private identity and expressed identity are not in line as followers are likely to pick up on inauthentic displays (see too Zapf 2002). Thus support for a moderated or mediation model of this trait has been found. The effect of ethical leader behaviours on engagement was less strong when ethical leaders were high as opposed to low on Machiavellianism.

Finally we should look into the third dark trait, what the famous forensic psychologist Robert Hare called «psychopathy»

(see Hare, 2003; Hare, Neumann, 2008). In 2006, Babiak and Hare published their book entitled «Snakes in suits: When psychopaths go to work», in which they suggested that one could observe a presence of "darkness" among those in management positions. Keeping in mind that we are mainly talking about subclinical levels of psychopathy, according to Hare and his colleagues about 3 percent in higher level positions in organizations are psychopaths (Babiak, Hare, 2007; Babiak, Neumann, Hare, 2010). Others note that this subclinical form of psychopathy is associated with positive outcomes such as communication skills, and with negative outcomes such as poor management skills and hard manipulation tactics (Smith, Lilienfeld, 2013). While we need more research into psychopathy in the workplace, preliminary evidence suggests that individuals with this subclinical form of psychopathy are likely to be attracted to positions of influence and thus might be slightly over-represented in leadership positions and appear to be mainly toxic for an organization.

Reflecting on these inconsistent and sometimes counterintuitive findings, Harms et al. (2011) noted that the nature of the dark side personality appears "far more complex than originally thought" and suggested that "there is a great deal of research to be done" (p. 508) to understand how it affects leadership. In their article, Kaiser, Lebreton, Hogan (2015) offer some theoretical explanations for these inconsistencies They suggested that the effectiveness of leader behaviour is typically conceptualized in a linear way where, for instance, more consideration or initiation is assumed to be "better". However, Kaiser et al. (2015) explain that this ignores a key finding in the early derailment research that strengths can become weaknesses through overuse (McCall, Lombardo, 1983; see also McCall, 2009). According to Kaiser et al. (2015), although the concept of strengths overused is acknowledged, it is seldom applied in the measurement of leader behaviour as the standard method relies on Likert-type rating scales where higher scores indicate more frequent or more

effective behaviour. According to Kaiser et al. (2015), this method confounds doing a lot with doing too much; it also blurs the distinction between deficiency and excess as two distinct sources of ineffectiveness (Kaiser, Kaplan, 2005). Thus, Kaiser et al. (2015) proposed that this may be one reason why leadership research on dark side traits has produced inconsistent findings. In their study, Kaiser et al. (2015) used a measurement methodology that allowed raters to distinguish when managers do too little or too much of specific leader behaviours. Their results demonstrated that scores near the normative mean on the dark-side traits were associated with optimal levels of the leader behaviours, translating into strengths, whereas both high scores and, unexpectedly, low scores were associated with extreme, ineffective leader behaviours, translated into weak nesses. Support for a moderating effect for Emotional Stability was also found.

In general it thus seems that a leader's dark personality may, in the short term, be associated with what may appears to be a positive relationship with good leadership and both employees and organizational positive outcomes. However, what appears appealing in the short term may, in the long term, evolve into very toxic and unethical leadership behaviours which in turn will contribute to a more polluted organizational environment. Moreover some researchers have found that an ethical context and a bright personality dimension such as emotional stability, can moderate the relations between leaders' dark personality and leadership and outcomes (Hoffman et al., 2013; Kaiser et al., 2015. Thus, much as Hoffman et al. (2013) have suggested, reinforcing an ethical context and having an efficient leader seems to be necessary to avoid having to deal with the devastating consequences of unethical leadership and polluted organizations.

FOLLOWERS, THEIR EFFECT ON UNETHICAL LEADERSHIP AND
ORGANIZATIONAL POLLUTION

Today academics and professionals have come to recognize
that leadership is a process that includes not only leaders, but also
followers and the context (Hollander, 1992; Kellerman, 2004; Lord,
Brown, 2004; Uhl-Bien, 2006; Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, Carsten,
2014; Padilla, Hogan, Kaiser, 2007). Although the role of the fol-
lowers has been studied less than that of the leaders, their role in
the leadership process is now obviously important (Baker, 2007;
Boccialetti, 1995; Carsten et al., 2010; Carsten, Uhl-Bien, 2013;
then Cornelis, 2012 and Camps et al., 2012, as cited in Cross-
man, Crossman, 2011; Den Hartog, Koopman, 2005; Hollander,
1992; Hollander, Offermann, 1990; Keller, 1999; Lord, Brown, 2004;
Meindl, 1995; Nye, 2005; Offerman et al., 1994; Sy, 2010; Uhl-Bien,
2005; Uhl-Bien, Carsten, 2007; and Yukl, 2005). Following a review
of the literature on "followership", Baker (2007) suggests that the
definitions of "followership" are better seen as relational roles,
a perspective shared by Kelley (1998, cited in Crossman, Cross-
man 2011). Based on this perspective Crossman and Crossman
(2011) define "followership" as a complementary factor to leader-
ship and they endorses the idea put forth by Carsten, Uhl-Bien,
West, Patera, and McGregor (2010), suggesting that the concept
of "followership" represents leadership ascending (upward) or,
more specifically, a relational role in which "follow ers" have the
ability to influence leaders, to contribute to the improvement of
the group and to its achieving of the organization's goals. That
is followers can have a direct upward impact on the behaviour
of their leaders.

According to Hollander (1995) and Perreault (1997), research-
ers interested in studying organizational ethics must also explore
the influence of subordinates on maintaining ethics in their or-
ganization. The Hinrichs' (2007) study on "followers" crimes of
obedience, that is of blind acceptance of directives or the collusion

of "followers" against a leader's directives, is a sn example of why research should now also focus on the ethical or unethical behaviours of "followers". Meanwhile Uhl-Bien and Carsten (2007) attempt to explain the psychological processes involved when an employee must deal with unethical behaviours of a manager. According to them, having to face such a situation engenders a sense of moral distress, that is an ability to recognize the morally appropriate way to behave but at the same time a sense of restriction in relation to one's ability to taking an appropriate action. Moreover this sense of moral distress can further «enhanced» by personal characteristics (lack of courage, helplessness, lack of control) and/ or situational characteristics (climate or unethical culture) resulting in anxiety, regret and in extreme cases, physical and mental disorders. Indeed according to Uhl-Bien and Carsten (2007), either active or passive reactions are possible in this situation. Active reactions are defined by actions to maintain ethical standards when leaders' ethical behaviour can be questionable. In contrast passive reactions represent acceptance, compliance or ignorance vis-a-vis such unethical situations. From this perspective it is possible to see that the "followers", by their reaction to a manager's unethical behaviour, can contribute or not to maintaining the current ethics of their organization. A number of researchers have already suggested that various personal characteristics such as the shifting of responsibility (Carsten, Uhl-Bien, 2013; Blass, 2009; Burger, 2009, Milgram, 1965; 1974; Wood, Bandura, 1989; Modigliani, Rochat, 1995) and a level of moral disengagement (Bandura, 1991; 1999), and also various situational characteristics such as communication flow and work climate (Miller et al., 1995; Carsten, Uhl-Bien, 2012), can indeed influence the follower's decision to obey or resist a leader unethical request.

Note that in their model of what is destructive leadership, which they called the toxic triangle, Padilla et al. (2007) also highlighted the influence of interactive factors to explain leaders' destructiveness that is the leader, the follower and the environ-

ment. This model first highlights five individual characteristics of destructive leaders: charisma, personalized use of pow er, narcissism, negative life themes, and an ideology of hate. Next the model refers to two types of susceptible followers, namely the colluders and the conformers. According to Padilla et al. (2007), while colluders actively contribute to destructive leadership, conformers can also contribute to the destructive leadership process by their obedience. Finally Art Padilla suggests four environmental factors that also seem to be important for destructive leadership to occur, respectively: instability, perceived threat, cultural values, the absence of checks and balances, and institutionalization (Padilla et al., 2007). Building on this work Thoroughgood et al. (2012) would further divide Padilla's conformers, i.e. into lost souls, authoritarians, and bystanders, and divide Padilla's colluders, i.e. into acolytes and opportunists. According to Thoroughgood et al. (2012), these types of susceptible followers are a response to different triggers. Meanwhile the role of followers in the process of destructive leadership has been further outlined in recent two theoretical articles. For example May, Wesche, Heinitz, and Kerschreiter (2014) outline how followers' coping strategies for dealing with abusive supervisors can actually increase a leaders' abusive supervision when the leader interprets a followers' coping behaviour as being either aggressive or submissive. Another example can be found in Pundt's (2014) observation that, for example, a followers' refusal to «accept» a leader's charisma can often lead to abusive behaviours by this leader due to his or her feelings of frustration. This line of thinking is similar to Barbara Kellerman's when she talked about undue influence being given to a leader due to the followership's actions or lack of action (Kellerman, 2008).

Some more recent studies bring still a different perspective on the role of followers in this leadership processes. For example, Grijalva and Harms (2014) attempt to show which followers could work most effectively with narcissistic leaders. This is also in line

with Jonason, Wee, and Li (2014) who call for finding "niches" (p. 119) for individuals who score high on one of the dark triad personality traits, i.e. in order to make use of their personality in a positive way. In another recent study, Lebel et al. (2015) explored the effect of followers' bright and dark personality traits as well as their perception of their work, of their organization's culture and a subset of this latter, the organization's ethical culture, and finally of their evaluation of their supervisor' ethical and unethical leadership, as these contribute to their level of stress at work. The result of this latter study demonstrated that employees' bright and dark personality and certain environmental factors, each had unique relationships with ethical and unethical leadership and with their level of stress at work (Lebel et al., 2015).

Overall, the research outlined above highlights one important aspect, that unethical leadership behaviour is the product of not only the leaders' individual characteristics but also of the context as well as of the followers (employees) reactions to leaders' unethical behaviours. These reactions in turn are also influenced by followers own individual characteristics and by environmental or situational characteristics. Next we take a look at some of these organizational environmental characteristics.

ORGANIZATIONAL ENVIRONMENT, ITS EFFECTS ON UNETHICAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL POLLUTION

The organizational context is now a frequently cited significant consideration when studying, evaluating or planning for a work outcome (ex Harvey, Jas, Walshe, 2014). Meanwhile this organizational context has been define in terms of its structure (Campion, Medsker, Higgs, 1993; Mintzberg, 1993), its procedures (Tivendell, Doucette, 1998; Guilliland, 1993), its climate (Denison, 1996) and its culture (Schein, 1996; Denison, 1996; Muchinsky, 2000). For example there is a long scientific tradition of studying the orga-

nization's culture or climate in order to explain and predict the behaviour of managers and employees (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Denison, 1996; Hofstede, 1991; Schein, 1985). Similarly many studies have demonstrated that organizational culture has a significant influence on employees' attitudes and behaviors and on the organization's productivity and effectiveness (Danna, Griffin, 1999; Hartnell, Ou, Kinicki, 2011; Dextras-Gauthier et al., 2012; Dion, 2009; Levesque, 2006; Martel, 2010; Smith et al., 2012; Zheng, Yang, McLean, 2009;). Indeed a recent albeit untested model suggests that an organization's climate or culture may explain, much of the variance in individual and organizational outcomes, previously thought to be contributed by its structure and its procedures (see Levesque, 2006; Martel, 2010).

In the business ethics literature, attention to the context initially did focus largely on ethical climate. For example Victor and Cullen (1987, 1988) were among the first to develop a model of the informal ethical context in organizations. Their definition of ethical climate – «those aspects of work climate that determine what constitutes ethical behaviour at work» (Victor, Cullen, 1988, p. 101) – is much cited and their model and its corresponding questionnaire have often been used since to study the influence of ethical climate on unethical behavior (e.g. Kish-Gephart et al., 2010; Martin, Cullen, 2006; Peterson, 2002a; 2002b; Schminke, Ambrose, Neubaum, 2005; Treviño et al., 1998; Vardi, 2001; Wimbush, Shepard, Markham, 1997a; 1997b). Recently, Grijalva and Harms (2014) found that the ethical climate of an organization has an effect on a narcissistic leader's behaviour. However, we should note that this approach has not been without critics (Brown, Treviño, 2006; Kaptein, 2008; 2011; Debode et al., 2013).

As a subset of organizational culture, the ethical culture of an organization is regarded as an important component of the organizational context in order to account for unethical behavior. (see Casey, Davidson, Schwartz, 2001; Key, 1999; Ford, Richardson, 1994; Fritzsche, 1991; Sims, Brinkmann, 2003). Ethical organiza-

tional culture here can represent various formal and informal systems of behavioral control, or at least of influence, that are capable of promoting either ethical or unethical behavior (Brown, Treviño, 2006; Debode et al., 2013; Kaptein, 2008; 2011; Treviño. Youngblood, 1990; Treviño et al., 1998). These may include policies (e.g., codes of ethics), leadership, authority structures, reward systems, training programs and peer behavior and the implementation of certain ethical norms. Some measure ethical organizational culture using a unidimensional questionnaire (ex Treviño et al., 1998) whereas others assess it using a multiple dimensions questionnaire (ex Debode et al., 2013; Kaptein, 2008; 2011). The literature also provides evidence that an ethical organizational culture can positively influence several employee attitudes, behaviours and even their health (Debode et al., 2013; ERC, 2010; Huhtala et al., 2011; Kaptein, 2011; Ruiz-Palomino, Martinez-Canas, 2014; Treviño et al., 1998) organizational effectiveness (Kish-Gephart et al., 2010; Riivari, 2012) and even ethical leadership (Toor, Ofori, 2009; Schaubroeck et al., 2012).

CONCLUSION: UNETHICAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL POLLUTION, SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY.

In this latter we suggest that employees' bright and dark personality traits, work characteristics and organizational characteristics have unique relationships with ethical and unethical leadership aa well as with employees general health and stress

At this time our understanding of the relationship between bright and dark personality traits, job and organizational characteristics, and their link to ethical and unethical leadership and to organizational pollution, is still very limited (Paradis et al., 2014; Lebel et al., 2015). This article may be a first attempt to enhance our understanding of these relationships. It also presents a model,

if not a plan, for subsequent research to expand our knowledge of the relation between organizational pollution and environmental pollution. However, more studies are needed. This is also very much in line with the recommendations put forth in Ünal et al. (2012), in Ruiz-Palomino and Martinez-Canas (2014) and even in Besio and Pronzini (2014) which includes exploring the role that corporate morality, ethics, and values plays in the public debate on environmental issues such as climate change.

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, *50*, 179–211.

Ajzen, I., Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Andersson, L.M., Pearson, C.M. (1999). Tit for Tat? The spiraling effects of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, *24*, 452–471.

Arneson, S., Milliken-Davies, M., Hogan, J. (1993). Validation of personality and cognitive measures for insurance claims examiners. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *7*, 459–473.

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

Babiak, P., Hare, R.D. (2007). *Snakes in Suits: When Psychopaths Go to Work.* Harper Collins, ISBN 0061147893.

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

Baker, S. (2007). Followership: The theoretical foundations of a contemporary construct. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *14* (*1*), 50–60.

Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *50* (*2*), 248–287.

Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *3*, 193–209.

Bandura, A., Caprara, G.-V., Zsolnai, L. (2000). Corporate Transgressions through Moral Disengagement. *Journal of Human Values*, *6* (*1*), 57–64.

Becker, J.H.A., O'Hair, H.D. (2007). Mahciavellians' motives in organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 2007, 246–267.

Beggs, J.M., Dean, K.L. (2007). Legislated Ethics or Ethics Education? Faculty Views in the Post-Enron Era. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *71* (*1*), 15–37.

Behnke, S. (2005). On being an ethical psychologist. *APA Monitor*, *36* (*7*), 114.

Benson, M., Campbell, J. (2007). To be, or not to be, linear: An expanded representation of personality and its relationship to leadership performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *15*, 232–249.

Bentz, V.J. (1967). The Sears experience in the investigation, description, and prediction of executive behavior. In F.R. Wickert, D.E. McFarlands (Eds.), *Measuring executive effectiveness* (pp. 147–206). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Bentz, V.J. (1985a, August). A view from the top: A thirty-year perspective on research devoted to discovery, description, and prediction of behavior. Paper presented at the 93rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Bentz, V.J. (1985b). Research findings from personality assessment of executives. In J.H. Bernardin, D.A. Bownas (Eds.), *Personality assessment in organizations* (pp. 82–144). New York: Praeger.

Bentz, V.J. (1990). Contextual issues in predicting high-level leadership performance. In K.E. Clark, M.B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 131–144). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Besio, C., Pronzini, A. (2014). Morality, Ethics, and Values Outside and Inside Organizations: An Example of the Discourse on Climate Change. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *119*, 287–300.

Biela, A. (1984). *Stres psychologiczny w sytuacji kryzysu ekologicznego [Psychological stress in the situation of ecological crisis].* Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL [Scientific Association KUL].

Blair, C.A., Hoffman, B.J., Helland, K.R. (2008). Narcissism in organizations: A multisource appraisal reflects different perspectives. *Human Performance*, *21*, 254–276.

Blass, T. (2009). From New Haven to Santa Clara: A historical perspective on the Milgram obedience experiments. *American Psychologist*, *64*, 37–45.

Blickle, G., Schlegel, A., Fassbender, P., Klein, U. (2006). Some personality correlates of business white-collar crime. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *55*, 220–233.

Boccialetti, G. (1995). *It takes two.* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). *Making Human Beings Human: Bioecological Perspectives on Human Development.* Sage Publications. ISBN ISBN0761927115.

Brown, M.E., Mitchell, M. (2010). Ethical and unethical leadership: Exploring new avenues for future research. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *20* (*4*), 583–616.

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

Brown, M.E., Treviño, L.K., Harrison, D. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *97*, 117–134.

Burger, J.M. (2009). Replicating Milgram: Would people still obey today? *American Psychologist*, *64*, 1–11.

Burke, R. (2006). Why leaders fail: Exploring the dark side. *International Journal of Manpower*, *27*, 91–100.

Cammalleri, C.M. (2012). Flexicurity as a measuring leakage protection of workers: between "social pollution" and" total security". *TEMILAVORO. IT-ISSN 1826-9028 sinossi internet di diritto del lavoro e della sicurezza sociale*, *4* (*1*).

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

Campion, M.A., Medsker, G.J., Higgs, A.C. (1993). Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: implications for designing effective work groups. *Personnel Psychology*, *46*, 823–850.

Carls, P., *Émile Durkheim* (*1858-1917*). Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy and its Authors. http://www.iep.utm.edu/durkheim.

Carroll, T. (2006). Les antécédents du harcèlement psychologique au travail. Unpublished Bachelor Psychology Memoir presented at the Psychology School, Moncton, NB: Université de Moncton, Canada.

Carsten, M.K., Uhl-Bien, M. (2012). Follower beliefs in the co-production of leadership: examining upward communication and the moderating role of context. *Journal of Psychology*, *220*, 210–220.

Carsten, M.K., Uhl-Bien, M. (2013). Ethical Followership: An Examination of Followership Beliefs and Crimes of Obedience. *Journal of Leadership Organizational Studies*, *20* (1), 49–61.

Carsten, M., Uhl-Bien, M., West, B., Patera, J., McGregor, R. (2010). Exploring social constructions of followership: A qualitative study. *Leadership Quarterly*, *21*, 543–562.

Casey, D.P., Davidson, R.A., Schwartz, B.N. (2001). The effect of organizational culture and ethical orientation on accountants' ethical judgments. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *34* (2), 101–121.

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

Ciulla, J. (1995). Leadership ethics: Mapping the territory. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *5* (*1*), 5–28.

Cortina, L.M., Magley, V.J., Williams, J.H., Langhout, R.D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *6*, 64–80.

Crossman, B., Crossman, J. (2011). Conceptualising followership: A review of the literature. *Leadership*, *7* (*4*), 481–497.

Danna, K., Griffin, R.W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management*, *25* (*3*), 357–384.

Deal., T.E., Kennedy, A.A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Dean, K.L., Beggs, J.M. Keane, T.P. (2010). Mid-level Managers, Organizational Context, and (Un)ethical Encounters. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Vol. 97, No 1*, pp. 51–69.

Debode, J.D., Armenakis, A.A., Feild, H.S., Walker, A.G. (2013). Assessing ethical organizational culture: Refinement of a scale. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *49* (*4*), 460–484.

Deluga, R.J. (1997). Relationship among American presidential charismatic leadership, narcissism, and rated performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 8, 49–65.

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

Den Hartog, D.N., Belschak, F.D. (2012). *Work Engagement and Machiavellianism in the Ethical Leadership Process. Journal of Business Ethics*, *107*, 35–47.

Den Hartog, D.N., Koopman, P.L. (2005). Linking the Big Five Factors of personality to charismatic and transactional leadership: perceived dynamic work environment as a moderator. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26* (*7*), 839–865.

Denison, D.R. (1996). What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy of Management Review, 21* (*6*), 19–654.

Deshpande, S.P. (1996). The impact of ethical climate types on Facets of job satisfaction: an empirical Investigation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *vol. 15;* p. 655–660.

Detert, J.R., Treviño, L.K., Sweitzer, V.L. (2008). Moral Disengagement in Ethical Decision Making: A Study of Antecedents and Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93* (*2*), 374–391.

Dextra-Gauthier, J., Marchand, A., Haines, V. (2012). Organizational culture, work organization conditions, and mental health: A proposed integration. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *19* (2), 81–104.

Dion, E. (2009). *Les comportements d'incivilité et de bons citoyens dans les organizations: leurs liens avec le harcèlement psychologique.* Unpublished Master's thesis, Moncton, NB: Université de Moncton.

Dotlich, D., Cairo, P. (2003). *Why CEOs fail: The 11 behaviors that can derail your climb to the top and how to manage them*. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Duffy, M.K., Ganster, D., Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*, 331–351.

Durkheim, É. (1895). *The Rules of Sociological Method*. Preface to the Second Edition, translated by W.D. Halls, The Free Press, 1982, ISBN 978–0-02–907940–9.

Durkheim, É. (1969). *The division of labor in society.* New York: The free press.

Durkheim, É. (1982). *The Rules of Sociological Method.* Preface to the Second Edition, translated by W.D. Halls, The Free Press, ISBN 978-0-02-907940-9, 45.

Einarsen, S., Aasland, M.S., Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behavior: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*, 207–216.

Egan, V., Hughes, N., Palmer, E.J. (2015). Moral disengagement, the dark triad, and unethical consumer attitudes. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *76*, 123–128.

Ethics Resource Center. (2014). *National Business Ethics Survey of the U.S. Workforce.* Arlington, VA: Ethics Resource Center (ERC).

Evans, G. (Ed.). (1982). *Environmental Stress*. N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. California: Stanford University Press.

Festinger, L. (1962). Cognitive dissonance. *Scientific American*, *207* (*4*), 93–107.

Fiedler, F.E. (1967) *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fishbein, M., Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ford, R.C., Richardson, W.D. (1994). Ethical decision making: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *13* (*2*), 205–221.

Fritzsche, D.J. (1991). A model of decision-making incorporating ethical values. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *10* (*11*), 841–852.

Furnham, A., Richards, S.C., Paulhus, D.L. (2013). The Dark Triad of Personality: A 10 Year Review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, Vol. 7; No. 3:* 199– 216, 10.1111/spc3.12018.

Gadis, B.H., Foster, J.L. (2015). Meta-Analysis of dark side personality characteristics and critical work behaviors among leaders across the globe: Findings and implications for leadership development and executive coaching. *Applied Psychology: An International review*, *64* (*1*), 25–54.

Giacalone, R.A., Promislo, M.D. (2010). Unethical and unwell: Decrements in well-being and unethical activities at work. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *91*, 275–297.

Giacalone, R.A., Promislo, M.D. (2013). *Handbook of unethical work behavior. Implications for individual well-being.* New York: M.E. Sharpes Inc.

Gifford, R. (2007). *Environmental psychology: Principles and practice*. Victoria, BC: Optimal Books.

Gifford, R. (2014). Environmental psychology matters. *Psychology*, *65* (*1*), 541.

Goldberg, L.R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public-domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, L.I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, F. Ostendorf (Eds.). *Personality Psychology in Europe*, *Vol. 7*, pp. 7–28. Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.

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

Guilliland, S.W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: an organizational justice perspective. *Academy of management*, *18*, 694–734.

Hackman, J.R., Oldham, G. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *60*, 159–170.

Hackman, J.R., Oldham, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *16*, 250–279.

Halls, W.D. (1982). «Durkheim, Émile» The Rules of Sociological Method. Second Edition. This edition is translated by W.D. Halls, The Free Press, ISBN 978-0-02-907940-9.

Hare, R.D. (2003). *Hare PCL-R.* 2nd Edition. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

Hare, R.D., Neumann, C.S. (2008). Psychopathy as a Clinical and Empirical Construct. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *4*, 217–46. doi: 10.1146/annurev. clinpsy.3.022806.091452. PMID 18370617.

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

Hartnell, C.A., Ou, A.Y., Kinicki, A. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96* (*4*), 677–694.

Harvey, G., Jas, P. Walshe, K. (2014). Analysing organisational context: case studies on the contribution of absorptive capacity theory to understanding inter-organisational variation in performance improvement. In: BM Journal Quality and Safety, doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2014-002928; downloaded from: http://qualitysafety.bmj.com/content/early/2014/10/21/bmjqs-2014-002928.

Helland, K.R., Blair, C.A. (2005, April). *Leaders behaving badly: The relationship between narcissism and unethical leadership*. Interactive poster session presented at the 20th annual conference of the Society for Industrial an Organizational Psychology, Los Angeles, CA.

Hershcovis, M.S. (2011). Incivility, social undermining, bullying... Oh my! A call to reconcile constructs within workplace aggression research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *32*, 499–519.

Hinrichs, K.T. (2007). Follower propensity to commit crimes of obedience. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *14* (*1*), 69–76.

Hoffman, B.J., Strang, S.E., Kuhnert, K.W., Campbell, W.K., Kennedy, C.L., and LoPilato, A.C. (2013). Leader narcissism and Ethical context: Effects on Ethical Leadership and Leader Effectiveness. *Journal of Leadership Organizational Studies*, 20(1), 25–37.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizafions.* NewYork: McGraw-Hill.

Hogan, R. (1994). Trouble at the top: Causes and consequences of managerial incompetence. *Consulting Psychology Journal*, *46*, 9–15.

Hogan, R., Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *9*, 12–23.

Hogan, R., Hogan, J. (2009). *Hogan Development Survey manual* (3rd Ed.). Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.

Hogan, R., Raskin, R., Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K.E. Clark, M.B. Clark (eds), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 343–354). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Hollander, E.P. (1992).The essential interdependence of leadership and followership. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *1*, 71–75.

Hollander, E.P. (1995). Ethical challenges in leader-follower relationships. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *5*, 55–65.

Hollander, E.P., Offermann, L. (1990). Power and leadership in organizations: Relationships in transition. *American Psychologist*, *45*, 179–189.

Hoobler, J.M., Brass, D.J. (2006). Abusive supervision and family undermining as displaced aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91* (*5*), 1125–1133.

Hornett, A., Fredericks, S. (2005). An empirical and theoretical exploration of disconnections between leadership and ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *59*, 233–246, doi: 10.1007/s10551-004-8205-4.

Huhtala, M., Feldt, T., Lamsa, A.M., Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U. (2011). Does the ethical culture of organizations promote managers' occupational well-being? Investigating indirect links via ethical strain. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *101*, 231–247.

Hunt, D.E. (1975). Person-Environment Interaction: A challenge found wanting before it was tried. *Review of Educational Research*, *45* (2), 209–230.

Jakobwitz, S., Egan, V. (2006). The dark triad and normal personality traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *40* (2), 331–339.

Jonason, P.K., Wee, S., Li, N.P. (2014). Thinking bigger and better about 'bad apples': Evolutionary industrial-organizational psychology and the dark triad. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 7, 117–121.

Judge, T.A., LePine, J.A., Rich, B.L. (2006). The narcissistic personality: Relationship with inflated self-ratings of leadership and with task and contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 762–776.

Judge, T.A., Piccolo, R.F. Kosalka, T. (2009). The bright and dark sides of leader traits: A review and theoretical extension of the leader trait paradigm. *The Leadership Quarterly Vol. 20*, pp 855–875; http://m.timothy-judge.com/documents/ Thebrightanddarksidesofleadertraits.pdf.

Kail, R.V., Cavanaugh, J.C. (2010). *The Study of Human Development. Human Development: A Life-span View* (*5th ed.*). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Kaiser, R.B., Kaplan, R.E. (2005). Overlooking overkill? Beyond the 1 to 5 rating scale. *Human Resources Planning*, *28* (3), 7–11.

Kaiser, R.B., LeBreton, J.M., Hogan, J. (2015). The dark side of personality and extreme leader behavior. *Applied Psychology*, *64* (*1*), 55–92.

Kant, I. (1830). *Grundlegung zur Methaphysic der Sitten*. Gotha: L. Klotz.

Kaptein, M. (2008). Developing and testing a measure for the ethical culture of organizations: the corporate ethical virtues model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *29*, 923–947.

Kaptein, M. (2011). Understanding unethical behavior by unraveling ethical culture. *Human Relations*, *64* (*6*), 843–869.

Karasek, R.A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *24*, 285–308.

Karpoff, J.M., Lee, D.S., Martin, G.S. (2008). The cost to firms of cooking the books. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, *43*, 581–611.

Keashly, L., Trott, V., MacLean, L.M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims*, *9*, 341–357.

Kellerman, B. (2004). Bad Leadership: What it is, how it happens, why it matters. *Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press*.

Kellerman, B. (2008). *Followership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kets de Vries, M., Miller, D. (1984). Neurotic style and organizational pathology. *Strategic Management Journal*, *5*, 35–55.

Kets de Vries, M., Miller, D. (1985). Narcissism and leadership: An object relations perspective. *Human Relations*, *38*, 583–601.

Key, S. (1999). Organizational Ethical Culture: Real or Imagined? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *vol. 20*; pp. 217–225.

Kiazid, K., Restubog, S., Zagenczyk, T., Kiewitz, C. (2010). In pursuit of power: The role of authoritarian leadership in the relationship between supervisors' Machiavellianism and subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervisory behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *44*, 512–519.

Kish-Gephart, J., Detert, J., Treviño, L.K., Baker, V., Martin, S. (2014). Situational Moral Disengagement: Can the Effects of Self-Interest be Mitigated? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *125*, 267–285.

Kish-Gephart, J., Harrison, D.A., Treviño, L.K. (2010). Bad apples, bad cases, and bad barrels: Meta-analytic evidence about sources of unethical decisions at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95 (1)*, 1–31.

Lebel, J., Paradis, R., Tivendell, J. (2015). *Un modèle multidimensionnel pour expliquer la santé et le bien-être des travailleurs.* Unpublished Bachelor Psychology Memoir presented at the Psychology School, Moncton, NB: Université de Moncton, Canada.

Lehnert K., Park, Y.H., Singh, N. (2014). Research Note and Review of the Empirical Ethical Decision-Making Literature: Boundary Conditions and Extensions. *Journal of Business Ethics*; doi: 10.1007/s10551-014-2147-2).

Leslie, J., Van Velsor, E. (1996). *A look at derailment today: North America and Europe.* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Levesque, A. (2006). *Examen du lien entre le travail, la culture organisationnelle et la personnalité des travailleurs.* Unpublished Master's thesis, Moncton, NB: Université de Moncton.

Lévy-Leboyer, C. (1988). Success and failure in applying psychology. *American Psychologist*, *43 (10)*, 779–785. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.43.10.779.

Lévy-Leboyer, C., Bonnes, M., Chase, J., Ferreira-Marques, J., Pawlik, K. (1996). Determinants of pro-environmental behaviors: A five-countries comparison. *European Psychologist*, *1*(2), 123–129; http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.1.2.123.

Lévy-Leboyer, C., Duron, Y. (1991). Global Change: New Challenges for Psychology. *International Journal of Psychology*, *26* (*5*), 575–583; doi: 10.1080/00207599108247145.

Lewin, K. (1935). *A Dynamic theory of personality*. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill.

Lewin, K. (1952). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers by Kurt Lewin*. London: Tavistock (quote on p. 169), also cited in: Maarten Vansteenkiste Kennon M. Sheldon (2006). There's nothing more practical than a good theory: Integrating motivational interviewing and self-determination theory; *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* (*2006*), *45*, 63–82.

Lombardo, M., McCauley, C. (1994). *Benchmarks: A manual and trainer's guide*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Lombardo, M., Ruderman, M., McCauley, C. (1988). Explanations of success and derailment in upper-level management positions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *2*, 199–216.

Lord, R.G., Brown, D.G. (2004). Leadership processes and follower self-identity. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

MacDonald, M.J., Szpilfogel, C. (2012). The healthy Lifeworks Project: the role of organizational health in the personal health of employees. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, *5* (*3*), 194–209.

Machiavelli, Nicolo (1513). *The Prince* (translated by W.K. Marriott (2012); see The Project Gutenberg EBook of The Prince, by Nicolo Machiavelli; https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1232/1232-h/1232-h.htm.

Martel, J.-F. (2010). *Analyse des choix professionnels suite au Burnout.* Unpublished Master's thesis, Moncton, NB: Université de Moncton.

Martin, K., Cullen. J. (2006). Continuities and Extensions of Ethical Climate Theory: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *69*, 175–194.

May, D., Wesche, J.S., Heinitz, K., Kerschreiter R. (2014). Coping with destructive leadership: Putting forward an integrated theoretical framework for the interaction process between leaders and followers. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, *222*, 203–213.

McCall, M.W., Jr. (2009). Every strength a weakness and other caveats. In R.B. Kaiser (Ed.), *The perils of accentuating the positive* (pp. 41–56). Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.

McCall, M.W., Jr., Lombardo, M.M. (1983). *Off the track: Why and how successful executives get derailed* (Technical Report No. 21). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

McClaren, N. (2013). The Personal Selling and Sales Management Ethics Research: Managerial Implications and Research Directions from a Comprehensive Review of the Empirical Literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *112* (*1*), 101–125.

McFarlin, D.B., Sweeney, P.D. (1992). Distributive and Procedural Justice as Predictors of Satisfaction with Personal and Organizational Outcomes. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *35* (*3*), 626–637.

McHoskey, J.W. (1999). Machiavellianism, intrinsic versus extrinsic goals, and social interest: A self-determination theory analysis. *Motivation and Emotion*, *23*, 267–283.

Meindl, J.R. (1995). The romance of leadership as a follower-centric theory: A social constructivist approach. *Leadership Quarterly*, *6*, 329–341.

Milgram, S. (1965). Some conditions of obedience and disobedience to authority. *Human Relations*, *18*, 57–76.

Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to authority: An experimental view*. New York, NY: Harper Row.

Miller, A.G., Collins, B.E., Brief, D.E. (1995). Perspectives on obedience to authority: The legacy of the Milgram experiments. *Journal of Social Issues*, *51*, 1–19.

Mintzberg, H. (1993). *Structure in fives: Designing Effective Organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Modigliani, A., Rochat, F. (1995). The role of interaction sequences and the timing of resistance in shaping obedience and defiance to authority. *Journal of Social Issues*, *51*, 107–123.

Moore, C. (2008). Moral Disengagement in Processes of Organizational Corruption. *Journal of Business ethics*, *80*, 129–139.

Moore, C., Detert, J.R., Treviño, L.K., Baker, V., Mayer, D.M. (2012). Why employees do bad things: Moral disengagement and unethical organizational behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *65*, 1–48.

Muchinsky, P. (2000). *Psychology applied to work*, 6th edition. Toronto: Wadsworth.

Mumford, M.D., Connelly, M.S., Helton, W.B., Strange, J.M., Osburn, H.K. (2001). On the construct validity of integrity tests: Individual and situational factors as predictors of test performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *9*, 240–257.

O'Boyle, E.H., Forsyth, D.R., Banks, G.C., Story, P.A. and White, C.D. (2014), A Meta-Analytic Test of Redundancy and Relative Importance of the Dark Triad and Five-Factor Model of Personality. *Journal of Personality;* doi: 10.1111/jopy12126.

O'Fallon, M.J., Butterfield, K.D. (2005). A review of the empirical ethical decision-making literature: 1996–2003. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *59* (*4*), 375–413.

O'Reilly, C.A., Doerr, B., Caldwell, D.F., Chatman, J.A. (2014). Narcissistic CEOs and executive compensation. *Leadership Quarterly*, *25*, 218–231.

Ossowska, M. (1970). *Normy moralne: proba systematyzacji.* Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

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

Paradis, R., Demers, M., Dion, E., Tivendell, J., Pietrulewicz, B. (2014). Interpersonnal pollution in organizations: Exploring ethical leadership and the dark side of organizations. *Polish Journal of Social Science*, *9* (*1*), 7–26.

Parker, S.K.,Wall, T.D., Cordery, J.L. (2001). Future work design research and practice: Towards an elaborated model of work design. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *74*, 413–440.

Paulhus, D.L., (2014). Toward a Taxonomy of Dark Personalities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *Vol. 23* (*6*); 421–426.

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

Penney, L. (2002). *Workplace incivility and counterproductive workplace behavior (CWB): What is the relationship and does personality play a role?* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of South Florida, Tampa.

Penney, L., Spector, P.E. (2002). Narcissism and counterproductive work behavior. Do bigger egos mean bigger problems? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *10*, 126–134.

Perreault, G. (1997). Ethical followers: A link to ethical leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *4*, 78–89.

Peterson, D.K. (2002a). Deviant workplace behavior and the organization's ethical climate. *Journal of Business Psychology*, *17*, 47–61.

Peterson, D.K. (2002b). The relationship between unethical behavior and the dimensions of the ethical climate questionnaire. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *41*, 313–326.

Piccolo, R.F., Greenbaum, R., Den Hartog, D.N., Folger, R. (2010). The relationship between ethical leadership and core job characteristics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*, 259–278.

Pietrulewicz, B. (1984). Cognitive barriers to moral evaluation of environmental pollution: A research proposal. A paper presented in 1984 to the «International Conference for Physical Surroundings», West-Berlin.

Pundt, A. (2014). A multiple pathway model linking charismatic leadership attempts and abusive supervision. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, *222*, 190–202.

Raskin, R., Hall, C.S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Report*, *45*, 590.

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

Resick, C.J., Whitman, D.S., Weingarden, S.M., Hiller, N.J. (2009). The bright-side and the dark-side of CEO personality: Examining core self-evaluations, narcissism, transformational leadership, and strategic influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1365–1381. doi: 10.1037/a0016238.

Riivari, E. (2012). Ethical culture of organizations, organizational innovativeness and organizational effectiveness. *The International Society for Professional Innovation Management*, 1–9.

Riivari, E., Lämsä, A.-M., Kujala, J., Heiskanen, E. (2012). The ethical culture of organizations and organizational innovativeness. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, *15* (*3*), 310–331.

Ruiz-Palomino, P., Martinez-Canas, R. (2014). Ethical culture, ethical intent and organizational citizenship behaviour: The moderating and mediating role of person-organization fit. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *120*, 95–108.

Resick, C.J., Whitman, D.S., Weingarden, S.M., Hiller, N.J. (2009). The bright-side and the dark-side of CEO personality: Examining core self-evaluations, narcissism, transformational leadership, and strategic influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1365–1381. doi: 10.1037/a0016238.

Riivari, E. (2012). Ethical culture of organizations, organizational innovativeness and organizational effectiveness. *The International Society for Professional Innovation Management*, 1–9.

Riivari, E., Lämsä, A.-M., Kujala, J., Heiskanen, E. (2012). The ethical culture of organizations and organizational innovativeness. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, *15* (*3*), 310–331.

Ruiz-Palomino, P., Martinez-Canas, R. (2014). Ethical culture, ethical intent and organizational citizenship behaviour: The moderating and mediating role of person-organization fit. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *120*, 95–108.

Sarine, E.L. (2012). Regulating the Social Pollution of Systemic Discrimination Caused by Implicit Bias. *California Law Review*, *100*(*5*), Available at: http://scholarship. law.berkeley.edu/californialawreview/vol100/iss5/11 Regulating the Social Pollution of Systemic Discrimination Caused by Implicit Bias.

Schat, A.C. H., Desmarais, S., Kelloway, E.K. (2006). Exposure to workplace aggression from multiple sources: Validation of a measure and test of a model. Unpublished manuscript, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada.

Schaubroeck, J.M., Hannah, S.T., Avolio, B.J., Kozlowski, S.W., Lord, R.G., Treviño, L.K., Dimotakis, N., Peng, A.C. (2012). Embedding ethical leadership within and across organization levels. *Academy of Management Journal*, *55* (*5*), 1053–1078.

Schein, E.H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view.* San Francisco, Jossey Bass.

Schein, E.H. (1996). Culture: The missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41*, 229–240.

Schminke, M., Ambrose, M., Neubaum, D. (2005). The Effect of Leader Moral Development on Ethical Climate and Employee Attitudes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *97*, 135–151.

Schyns, B. (2015). Dark personality in the workplace: Introduction to the special issue. *Applied Psychology*, *64* (*1*), 1–14.

Shafer, W.E., Simmons, R.S. (2011). Effects of organizational ethical culture on the ethical decisions of tax practitioners in mainland China. *Accounting, Auditing Accountability Journal*, *24* (*5*), 647–668.

Sheehan, M., McCarthy, P., Barker, M., Henderson, M. (2001). *A model for assessing the impacts and costs of workplace bullying*. Paper presented at the Standing Conference on Organizational Symbolism (SCOS). Dublin: Trinity College.

Sims, R.R., Brinkmann, J. (2003). Enron ethics or: culture matters more than codes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *45* (*3*), 243–256.

Simonton, D. (1986). Presidential personality: Biographical use of the Gough Adjective Checklist. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 149–160.

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

Spain, S.M., Harms, P., Lebreton, J.M. (2013). The dark side of personality at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *Vol. 1; No 1*; pp. 1–21. DOI: 10.1002/job.1894.

Stokols, D., Altman, I. (Ed.). (1987). *Handbook of Environmental Psychology*, *Vol. 1*, N.Y.: John Wiley Sons.

Stouten, J., Baillien, E., Van den Broeck, A., Camps, J., Witte, H., Euwema, M. (2011). Discouraging bullying: The role of ethical leadership and its effects on the work environment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *95*, 17–27. DOI: 10.1007/ s10551-011-0797-x.

Sullivan, B.N., Haunschild, P., Page, K. (2007). Organizations non gratae? The impact of unethical corporate acts on interorganizational networks. *Organizational Science*, *18*, 55–70.

Sy, T. (2010). What do you think of followers? Examining the content, structure, and consequences of implicit followership theories. *Organizational Behavior Human Decision Processes*, *113*, 73–84.

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

Tepper, B.J. (2007). Abusive Supervision in Work Organizations: Review, Synthesis, and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, *33*, 261–289.

Tepper, B.J., Carr, J.C., Breaux, D.M., Geider, S., Hu, C., Hua, W. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance:

A power / dependence analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *109* (2), 156–167.

Tepper, B.J., Duffy, M.K., Henle, C.A., Lambert, L.S. (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, *59*, 101–123.

Tepper, B.J., Henle, C.A. (2011). A case for recognizing distinctions among constructs that capture interpersonal mistreatment in work organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *32*, 487–498.

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

Tivendell, J., Doucette, J. (1998). *Justice organisationnelle: évaluation a posteriori du modèle de Guilliland. Collection des paradoxes dans les organisations*, *Tome 3*. Actes du 9ième congrès de l'Association Internationale de psychologie du travail de langue française; Presses interuniversitaires.

Tivendell, J., Pietrulewicz, B., Demers, M., Dion, E., Paradis, R. and Carroll, T. (2013). MOI: Self or traits, for a short efficient measure of individual differences? *Polish Journal of Social Science*, *8* (*1*), 1–26.

Toor, S.-U.-R., Ofori, G. (2009). Ethical leadership: Examining the relationships with full range leadership model, employee outcomes, and organizational culture. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *90*, 533–547.

Torregiante, J. (2005). *Destructive personality traits and leadership performance: A pattern-oriented approach*. Unpublished thesis, North Carolina State University.

Treviño, L.K., Butterfield, K.D., McCabe, D.L. (1998). The ethical context in organizations: Influences on employee attitudes and behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *8* (*3*), 447–476.

Treviño, L.K., Youngblood, S.A. (1990). Bad apples in bad barrels: A causal analysis of ethical decision-making behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *75* (*4*), 378–385.

Turk, A., Turk, J., Wittes, J.T. (1972). *Ecology*, *Pollution*, *Environment.* Philadelphia: Saunders; (now by Brooks/Cole). ISBN 10: 0721689256/ISBN 13: 9780721689258.

Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *Leadership Quarterly*, *17* (*6*), 654–676.

Uhl-Bien, M., Carsten, M.K. (2007). Being ethical when the boss is not. *Organizational Dynamics*, *36*, 187–201.

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

Ünal, A., Warren, D., Chen, C. (2012). The normative foundations of unethical supervision in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *107*, 5–19.

Usmani, S., Jamal, S. (2013). Impact of Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, Temporal Justice, Spatial Justice on Job Satisfaction of Banking Employees. *Review of Integrative BusinessEconomic Research*,*2*(*1*)351. http://sibresearch.org/uploads/2/7/9/9/2799227/riber_k13-103_351-383.pdf.

Van Dijk, E., De Cremer, D. (2006). Self-benefiting in the allocation of scarce resources: Leader-follower effects and the moderating role of social value orientations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *32*, 1352–1361.

Van Velsor, E., Leslie, J.B. (1995). Why executives derail: Perspective across time and cultures. *Academy of Management Executive*, *9*, 62–72

White, J., Bandura, A., Bero, L.A. (2009). Moral disengagement in the corporate world. *Accountability in Research*, *16*, 41–74.

Wood, R., Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *Academy of Management Journal*, *14*, 361–384.

Youli, H., Chao, L. (2014). A comparative study between the dark triad of personality and the big five. *Canadian Social Science*, *11* (*1*), 93.

Yulk, G.A., (2005). *Leadership in organizations*, 6th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zapf, D. (2002). Emotion work and psychological well-being: A review of literature and some conceptual considerations. *Human Resource Management Review*, *12*, 237–268.

Zellars, K.L., Tepper, B.J., Duffy, M.K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87* (6), 1068–1076.

Zheng, W., Yang, B., McLean, G.N. (2009). Linking organizational culture, structure, strategy, and organizational effectiveness: Mediating role of knowledge management. *Journal of Business Research*, *63* (7), 763–771.