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ABSTRACT

Although leadership scholars increasingly acknowledge the influence of followers in the leadership process, less attention has been paid to followers’ role in the destructive leadership process. Specifically, research has largely adopted a leader-centric approach to destructive leadership in organizations. Unfortunately, this overemphasis on the leader has restricted our understanding of this complex and multi-faceted social-organizational process. Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser (2007), however, suggested destructive leadership is not simply a function of destructive leaders, but rather results from the confluence of destructive leaders interacting with susceptible followers and conducive environments. With respect to susceptible followers, Padilla et al. (2007) proposed two broad categories of such followers: conformers and colluders. The focus of the present research was to develop and validate scales to assess the susceptibilities of conformers and colluders to destructive leaders. Four separate studies were conducted to evaluate the content validity, factor structures, convergent and divergent validity, and criterion validity of the two scales. Future research directions and theoretical and practical implications are discussed.
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Chapter 1

Introduction and Literature Review

“The German calamity of years ago repeats itself: People acquiesce without resistance and align themselves with the forces of evil.”—Albert Einstein, (Calaprice, 2011)

Although leadership research has been plagued by an overarching emphasis on leaders as the driving force behind various organizational outcomes (Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985; Meindl & Ehrlich, 1987), scholars increasingly recognize the vital role followers play in the leadership process (Baker, 2007; Chaleff, 1995; Hollander, 1992; Hollander & Offermann, 1990; Howell & Shamir, 2005; Kelley, 1992; Lord & Brown, 2004). Indeed, most scholars agree that followers are the essence of leadership, and that leaders cannot exist without followers (Collinson, 2006). Following Kelley’s (1988) and Chaleff’s (1995) seminal works, the 1990s brought with them a growing body of work on followers and follower-centric approaches to leadership, which stressed the importance of no longer studying leaders in isolation from followers (Baker, 2007). Although the study of leadership has seen a growing appreciation for the role of followers in leadership processes, research on destructive leadership (DL) has taken a decidedly uni-dimensional, leader-centric approach, which has hindered researchers from understanding DL from a holistic standpoint (Kellerman, 2004; Hollander, 1992; Padilla, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2007).

This overemphasis on the leader in DL research is evidenced in the proliferation of constructs that have been used to describe various forms of destructive, or toxic, leader behavior, such as toxic leadership (Frost, 2004; Lipman-Blumen, 2008; Goldman, 2006), narcissistic leadership (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006), bad leadership (Kellerman, 2004), hypnotic leadership (Popper, 2001), petty tyranny (Ashforth, 1994), and leader bullying, (Ferris, Zinko, Brouer, Buckley, & Harvey, 2007). Moreover, with the exception of a few
(e.g. Gessner, O’Connor, Mumford, & Clifton, 1995; Mumford et al., 2007; O’Connor, Mumford, Clifton, Gessner, & Connelly, 1995), little empirical work has examined how environmental and follower-related factors contribute to the emergence and persistence of DL in organizations. As such, we still know little about DL and even less about factors outside the leader, such as followers, which contribute to its prevalence in organizations.

Recently, however, promising new work by several authors has stressed the need to take a more comprehensive, systems-based approach to the study of DL (Mumford et al., 2007; Neal & Tansey, 2010; Padilla et al., 2007; Kellerman, 2004; Lipman-Blumen, 2008). Padilla et al. (2007), for example, offered a model of DL (the “toxic triangle”), which suggests that DL results from the confluence of destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. With respect to followers, the authors argue that there are two types of susceptible followers: conformers and colluders. While conformers passively allow toxic leaders to wield power over them, colluders actively participate in the leader’s agenda. As such, the authors’ model takes into account the complex mutual influence process that occurs between destructive leaders and susceptible followers. That is, while conformers may act as passive enablers of destructive leader behavior, colluders may actually cause destructive leaders to engage in higher levels of unethical behavior.

Echoing these views, Kellerman (2004) suggested followers of “bad leadership” could be broadly classified into bystanders (i.e. conformers) and acolytes (i.e. colluders). According to Kellerman, bystanders follow bad leaders out of their own best interest. That is, because even bad leaders have the potential to satisfy our most basic individual (i.e. safety, stability, certainty, etc.) and group needs (i.e. order, identity, cohesion, etc.), these followers may perceive inherent costs to their family, position, or even life for demonstrating resistance. Thus, bystanders typically elect to do nothing about DL, acting
instead as enablers for the leader’s destructive agenda. In contrast, acolytes deliberately commit themselves to a destructive leader and their unethical activities in the hopes of personally benefiting from the relationship (Kellerman, 2004). In fact, research suggests that some followers will actually collude with authoritarian leaders for the right price (Lipman-Blumen, 2008). Further, acolytes often share the same worldview as the leader and are intent on achieving the same unethical goals and aspirations. Thus, like colluders, acolytes may actually serve to encourage and strengthen a leader’s destructive goals.

In sum, while DL research has come a long way since House and Howell (1992) first distinguished between personalized and socialized leader orientations, we still know relatively little about this harmful, enduring phenomenon in organizations. In terms of followers, we do know from the experiences of Nazi Germany, of My Lai [Vietnam], of Milgram’s (1963) laboratory, of Zimbardo’s (1972) Stanford Prison experiment and other instances of obedience to destructive authorities that regardless of how strong a situation may be, people differ in how they react to compliance situations (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989; Thoroughgood et al., 2012). Distinguishing between different types of susceptible followers is necessary given different types of followers will inevitably react in different ways to the same destructive leader. Further, while recent theoretical work (e.g., Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012) suggests different types of followers (conformers and colluders) play different roles in the DL process, there remains a strong need for psychometrically valid and reliable ways of distinguishing between these follower types. Moreover, although susceptible followers reflect only a piece of this complex puzzle, it is vital that academics and practitioners alike are well equipped with the psychometric tools necessary to empirically investigate their contribution to this complex mosaic that is DL.
As such, the present effort has several purposes. First, drawing on existing theory, I provide a conceptualization of follower susceptibility to DL that is multidimensional in nature. Consistent with Hinkin’s (1998) scale development guidelines, I have thoroughly reviewed the extant literature to delineate a well-articulated theoretical foundation for the content domain of both follower susceptibility to conformity and collusion with DL. In terms of conformity, this construct is comprised of four dimensions, consisting of 1) unmet basic needs, 2) low self-concept clarity, 3) low core self-evaluations, and 4) personal life distress (Cushman, 1984; Howell & Shamir, 2005; Padilla et al., 2007; Weierter, 1997; Wright & Wright, 1982). In contrast, follower collusion is comprised of 1) personal ambition, 2) Machiavellianism, 3) greed, as well as 4) low self-control (Kellerman, 2004; Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood, Padilla, Hunter, & Tate, 2012).

Second, the current research will attempt to develop two scales that assess both conformer and colluders’ susceptibilities to DL. Unfortunately, criticism abounds in the leadership literature regarding the construct validity of many of the most popular scales used by researchers (Hunter, Bedell-Avers, & Mumford, 2007; Scherbaum, Finlinson, Barden, & Tamanini, 2006). Indeed, Ghiselli, Campbell, and Zedeck (1981) emphasized the importance of grounding scale development in a comprehensive review of existing theory and an adequate sampling of the specified content domain. Aided by Hinkin’s (1998) scale development guidelines, the present study attempts to construct measures that better reflect those key elements distinguishing different types of followers of DL.

Finally, the present effort seeks to provide evidence of the two measures’ psychometric validity. To date, a general concern exists among scholars over the factor structure and overall psychometric quality of many of the most commonly used measures in leadership research (Carless, 1998; Heinitz, Liepmann, & Felfe, 2005; Hunter, Bedell-
Avers, & Mumford, 2007; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004; Tejeda, Scandura, & Pillai, 2001). Because the scores used in statistical analysis are a function of the quality of the measures used, the use of measures with poor psychometric properties presents inherent difficulties in the interpretation and meaningfulness of data (Hinkin, 1995; Pedhauzur & Schmelkin, 1991), as well as the interpretation of findings across studies and samples (Hunter et al., 2007). As such, the present effort will seek to rigorously examine the construct validity of follower conformity and collusion with DL by determining the factor structure and nomological network associated with each (Chronbach & Meehl, 1955), as well as demonstrating convergent and discriminant validity (Campbell & Fiske, 1959).

**Introduction to the Present Research**

As previously mentioned, while a growing appreciation for the role of followers has taken place in the leadership literature, in general, (Baker, 2007; Carsten et al., 2010; Kelley, 1992; Hollander, 1992; Chaleff, 1995; Howell & Shamir, 2005), DL researchers have been slow to acknowledge the critical influence of followers on the DL process. Indeed, it seems that DL research has maintained a trajectory similar to that of leadership research, in general, by taking an overly simplistic, leader-centric approach to its study. This enduring interest in the traits and behaviors of destructive leaders that contribute to the enactment of DL in organizations seems to originate from a more general fascination with leaders in our society—a phenomenon that Meindl and colleagues (1985; Meindl & Ehrlich, 1987; Meindl, 1995) famously referred to as the “Romance of Leadership.” This overly narrow view, however, has stunted the growth of DL research and precluded researchers from painting a more complex and realistic portrait of DL in organizations.

However, while Industrial-Organizational Psychologists have largely neglected, with the exception of a few (e.g. Padilla et al., 2007; Howell & Shamir, 2005; Kellerman,
the influence of followers on the DL process, a relatively rich body of work on follower susceptibility to destructive brands of leadership exists in other literatures, such as clinical psychology, criminology, and cult studies. Thus, I take a multi-disciplinary perspective by drawing on these various literatures to both describe and define the domain of follower susceptibility to conformity and collusion with DL. As mentioned above, existing theory and research suggests four dimensions (unmet needs, low self-concept clarity, low core self-evaluations, and personal life distress) appear to underlie conformity to DL, while four dimensions (personal ambition, Machiavellianism, Greed, and low self-control) are representative of follower collusion with DL.

In the following, I first review prevailing theory on the role of followers in the DL process. I then describe the dimensions underlying each scale to clearly define the content domain underlying follower susceptibility to conformity and collusion with DL. Finally, I offer hypotheses regarding convergent, divergent, and criterion-related validity of the scales to provide support for their construct validity and establish their nomological net.

**Types of Followers Associated with DL**

Padilla et al. (2007) recently offered a theoretical framework for studying DL that emphasizes the importance of broadening our perspective on DL to include the impact of conducive environments and susceptible followers on the DL process. According to the authors, destructive leaders are embedded within a variety of different organizational contexts, which vary in terms of their conduciveness to DL. In particular, these authors suggest that followers play a critical role in determining whether destructive leaders are successful in obtaining positions of authority in organizations, as well as enacting their destructive agendas. Furthermore, their review of the literature suggests that susceptible followers can be categorized into two overarching groups: conformers and colluders.
While conformers submit to the influence of destructive leaders as a result of fear, colluders actively and willfully engage in the destructive leader’s agenda (Padilla et al., 2007; Rispens, Giebels, & Jehn, 2010; Wang, Sinclair, & Deese, 2010). Although conformers and colluders are both motivated by self-interest, their concerns are different (Higgins, 1997). That is, conformers perceive consequences for not obeying a destructive leader’s orders, and therefore are motivated to minimize these consequences by passively submitting to the destructive leader. In contrast, colluders actively participate in the DL process to personally benefit from their association with a toxic leader. As previously mentioned, research suggests some followers will collude with authoritarian leaders for the right price (Lipman-Blumen, 2008). Moreover, the distinction between conformers and colluders parallels discussions of follower susceptibility made by other researchers.

Kellerman (2004), for example, outlined a number of reasons why followers of “bad leadership” continue to follow even when they are aware of their leader’s misguided or malevolent intentions. Congruent with Padilla et al.’s (2007) concept of conformers, Kellerman suggested that bystanders often have good and sound reasons for obeying bad leaders. Indeed, even bad leaders can be highly adept at providing for the needs of their followers, thereby providing incentive for bystanders to overlook a leader’s destructive behavior out of self-interest. Specifically, bad leaders often are able to satisfy our most basic individual needs such as safety, simplicity, stability, and certainty, as well as group needs such as order, identity and cohesion. Additionally, like conformers, bystanders also perceive potential consequences to their family, position, and even their life for not obeying. Thus, because organizing active opposition to despotic leaders necessitates substantial resources (i.e. time, energy, etc.) and perhaps more importantly, courage, the costs of opposing such leaders often outweigh the costs of passivity (Kellerman, 2004).
In contrast, consistent with Padilla and colleagues’ (2007) notion of colluders, Kellerman (2004) suggested acolytes deliberately support destructive leaders by actively committing themselves to their malevolent mission. Like colluders, acolytes perceive their relationship with a bad leader as a vehicle for obtaining valued financial and/or political outcomes. Moreover, according to Kellerman (2004), this type of follower, often shares a congruent value system and worldview with the leader, providing alignment between the two’s goals and aspirations. In contrast to bystanders, acolytes, obey bad leaders because they intrinsically want to, not because of any extrinsic pressure to do so.

Echoing Kellerman’s (2004) views, Lipman-Blumen (2008) suggested that all too often followers not only tolerate toxic leaders but, in fact, prefer and even create them. Indeed, many followers perceive high social, psychological, financial, and political costs to escaping toxic leaders, electing instead to acquiesce to their orders and wait it out in hopes of someone else challenging their established power structure. Lipman-Blumen (2008), thus, pointed to a vicious cycle of follower enablement of toxic leadership, whereby toxic leaders are given free reign by followers to implement their destructive policies. Consistent with Kellerman (2004), followers of toxic leaders often submit to such leaders out of their best interest. That is, toxic leaders, while ultimately destructive forces, often provide for followers’ basic needs, including security, safety, and certainty.

Although such needs are consistent with those desired by Kellerman’s (2004) bystanders, Lipman-Blumen (2008) also discusses a variety of needs that seem to be more congruent with those sought after by acolytes. In particular, the need to feel chosen into a select group carries with it great appeal to human-beings, due mostly in part to the valued perks associated with such membership. Additionally, the need to be at the center of the action provides our lives with increased relevance and meaning, thereby providing feelings
of power, knowledge, and control, among other things. Finally, the need for self-esteem and!achievement go hand in hand. By associating oneself with a toxic leader, a follower may share in the leader’s successes and experience instant growth in his or her self-esteem. Thus, some followers may actively contribute to the attainment of a toxic leader’s goals in to secure valuable outcomes for themselves. In fact, there are Afghan warlords who have followers that pledge their loyalty based on the potential of gaining valued resources, privilege, and prestige in a new regime (Lipman-Blumen, 2008). Using this framework, I now turn to those dimensions distinguishing these different followers.

**Dimensions Underlying Conformers**

A cross-disciplinary review of existing research across the academic disciplines of industrial-organizational psychology, political psychology, psychiatry, criminology, and!cult psychology, among others, suggests the existence of four dimensions underlying conformity to DL, including 1) *unmet basic needs*, 2) *low self-concept clarity*, 3) *low core self-evaluations*, and 4) *personal life distress* (Cushman, 1984, 1990; Kohut, 1977; Howell & Shamir, 2005; Padilla et al., 2007; Weierter, 1997; Wright & Wright, 1982). I now review each of these dimensions in detail in order to define the domain of follower conformity to DL. Figure 1 further provides a model of these underlying dimensions.

**Unmet Basic Needs**

Though toxic leaders ultimately leave a trail of damage and ruin in their wake, at least in the short run they often have the ability to provide for their followers basic needs (Fox & Levin, 2003; Galanter, Rabkin, Rabkin, & Deutsch, 1979; Lipman-Blumen, 2008; Padilla et al., 2007; Ullman, 1979; Ungerleider & Wellischh, 1979; Wright & Wright, 1982). A review of the literature suggests such leaders are often able to satisfy follower needs for safety and security, certainty and stability, group membership and acceptance,
affection, achievement and self-esteem, as well as to possess a deeper purpose, meaning, and direction in one’s life (Kellerman, 2004; Lipman-Blumen, 2008; Padilla et al., 2007).

**Safety and security.** Arguably one of our most basic needs is that of safety and security, a need that is well ingrained in the human psyche (Kellerman, 2004; Padilla et al., 2007). That is, we learn from a very early age to follow our parents because it is they who provide us with food, shelter, and a concrete sense of safety in a seemingly unsafe world. Kellerman (2004) noted that we later carry this mentality into the workplace, following the rules even when we perceive those rules to be unfair or even sometimes unethical. Indeed, in such situations the costs of resistance (i.e. losing one’s job, income, healthcare and retirement benefits, etc.) often far outweigh the costs of following (Kellerman, 2004). As such, the mental math that takes places in followers’ minds when deciding whether to question authority or passively submit is often sound and logical. After all, our own needs and desires, as well as those of the ones we love, are intrinsically tied to the positions we hold in life and the leaders that often determine the security of those positions. Lipman-Blumen (2008) suggested that a leader’s offer of protection and security from physical or social death via participation in one’s larger-than-death projects is an attractive proposition to followers, one that can yield potent effects over followers.

This underlying dependency on leaders for safety and security is well documented in the area of self-psychology. Heinz Kohut, a pioneer of the self-psychology movement, famously coined the term “self object,” referring to providers, initially parents, of those basic psychological functions required in infancy (Shaw, 2003). By projecting an image of strength that a child can idealize, children internalize a sense of security from their parents – the “self objects” they most readily identify with in childhood. Yet, for those whose self-object requirements are deprived early in life, or due to unanticipated events, there may
exist an underlying tendency for such individuals to seek out leaders or other authority figures for safety and security in life (Fromm, 1941; Kohut, 1976; Shaw, 2003).

Becker (1973) further suggested that alignment with a leader allows followers to overcome their own innate fear of life and the insecurities over their ability to achieve a sense of individuality. Thus, by internalizing a leader’s ideology and endowing him or her with extraordinary powers, followers are able to bypass the difficult work of creating their own worldviews and place in the world (Becker, 1973; Wright & Wright, 1982). Moreover, Becker (1973) theorized that when cult members deify their leaders by placing them on pedestals or bestow upon them extraordinary powers, they inherently believe themselves to be more powerful and therefore more safe and secure in their own lives.

**Belonging and companionship.** In addition, research suggests that individuals are more likely to follow a leader when the leader is able to fulfill their inherent need for group membership and acceptance (Deutsch, 1980; Fox & Levin, 2003; Lipman-Blumen, 2008; Shaw, 2003; Volkan & Kayatekin, 2006; Wright & Wright, 1982). Indeed, being chosen and accepted into a prestigious group, with all the associated benefits that come with such membership, holds an immeasurable appeal to most human beings (Deutsch, 1980; Lipman-Blumen, 2006). Lipman-Blumen (2008) further suggested when a leader accepts one into his or her group of followers, the newcomer feels a sense of being at the center of the action, which enriches the newcomer’s belief that their life holds increased relevance and meaningfulness. Research on cult behavior, in fact, suggests that devotees of cult leaders are motivated by a feeling of group acceptance (Becker, 1973; Deutsch, 1980; Kohut, 1977; Wright & Wright, 1982), which causes members to routinely forego their freedoms and blindly follow the orders of a given leader (Lipman-Blumen, 2008).
In some instances, such blind obedience has resulted in the committal of heinous crimes, such as the infamous LaBianca and Tate murders perpetrated by followers of Charles Manson in the late 1960’s (Bugliosi, 1994). Reflecting on the murders, Fox and Levin (2003) noted that Manson acted as a “father figure” to his followers and provided justification for the crimes by making his disciples feel special and chosen to carry out “Helter Skelter” (i.e. an apocalyptic war Manson predicted was imminent between blacks and whites over race relations at the time). Arendt (1951), moreover, suggested feelings of alienation promulgate apathy and a sense of powerlessness among followers. Such feelings, according to Arendt (1951), created fertile ground for totalitarian regimes to take control, such as those that assumed power in Germany, Russia, and Italy in the early 20th Century. Thus, by providing followers with a sense of group membership, belonging, and connectedness, as well as a feeling of having a piece of the action, toxic leaders may exert powerful effects on followers that leave them susceptible to destructive leadership.

On a related note, leaders have the potential to provide their followers with the much needed affection and companionship they may lack in other areas of their lives, creating the potential for extreme devotion and attachment to such leaders even in the face of their unethical behavior (Cushman, 1984; Shaw, 2003; Wright & Wright, 1982). The cult literature, in fact, points to a technique, referred to as “love bombing,” which is used by many modern cults to help recruit new members. “Love bombing” occurs when potential recruits are overwhelmed with attention, affection, and enthusiastic approval from the group (Wright & Wright, 1982). Consequently, followers internalize the belief that the cult leader has their best interests at heart and will make good on his or her promise of unconditional love forever (Fromm, 1941; Shaw, 2003). Thus, by offering followers the
promise of unwavering love and affection, destructive leaders are able to prey upon individuals who yearn for these missing elements in their lives (Shaw, 2003).

**Purpose and meaning.** Finally, destructive leaders may be particularly attractive to certain individuals given their capacity to provide followers with a purpose and meaning in life (Cushman, 1984; Deutsch, 1980; Kohut, 1977; Lipman-Blumen, 2008; Shaw, 2003; Ullman, 1979; Wright & Wright, 1982). The search for purpose and meaning in life is often a tumultuous road for many of us, requiring a great deal of introspection and soul-searching. When purpose and meaning are lacking, however, there may exist a unique vulnerability to destructive leaders, who provide a path to a seemingly meaningful and memorable life (Lipman-Blumen, 2008). Under the tutelage of such leaders, moreover, individuals are able to develop a sense of purpose and direction by adopting the leader’s philosophy, values system, and goals (Deutsch, 1980; Shaw, 2003).

Indeed, following World War I, a state of political and economic turmoil existed in Germany, due in part to the extensive war reparations handed down after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles. Toland (1976) alluded to these conditions playing upon the German people’s ever-present sense of inferiority, “the one characteristic which colors every German soul” – a “complex of the younger brother, of the one who is always a bit late to the feast” (p. 525). By projecting a vision of a greater Germany (which he termed Lebensraum) marked by German superiority and nationalism, Hitler manipulated his people’s needs for purpose and direction during times of ambiguity and instability. As such, he assumed a larger-than-life status during his reign, a status Carl Jung equated to a “mystic medicine man” among many of the German people (Toland, 1976, p. 525).

In sum, the aforementioned needs, when deprived or unfilled, have the potential to contribute to people’s susceptibility to DL. Fromm (1941) referred to these susceptible
individuals as “authoritarian characters,” and alluded to their unique vulnerability to a “magic helper” – which reflects either a person or a personification that offers protection, answers and solutions, unconditional love, and everlasting companionship (Fromm, 1941; Wright & Wright, 1982). By aligning oneself with this “magic helper,” who embodies all the qualities one perceives him or herself to be missing, the individual is able to shift the focus off the self (which is experienced as insecure, lonely, empty, and worthless) to the “magic helper” (Fromm, 1941; Shaw, 2003). As such, the “magic helper” validates one’s existence by eliminating feelings of emptiness, loneliness, and anxiety that plague one’s sense of self, thus fulfilling the above needs (Shaw, 2003). Fromm (1941) further noted that when the “magic helper” takes a human form, they are endowed with supernatural powers and qualities, which creates the potential for blind obedience among followers.

**Low Self-Concept Clarity**

Research also suggests one’s level of self-concept development plays a vital role in determining one’s susceptibility to DL. Padilla et al.’s (2007) toxic triangle theory of DL directly implicates follower self-concept in the DL process, suggesting that followers possessing less developed self-concepts are more likely to conform to authority and engage in destructive or unethical behavior (Howell & Shamir, 2005; Padilla et al., 2007; Treviño, Weaver, & Reynolds, 2006; Trevino & Youngblood, 1990; Weierter, 1997).

Indeed, several authors have suggested that followers’ self-concepts play a critical role in the types of charismatic relationships formed between leaders and followers (e.g. Kark & Shamir, 2002; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993), and specifically whether certain followers are more or less susceptible to the influence tactics of personalized charismatic leaders (e.g. Howell & Shamir, 2005; Weierter, 1997, 1998). Shamir et al. (1993) argued that at the core of the charismatic relationship is the relationship between followers’ self-
concepts and the leader, the collectivity (i.e. the group, organization, movement), and the collective mission. These authors further suggested strong links between followers’ self-concepts and these respective entities are indicative of a charismatic relationship, where the leader, group, and collective mission reflect vital components of one’s self-concept.

Like Kark and Shamir (2002), Weierter (1997) suggested the existence of two charismatic relationships, based on House and Howell’s (1992) distinction between personalized and socialized charismatic leadership. Consistent with some of the aforementioned discussion on follower needs, Weierter (1997) theorized that different charismatic relationships (personalized or socialized) form depending on the types of follower needs the relationship satisfies. Personalized relationships develop when followers are initially confused and disoriented and thus join the relationship in order to derive a clearer sense of self and increased level of self-confidence (Weierter, 1997; Howell & Shamir, 2005). Like Kark and Shamir’s (2002) theory, this relationship primarily revolves around followers’ personal identification with the leader. These followers lack a clear sense of self necessary to evaluate the leader’s message and means of influence, thereby producing an inherent dependency and vulnerability to the leader.

In contrast, those who form socialized relationships possess a clear sense of self and well-ingrained values that they use to evaluate the leader’s message and influence attempts against. As such, these followers do not personally identify with the leader him or herself, but rather seek self-expression of their values through the charismatic relationship and derive a sense of direction through the leader’s message (Weierter, 1997; Howell & Shamir, 2005). In so doing, followers inherently place constraints on the leader’s influence attempts, actively shape the values expressed by the leader, and are less dependent and susceptible to manipulation by the leader (Howell & Shamir, 2005).
Integrating these aforementioned theories, Howell and Shamir (2005) directly implicated followers’ self-concept clarity in the formation of personalized and socialized charismatic relationships. Consistent with Shamir and colleagues (1993) and Kark and Shamir (2003), Howell and Shamir (2005) theorized, congruent with Weierter (1997), that individuals possessing lower levels of self-concept clarity are more likely to form personalized charismatic relationships with leaders, while those with higher levels of self-concept clarity are inherently more likely to form socialized charismatic relationships.

Self-concept clarity is defined as the extent to which the contents of one’s self-concept are clearly and confidently defined, internally consistent, and temporally stable (Campbell, 1990). As such, individuals low on self-concept clarity lack a clear and consistent self-concept to guide their behavior. As such, their self-concept is highly malleable and vulnerable to self-relevant social cues, especially those originating from attractive or powerful others (Brockner, 1988; Howell & Shamir, 2005). Charismatic leaders, thus, are a source of self-direction for these followers, making the charismatic relationship a highly sought after solution to this type of follower’s ill defined sense of self (Howell & Shamir, 2005). This type of follower is highly likely to become dependent on a charismatic leader, and thus inherently susceptible to leaders who wish to manipulate such followers for personal gain (Howell & Shamir, 2005; Weierter, 1997).

Conversely, followers possessing high levels of self-concept clarity seek self-expression through the charismatic relationship and place great value on maintaining self-consistency. Thus, they may form charismatic relationships with leaders who articulate messages, pursue goals, and demonstrate behaviors that align with the values and social identities that comprise their self-concepts. In sum, socialized relationships depend on the extent to which the leader represents and promotes the values and identities of this type of
follower and clearly articulates how the mission embodies these identities and values (Howell & Shamir, 2005). To the extent that leaders veer off track from the stated mission, fail to represent the core values and identities of the group, or attempt to manipulate their power at the expense of followers, those with high self-concept clarity hold such leaders accountable rather than passively acquiesce to the leader’s demands.

**Low Core Self-Evaluations**

Padilla and colleagues’ (2007) toxic triangle theory further states that followers possessing low (or, negative) core self-evaluations are inherently more vulnerable to DL. Judge and Bono (2001) defined core self-evaluations as the “basic conclusions or bottom-line evaluations that individuals hold about themselves” (p. 81). Furthermore Judge, Locke, and Durham (1997) suggested that core self-evaluations represent a higher-order personality factor that encompasses self-esteem, locus of control, and self-efficacy.

Self-esteem refers to the most fundamental core evaluation that individuals make about themselves and represents the overall value one places on oneself as a person (Harter, 1990; Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998). Research suggests individuals possessing low self-esteem are more likely to identify with charismatic leaders, given their underlying tendency to devalue themselves and desire to be people who they envy (Freemesser & Kaplan, 1976; Galanter, 1982; Shamir, Arthur, & House, 1994). Freemesser and Kaplan (1976), for example, conducted interviews and found that individuals with lower levels of self-esteem were more likely to join charismatic religious cults than those with higher levels of self-esteem. Weierter (1997) further argued that such individuals question their place in the world and therefore are more susceptible to manipulation by charismatic leaders because they believe such treatment is deserved.
While self-esteem refers to the overall value attached to the self, generalized self-efficacy, in contrast, reflects the estimations one makes about his or her ability to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and actions necessary to exert control over events in one’s life (Judge et al., 1997, 1998). As such, it reflects the overall evaluation one makes about their fundamental ability to cope with the needs and demands encountered in their lives (Judge et al., 1998). It thus stands to reason that individuals who possess low levels of generalized self-efficacy are more likely to conform to the influence attempts of destructive leaders, given they do not believe they have the capacity to challenge or oppose them (Luthans, Peterson, & Ibrayeva, 1998). For such individuals, going along with a destructive leader is perceived as the only choice they possess. Luthans and colleagues (1998) further noted that individuals with low self-efficacy lack the motivation and persistence necessary to overcome life’s challenges, rendering them susceptible to authoritative leaders who provide structure and security in their lives.

Similarly, locus of control refers to the extent to which individuals believe they can exert control over events in their lives (internal locus of control) or that the environment or fate shapes such events (external locus of control) (Judge et al., 1998; Rotter, 1966). An important distinction between generalized self-efficacy and locus of control, moreover, is that while self-efficacy concerns confidence related to performance of actions or behaviors, locus of control pertains to confidence in one’s ability to control outcomes (Judge et al., 1998). Thus, individuals who do not believe they can control the type of leadership that governs them or believe that the type of leadership that emerges is a matter of fate (external locus) may be more likely to conform to destructive leaders.

In fact, research suggests that people with an internal locus of control prefer participative leadership styles (Runyon, 1973), while individuals with an external locus of
control may be less likely to endorse participative leadership (Luthans et al., 1998). As such, there is good reason to believe that individuals who possess low self-esteem, low generalized self-efficacy, and an external locus of control (i.e., low core self-evaluations), are more likely to be vulnerable to conformity to destructive leaders (Padilla et al., 2007).

**Personal Life Distress**

Existing research suggests certain individuals who experience significant personal transition and emotional distress in their lives are highly susceptible to the influence of destructive leaders (Cushman, 1984; Shaw, 2003; Wright & Wright, 1982). A number of studies on cult recruitment, in fact, indicate that members are often distraught from some acute life occurrence prior to joining a cult and subsequently derive a sense of relief, at least in the short run, from their cult membership (Galanter, 1980; Galanter & Buckley, 1978; Galanter et al., 1979; Ullman, 1979; Ungerleider & Wellisch, 1979). Such distress may come in various forms, including experiencing conflict with and hostility towards one’s family, moving away from home, starting college, failing out of college, ending a relationship with a significant other, coping with the death of a loved one, and/or losing one’s job, among other stressful life events (Wright & Wright, 1982; Cushman, 1984).

According to Cushman (1984), these personal transition states share the common thread of leaving individuals feeling betrayed, helpless, and/or alone. Consistent with the aforementioned discussion on follower needs, such life transitions render those experiencing them in strong need of friendship, authority, and meaning in their lives (Cushman, 1984; Wright & Wright, 1982). It is at these times of great personal vulnerability, need, and confusion that individuals look for easy solutions and immediate fulfillment of such needs (Cushman, 1984), thereby creating a unique susceptibility to the influence of cults and the charismatic leaders that head them (Cushman, 1984; Galanter et
al., 1979; Ungerleider & Wellischch, 1979). Charismatic cult leaders, moreover, are able to prey upon these vulnerable individuals by addressing their anxieties and feelings of loneliness and promising a transformative healing in the context of the cult’s seemingly caring and understanding community of members (Shaw, 2003; Tobias & Lalich, 1994).

Indeed, notorious examples abound of destructive leaders who were able to manipulate the vulnerable emotional states of their followers for power and personal gain. Susan Atkins, one of the most infamous members of the “Manson family” who was convicted for her participation in eight murders committed in the summer of 1969, reportedly grew up with alcoholic parents and was sexually abused by a male relative as a young girl (Fox, 2009). Atkins’ mother died of cancer in 1964, and over the next three years her life was disrupted by her father’s frequent relocation of the family in order to find work after being financially depleted by his wife’s illness (Fox, 2009). She and her brothers were frequently left with relatives while her father searched for work, which fragmented the family and led to Atkins’ own relocation, at the age of eighteen, to San Francisco’s famous Haight-Ashbury district (where she met Manson) (Fox, 2009).

Similarly, Adam Gadahn, the well-known American-born spokesman for the terrorist organization, Al-Qaeda, reported being heavily involved in the death metal community, experiencing significant strain in his relationship with his parents, and eventually moving in with his grandparents as a young adult (Khatchadourian, 2007). In recounting this time of emotional strife, Gadahn described himself as having a “yawning emptiness” and a strong need to “fill that void” (Khatchadourian, 2007, p. 5). Soon after, Gadahn began studying Islam (eventually converting in 1998), moved to Pakistan, and today has assumed the role of senior commander in Al-Qaeda (Khatchadourian, 2007).
In sum, these examples serve to highlight the profound effects that toxic leaders may have on certain individuals experiencing substantial emotional turmoil and personal transition in their lives. Thus, there is reason to believe that even the best of us have the potential to be susceptible to toxic leaders, given we all experience times when emotional discord and certain life events leave us searching for ways to get our lives back on track.

**Dimensions Underlying Colluders**

In contrast to those dimensions thought to comprise conformity to DL, follower collusion is theorized to encompass four dimensions, including 1) *personal ambition*, 2) *Machiavellianism*, 3) *Greed*, and 4) *low self-control* (Kellerman, 2004; Lipman-Blumen, 2008; Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012). In the following, I provide detailed descriptions of each dimension in greater detail. Figure 2 further provides a theoretical model of the four dimensions that underlie follower collusion with destructive leaders.

**Personal Ambition**

Shifting to those dimensions underlying follower collusion with DL, it is apparent that despite the deleterious outcomes destructive leaders exert upon their subordinates and respective organizations, at least in the short term there may be strong financial, political, and professional incentives for actively cooperating with destructive leaders (Kellerman, 2004; Lipman-Blumen, 2008; Padilla et al., 2007). Padilla and colleagues’ (2007) toxic triangle theory of DL states that highly ambitious individuals may perceive the potential benefits of aligning themselves with destructive leaders and subsequently work to promote a leader’s destructive agenda and vision in order to reap the benefits of such a relationship. It has also been suggested that ambitious individuals are sometimes more willing to exploit others or follow coercive policies in order to obtain status or further their own personal goals and interests (McClelland, 1975; Padilla et al., 2007).
Indeed, research suggests that some followers will collude with authoritarian leaders for the right price (Altemeyer, 1981; Padilla et al., 2007). For instance, there are warlords in Iraq and Afghanistan known for having followers who vow their allegiance based on the potential for obtaining valuable resources, privilege, and prestige in a new regime (Lipman-Blumen, 2008). Indeed, much of Hitler’s closest staff was comprised of highly ambitious individuals who recognized that power and status in the Nazi chain of command was predicated upon their ability to satisfy the Fuhrer’s demands (Browning, 1989, 2004; Padilla et al., 2007). In fact, Hitler often only had to delineate his guiding ideological principles and vision regarding annihilation of the Jews, while his highly ambitious personal staff, including Heinrich Himmler, Hermann Goring, and Reinhard Heydrich, worked to give his grandiose visions a concrete shape (Browning, 2004).

Moreover, recent cases of corporate corruption in more traditional organizations underscore the role of follower ambition in the DL process. Andrew Fastow, the chief financial officer of Enron and mastermind behind the company’s intricate web of off-balance-sheet special purpose entities used to cover up its immense financial losses, was perceived by his colleagues as an extremely ambitious man overly willing to press the legal limits on deals (Bolman & Deal, 2006; McLean & Elkind, 2003). Upon starting at Enron in 1990, Fastow’s ambition became widely known, as evidenced, in part, by his overly ingratiating behavior toward Jeff Skilling (Enron’s president at the time), as well as his insistence on becoming Enron’s Chief Financial Officer – despite having no background in finance (Bolman & Deal, 2006). As such, it seems that when opportunities to profit exist, there are likely ambitious followers willing to collude with destructive leaders for person gain (Kellerman, 2004; McLean & Elkind, 2005; Padilla et al., 2007).
**Machiavellianism**

Based on Niccolo Machiavelli’s seminal work, *The Prince*, Machiavellianism refers to a social influence process marked by the use of politics, power, and expressive behavior to achieve personally desirable ends (Christie & Geis, 1970; Bedell et al., 2006). Dahling et al.’s (2009) suggested that Machiavellianism is comprised of four interrelated factors, including 1) *distrust of others* (defined as a cynical outlook on the motivations and intentions of others with a concern for the negative implications that those intentions have for the self), 2) *Amoral manipulation* (referring to a willingness to disregard standards of morality and see value in behaviors that benefit the self at the expense of others), 3) *desire for control* (defined as a need to exercise dominance over interpersonal situations to minimize the extent to which others have power) and 4) *desire for status* (which refers a desire to accumulate external indicators of success). High Machs use cunning, manipulation, deception, and forceful persuasion in order to obtain political and social power and control (Goldberg, 1999; Judge et al., 2009; McHoskey, 1999). Because high Machs utilize their impression management and social influence skills to obtain personal power, they are inherently less motivated toward collective organizational and prosocial concerns (Becker & O’Hair, 2007) and less likely to adhere to organizational rules and procedures, much less lofty ethical or moral standards (Judge et al., 2009).

While Machiavellianism has traditionally been discussed in terms of leadership, Machiavelli’s teachings are very much applicable to the realm of followership as well. Indeed, high Mach followers may use their strong social influence tactics and methods of deception to obtain power and position within the collective hierarchy of a destructive leader. For instance, before Joseph Stalin consolidated power and became dictator of the Soviet Union, he rose through the Bolshevik ranks under Lenin using his expert skills of
deception, manipulation, and murder to eliminate political rivals and threats to his accumulating power (Hochschild, 1994; Lenoe, 2010). Stalin admired Machiavelli’s *The Prince* and employed his teachings to seize and maintain political power (Harris, 2010).

Clements and Washburn (1999) called attention to the role of Machiavellianism in followership research, suggesting the high Mach personalities possessed by sycophants may cause such individuals to flatter their leaders on one hand, while withholding critical feedback from them for the purpose of self-enhancement on the other. Thus, while high Mach followers may collude with toxic leaders given the potential to personally benefit from their relationships with such leaders (Kellerman, 2004; Lipman-Blumen, 2008), ultimately they may create situations that set their leaders up for failure and which help them satisfy their own needs for power and influence (Clements & Washburn, 1999).

**Greed**

Consistent with the selfish tendencies of Machiavellian individuals, colluders are also strongly motivated by greed and the selfish desire to acquire valuable financial and political outcomes through their associations with destructive leaders (Kellerman, 2004; Padilla et al., 2007). Greed refers to a selfish longing to personally accrue goods, status, or power beyond any reasonable limits and without any regard for others or the common good (Farrugia, 2002; Kaplan, 1991; Nikelly, 1992). Certainly, recent cases of corporate corruption in companies like Enron, Bear Stearns, Fannie Mae, and Freddie Mac underscore the extreme greed and avarice displayed by colluders in these organizations. Yet, while greed may be a more salient aspect of those prone to collusion in the business realm (Padilla et al., 2007), it appears to be a central feature of colluders across settings.

Within a military context, Heinrich Himmler, commander of Hitler’s SS and a high-ranking member of the Nazi Party, actively engaged in the theft and transportation of art
and other cultural valuables as a part of Hitler and the Nazi regime’s policy of selling or removing stolen art to museums in the Third Reich during World War II (Kurtz, 2006). Yet, Hermann Goring, Hitler’s Commander-in-Chief of the Luftwaffe (or German Air Force) and avid art collector, reflected the heart of German looting and greed and was personally responsible for stealing over 200 valuable pieces of art, with most coming from Jewish victims of the Holocaust (Aalders, 2004; Kurtz, 2006; Turner, 1999). Thus, it is likely that those who collude with toxic leaders are marked by greedy tendencies that manifest in the form of an excessive desire for wealth, power, and status.

Further, colluders in the political arena, such as top officials under Zimbabwe’s brutal dictator, Robert Mugabe, have each personally accumulated substantial amounts of wealth and power during Mugabe’s twenty-eight years in power (Peta, 2003; Ward, 2008). Since 1987, corruption has been a pervasive element of Zimbabwe’s national culture, with scandals affecting the grain, housing, timber, aircraft, and water industries (Ward, 2008). However, one of the worst incidents of political corruption benefitting Mugabe’s closest government officials and allies was the redistribution of the white-owned land, which left an overwhelming majority of the country’s twelve million people close to starvation (Ward, 2008). These examples of collusion in the business, military, and political arenas serve to highlight the overwhelming greed and avarice intrinsic to those who collude with destructive leaders and the pervasive desire to accumulate wealth, power, and status without regard for the wellbeing of others, as well as the organization.

**Low Self-Control**

Self-control refers to the “tendency to avoid acts whose long-term costs exceed momentary advantages,” (Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1994, p. 4) and has been implicated as the core explanation for criminal activity. Self-control theory suggests those possessing
high levels of self-control display restraint from engaging in deviant behaviors because they sufficiently process and consider the long-term consequences of their behavior (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Despite criticism (e.g. Geis, 2000; Miller & Burack, 1993; Akers, 1991), there is growing empirical support for individual self-control as one of the strongest predictors of crime (Vazsonyi & Belliston, 2007), including a meta-analysis by Pratt & Cullen (2000). Moreover, the construct of self-control has attracted the attention of counterproductive work behavior (CWB) researchers (e.g. Collins & Griffin, 1998; Wanek, 1995) and, in particular, has been linked to corruption in organizations (Marcus & Schuler, 2004). Thus, colluders are likely to possess a tendency to let their deviant impulses get the best of them, especially when the target behavior is linked to outcomes of substantial personal value (e.g. money, status, power). Consistent with Hirschi and Gottfredson (1987) and others (e.g. Evans et al., 1997; Kahan & Posner, 1999), colluders are highly impulsive, shortsighted, and risk-taking, and display a strong need for immediate gratification, an indifference to punishment, as well as a lack of concern for the interests of other people.

Such behavior is evidenced in the case of former stockbroker, Kosta Kovachev, who conspired with Marc Dreier, former owner of Dreier L.L.P. (a New York City law firm) to commit wire fraud by selling counterfeit promissory notes, through Solow Realty (a real estate development company), to major hedge funds and other investors (Chan & Bagli, 2008). Despite enormous risk, Kovachev impulsively agreed to Dreier’s request to impersonate Solow’s controller in a meeting with hedge fund representatives to discuss millions of dollars in unpaid notes. Kovachev purportedly answered questions about the company’s finances, buying time for Dreier to sell more fake notes, pay off the debt, and continue his Ponzi scheme. However, Kovachev’s shortsighted behavior landed him with a sentence of five years in jail and a fine of 350 million dollars (Chan & Bagli, 2008).
Chapter 2

Trait Validity of the Conformer and Colluder Scales

To demonstrate the construct validity of the conformer and colluder measures, it is necessary to examine the trait (i.e., convergent and discriminant) validity of each of the constructs (Campbell, 1960; Edwards, 2003). Trait validity is evidenced by evaluating the degree to which the proposed measures are correlated with scales which are designed to measure theoretically similar constructs (convergent validity) and are not highly related to theoretically disparate constructs (discriminant validity) (Hinkin, 1995, 1998). In the following, I offer predictions regarding these expected relationships to provide evidence for both measures as unique psychological constructs. Figure 3 shows these hypothesized relationships for the conformer scale, while Figure 4 depicts those for the colluder scale.

Conformer Scale: Discriminant Validity

Big Five personality traits. As previously mentioned, negative views of the self are a driving cause of conformity to DL. Those prone to conformity display low core self-evaluations, including low self-esteem, low self-efficacy and an external locus of control, as well as high levels of neuroticism (Judge et al., 1997; Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2003; Padilla et al., 2007). Research suggests that core self-evaluations, in particular, are highly correlated with neuroticism, a Big Five personality construct that represents one’s tendency towards experiencing unpleasant emotions (i.e. anger, anxiety, depression, or vulnerability) (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002; Magnus, Diener, Fujita, & Pavot, 1993). With respect to the remaining Big Five personality constructs, core self-evaluations have demonstrated moderate correlations with conscientiousness and extraversion, and at best weak relationships with agreeableness and openness to experience (Judge et al., 2003).
Because low, or negative, core self-evaluations represent a core component of the present measure, its discriminant validity may be evaluated by determining whether (a) it is related, yet empirically distinct, from conscientiousness and extraversion, and whether (b) it is empirically unrelated to theoretically distinct Big Five personality constructs such as agreeableness and openness to experience. Therefore, it is predicted that the conformer scale will be moderately associated with, but empirically distinct from, conscientiousness and extraversion and empirically unrelated to agreeableness and openness to experience.

**Hypothesis 1**: (a) Conscientiousness and (b) extraversion will be positively correlated with, yet empirically distinct from, the conformer scale.

**Hypothesis 2**: (a) Agreeableness and (b) openness to experience will be weakly related to the conformer scale.

**Authoritarianism.** Authoritarianism refers to a hierarchical personality trait that is comprised of three attitudinal clusters: conventionalism, authoritarian submission, and authoritarian aggression (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988, 1998). It entails uncritical deferment to authority based on a leader’s legitimate form of power (authoritarian submission), strict adherence to in-group norms, rules, and social conventions (conventionalism), and to a general intolerance and punitiveness toward individuals perceived to comprise out-groups and those viewed as social dissidents (authoritarian aggression). Thoroughgood et al. (2012) argued that while those high on authoritarianism are likely to conform to the toxic orders of destructive leaders as a result of such leaders’ legitimate power, they reflect a very different type of susceptible follower than the conformer of interest in the present study. Specifically, such individuals do not possess negative core self-evaluations, a lack of self-concept clarity, high levels of unmet needs, or personal life distress, but rather a highly rigid ideological worldview that centers around a tendency to perceive their social world
through hierarchy and existing social structures (Thoroughgood et al., 2012). As such, these individuals obey destructive orders out of their adherence to role expectancies (Bandura, 1986; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1975) and respect for those in legitimate positions of authority (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1989). As such, it is predicted that the conformer scale will not be highly related to authoritarianism, a core feature of the authoritarian follower.

**Hypothesis 3:** Authoritarianism will be weakly related to the conformer scale.

**Social desirability.** It is further predicted that the conformer measure will be unrelated to an individual’s propensity to provide socially desirable responses. Campbell (1960) stressed the importance of examining new measures for social desirability in order to demonstrate discriminant validity and ensure that respondents do not react to items differently based on perceived social value rather than differences in their evaluation of content. Moreover, although debate continues to surround the fakability of personality measures (Jones, Robson, & Abraham, 2008), there does appear to be some agreement, based on a number of meta-analyses, that socially desirable responding does not present as serious a risk to construct validity as once thought (Hough, 1998; Hough & Ones, 2001; Saldago et al., 2001). This should especially be the case given participants will be warned about socially desirable responding (Dwight & Donovan, 2003), as well as made aware that their responses will remain anonymous (Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005).

**Hypothesis 4:** Social desirability will be weakly related to the conformer scale.

**Conformer Scale: Convergent Validity**

**Neuroticism.** Turning to convergent validity, it is predicted that individuals who conform to DL are also likely to demonstrate neurotic tendencies. Neurotic people tend to experience unpleasant emotions, such as anger, anxiety, depression, or vulnerability, and thus often have a negative outlook on life relative to their emotionally stable peers (Judge
et al., 2002; Magnus, Diener, Fujita, & Pavot, 1993). With respect to follower conformity to DL, research on cult membership suggests individuals who are the most vulnerable to charismatic cult leaders are also those who display significant emotional unrest (Deutsch, 1980; Galanter, 1980, 1982; Wright & Wright, 1982). Galanter and Buckley (1978) found amongst a sample of 119 Divine Light members that 38% had sought out professional help for their emotional problems prior to joining. Similarly, Galanter et al. (1979) found these estimates to be 30% in a sample of 237 members of the Unification Church. Among a sample of 24 devotees of a cult leader named Baba, Deutsch (1980) found nearly all of his followers had experienced chronic unhappiness and emotional turmoil during their lives. Further, research suggests core self-evaluations, which reflect a central component of the present measure, are positively correlated with neuroticism (Judge et al., 2003). In addition, given the proposed scale is designed to capture respondents’ level of emotional distress and any unmet needs contributing to feelings of emptiness and worthlessness, it stands to reason that the conformer scale should correlate with measures of neuroticism.

**Hypothesis 5:** Neuroticism will be positively related to the conformer scale.

**Self Esteem.** As mentioned earlier, self-esteem concerns the overall value people place on themselves (Harter, 1990) and, like neuroticism, is another factor comprising the broader core self-evaluations construct (Judge et al., 2003). Research on followers of religious and ideological cults, in particular, suggests that individuals who conform to DL tend to have low self-esteem (Freemesser & Kaplan, 1976; Galanter, 1980; 1982; Howell & Shamir, 2005), as evidenced in their tendency to perceive themselves as worthless and empty (Fromm, 1941; Shaw, 2003). These individuals often long to be someone more desirable and tend to question their place in the world – which, in turn, prompts their propensity for being manipulated by destructive leaders given they believe such treatment
is deserved (Clements & Washburn, 1999; Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012; Weierter, 1997). Again, because core self-evaluations are a key component of the conformer scale and because self-esteem represents one of the four traits comprising the more general core self-evaluations construct, it would appear logical to expect that the conformer measure will be negatively associated with existing measures of self-esteem.

**Hypothesis 6:** Self-esteem will be negatively related to the conformer scale.

**Self-efficacy.** Self-efficacy refers to beliefs about one’s capability of performing well (Bandura, 1982). Conformers tend to look to leaders to take care of them and convey simple solutions to complex problems they do not believe they are able to solve on their own (Shaw, 2003). Dawson (2006), for example, suggested that the low self-efficacy of followers of new religious movements manifests in a need for vicarious control over their environment through an intense emotional identification with an all-powerful charismatic leader. Such individuals display an inability to challenge destructive leaders and control the type of leadership governing them. They believe that fate, or luck, determines the leadership processes they have to endure and submit to whatever leader ascends to power (Padilla et al., 2007). Because self-efficacy is also a dimension underlying the broader core self-evaluations construct, it is expected to negatively relate to the present measure.

**Hypothesis 7:** Self-efficacy will be negatively related to conformer scale.

**Locus of control.** Locus of control refers to the belief that one controls their own fate versus the belief that outcomes result from external factors (Rotter, 1966). Followers with an external locus of control are easier to manipulate and are attracted to individuals who appear to be powerful and willing to care for them (Padilla et al., 2007; Runyon, 1973). They also tend to conform to the status quo and are less likely to report instances of ethical misconduct in organizations (Dozier & Miceli, 1985; near & Miceli, 1996). Luthans
and colleagues (1998) noted that many citizens of the former Soviet Union have internalized a sense of helplessness, as evidence in their continued vulnerability to “dark” leaders and failure to take control and escape their oppressive past. Extending the logic above, because locus of control, again, reflect an underlying dimension of the core self-evaluations construct, we expect it to negatively related to the follower conformity scale.

**Hypothesis 8:** *Locus of control will be negatively related to the conformer scale.*

**Colluder Scale: Discriminant Validity**

**Big Five personality traits.** There is little reason to suspect that certain Big Five traits, including extraversion, openness to experience, and neuroticism, will be correlated with the proposed measure. Indeed, Paulus and Williams (2002), in examining the relationships between the “dark triad” of personality (i.e., Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and psychopathy) and the Big Five personality constructs, found that their common correlate was disagreeableness. However, they did not find any other significant empirical relationships, outside of a negative relationship between Machiavellianism and conscientiousness – consistent with prior research (e.g., Dahling et al., 2009). Moreover, from a conceptual standpoint, there does not seem to be a sound theoretical argument for why highly ambitious, unsocialized individuals would be more or less likely to be extraverted, neurotic, or open to experience. As such, because Machiavellianism, and other “dark” characteristics, including greed and low impulse control, comprise the colluder measure, it is expected that the proposed colluder measure will not be highly correlated with extraversion, neuroticism, and openness to experience.

**Hypothesis 9:** *The colluder scale will be weakly related to (a) neuroticism, (b) openness to experience, and (c) extraversion.*
Authoritarianism. Similar to the conformer scale, Thoroughgood et al. (2012) argued that colluders represent a distinct type of susceptible follower in comparison to conformers, and in this case authoritarians. Specifically, colluders are marked by personal ambition, Machiavellianism, greed, and low impulse control, and therefore are motivated to follow destructive leaders due to the leader’s ability to provide valued outcomes, such as money, power, and prestige. Thus, colluders are particularly susceptible to destructive leaders’ reward power, in contrast to authoritarian followers’ susceptibility to destructive leaders’ legitimate, or positional, power. As a result, these follower types have different motivations for following toxic orders, which stem, in part, from inherent differences in their dispositional make-ups (Thoroughgood et al., 2012). Thus, it is predicted that the conformer scale will not be highly correlated with existing measures of authoritarianism.

Hypothesis 10: Authoritarianism will be weakly related to the colluder scale.

Social desirability. In accordance with Campbell’s (1960) recommendations, the colluder measure will also be examined for any possible contamination by an individual’s tendency to provide socially desirable responses. Consistent with the prediction made for the conformer scale, it is expected that social desirability will be weakly correlated with the colluder scale given respondents will be warned about socially desirable responding (Dwight & Donovan, 2003) and informed that their responses will remain anonymous.

Hypothesis 11: Social desirability will be weakly related to the colluder scale.

Colluder Scale: Convergent Validity

Narcissism. Given those who collude with destructive leaders are ambitious and concerned with furthering their own selfish needs and desires (Kellerman, 2004; Lipman-Blumen, 2008; McClelland, 1970; 1975; Padilla et al., 2007), they likely possess high levels of narcissism. Narcissistic people possess an inflated sense of self, which manifests
in the form of a strong need for recognition and excessive degree of self-reference in interactions with others (Kernberg, 1989; Resick, Whitman, Weingarden, & Hiller, 2009). More specifically, narcissists conform to a pattern of behavior characterized by a grandiose sense of self-importance, extreme self-love and arrogance, a proclivity towards embellishment of personal achievements, a strong tendency to fantasize over power and success, hostility towards personal criticism, and unwillingness to compromise (Deluga, 1997; Judge et al., 2006; Lubit, 2002; Resick et al., 2009; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006).

Discussions of workplace ethics, moreover, suggest that these underlying self-centered tendencies likely play a significant role in shaping the greed, recklessness, blatant disregard for organizational rules, and inexorable desire to succeed at any cost witnessed in recent cases of fraud and corporate scandal (De Cremer, 2009). Indeed, with respect to leaders, research suggests that narcissistic leaders’ drive to attain and maintain power and influence is a function of their selfish needs for power and superiority (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1997; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006), which often comes at the expense of their respective organizations (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2006; Resick et al., 2009). Thus, people who are likely to collude with destructive leaders are also likely to be narcissistic.

**Hypothesis 12**: Narcissism will be positively related to the colluder scale.

**Need for achievement**. Because of their reckless ambition and relentless drive to secure personal outcomes via their association with destructive leaders, it is logical to suggest that such individuals would be high on need for achievement. However, research on Machiavellianism, one of the core underlying dimensions of colluders, has yielded inconsistent findings between Mach and need for achievement (Christie & Geis, 1970; Fehr et al., 1992; Okanes & Murray, 1980). Dahling et al. (2009) suggested that while the desire to outperform and dominate others reflects a core aspect of need for achievement that
overlaps with Mach, need for achievement also includes a desire to attain personal excellence and recognition from others, which does not concern high Machs (Cassidy & Lynn, 1989). As such, Dahling and colleagues (2009) hypothesized and found support for the relationship between the specific facet of competitiveness associated with need for achievement and Machiavellianism. As such, it is expected that the follower collusion measure will positively correlate with the competitiveness facet of need for achievement.

Moreover, in addition to need for achievement (competitiveness), two other subdimensions of the broader need for achievement construct seem relevant to the proposed collusion measure, namely dominance and status aspiration. The dominance facet refers to a desire to lead or to be in a position of dominance (Cassidy & Lynn, 1989) and corresponds to the need for control facet of Machiavellianism. Because colluders display forceful persuasion, on top of manipulation and deception, to obtain personal power and control (Christie & Geis, 1970; Judge et al., 2009; Thoroughgood et al., 2012), it is expected that the dominance facet of need for achievement will positively correlate with the follower collusion scale. Further, the status aspiration facet of need for achievement refers to a motivation that is reinforced by climbing the social status hierarchy and entails the desire to be dominant and be a leader (Cassidy & Lynn, 1989). Like colluders, those high on status aspiration subscribe to notions of a “pecking order” in social hierarchies and evaluate themselves in terms of significant others (Cassidy & Lynn, 1989; Jackson et al., 1976; Lynn et al., 1983). Moreover, status aspiration corresponds to the need for status subdimension of Machiavellianism (Dahling et al., 2009), and thus it is expected that this facet of need for achievement will positively correlated with the collusion scale.

**Hypothesis 13:** Need for achievement (a) competitiveness, (b) dominance, and (c) status aspiration will be positively related to the colluder scale.
Factor Structure

Consistent with best practices outlined in the SEM literature (e.g. Kline, 2005; Byrne, 1998), the present effort will empirically assess and compare several alternative models associated with follower susceptibility to DL. Friedrich, Byrne, and Mumford (2009) highlighted the frequent failure in the leadership literature for researchers to test alternative models. Specifically, these authors argued that researchers ought to compare their hypothesized model to other plausible models based on existing research and theory rather than “straw man” models that pose no theoretical challenge to the hypothesized model. As previously stated, existing theory suggests that follower susceptibility to DL is broadly comprised of two general factors: conformers and colluders (Padilla et al., 2007).

Thus, three competing models will be empirically evaluated, including a 1) two-factor uncorrelated, 2) two-factor correlated, and 3) one hierarchical factor with two sub-factors. While the first model represents two uncorrelated higher-order factors of follower susceptibility to conformity and collusion, the second model represents two correlated higher order latent factors. In the third model, the two latent factors are allowed to load onto a general follower susceptibility factor. It is hypothesized that the two-factor model consisting of two correlated higher-order latent factors will reflect the best fit to the data given exiting theory on follower susceptibility to DL. This model is illustrated in figure 5.

**Hypothesis 14**: The model consisting of two correlated latent factors reflecting susceptibilities to conformity and collusion will represent the best fit to the data.

Criterion-Related Validity

In addition to establishing the trait (i.e. convergent and discriminant) validity of the proposed measures, it is critical to assess their criterion validity. Criterion validity is evaluated based on the degree with which there is empirical support for the theoretically
proposed relationships between the target measure and its likely outcomes (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955; Hinkin, 1995, 1998). In the following, I offer arguments and hypotheses regarding the proposed relationships between both the conformer and colluder scales and their likely outcomes in organizations. Figure 6 depicts these hypothesized relationships.

**Conformer scale.** As mentioned earlier, some people who conform to the policies of toxic leaders have a unique vulnerability stemming from unmet needs, a lack of self-concept clarity, negative core self-evaluations, and emotional unrest (Luthan et al., 1998; Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012; Weierter, 1997; Wright & Wright, 1982). Such followers are attracted to charismatic leaders who they think can provide them with clarity, direction, and enhanced self-esteem; offer them a sense of community, belonging, and companionship; and instill in them a clear sense of self (Fromm, 1941; Howell & Shamir, 2005; Thoroughgood et al., 2012; Wright & Wright, 1982). Indeed, charismatic leaders are marked by their sensitivity to followers’ needs, emphasis on creating a group identity, articulation of an emotionally evocative, imagery-laden vision, communication of high performance standards and confidence in followers’ ability to achieve them, and high self-confidence (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977; Shamir et al., 1993). Thus, such leaders would seem especially attractive to conformers (Thoroughgood et al., 2012).

Research suggests conformers often personally identify with charismatic leaders and attribute them extraordinary qualities (i.e., charisma) (Conger & Kanungo; Weber, 1947; Thoroughgood et al., 2012). Such followers may become dependent on charismatic leaders to relieve their feelings of personal distress, provide for their unmet needs, give them a sense of personal identity, and improve their core self-evaluations (Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012). Yet, their strong affection, devotion, and idealization tend to result in vulnerability to manipulation (Deutsch, 1980; Howell & Shamir, 2005).
Though destructive leaders may ultimately leave their followers psychologically, financially, and professionally damaged in the long run (Padilla et al., 2007), given such leaders may resolve the emotional turbulence and weaknesses of the self associated with conformers in the short run, these followers may be more likely to forgive a destructive charismatic leader’s unethical decision-making and be more willing to follow him or her and view the leader as desirable to work (as well as likable) than individuals low on the susceptibility factors discussed above. Research indicates life stressors and unmet needs, including feelings of instability (Janis & Mann, 1977; Cohen et al., 2004; Landau et al., 2004), enhance the amount of power granted to non-participative, authoritarian leaders. Those with negative self-evaluations, including a belief that they do not have the agency to control life outcomes nor meet the demands of their environment, are more likely to identify with and prefer “dark” leaders (Burger, 1986; Clements & Washburn, 1999; Luthans et al., 1998). Based on these arguments, the following hypotheses are proposed:

**Hypothesis 15:** Individuals who score higher on the conformer scale will report (a) a greater willingness to comply with destructive leaders and (b) a greater willingness to comply with destructive charismatic leaders vs. destructive non-charismatic leaders, more specifically.

**Hypothesis 16:** Individuals who score higher on the conformer scale will report (a) a greater desire to work for destructive leaders and (b) a greater desire to work for destructive charismatic leaders vs. destructive non-charismatic leaders, more specifically.

**Hypothesis 17:** Individuals who score higher on the conformer scale will report (a) a greater liking toward destructive leaders and (b) a greater liking toward
destructive charismatic leaders vs. destructive non-charismatic leaders, more specifically.

Additionally, because conformers personally benefit from destructive charismatic leaders who provide them with emotional stability, group membership and acceptance, as well as a clear sense of self and collective identity, among other things, these individuals may be less likely to report or directly challenge such leaders. These followers may seek to preserve the feelings of certainty and stability afforded them by toxic leaders, at least in the short run. Indeed, research on needs, namely on self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1980, 1991), suggests the fulfillment of certain psychological needs is critical for healthy psychological development and wellbeing. When left unfulfilled, individuals will tend to pursue goals, domains, and relationships, sometimes with leaders, who permit or support their need satisfaction (Deci & Ryan, 2000). By offering a sense of community and a group with which to belong, as well as acting as a source of acceptance, destructive leaders can attract weak conformers who will sacrifice their autonomy in exchange for fulfillment of highly entrenched unmet needs and relief from emotional discomfort and negative self-construals (Thoroughgood et al., 2012). As such, it is predicted that higher conformer scores will be related to a lower readiness to report toxic charismatic leaders.

**Hypothesis 18:** Individuals who score higher on the conformer scale will report (a) a lower willingness to report destructive leaders and (b) a lower willingness to report destructive charismatic leaders vs. destructive non-charismatic leaders, more specifically.

**Colluder scale.** As mentioned earlier, followers who are susceptible to collusion with destructive leaders have high levels of Machiavellianism and greed and low levels of impulse control, and thus are likely to seek out others, including leaders, who can help
them achieve their self-serving ends (Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012). These followers view their alliance with toxic leaders as a vehicle for personal gain and willingly follow to attain financial, political, or professional outcomes (Lipman-Blumen, 2005; Padilla et al., 2007). Colluders contribute to destructive leadership because they believe there is an instrumental link between their participation in the leader’s mission and contingent rewards (Bass, 1985; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). Thus, colluders are likely to be especially attracted to destructive transactional leaders who focus on behaviors that center around reward contingencies, exchange relationships, and an emphasis on task accomplishment (Burke et al., 2006; Burns, 1978; Howell & Avolio, 1993). In contrast to destructive charismatic leaders, whom conformers are likely drawn to more, colluders are likely to be attracted to the destructive transactional leader’s focus on tangible outcomes in the form of money, promotions, as well as increased power and status in their regimes.

Research suggests those high on Machiavellianism employ their influence tactics and methods of deception to attain power and status (Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012) and are prototypical “yes” men, engaging in flattery with their leaders while also withholding criticism from them (Clements & Washburn, 1999; Thoroughgood et al., 2012). Moreover, high Machs often engage in economic opportunism, demonstrating little concern for financial partners (Dahling et al., 2009; Sakalaki et al., 2007). They are more likely to steal (Fehr et al., 1992; Harrel & Hartnagel, 1976), use influence tactics to establish political connections (Dingler, Duhon, & Brown, 1987; Harrell, 1980; Pandey & Rastogi, 1979); select politically charged careers with greater opportunities for wealth, power, and status (Corzine, 1997; Fehr et al., 1992; Hunt & Chonko, 1984); and are less likely to adhere to organizational rules and policies (Judge et al., 2009). As such, given colluders are opportunistic and perceive toxic leaders as a means to their own ends, like
conformers, they may be inherently more willing to comply with these leaders (albeit for different reasons) and more likely to perceive destructive leaders as desirable to work for. Further, as long as colluders personally prosper from their relationships with destructive leaders, they would appear less likely to report or challenge such leaders, given “blowing the whistle” and direct challenges of the leader would not be in their own best interests. They may also be more likely to like toxic leaders than those less disposed to collusion.

**Hypothesis 19**: Individuals who score higher on the colluder scale will report (a) a greater willingness to comply with destructive leaders and (b) a greater willingness to comply with destructive transactional leaders vs. destructive non-transactional leaders, more specifically.

**Hypothesis 20**: Individuals who score higher on the colluder scale will report (a) a greater desire to work for destructive leaders and (b) a greater desire to work for destructive transactional leaders vs. destructive non-transactional leaders, more specifically.

**Hypothesis 21**: Individuals who score higher on the colluder scale will report (a) a greater liking toward destructive leaders and (b) a greater liking toward destructive transactional leaders vs. destructive non-transactional leaders, more specifically.

**Hypothesis 22**: Individuals who score higher on the colluder scale will report (a) a lower willingness to report destructive leaders and (b) a lower willingness to report destructive transactional leaders vs. destructive non-transactional leaders, more specifically.

**Method**

To demonstrate the construct validity of both the conformer and colluder scales, this study conformed to those scale development steps delineated in the psychometric literature.
(e.g. Ghiselli, 1981; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Specifically, the current effort followed the guidelines articulated by Hinkin (1998), who stated that development of psychometrically sound measures comprises the following steps: 1) item generation, 2) questionnaire administration, 3) initial item reduction (i.e., exploratory factor analysis), 4) confirmatory factor analysis, 5) convergent and divergent validity, and 6) replication.

This study focused on four of these steps, including item generation, initial item reduction/exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, as well as convergent and divergent validity analysis. In following a multi-step process using multiple samples, the study sought to demonstrate adequate content validity, factor structure, convergent and discriminant validity, and criterion validity for the conformer and colluder measures.
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Study 1: Item Generation & Content Validity

Item Generation

Consistent with Hinkin (1995, 1998), the current project utilized a deductive approach based on existing theory in order to generate items that adequately sample the domain of follower susceptibility to DL. Domain sampling theory suggests that while capturing the entire domain of a particular construct is not feasible, it is critical that researchers strive to construct items that adequately tap the construct of interest (Ghiselli, Campbell, & Zedeck, 1981). Moreover, according to psychometric theory, this step is critical to maximizing a new measure’s construct validity (Hinkin, 1998; Schwab, 1980).

It is important to note that because follower susceptibility to DL is thought to encompass a wide array of follower attributes, some of these underlying dimensions have already been captured in existing measures. For instance, psychometrically valid scales have been developed for self-concept clarity (e.g. Campbell et al., 1996) and core self-evaluations (Judge et al., 2003), the latter being comprised of measures of self-esteem (e.g. Rosenberg, 1965), generalized self-efficacy (e.g. Judge et al., 1998), and locus of control (e.g. Levenson, 1981). As such, in addition to creating new items for those dimensions previously unaccounted for in the literature, this study adapted items from existing scales to measure those dimensions already accounted for in previous research.

Content Validity: Item-Sort Task

Procedure. Following item generation, a sample of 38 subject matter experts (SMEs), including graduate students, faculty, and practitioners in psychology, completed a Q-sort task designed to assess each of the items’ content validity – a critical first step in establishing construct validity (Schriesheim et al., 1993). The Q-sort task was intended to
ensure the items comprising the two scales reflected an adequate sample of the theoretical domain comprising each follower’s susceptibility to DL (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), while removing conceptually inconsistent items (Hinkin, 1995). All 38 respondents were provided with definitions of each of the dimensions comprising each of the scales, as well as the initial pool of items created during item generation. The items were presented in random order to respondents. They were then asked to assign each item to one of the dimension categories they believed the item assessed. Respondents were also provided with an option of “no dimension” in order to prevent forced assignment to categories.

**Analysis.** Responses were analyzed using a two-step procedure developed by Anderson and Gerbing (1991). In the first step, responses were analyzed using Anderson and Gerbing’s (1991) *substantive agreement index* ($p_{sa}$), which assesses the percentage of respondents who assign an item to its intended dimension. The proportion of substantive agreement is calculated using the equation, $p_{sa} = n_c / N$, where $n_c$ represents the number of respondents who assign a measure, or item, to its posited construct and $N$ represents the total number of respondents. The values of $p_{sa}$, of course, range from 0.0 to 1.0, with larger values indicating greater substantive validity (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991).

Items were retained if assigned to the intended dimension 70 percent of the time - a commonly agreed upon standard for establishing content validity in the psychometric literature (Holt, Armenakis, Field, & Harris, 2007; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990). While the substantive agreement index indicates the extent to which an item reflects its intended construct, it does not indicate the extent to which an item might also be tapping other, unintended constructs (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991). Thus, Anderson and Gerbing (1991) proposed using an index that determines the extent to which respondents assign an item to its posited construct more so than to any other construct, what these authors termed the
substantive-validity coefficient. The level of substantive validity for items is calculated using the following equation, \( C_{sv} = \frac{(n_c - n_o)}{N} \), where \( n_c \) and \( N \) are defined as before, and \( n_o \), reflects the highest number of assignments of a given item to any other construct in the set.

The values of \( C_{sv} \) range from -1.0 to 1.0 with larger values indicating a greater level of substantive validity. However, large negative values would indicate that an item has substantive validity, but for a construct other than the one posited by the researcher (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991). This index can be tested for statistical significant to assess whether the number of respondents who assign the item to its intended construct can be accounted for by random chance alone. In order to test whether a specific item’s \( C_{sv} \) is significant, the researcher must determine the minimum value that the \( C_{sv} \) would have if random chance alone still could not account for the number of assignments that an item had received to its posited construct (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991). Any \( C_{sv} \) value higher than this critical value suggests chance alone could not account for this number of assignments. Critical values for \( C_{sv} \) are calculated using the formula, \( C_{sv} = m - (N - m)/N = 2m/N - 1 \)

Where \( N \) denotes the total number of respondents and \( m \) reflects the minimum total number of assignments to the intended construct that are needed in order to reject the null hypothesis (H_o). This \( m \) value is calculated by adding up the binomial probabilities for a given \( p \)-value and \( N \) size, in this case .05 and 38, respectively. Once \( m \) is calculated, it is substituted for \( n_c \) in the previous equation, and \( N-m \) is also substituted for \( n_o \), because, irrespective of the number of constructs in the set, respondents only assign the item to two constructs, so that \( N-m \) represents the \( n_o \) assignments (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991). Based on a sample of 38 and \( p \)-value of .05, critical values of .32 and .30 were found for the conformer and colluder scales, respectively. \( C_{sv} \) values for items were then compared to these critical values to determine which items would be retained for further analysis.
**Results.** Tables 1 and 2 provide results for the tests of substantive agreement \( (p_{sa}) \) and substantive validity \( (c_{sv}) \) for the conformer and colluder measures, respectively. With respect to the initial pool of 56 items generated for the conformer scale, as can be seen in Table 1, five items were removed either because their \( p_{sa} \) values fell below the minimum .70 threshold and/or their \( c_{sv} \) values fell below the minimum \( c_{sv} \) critical value. These five items came from both the unmet needs and the core self-evaluations constructs. It seems that some of the unmet needs items tended to overlap a bit in content with the neuroticism component of the broader core self-evaluations construct. For example, participants may have had a difficult time discerning whether the item “I frequently wish for a safe haven from the stresses of life” (which was intended to tap unmet needs) belonged under this category or the core self-evaluations dimension - given this item seems to tap into the emotional instability that characterizes the neurotic elements of core self-evaluations. In contrast, the items “I sometimes feel very depressed” and “There are times when I feel very bleak and hopeless” (which were intended to tap core self-evaluations) may have actually been interpreted as indicating strong needs for more security and certainty in life.

With respect to the colluder scale, of the 59 total items generated, six items were removed again if their \( p_{sa} \) values fell below the minimum .70 threshold and/or their \( c_{sv} \) values fell below the minimum \( c_{sv} \) critical value. These six items tended to come from the greed and Machiavellianism sub-scales. Specifically, several items that were intended to tap the need for status sub-dimension of the Machiavellianism scale seemed to have been interpreted as reflecting elements of greed as well. For example, the items “If you want to be successful, you should focus on accumulating personal wealth,” “I do not need a lot of fame and fortune to be content with my life” (R), and “I do not have a strong desire to accumulate lots of money and power” (R), which were intended to tap the need for status
sub-dimension of Machiavellianism, seemed to have been interpreted, justifiably so, as reflecting elements of greed as well. As such, these items were removed to improve the chances of the retained items performing well in later factor analyses (Ferris et al., 2008).
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Study 2: EFA & Initial Item Reduction

Method

Sample and procedure. Following item generation and assessment of the scales’ content validity, 562 undergraduate students from a large northeastern university were administered the retained items from Study 1 by two undergraduate research assistants over the course of ten study sessions. Participants completed an online survey containing the items in a computer lab located on campus. Study 2’s sample included 492 females and 70 males between the ages of 18 and 36 ($M = 19.32, SD = 1.76$). The sample was predominantly Caucasian (76.9%), followed by African American (7.8%), Asian (7.8%), and Hispanic (5.2%) individuals. Participants possessed, on average, 3.62 years of work experience ($SD = 2.06$) and reported an average of 7.42 years ($SD = 4.93$) of experience as a subordinate working under some type of leader. With respect to the latter statistic, it is important to note that participants were asked to report experiences that were not limited to paid work but also instances of working under a professor in a research lab, volunteering at a non-profit organization, or even playing on a sports team under a coach.

Statistical analysis. The data were initially screened to determine the distribution of the items, with each item evaluated based on its observed levels of skew and kurtosis. Researchers have suggested that one’s choice of extraction method in EFA depends on the distributional nature of items (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999). If the data are relatively normally distributed, maximum likelihood estimation is the best choice, given it allows for the computation of a wide range of goodness of fit indices of the model, permits significance testing of factor loadings and correlations among factors, and computes confidence intervals (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Fabrigar et al., 1999). If the data
are multivariate non-normal, it is recommended one use principal factor methods (In SPSS, this procedure is known as “principal axis factoring”). Because the proportion of scale items displayed significant levels of skew (> 3.) and/or kurtosis (>10.0) (Kline, 2005), results of the data screening suggested that the data were not multivariate normal.

As such, following data screening, and consistent with existing guidelines (e.g., Costello & Osborne, 2005; Hinkin, 1998; Ford, MacCallum, & Tait, 1986), two EFAs were conducted, one on the conformer scale and one on the colluder scale, respectively, using direct oblimin (oblique) rotation and principal axis factoring. Oblique rotation was used given the dimensions underlying each of the scales were expected to correlate with each other and load onto higher-order constructs. As Costello and Osborne (2005) noted:

Conventional wisdom advises researchers to use orthogonal rotation because it produces more easily interpretable results, but this is a flawed argument. In the social sciences we generally expect some correlation among factors, since behavior is rarely partitioned into neatly packaged units that function independently of one another. Therefore, using orthogonal results in a loss of valuable information if the factors are correlated, and oblique rotation should theoretically render a more accurate, and perhaps more reproducible, solution (p. 3).

Items were retained based on whether they had: 1) a factor loading of, at least, .40 (Ford et al., 1986); 2) a factor loading twice as strong on the appropriate factor than on any other factor (Hinkin, 1995, 1998); and 3) a communality of, at least, .40 (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Hinkin, 1998). After conducting each EFA to determine the underlying dimensionality of the two scales (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988), items were subjected to an internal consistency reliability analysis. Coefficient alpha was used to assess the average intercorrelation among the items comprising each of the measures’ respective dimensions (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). This analysis helps in determining item-specific variance (Cortina, 1993), which can be used to eliminate items that negatively affect each scale’s
reliability (Hinkin, 1998). Nunnally (1978) suggested a minimum reliability of .70, yet, in most cases internal consistency estimates should be substantially higher (Hinkin, 1998).

Results

Conform measure. Table 3 presents pattern loadings for each of the conformer scale’s relevant subscales. After a careful examination of the eigenvalues and scree plot, seven interpretable factors emerged, accounting for 61.15% of the total item variance. Consistent with expectations, the EFA results revealed three dimensions associated with unmet basic needs, including those associated with “safety and security,” “belonging and companionship,” and “purpose and meaning.” Pattern loadings ranged from -.44 to -.76 for the “safety and security” factor, -.49 to -.68 for the “belonging and companionship” factor, and -.53 to -.74 for the “purpose and meaning” dimension. Communalities for the retained items were adequate (> .43). Four items from the unmet needs subscale were removed due to high cross loadings: “I often feel plagued by a deep sense of insecurity in my life,” “My needs for love and affection are usually met” (R), “I often desire a greater feeling of acceptance and approval from others,” and “I oftentimes feel a deep sense of emptiness inside.” Reliability estimates for each of the three dimensions and the overall subscale were adequate: safety and security ($\alpha = .90$), belonging and companionship ($\alpha = .88$), purpose and meaning ($\alpha = .85$), as well as the overall unmet needs scale ($\alpha = .92$).

Items intended to measure personal life distress exhibited pattern loadings ranging from -.55 to -.93, with all communalities greater than .55. EFA results suggested no cross loadings for any of the personal life distress items. The subscale displayed a high level of internal consistency reliability as well ($\alpha = .96$). With respect to the self-concept clarity subscale, pattern loadings ranged from .43 to .87. Communalities were all above .41.
Again, no cross loadings or subpar communalities were observed, and thus no items were deleted from this subscale. Overall reliability was also at a satisfactory level ($\alpha = .90$).

Finally, results of the EFA showed that items intended to tap core self-evaluations loaded on two distinct factors. These dimensions reflected a self-efficacy/locus of control dimension and a self-esteem/neuroticism dimension. With respect to the former, pattern loadings ranged from .43 to .65, with communalities above .40. Reliability for the self-efficacy/locus of control dimension was adequate ($\alpha = .83$). Pattern loadings for the self-esteem/neuroticism dimension ranged from .45 to .60. Communalities were all above .43. This dimension also displayed adequate reliability ($\alpha = .76$). Due to high cross loadings, three items were deleted from the core self-evaluations subscale [“Overall, I am satisfied with myself” (R); “I have strong doubts about my competence”; “I attach a lot of value to myself as a person” (R)]. One item was also deleted due to a low communality [“I have control over the events that take place in my life” (R)]. Overall, the core self-evaluations subscale displayed adequate reliability ($\alpha = .82$). Also, the conformer scale, as a whole, exhibited excellent internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .96$). In sum, 8 of the original 52 items were removed based on results of the EFA, yielding a revised 44-item measure.

**Colluder scale.** Table 4 provides pattern loadings from the EFA of the colluder items. An evaluation of the eigenvalues and scree plot indicated a seven-factor solution, which accounted for 53.27% of the total item variance. With respect to the personal ambition subscale, pattern loadings ranged from .58 to .81, with all communalities greater than .51. Two items [“I’m content with doing just enough work to get by” (R) and “It wouldn’t bother me to be an average performer at work” (R)] were deleted due to high cross loadings. The subscale displayed adequate internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .88$).
Pattern loadings and communalities for the Machiavellianism subscales were as follows: amoral manipulation (loadings: .54-.87; communalities > .43), desire for control (loadings: -.40 -.78; communalities > .44), desire for status (loadings: -.65 -.79; communalities > .53), and distrust of others (loadings: .59-.71; communalities > .49). The following items were removed due to high cross loadings: [amoral manipulation: “I am willing to use charm and flattery with people to get my way even when I do not mean it” and “Conforming to ethical standards is important even when it doesn’t benefit one to do so” (R); desire for control: “I like people to think they’re on an equal playing field when talking to me” (R); distrust of others: “Most people are honest and trustworthy” (R)]. Overall, the Machiavellianism subscale demonstrated adequate reliability (\(\alpha = .91\)).

Pattern loadings for the greed scale ranged from .54 to .59, with all communalities above the .40 threshold. Four items were removed due to high cross loadings on the other factors: “I do not like to share with other people,” “I sometimes avoid paying people back for money I have borrowed,” “The more money I get, the more money I want,” and “I’m the type of person who only takes as much of something as I need” (R). One item (“I want to have a lavish and extravagant lifestyle.”) was reassigned to the Machiavellianism subscale’s “need for status” dimension due to a high loading on that factor. The greed subscale demonstrated a satisfactory level of internal consistency reliability (\(\alpha = 74\)).

Finally, with respect to the impulse control subscale, pattern loadings ranged from .57 to .74. No cross loadings were observed, however, two items were deleted due to low communalities (<.40): “I’m good at controlling my emotions” (R) and “I have difficulty postponing immediate gratification.” Internal consistency reliability was found to be at an adequate level (\(\alpha = 83\)). Overall, the colluder measure demonstrated a satisfactory level of
internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .90$). In sum, 15 of the 54 original items were removed via this initial item reduction process, resulting in a revised 41-item measure.
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Study 3: CFA & Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Following the EFA, a CFA was conducted on the two scales to cross-validate the factor structures identified in Study 2. CFAs aid in determining whether items load onto their intended factors and assess the model’s overall fit to the data (Hinkin, 1998). Thus, while the EFA was used to explore the general factor structure underlying scores on the two scales’ items, the CFA served as a rigorous test of this factor structure and provided added assessment of the measurement model (Hurley et al., 1997; Hinkin, 1995). In addition to evaluating each scale’s factor structure through CFA, both convergent and discriminant validity analyses were conducted on each measure. In terms of convergent validity, the degree to which each measure correlated with theoretically similar constructs was determined (Hinkin, 1998; Kumar & Beyerlein, 1991), as well as the extent to which each measure correlated with theoretically dissimilar constructs, or discriminant validity.

Sample and procedure

A sample of 510 undergraduates from a large public university, including 272 females and 239 males, participated in Study 3. Subjects ranged in age from 18 to 53 (M = 19.52, SD = 2.59), and were primarily Caucasian (71.3%), followed by Asian (9.3%), African American (8.1%), Hispanic (5.6%), “other” (3.5%), Native American (.6%), and Pacific Islander (.6%). They held, on average, 4.05 years of work experience (SD = 3.05).

Subjects completed the revised 45-item conformer scale and the revised 41-item colluder measure from Study 2. With respect to the former, to improve the reliability of the needs for purpose and meaning dimension, four new items were written, including “I feel like my life is missing a direction and purpose,” “I often wonder what my calling in life is,” “I need a greater feeling of meaning in my life,” and “I know what my life’s mission is”
Two items were further added to the self-esteem/neuroticism dimension, including “I sometimes feel depressed” and “There are times when things look pretty bleak and hopeless to me,” and one item for the self-efficacy/locus of control dimension, “I complete tasks successfully.” Participants responded to each item on a 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) Likert scale. Additionally, participants responded to items comprising measures of the convergent and discriminant variables. These scales are described below.

**Discriminant Measures**

**Extraversion.** John et al.’s (1991, 2008) eight-item extraversion scale from their Big Five Inventory (BFI) was used to measure extraversion. Items were completed on a 1 (Strongly disagree) – 5 (Strongly agree) scale, including sample items such as, “I am someone who is talkative,” “I am someone who is full of energy,” and “I am someone who tends to be quiet” (R). Internal consistency for the scale was .86 in the present study.

**Conscientiousness.** Nine items from John and colleagues’ (1991, 2008) Big Five Inventory (BFI) were used to measure conscientiousness. Participants responded to each of the items on a 1 (Strongly disagree) – 5 (Strongly agree) scale, including sample items such as, “I am someone who does a thorough job,” “I am someone who can be somewhat careless” (R), and “I am someone who is a reliable worker.” The conscientiousness scale showed an adequate level of internal consistency reliability in the present study (α = .81).

**Agreeableness.** Agreeableness was measured with nine items from John et al.’s (1991, 2008) Big Five Inventory (BFI). Response items were measured on a 1 (Strongly disagree) – 5 (Strongly disagree) scale. Sample items included, “I am someone who can be cold and aloof” (R), “I am someone who is sometimes rude to others” (R), and “I am someone who has a forgiving nature.” Internal consistency for the measure was .77.
Openness to experience. Ten items from John and colleagues’ (1991, 2008) Big Five Inventory (BFI) were used to assess openness to experience. Items were assessed on a 1 (Strongly disagree) – 5 (Strongly agree) scale. Sample items included, “I am someone who is original, comes up with new ideas,” I am someone who is inventive,” and “I am someone who prefers work that is routine” (R). Cronbach alpha for the measure was .81.

Authoritarianism. Zakrisson’s (2005) fifteen-item short form of the right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) scale was used assess authoritarianism. The scale measures three interrelated attitudinal clusters, including conventionalism, authoritarian aggression, and authoritarian submission. Sample items from each of these sub-factors include, “People ought to put less attention to the Bible and religion, instead they ought to develop their own moral standards” (R) (Conventionalism), there are many radical, immoral people trying to ruin things; the society ought to stop them” (Authoritarian aggression), and “God’s laws about abortion, pornography, and marriage must be strictly followed before it is too late, violations must be punished” (Authoritarian submission). Zakrisson’s scale displayed adequate levels of internal consistency reliability in the present study (α = .78).

Social desirability. Paulhus’ (1986) 20-item impression management scale was used to assess participant’s inclination to provide socially desirable responses. Items were measured on a 1 (Strongly disagree) – 5 (Strongly agree) scale. Samples items included “I have never dropped litter on the street,” “I don’t gossip about other people’s business,” and “I never take things that don’t belong to me.” Cronbach alpha for the scale was .72.

Convergent Measures

Neuroticism. Eight items from John et al.’s (1991, 2008) BFI were used to assess neuroticism. Scale items were measured on a 1 (Strongly disagree) – 5 (Strongly agree) scale and included sample items, such as “I am someone who is depressed, blue,” I am
someone who is emotionally stable, not easily upset” (R), and “I am someone who can be moody.” Internal consistency reliability for the neuroticism scale was .82 in this study.

**Self-esteem.** Rosenberg’s (1965) ten-item self-esteem scale was used to measure self-esteem. Items were assess on a 1 (Strongly disagree) – 5 (Strongly agree) scale and included sample items, such as “I feel that I have a number of good qualities,” “All in all, I am able to do things as well as most other people,” and “I take a positive attitude toward myself.” Internal consistency reliability for Rosenberg’s measure was .91 in this study.

**Self-efficacy.** Judge et al.’s (1998) generalized self-efficacy measure was used to assess self-efficacy. The scale is comprised of eight-items, which were measured on a 1 (Strongly disagree) – 5 (Strongly agree) Likert scale. Sample items include, “I am strong enough to overcome life’s struggles,” “I can handle the situations that life brings,” and “I feel competent to deal effectively with the real world.” Reliability for the scale was .82.

**Locus of control.** Eight items from Levenson’s (1981) locus of control scale was used to assess locus of control. Scale items were measure on a 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree) Likert scale. Sample items include, “My life is determined by my own actions,” “When I get what I want, it’s usually because I’m lucky” (R), “When I get what I want, it’s usually because I worked hard for it.” Cronbach alpha for the scale was .61.

**Competitiveness.** Cassidy and Lynn’s (1989) seven-item need for achievement (competitiveness) subscale was used to assess competitiveness. Items were measured on a 1 (Strongly disagree) – 5 (Strongly agree) scale and included items, such as “I try harder when I’m in competition with other people,” “It annoys me when other people perform better that I do,” “It is important to me to perform better than others on a task,” and “I judge my performance on whether I do better than others rather than just getting a good result.” Internal consistency reliability for the competitiveness scale was .68 in this study.
Dominance. Seven items from Cassidy and Lynn’s (1989) need for achievement scale assessed dominance. Ratings were made on a 1 (Strongly disagree) – 5 (Strongly agree) scale. Sample items include, “I think I would enjoy having authority over other people,” “I like to give orders and get things going,” and “People take notice of what I say.” This scale showed adequate internal consistency reliability in this study ($\alpha = .87$).

Status aspiration. Status aspiration was assessed with eleven items from Cassidy and Lynn’s (1989) need for achievement (status aspiration) subscale. Scale items were measured on a 1 (Strongly disagree) – 5 (Strongly agree) scale. Sample items include, “I would like an important job where people looked up to me,” “I like talking to people who are important,” and “I like to be admired for my achievements.” Cronbach alpha was .84.

Results: Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Conformer scale. Using AMOS 20.0, a seven-factor model was tested in order to cross-validate the seven-factor solution identified in Study 2 at the item level. Given the data were not multivariate normal, Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-square statistics (Satorra & Bentler, 2001) were used to determine the fit of the model. This correction adjusts the chi-square test statistic associated with a model for non-normality. This adjustment was used instead of a bootstrap analysis given these adjustments are robust across different degrees of item-level kurtosis, as well as sample and model sizes (Curran et al., 1996; Herzog et al., 2006). A CFA resulted in less than adequate fit to the data. After examining modification indices and factor loadings, model trimming was performed to improve the fit of the model. In terms of factor loadings, items possessing factor loadings less than .70 were removed.

With respect to the needs for safety and security factor, two items were removed, including “I often feel an intense need for more security in life” ($\lambda = .67$) and “I often wish for a greater feeling of protection in life” ($\lambda = .66$). Three items were deleted from the
belonging and companionship dimension, including “My needs for love and affection are usually met” ($\lambda = .26$), “I often feel deprived of warmth and caring from others in my life” ($\lambda = .62$), and “I often wish I received more love and affection in my life” ($\lambda = .65$). Two items from the needs for purpose and meaning dimension were deleted, including “I know what my life’s mission is” (R) ($\lambda = .31$) and “I often wonder what my calling in life is” ($\lambda = .64$). Additionally, in terms of the personal life distress dimension, one item was further removed the model, “I feel like my life is spiraling out of control lately” ($\lambda = .68$).

Five items from the self-concept clarity factor were removed, including “I have a clear sense of who I am and what I stand for as a person” ($\lambda = .42$), “I am very indecisive because I don’t know what I really want,” ($\lambda = .57$), “I am unsure what I was like in the past” ($\lambda = .61$), “My personal values often contradict one another” ($\lambda = .61$), and “My opinion of myself changes on a regular basis” ($\lambda = .64$). Moreover, six items were further removed from the self-efficacy/locus of control dimension, including “I complete tasks successfully” (R) ($\lambda = .58$), “I sometimes feel like I am not in control of my work” ($\lambda = .51$), “I feel like my success in my career is outside of my control” ($\lambda = .50$), “I am capable of handling most of the problems I face” (R) ($\lambda = .58$), “I determine my own destiny in life” (R) ($\lambda = .64$), and “I usually succeed whenever I try” (R) ($\lambda = .63$). And finally, from the self-esteem/neuroticism factor, two items were deleted, including “I have a tendency to criticize myself a lot” ($\lambda = .52$) and “I get stressed out easily” ($\lambda = .51$).

Goodness-of-fit statistics for the revised model were within preexisting guidelines (Byrne, 1998): scaled chi-square, $\chi^2 = 1408.51$ (428), comparative fit index (CFI) = .92, incremental fit index (IFI) = .92, normed fit index (NFI) = .89, and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .07. Loadings for the 31 items can be found in Table 5 and Figure 6. Reliabilities estimates for each of the conformer scale’s subscales were as
follows: safety and security ($\alpha = .86$), belonging and companionship ($\alpha = .87$), purpose and meaning ($\alpha = .91$), personal life distress ($\alpha = .96$), self-concept clarity ($\alpha = .90$), self-esteem/neuroticism ($\alpha = .79$), and self-efficacy/locus of control ($\alpha = .80$). Overall, the conformer scale displayed an adequate level of internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .95$). Inter-factor correlations among the dimensions are given in Table 6. A follow-up CFA, using a separate sample, was conducted in Study 4 to cross-validate results from Study 3.

**Colluder scale.** Again, using AMOS 20.0, a seven-factor model was evaluated in order to cross-validate the seven-factor solution identified in Study 2’s EFA. Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-square statistics were again utilized to determine the model’s fit, given the data were not multivariate normal. A preliminary CFA revealed a less than acceptable fit of the model to the data. As such, modification indices and factor loadings were again examined in order to identify areas in which the model could be trimmed to improve fit. In terms of loadings, items with coefficients less than .70 were removed from the model.

Interestingly, the personal ambition factor did not load highly on the hierarchical colluder susceptibility factor ($\gamma = .07$), nor did it correlate positively with several of its proposed lower-order colluder sub-dimensions, including amoral manipulation ($r = -.02$), distrust of others ($r = .09$), greed ($r = .02$), and impulse control (reverse scored to reflect problems controlling one’s impulses) ($r = -.15$). Because gamma ($\gamma$) estimates function as factor loadings in hierarchical models where the higher-order latent construct is presumed to affect scores on the lower-order factors, as well as the assumption that the lower-order factors should be relatively highly intercorrelated with one another (Dahling et al., 2009; Mackenzie et al., 2005), the personal ambition sub-factor was removed from the model.

With respect to the amoral manipulation factor, three items were removed from the model, including “I would cheat if there were little chance of being caught” ($\lambda = .64$), “It’s
important to gather information about others in order to use it to one’s advantage” ($\lambda = .58$), and “I would spread lies about other people if I could benefit from doing so” ($\lambda = .62$).

Three items were deleted from the *desire for control* dimension, including “I enjoy exerting control over the situations I’m placed into” ($\lambda = .69$), “I have a strong desire to minimize the power of others in interpersonal situations” ($\lambda = .68$) and “I enjoy putting people in their place when I disagree with them” ($\lambda = .65$). Two items were deleted from the *desire for status* dimension, including “Having high status is a good sign of being successful” ($\lambda = .69$) and “I want to have a lavish and extravagant lifestyle” ($\lambda = .68$).

In terms of the *distrust of others* dimension, two items were removed, including “I rarely get too close to people because they will only betray me in the end” ($\lambda = .65$) and “I’m always on the lookout for signs that people are trying to manipulate me” ($\lambda = .67$). Six items were removed from the *greed* dimension, including “I see nothing wrong with making a fortune without giving anything back” ($\lambda = .45$), “I tend to hoard things of material value” ($\lambda = .55$), “I accumulate a lot of material possessions” ($\lambda = .49$), “I hate paying people back for money I have borrowed” ($\lambda = .44$), “I only like spending money on things that benefit me directly” ($\lambda = .53$), and “I enjoy living a modest lifestyle” (R) ($\lambda = .31$). Finally, three items were deleted from the *impulse control* factor, including “I have a tendency to act on my impulses” ($\lambda = .66$), “I always think carefully before I act” (R) ($\lambda = .45$), and “I have trouble resisting temptation” ($\lambda = .66$). Following this model trimming process, the revised 25-item colluder measure was subsequently subjected to a final CFA.

Goodness-of-fit statistics were at or above preexisting guidelines (Byrne, 1998): scaled chi-square, $\chi^2 = 847.37$ (268), comparative fit index (CFI) = .91, normed fit index (NFI) = .88, incremental fit index (IFI) = .91, and RMSEA = .06. Loadings for each of the 21 items comprising the revised colluder measure can be found in Table 7 and Figure 7.
Internal consistency reliabilities for each of the colluder scale’s sub-dimensions were as follows: amoral manipulation ($\alpha = .86$), desire for control ($\alpha = .87$), desire for status ($\alpha = .88$), distrust of others ($\alpha = .83$), greed ($\alpha = .77$), and impulse control ($\alpha = .79$). Internal consistency reliability for the overall colluder measure was adequate ($\alpha = .89$). Inter-factor correlations among the dimensions are given in Table 8. A follow-up CFA, using a separate sample, was conducted in Study 4 to cross-validate results from Study 3.

**Model comparison.** Additionally, based on existing best practices outlined in the SEM literature (e.g., Byrne, 1998; Kline, 2005), three competing models associated with follower susceptibility to DL were compared using AMOS 20.0. These models included a null model, in which the two higher-order conformer and colluder factors did not covary; a correlated model in which the conformer and colluder factors were allowed to freely covary with one another; and finally, a hierarchical model with a higher-order follower susceptibility factor that was specified to directly affect both the conformer and colluder factors. The hierarchical model freely estimated loadings of the conformer and colluder dimensions, and thus it was necessary to set the variance of the follower susceptibility latent variable to one in order to identify the model (Dahling et al., 2009; Kline, 2005).

Goodness-of-fit statistics associated with each of the three models are provided in Table 9. Results indicated that each model showed a relatively satisfactory fit to the data. A chi-square difference test was used to compare the models and identify the best fitting model. Consistent with Hypothesis 14, the correlated model showed a significantly better fit to the data than the null model, $\chi^2 (1) = 51.06$ and the hierarchical model, $\chi^2 (2) = 19.21$. Fit indices showed an adequate fit to the data (e.g., Kline, 2005) of the correlated model, $\chi^2 (1470) = 3557.50$, $p < .01$; CFI = .90; NFI = .83; IFI = .90; and RMSEA = .05.
Results: Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Conformer scale. With respect to discriminant validity, consistent with previous research (e.g., Judge et al., 2003), the conformer measure was moderately correlated with the Big Five traits of conscientiousness ($r = -.30, p < .05$) and extraversion ($r = -.36, p < .05$), providing support for Hypotheses 1a and 1b, respectively. However, interestingly, results contradicted Hypothesis 2a; agreeableness was moderately negatively correlated with the conformer scale ($r = -.35, p < .05$), perhaps due to the fact that the scale taps individuals’ personal life distress as well. Presumably, individuals experiencing emotional turmoil in their lives may experience higher levels of sensitivity and irritability around others and thus greater interpersonal discord, at least in the time being. These individuals, in turn, may be more likely to report being lower on agreeableness as a result. In contrast to Hypothesis 2b, the conformer measure was uncorrelated with openness to experience ($r = .02, p > .05$).

Additionally, consistent with existing theory (e.g., Thoroughgood et al., 2012), the conformer measure was weakly related to authoritarianism ($r = -.09, p < .05$), thus providing support for Hypothesis 3. In terms of social desirability, consistent with expectations, the conformer scale was weakly correlated with impression management ($r = .17, p < .05$), thereby supporting Hypothesis 4. However, while this relationship was not extremely strong, it was significant, suggesting scale items may be somewhat vulnerable to self-presentation and impression management issues (Acquino & Reed, 2002). Finally, with respect to the scale’s convergent validity, it was positively associated with each of the individual core self-evaluations constructs. Specifically, providing support for Hypotheses 5, 6, 7, and 8, the conformer scale was positively related to neuroticism ($r = .62, p < .05$), as well as negatively associated with self-esteem ($r = -.66, p < .05$), generalized self-efficacy ($r = -.41, p < .05$), and locus of control ($r = -.33, p < .05$), respectively. Taken as a whole, the
pattern of relationships reported above offers empirical support for the construct validity of the 31-item conformer scale.

**Colluder scale.** Turning to the discriminant validity of the colluder scale, results provided support for *Hypotheses 9a, 9b, 9c, and 10*. Specifically, the colluder scale was weakly related to the Big Five constructs of neuroticism \( (r = .10) \), openness to experience \( (r = .02) \), and extraversion \( (r = .15) \), as well as authoritarianism \( (r = .10) \), congruent with expectations. In terms of social desirability, the colluder measure was relatively weakly correlated with impression management \( (r = -.29) \), but nonetheless significant. As such, some discretion should be paid towards the colluder measure’s potential to elicit socially desirable responses. With respect to convergent validity, the colluder scale was positively correlated with narcissism \( (r = .56) \), competitiveness \( (r = .33) \), dominance \( (r = .45) \), and status aspiration \( (r = .37) \), thus providing support for *Hypotheses 12, 13a, 13b, and 13c*. Taken together, the pattern of relationships reported above were generally consistent with expectations and provides support for the construct validity of the 21-item colluder scale.

**Discussion**

Consistent with Hinkin (1998), it can be reasonably concluded that the retained items comprising both measures reflect an adequate sampling of their respective content domains (content valid), are internally consistent (reliable), have clear and interpretable factor structures, and maintain theoretically consistent empirical relationships with similar and dissimilar constructs (convergent/divergent validity) – thus providing empirical support for their construct validity. Consistent with expectations, the conformer scale displayed positive relationships with each of the core self-evaluations constructs (i.e., self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism) and weak relationships with theoretically distinct constructs, such as conscientiousness, extraversion, openness, and authoritarianism.
In terms of the colluder scale, interestingly, results of Study 3 suggested personal ambition was not an identifiable sub-dimension of the higher-order colluder susceptibility construct and was not highly intercorrelated with other sub-factors comprising the scale. In explanation, although studies suggest that highly ambitious employees are more likely to violate ethical codes of conduct, betray their coworkers, and engage in corruption at work (Jackall, 1988; Zyglidopoulos et al., 2009), and thus might presumably be expected to possess high levels of Machiavellianism, greed, and low impulse control (Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012), it may not be ambition per se that contributes to the tendency to engage in unethical behaviors. Presumably, many people possess ambition, but for very different goals and end states. For instance, some individuals have ambitions for careers in prosocial professions (e.g., nursing, social work, education) that may be less likely to attract those with high levels of Machiavellianism, greed, and low impulse control. In contrast, it may be more accurate to suggest that colluders have a strong need for status, reflected in the Mach construct, which may be confused with general ambition.

After adjusting the model, the colluder measure demonstrated an interpretable six-factor solution and a satisfactory level of internal consistency reliability both overall, as well as for each of its dimensions. Additionally, the measure yielded positive correlations with theoretically related constructs, such as narcissism, competitiveness, dominance, and status aspiration, and weak relationships with theoretically dissimilar constructs, such as authoritarianism, and the Big Five constructs of neuroticism, openness, and extraversion.
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Study 4: CFA & Criterion-Related Validity

To cross-validate the factor structure identified in Studies 2 and 3, a second CFA was conducted in Study 4. Furthermore, although the above-mentioned steps in the scale development process are necessary in order to establish the construct validity of a new scale, they are not sufficient. The researcher must further examine relationships between the new scale and constructs with which it could be theorized to relate in order to develop the measure’s nomological network and criterion-related validity (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955; Hinkin, 1998). Thus, Study 4 sought to establish the two scales’ criterion validity.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Conformer scale. The 31-item conformer measure from Study 3 was subjected to a follow-up CFA, again using Satorra-Bentler chi-square adjustments to correct for non-normality. The CFA revealed that the seven-factor model had an adequate fit to the data: scaled chi-square, \( \chi^2 = 759.14 \) (427), CFI = .92, IFI = .90, NFI = .89, and RMSEA = .07. Results lend support to the robustness of this seven-factor solution across samples. Factor loading ranges for each of the conformer measure’s dimensions are as follows: needs for safety and security (.64-.86), needs for belonging and companionship (.79-.90), needs for purpose and meaning (.86-.89), personal life distress (.85-.93), self-concept clarity (.79-.88), self-efficacy/locus of control (.79-.88) and neuroticism/self-esteem (.59-.86).

Colluder scale. A follow-up CFA was conducted on the 21-item colluder scale from Study 3 as well, again using Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-square statistics to adjust for non-normality in the data. Goodness-of-fit statistics were at or above existing guidelines (e.g., Byrnes, 1998): scaled chi-square, \( \chi^2 = 320.64 \) (182), CFI = .90, IFI = .90, NFI = .88, and RMSEA = .07, thus lending support to the robustness of this six-factor model across
samples. Factor loading ranges for the sub-dimensions comprising the colluder scale are as follows: *impulse control* (.70-.79), *amoral manipulation* (.71-.85), *desire for control* (.67-.85), *desire for status*, (.73-.82), *distrust of others* (.53-.88), and *greed* (.52-.86).

**Design and Participants**

Study 4’s sample was comprised of 112 undergraduates from a large Northeastern University, including 21 males and 91 females between the ages of 18 and 26 ($M=18.98$, $SD=1.43$). The sample was primarily Caucasian (73.1%), followed by Asian (17.2%), African American (4.3%), Hispanic (4.3%), and finally individuals identifying as “other” (4.3%). Participants possessed, on average, 3.78 years of work experience ($SD=1.73$).

To evaluate the criterion-related validity of the conformer and colluder measures, a procedure similar to that employed by Son Hing and colleagues (2007), who examined authoritarian followers’ compliance with unethical leadership decisions, was used. More specifically, participants were randomly presented with one of three fictional scenarios, each of which documented the behavior of a particular leader, and were asked to envision themselves as followers of the leader in question. While the first scenario was intended to tap into conformers’ vulnerabilities, the second script was designed to activate colluders’ susceptibilities. The third scenario was meant to serve as a control condition. In all three scripts, participants were asked to imagine themselves working as a copywriter for New Horizons, Inc., a nationally recognized advertising and public relations company. New Horizons was described as generating much of its revenue from promoting local, state, and national political candidates. Participants were told that they had just begun working in a creative team, led by one of New Horizon’s senior advertising editors, on a series of promotional advertisements to be pitched to an incumbent state senator up for reelection.
In the first scenario, the leader was described as exhibiting charismatic qualities, including his: 1) articulation of an overarching vision and collective identity for the team, 2) concern for followers’ needs, 4) confidence in followers’ ability to achieve collective goals, 5) communication of high performance standards, and 6) readiness to take personal risks to achieve the group’s collective goals and vision (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Ehrhart & Klein, 2001; House, 1977; Shamir et al., 1993). Consistent with existing theory, conformers are believed to be attracted to charismatic leaders who they think can offer them clarity, direction, and increased self-esteem; provide them with a strong sense of community and belonging, and instill in them a clear sense of self; but at the same time are often rendered susceptible to manipulation in the process (Fromm, 1941; Howell & Shamir, 2005; Padilla et al., 2007; Wright & Wright, 1982; Thoroughgood et al., 2012).

In the second scenario, the leader was described as being highly transactional in nature, as demonstrated in his emphasis on: 1) clarifying rewards, responsibilities, goals, and control procedures, and 2) providing concrete and detailed information regarding the task and production process (Bass, 1990, 1985; Burke et al., 2006). Transactional leaders focus on behaviors that center around reward contingencies, exchange relationships, and an emphasis on task accomplishment (Burke et al., 2006; Burns, 1978; Howell & Avolio, 1993). Specifically, in the fictional scenario the target leader was described as willing and capable of dispensing monetary and promotional rewards for exceptional performance. Congruent with existing theory, colluders comply with unethical leader-directed activities because they see an instrumental link between their compliance and contingent rewards (Bass, 1985 Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987; Thoroughgood et al., 2012). Given their high levels of Machiavellianism, greed, and low impulse control, such individuals are thought to be prone
towards compliance in unethical activities because of their anticipation of tangible extrinsic rewards (e.g., money, power, status) upon task completion (Thoroughgood et al., 2012).

In the control condition, no descriptive information was provided about the leader or their management style. In all three scenarios, the advertising editor faced a series of ethical dilemmas related to the current campaign project. First, credible information was leaked that undisclosed funds from an apparent organized crime group in Nevada would be used to help fund the senator’s promotional campaign, thereby potentially jeopardizing New Horizon’s adherence to existing campaign finance guidelines. Second, the senator’s staff informed the editor of several unconfirmed rumors regarding the senator’s opponent, including claims of infidelity and a gambling addiction, which could help New Horizons produce a potent campaign but are nonetheless unsubstantiated. And finally, the senator’s staff has conveyed a strong interest for the senior advertising editor to play up, and even exaggerate if needed, the senator’s achievements to the public, despite the potential costs to New Horizons reputation for distorting the facts. In all three scenarios, the lead editor decided to continue working on the campaign despite its questionable source of funding and agreed to utilize the unsubstantiated rumors about the senator’s opponent, as well as embellished facts regarding the senator’s achievements, within the advertising campaign.

Participants were then asked to complete a series of measures intended to capture their willingness to comply with the advertising director’s decisions, their desire to work for this leader, how much they liked the advertising director, as well as their intent to both report the leader to higher authorities and directly challenge the leader’s decisions.

**Measures**

**Conformer scale.** The 31-item conformer scale was used to assess participants’ susceptibility to conformity to destructive leaders. The scale consisted of seven correlated
factors, including needs for safety and security (“I often yearn for a greater sense of certainty in my life”) (α = .85), needs for belonging and companionship (“I often wish for a greater sense of group membership in my life”) (α = .88), needs for purpose and meaning (“I often struggle for a greater sense of meaning in life”) (α = .94), personal life distress (“I feel like I’ve been in a state of emotional chaos lately”) (α = .97), low self-concept clarity (“I have difficult describing my personality”) (α = .92), self-efficacy/locus of control (“I know if I work hard I will be successful in my career”) (α = .83), and neuroticism/self-esteem (“I often feel worthless when I fail”) (α = .85). Items were rated on a 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree) scale. Reliability for the scale was .96.

Colluder scale. The 21-item colluder measure was used to assess participants’ susceptibility to collusion with destructive leaders. The scale consisted of six correlated first-order factors, including Machiavellianism factors of amoral manipulation (“Lying is a necessary means of gaining a competitive advantage over others”) (α = .81), desire for control (“I like having authority over other people”) (α = .86), desire for status (“Being someone of high social status is very important to me”) (α = .85), and distrust of others (“If I show any weakness at work, other people are certain to take advantage of it”) (α = .84), as well as the additional greed (“I’m always trying to get a penny for nothing”) (α = .84) and low impulse control (“I often have problems controlling my behavior”) (α = .77) sub-dimensions. Reliability for the colluder measure was at satisfactory levels (α = .90).

Willingness to comply. Participants’ readiness to comply with the leader and his decisions was assessed using five items developed for the purposes of this study. Sample items included, “I would comply with this leader’s decisions,” “I would not go along with what this leader has decided to do,” and “I would act in accordance with what this leader
has decided.” Responses were measured on a 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree) scale. Internal consistency reliability for this measure was at satisfactory levels (α = .85).

**Desire to work for the leader.** Desire to work for the leader was assessed using Cushenbery and colleagues’ (2009) 6-item measure, developed from work by Burke et al. (2007). Sample items include, “I would be willing to serve under this leader,” “I would like to work with this leader,” and “I would enjoy working with this leader.” Items were, again, assessed on a 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree) scale. Reliability was .95.

**Liking.** Liking for the leader was measured using a five-item scale developed for this study. Sample items include, “I would like this leader as a person,” “I would be quite fond of this leader,” and “I would hate being around this leader” (R). Items were assessed on a 1 (Strongly disagree) - 5 (Strongly agree) Likert scale. Internal consistency was .93.

**Whistle-blowing intentions.** Willingness to report the leader was measured using a five-item scale designed for the purposes of the present study. Sample items include, “I would report this leader to higher authorities in the organization,” “I would do my best to make certain senior officials knew about this leader’s decisions,” as well as “I would not saying anything to get this leader in trouble” (R). Internal consistency reliability was .89.

**Manipulation check**

After reading the scenarios, subjects were asked two questions, which served as a manipulation check. Participants were first asked to select from three descriptions of Tom Johnson, the advertising director, the one that reflected the information they were given, including: 1) “Tom was described as a highly charismatic leader who stresses teamwork, is attentive to employees’ needs, is caring and considerate, is confident in his employees’ ability to achieve goals, sets high performance standards, and is willing to take personal risks for his team”; 2) “Tom was described as a highly business-focused leader who
provides generous financial rewards for high performance, places high performers on the fast-track to upper management, sets clear deadlines and performance standards, and has helped his protégés attain wealth, power and status in the company;” and 3) “Neither of the descriptions matches the information given; there was no description of Tom given.” A frequency analysis revealed that 75.30% (N=70) of subjects answered this question correctly. Those failing this manipulation check were removed from the final analysis.

The second question was meant to ensure participants perceived that Tom made a series of unethical decisions. In particular, they were asked to indicate, true or false, if he had “decided to continue with creating the senator’s promotional campaign, knowing that the campaign will be funded by an organized crime group, that his team will incorporate unsubstantiated information about the senator’s opponent into the ad campaign, and that they will also include exaggerated achievements of the senator in the advertisements.” Results showed that 96.80% (N=90) of subjects passed this manipulation check. Across both manipulation checks, 24 out of 110 (21.80%) total participants answered at least one question wrong. After removing these individuals, the final sample size was eighty-six.

Results

Principal components analysis. In order to distinguish Study 4’s four dependent variables (willingness to comply, desire to work for the leader, liking for the leader, as well as whistle-blowing intentions), a principal components factor analysis using varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization was performed on the five scales. Four distinct factors emerged, accounting for 76.27% of the total item variance. Items from the willingness to comply measure loaded on the first factor, displaying factor loadings greater than .74 and an eigenvalue of 12.78, accounting for 44.06% of the total item variance. Items from the
*desire to work for the leader* measure loaded onto the second factor, with loadings greater than .67 and an eigenvalue of 4.14, which explained 14.29% of the total item variance.

Scale items comprising the *liking* scale loaded onto the third factor with loadings greater than .72 and an eigenvalue of 2.30, which accounted for 7.94% of the total item variance. Items from the *whistle-blowing intentions* measure loaded on the fourth factor, with loadings greater .74 and an eigenvalue of 1.85, which explained 6.39% of the total variance. Results provide support to the independence of the DVs as distinct constructs.

**Tests of normality.** Before proceeding with the criterion analysis, each predictor and outcome variable was assessed for skew and kurtosis. Tests of skew assess variables’ distributions on the degree to which they are symmetric, while tests of kurtosis serve to identify whether distributions are peaked or flat relative to a normal distribution (Fabrigar et al., 1999). Kline (2005) suggested distributions with a skewness statistic above 3.0 are problematic, given the distribution is significantly positively or negatively skewed, and thus non-normal in nature. Kline (2005) noted that distributions with a kurtosis statistic greater than 10.0 present problems given the distribution has a significantly higher peak or is significantly flatter than a normal distribution. Results of the skew and kurtosis tests revealed that none of the Study 4 variables demonstrated significant skew and kurtosis.

**Regression analysis.** Demographic variables were entered into the first block of the regression, followed by either the conformer or colluder measure and the leader styles variable reflecting the condition subjects were assigned (charismatic leader, transactional leader, control condition) in the second block, and finally the interaction between either the conformer or colluder scale and leader styles variable. Means, standard deviations and correlations among the study variables are provided in Table 12. Tables 13 and 14 report results of the regression analysis for the conformer and colluder measures, respectively.
In terms of the conformer measure, the scale marginally predicted *willingness to comply* with destructive leaders \((\beta=18, p<.10)\), suggesting individuals who scored higher on the conformer scale were more willing to comply with the toxic orders of destructive leaders than those who scored low. Thus, *hypothesis 15a* was partially supported. Further, a marginally significant interaction was found between the conformer scale and the leader styles variable (which reflected the experimental condition that subjects were randomly assigned to) \((\beta=30, p<.10)\). Simple slopes analysis revealed that participants who scored higher on the conformer scale displayed a greater willingness to comply when the leader was charismatic vs. non-charismatic in nature. These results suggest that conformers may be more attracted to destructive charismatic leaders, in particular, who display an outward attentiveness to their needs, who increase their core self-evaluations, and who offer them relief from feelings of emotional turmoil. Thus, *hypothesis 15b* was partially supported.

In terms of *desire to work for the leader*, the conformer measure was significantly positively related to participants’ desire to work with destructive leaders \((\beta=20, p<.05)\), suggesting those who scored higher on the scale exhibited a greater desire to work with destructive leaders than subjects who scored low. As such, *hypothesis 16a* was supported. However, no significant interaction emerged between desire to work for the leader and leader styles \((\beta=.11, p>.05)\). The slopes of the regression equations did not significantly differ between the charismatic leader scenario and non-charismatic leader scenarios. That is, conformers did not report a greater desire to work with destructive charismatic leaders relative to destructive non-charismatic leaders. Thus, *hypothesis 16b* was not supported.

Additionally, the conformer scale did not predict *liking* toward destructive leaders \((\beta=.12, p>.05)\). Individuals who scored higher on the conformer measure did not show a significantly greater level of liking toward destructive leaders. As such, *hypothesis 17a* was
not supported. Further, the conformer measure did not interact with the leader styles variable ($\beta=.03, p>.05$), suggesting those who scored high on the conformer scale did not report a greater liking toward destructive charismatic leaders relative to destructive non-charismatic leaders. Thus, *hypothesis 17b* was not supported. Finally, the conformer scale did not predict *whistle-blowing intentions* toward destructive leaders ($\beta=-.04, p>.05$). Subjects who scored higher on the measure did not report a greater willingness to report destructive leaders compared to those who scored lower. As such, *hypothesis 18a* was not supported. Furthermore, the conformer measure did not interact with the leader styles variable ($\beta=-.08, p>.05$), suggesting participants who scored higher on the measure did not report greater whistle-blowing intentions towards destructive charismatic leaders versus destructive non-charismatic leaders. As such, *hypothesis 18b* was not supported.

With respect to the colluder measure, the scale positively predicted *willingness to comply* with destructive leaders ($\beta=.43, p<.01$), suggesting subjects who scored higher on the colluder scale were significantly more willing to comply with destructive leaders than those who scored lower on the colluder measure. As such, *hypothesis 19a* was supported. A marginally significant interaction was also found between scores on the colluder scale and the leader styles variable ($\beta=.23, p<.10$) on subjects’ willingness to comply. Simple slopes analysis revealed that subjects who scored higher on the colluder measure reported a greater willingness to comply when the leader was transactional (i.e., the leader offered tangible rewards in the form of money, status, power) versus non-transactional. Results suggest colluders may be drawn more to destructive transactional leaders, who place a strong focus on tangible exchanges between leaders and followers and who offer tangible outcomes for colluders’ assistance. Thus, partial support was found for *hypothesis 19b*. 
The colluder scale also predicted subjects’ desire to work for the leader ($\beta=.31$, $p<.01$), suggesting higher scores on the conformer measure were associated with a greater desire on the part of participants to work for destructive leaders. As such, hypothesis 20a was supported. Yet, no significant interaction emerged between scores on the colluder measure and the leader styles variable ($\beta=.06$, $p>.05$). That is, participants demonstrated a similar desire to work for destructive transactional leaders as they did for destructive non-transactional leaders. Thus, hypothesis 20b was not supported. With respect to liking, the colluder measure displayed a marginally significant positive relationship ($\beta=.18$, $p<.10$), suggesting participants who scored higher on the colluder scale displayed a greater liking toward destructive leaders than those who scored low. Perhaps this was due to perceived similarities between the “dark” dispositions of colluders and the target leader depicted in the scenarios. A marginally significant interaction was also found between the colluder measure and leader styles ($\beta=.24$, $p<.10$). A simple slopes analysis showed subjects who scored higher on the measure displayed a greater liking toward destructive transactional vs. destructive non-transactional leaders. Thus, hypothesis 21b was partially supported.

Finally, the colluder measure was significantly negatively related to participants’ whistle-blowing intentions ($\beta=-.24$, $p<.05$), suggesting those who scored higher on the colluder measure were less willing to report destructive leaders than those scoring lower on the scale. However, no significant interaction between the colluder measure and the leader styles variable emerged ($\beta=-.09$, $p>.05$). Those who scored higher on the colluder scale were not less willing to report destructive leaders who were transactional vs. those who were non-transactional. As such, only partial support was found for Hypothesis 22.
Discussion

Results of Study 4’s criterion analysis offer at least some preliminary support for the predictive validity of the conformer and colluder scales. With respect to the colluder measure, results suggested that individuals who scored higher on the scale were generally more willing to comply with destructive leaders, possessed a greater desire to work for destructive leaders, displayed a greater liking towards destructive leaders, and were less willing to “blow the whistle” on destructive leaders compared to those who scored low on the scale. Further, those scoring higher on the colluder scale were generally more willing to comply with and like destructive leaders who were more transactional in nature. This suggests that leaders who offer tangible extrinsic rewards in the form of money, power, and status may appeal more to greedy, Machiavellian colluders who place a premium on accumulating external indicators of success and perceive certain toxic leaders as a means to those ends (Lipman-Blumen, 2005; Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012).

Interestingly, however, no interactions were found between scores on the colluder scale and the leader styles variable on participants’ desire to work for the leader and their whistle-blowing intentions. Existing theory (e.g., Thoroughgood et al., 2012) would seem to suggest colluders should display a greater desire to work with destructive transactional leaders, who clearly link tangible rewards such as money and power to their compliance, as well as a decreased willingness to report such leaders relative to their destructive non-transactional counterparts. Yet, an alternative explanation for why significant interactions were not found across all of the dependent variables might be that colluders are attracted to destructive leaders, in general, and perceive potential personal benefits of aligning with them, regardless of whether these leaders are more transactional and make more explicit the personal rewards for doing so. Indeed, a growing body of research on the similarity-
attraction hypothesis (e.g., Felfe & Schyns, 2006, 2010; Schyns & Felfe, 2006; Schyns & Sanders, 2007) suggests followers are attracted to leaders who they perceive to be similar in terms of their attitudes, values and dispositions. Thus, the toxic behavior of destructive leaders may be enough, in most instances, to attract the services of would-be colluders.

In terms of the conformer measure, results suggested those who scored higher on the scale were generally more willing to comply with destructive leaders and displayed a greater desire to work with toxic leaders relative to those who scored lower on the scale. As noted earlier, this could be due the fact that conformers tend to be attracted to strong leaders and often lack a firm set of internal values (i.e., high self-concept clarity) needed to judge the influence attempts of leaders (Howell & Shamir, 2005; Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012). Indeed, famous historical examples, such as the Hitler Youth and the Manson family, underscore the destructive potential of impressionable followers who go along with toxic orders. Further, research also suggests high levels of emotional turmoil and feelings of instability and insecurity, each hallmarks of conformers, enhance the attractiveness of strong non-participative leaders, even destructive ones (e.g. Galanter, 1980; Galanter & Buckley, 1978; Galanter et al., 1979; Wright & Wright, 1982), who embody stability and order (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Padilla et al., 2007).

However, those who scored higher on the conformer scale did not report a greater liking and lower whistle-blowing intentions toward destructive leaders. Further, they did not report a greater willingness to comply and desire to work with, liking for, or whistle-blowing intentions toward destructive charismatic leaders vs. destructive non-charismatic leaders. One possible reason is that the relationships formed between conformers and destructive charismatic leaders take time and thus it may be difficult, if not impossible, to capture the susceptibility of conformers to such leaders in a cross-sectional study. Indeed,
studies on cult followers suggest new recruits often go through a recruitment process that unfolds over time. Specifically, recruits are often exposed to a recruitment tactic known as “love bombing” whereby potential recruits are overwhelmed with attention affection, and enthusiastic approval from the leader and the cult group (Hundeide, 2003; Wright & Wright, 1982). Over time, this process capitalizes on conformers’ unmet needs for safety, companionship, and purpose, their high levels of personal life distress, and their negative core self-evaluations. In turn, recruits personally identify with and become dependent on the leader, thereby rendering them vulnerable to manipulation (Howell & Shamir, 2005).
Chapter 7

General Discussion

To date, the role of followers in destructive leadership has been largely neglected by researchers, despite evidence across various academic literatures that different types of susceptible followers exist (c.f. Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012). Based on their cross-disciplinary review, Thoroughgood et al. (2012) stated that it is critical future studies test the theoretical foundation governing the vulnerabilities of followers discussed in their taxonomy of susceptible followers. They noted, in particular, that while separate measures exist for different facets of conformers [e.g., self-concept clarity (Campbell et al., 1996), core self-evaluations (Judge et al. 2003)] and colluders [Machiavellianism (Dahling et al., 2009)], unified psychometric efforts are needed to identify each follower type’s factor structure, the degree to which the follower types are correlated or load onto a higher-order latent factor, and the ability of scales of each to predict relevant outcomes.

Thus, the present effort was intended to answer some of these questions directly. Across four studies, results provide preliminary evidence for the construct and criterion-related validity of two measures designed to assess the susceptibilities of conformers and colluders. In terms of the conformer scale, consistent with Thoroughgood et al. (2012), results indicate unmet needs, personal life distress, low self-concept clarity, and negative core self-evaluations form a higher-order conformity factor. With respect to the colluder scale, results suggest Machiavellianism (i.e., desire for status, desire for control, amoral manipulation, and distrust of others), greed, and low impulse control form a higher-order collusion factor. Moreover, both scales showed consistent relationships with theoretically similar and dissimilar constructs and were lowly correlated with one another, suggesting conformers’ and colluders’ susceptibilities to destructive leaders reflect relatively distinct
constructs. Moreover, while additional studies are necessary in order to further establish the criterion validity of these scales, the present study offers preliminary insight into the role of individuals factors in shaping certain followers’ susceptibilities to toxic leaders.

In sum, the most important contribution of the present effort is its emphasis on the role of followers in the destructive leadership process. Research on destructive leadership has primarily focused on destructive leaders, namely the main leader traits and behaviors thought to produce harmful outcomes in organizations. Perhaps this is due to the fact that there seems to be a fascination with leaders (c.f. Meindl et al., 1985), particularly toxic leaders associated with destructive results, such as Hitler and Stalin. We frequently ask the question, “Why do these leaders behave as they do?” rather than asking, “What other factors, outside of the leader, contribute to the destruction?” Indeed, leadership is a social process, and therefore it centrally involves groups (Kaiser, Hogan, & Craig, 2008). The success or failure of the leadership process is about group outcomes, and group outcomes involve more than just leaders and their traits and behaviors – they involve leaders in conjunction with followers and contexts (Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012). As such, this study seeks to shift the discussion away from a singular focus on destructive leaders and toward a balanced approach to understanding the DL process more broadly.

Implications for Research

From a theoretical perspective, it is important that DL researchers begin to take into account the critical role that followers play in the enactment and persistence of DL in organizations. To date, there has been a dearth of research on susceptible followers in the leadership literature. Work by Padilla and colleagues (Padilla, 2012; Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012; Mulvey & Padilla, 2010), Kellerman (2004), Lipman-Blumen (2008), and several other authors reflect important steps toward understanding DL from a
more comprehensive and multifaceted perspective, one that includes the role of followers and the environmental context in which leaders and followers interact. The present effort makes another important contribution to the literature by continuing this trend towards a more systems-based, process-oriented approach to studying DL by empirically examining the factor structure underlying two susceptible follower types and providing two scales to be utilized by researchers in future empirical studies of toxic leader-follower processes.

In particular, while previous studies shed some light on the interactions that occur between susceptible followers and destructive leaders (e.g., Son Hing et al., 2007), I am unaware of any studies examining the interpersonal dynamics between different types of susceptible followers – which may allow toxic leaders to thrive in various organizations. In other words, how do conformers and colluders interact with one another and how do their interactions contribute to the broader destructive leadership process? Furthermore, consistent with research on group polarization (e.g., Hogg, Turner, & Davidson, 1990), colluders may adopt more extreme worldviews as they interact with other colluders (e.g., Hitler’s Nazi SS), initiating a reciprocal chain reaction of destructiveness. Additionally, groupthink (Janis, 1972), a related group decision-making phenomenon that entails group members’ drive for consensus, may override followers’ independent thinking and stifle dissent and appraisal of alternatives – thereby facilitating compliance with toxic leaders. These questions are notable areas for research using the scales developed in this study.

Moreover, while I have reviewed information across various social-organizational contexts (e.g., political, corporate, religious, military), I am unaware of any research that has examined whether conformers and colluders are more prevalent in certain contexts than others. For example, colluders may be drawn to corporate and political arenas where their
greed and ambition can thrive, while conformers may surface more in deviant sub-groups (e.g., cults) where destructive charismatic leaders easily satisfy their unmet needs.

In sum, the scales developed in this study will serve as a backbone for rigorously testing Padilla et al.’s (2007) Toxic Triangle model, which suggests DL results from the confluence of destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. By providing measures that differentiate between conformers and colluders, researchers may begin to disentangle how the two follower types independently affect different outcomes and interact with various aspects of destructive leaders and conducive environments. As such, this study will provide another critical piece, namely the role of followers, to the complex puzzle of DL and will aid scholars in empirically examining the complex web of relationships, which underlie Padilla and colleagues’ (2007) Toxic Triangle theory of DL.

Implications for Practice

With respect practical implications, recent instances of corporate corruption, such as those witnessed at Enron, Arthur Anderson, Bear Stearns, and Fannie Mae, underscore the destructive effects of the DL process on organizations. As such, there is a vital need for organizations to understand what factors contribute to the enactment and persistence of DL, and namely what types of employees are more or less susceptible to destructive leaders. On the front end, the importance of proper and careful employee selection seems clear. The present scales might be used by organizations as pre-screening tools to identify job candidates at risk of becoming conformers or colluders, thereby assessing not only leader traits but also follower attributes when attempting to combat DL in organizations.

The scales might further be used in assessment centers, which have been shown to be valuable selection tools and robust predictors of various employee outcomes (Arthur, et al., 2003; Gaugler et al., 1987). Candidates might be given the conformer and colluder
measures beforehand and then placed into simulated leader-follower scenarios in which resistance to an unethical leader reflects a desirable course of action. In terms of existing employees, the conformer scale may be especially useful in identifying those who might benefit from training interventions that build confidence in such individuals to question or resist their leaders if necessary. Indeed, there is emerging body of research that points directly to the need for followers to question, resist, and hold their leaders accountable for actions that run contrary to organizational goals or standard principles of ethical conduct. As such, there is utility in this study’s emphasis on identifying susceptible individuals in organizations and building in them the capacity to challenge their leaders when needed.

Broadly speaking, the present study also points to role that organizations play in encouraging ethical climates which empower subordinates to hold leaders responsible for their unethical behavior. Organizations that endorse rigid bureaucracies and authoritarian leadership styles create climates characterized by hierarchical, top-down decision-making and submissive followers (Blau, 1968; Carsten et al., 2010). These climates reinforce conformers’ obedient tendencies and adherence to large power-status differentials (Blass, 2000; Ridgeway & Walker, 1995), thus resulting in an absence of checks and balances on toxic leaders’ abuse of power (Padilla et al., 2007). Organizations characterized by strong expectations of obedience, in fact, display higher levels of unethical behavior and lower levels of ethically relevant behaviors (Treviño & Weaver, 1998; Treviño et al., 1999).

However, organizations adopting practices and procedures, which stress ethical values and codes of conduct as well as initiatives to cultivate proactive employees, will be adept at preventing destructive leader-follower relationships (Chaleff, 2003; Hollander & Offermann, 1990). Creating an ethical climate involves establishing clear-cut whistle blowing procedures that remove barriers to timely reporting of unethical conduct, visibly
enforcing rules and regulations, supporting ethics-related discussions, and rewarding leaders who serve as ethical role-models (Treviño & Weaver, 1998; Brown et al., 2005).

Limitations

The present effort is not without its limitations. First, because the conformer and colluder measures are both multi-dimensional in nature, it is probably not a surprise that, together, they comprise more than fifty items. As such, the length of the measures creates practical constraints on their administration in real-world settings. However, it should be noted that the scales are relatively parsimonious. For example, each of the six dimensions comprising the colluder scale are comprised of 3-4 scale items, while each of the seven dimensions comprising the conformer measure contain 3-7 items. Moreover, the focus of the present study was on developing two validated scales for future research. Future work might seek to validate potential short-forms of the scales for more efficient administration in businesses, political institutions, military settings, and other real-world organizations.

Second, this study only addresses two types of susceptible followers: conformers and colluders. Based on their review of various academic literatures, Thoroughgood et al. (2012), however, have pointed to the existence of several other types of susceptible followers, specifically bystanders, authoritarians and acolytes. Bystanders are passive and motivated primarily by fear; their susceptibilities to destructive leaders stem from their high levels of self-monitoring, low extraversion and dominance, a lack of a courageous, prosocial disposition, and negative core self-evaluations. In contrast, authoritarians hold rigid, hierarchical attitudes that prescribe leaders’ legitimate right to exercise power over them and their inclination to accept their influence unconditionally. Their susceptibility stems from authoritarianism, cognitive rigidity, and high levels of just world thinking. Finally, acolytes hold congruent values and goals with their leaders and seek expression of
these values via the leader’s vision (i.e., they are “true believers.”). As such, there is a critical need for future scale development efforts to assess these follower types, as well as potential cluster analytic techniques to verify their existence in the general population.

Third, the present effort used several undergraduate samples in order to validate the conformer and colluder measures. With respect to the conformer measure, though key aspects of the scale (e.g., low self-concept clarity) are applicable to any immature adult, they are particularly applicable to the young (Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012), the primary group associated with conformers (Cushman, 1984; Galanter, 1980, 1982). As such, validating the conformer scale using an undergraduate sample was likely ideal, given this demographic is more likely to identify with and emulate cultural heroes and internalize their values (Padilla et al., 2007) and may be at greater risk for obeying destructive leaders and engaging in unethical acts as followers (Hoffer, 1951; Howell & Shamir, 2005; Kets de Vries, 1989; Thoroughgood et al., 2012) (e.g., the Manson family, the Hitler Youth, Castro’s Pioneros, and Mao’s Red Guard). At the same time, while the present study offers some preliminary evidence for the construct and criterion validity of the conformer and colluder measures, it is critical that future studies further assess the factor structures of the scales and their predictive validity in various real-world settings.

Finally, while Study 3’s sample consisted of roughly equal numbers of males and females (239 males, 272 females), Study 2 and Study 4’s samples were comprised of 492 females and 70 males and 21 males and 91 females, respectively. As such, questions may arise regarding the generalizability of the factor structures underlying the conformer and colluder measures and their predictive validity to males. Certainly, future studies should conduct additional CFAs on the two measures using samples that adequately reflect both genders. However, with respect to the two measures’ predictive validities, results of the
present study suggest little variation between men and women on the dependent variables of interest. Indeed, gender was the only significant control variable for liking toward the leader in both the conformer and colluder measures’ criterion validity studies. As such, it seems reasonable to suggest gender had little effect on the scales’ predictive capacities.

**Concluding Remarks**

Since House and Howell’s (1992) seminal work differentiating personalized and socialized leader orientations, scholars have begun to acknowledge the fact that there are certain leaders who pursue their own selfish agendas at the expense of their followers and organizations. This growing appreciation for the “dark” side of leadership represents an encouraging trend in the literature. However, it is critical researchers recognize that DL is not a leader (traits, behaviors), but rather a complex social-organizational process, which involves destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments – the combination of which results in ultimate destructive outcomes to organizations and their constituencies (Padilla et al., 2007; Thoroughgood et al., 2012). To continue to examine DL through a largely leader-centric lens runs the risk of oversimplifying future studies and drawing conclusions that fail to reflect the complexity of this broader social process.

This study has attempted to, at least partially, illuminate the role of two different susceptible followers in the destructive leadership process. Though it reflects only a piece of this complex mosaic, the present effort reflects the first attempt to develop measures to assess conformers and colluders and understand how such followers may react differently to destructive leaders. In so doing, it provides a foundation for future research to test the complex relationships underlying Padilla et al.’s (2007) toxic triangle theory. Moreover, by highlighting the importance of followers to the DL process, I hope this study begins to shift
the discussion of DL away from the field’s narrow focus on destructive leaders and toward a more comprehensive, multi-faceted understanding of the broader DL process.
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### Table 1

**Substantive Agreement and Substantive Validity Coefficients for the Conformer Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Intended Construct</th>
<th>Number Correct</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$p_{sa}$</th>
<th>Highest # Wrong</th>
<th>$c_{sv}$</th>
<th>$c_{sv}$ Crit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I often feel an intense need for more security in my life.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My opinion of myself changes on a regular basis. (R)</td>
<td>Self-Concept Clarity</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel like my life is spiraling out of control lately.</td>
<td>Personal Life Distress</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I usually succeed whenever I try.</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I frequently wish for a safe haven from the stresses of life.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I often struggle with who I am as a person. (R)</td>
<td>Self-Concept Clarity</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I often yearn for a greater sense of certainty in my life.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I am certain I can achieve the success I deserve in life.</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Recently I have been going through a rocky period emotionally.</td>
<td>Personal Life Distress</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I have control over the events that take place in my life.</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I often wish for a greater feeling of comfort and reassurance about my life.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I am capable of handling most of the problems I face.</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>My personal values often contradict one another. (R)</td>
<td>Self-Concept Clarity</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I have been experiencing a lot of emotional turmoil lately.</td>
<td>Personal Life Distress</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I know if I work hard I will be successful in my career.</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I oftentimes experience a strong need for more stability in life.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I am unsure what I was like in the past. (R)</td>
<td>Self-Concept Clarity</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I feel like I have been in a state of emotional chaos lately.</td>
<td>Personal Life Distress</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I often feel an overwhelming lack of clarity about my future.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I often feel plagued by a deep sense of insecurity in my life.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I am very indecisive because I do not know what I really want. (R)</td>
<td>Self-Concept Clarity</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I am confident I can perform well in most situations.</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I feel emotionally vulnerable in my life right now.</td>
<td>Personal Life Distress</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I often wish for a greater feeling of protection in life.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I determine my own destiny in life.</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I have difficulty describing my personality. (R)</td>
<td>Self-Concept Clarity</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I often desire a greater feeling of acceptance and approval from others.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I often feel worthless when I fail. (R)</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I often experience intense feelings of loneliness and alienation from others.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I sometimes feel like I am a mystery even to myself.</td>
<td>Self-Concept Clarity</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I have strong doubts about my competence. (R)</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I am currently experiencing emotional distress in my life.</td>
<td>Personal Life Distress</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I often wish for a greater sense of group membership in my life.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I often have difficulty answering others' questions about myself.</td>
<td>Self-Concept Clarity</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>There are times when I feel very bleak and hopeless. (R)</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I often wish for a greater feeling of belonging.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I often wish I received more love and affection in my life.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I feel like my success in my career is outside of my control.</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I often feel deprived of warmth and caring from others in my life.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>My needs for love and affection are usually met. (R)</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>My life feels like an emotional roller coaster as of late.</td>
<td>Personal Life Distress</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I sometimes feel very depressed. (R)</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>I frequently wish for a greater sense of purpose in my life.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I sometimes feel like I am not in control of my work. (R)</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Even if I wanted to, I don't think I could tell someone what I'm really like.</td>
<td>Self-Concept Clarity</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I often struggle for a greater sense of meaning in life.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>I tend to focus on the negative aspects of things. (R)</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I have a clear sense of who I am and what I stand for as a person.</td>
<td>Self-Concept Clarity</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I oftentimes feel a deep sense of emptiness inside.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I have been emotionally upset as of late.</td>
<td>Personal Life Distress</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I get stressed out easily. (R)</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I often feel like I'm walking aimlessly through life without a purpose.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I have a tendency to criticize myself a lot.</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I frequently feel lost and in need of purpose in my life.</td>
<td>Unmet Needs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>I attach a lot of value to myself as a person.</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**Substantive Agreement and Substantive Validity Coefficients for the Colluder Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Intended Construct</th>
<th>Number Correct</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$p_{sa}$</th>
<th>Highest # Wrong</th>
<th>$c_{sv}$</th>
<th>$c_{sv \text{ Crit}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I have high aspirations for my career.</td>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I have a tendency to act on my impulses. (R)</td>
<td>Impulse Control</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I disagree with paying taxes for any sort of government program.</td>
<td>Greed</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lying is a necessary means of gaining a competitive advantage over others.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I am the type of person who likes giving orders when interacting with other people.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It is unreasonable to think that people are motivated by anything more than personal gain.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Having high status is a good sign of being successful in life.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I do not like to share with other people.</td>
<td>Greed</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>If I show any weakness at work, other people are certain to take advantage of it.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I take advantage of every opportunity to further my career.</td>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I take pleasure in exercising dominance and control over other people.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I often have problems controlling my behavior. (R)</td>
<td>Impulse Control</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I am willing to engage in unethical behavior if I believe it will help me succeed.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I want to be a rich and powerful person in life.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The more money I get, the more money I want.</td>
<td>Greed</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Colleagues and coworkers will not hesitate to backstab each other in order to get ahead.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I enjoy exerting control over the situations I am placed into.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I consider myself a very ambitious person.</td>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>If you want to be successful, you should focus on accumulating personal wealth.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I have difficulty controlling my wants and desires. (R)</td>
<td>Impulse Control</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I am willing to undermine the efforts of others if they threaten my goals.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I have difficulty postponing immediate gratification. (R)</td>
<td>Impulse Control</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I have a strong desire to minimize the power of others in interpersonal situations.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Advancing ahead in my career is a top priority of mine.</td>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Other people regularly plot ways to take advantage of the situation at my expense.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I see nothing wrong with making a fortune without giving anything back.</td>
<td>Greed</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I want to be better than everyone else at what I do.</td>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I would cheat if there were little chance of being caught.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I want to associate with wealthy and important people in life.</td>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When I want something of material value, I typically want as much of it as I can get.

It is important to gather information about others in order to use it to one's advantage.

I would not be surprised if a coworker spread lies about me to gain a competitive advantage.

I am always trying to get a penny for nothing.

Being seen as someone of high social status is very important to me.

I tend to impose my will on other people when interacting with them.

I have a burning desire to get ahead in life.

I would spread lies about other people if I could benefit from doing so.

I sometimes act even when I shouldn't. (R)

I rarely get too close to people because they will only betray me in the end.

I want people to recognize me as a powerful and important person.

I sometimes avoid paying people back for money I have borrowed.

I like having authority over other people.

I constantly make plans and goals for my professional future.

I have trouble resisting temptation. (R)

I enjoy putting people in their place when I disagree with them.

I am always on the lookout for signs that people are trying to manipulate me.

I am willing to use charm and flattery with people to get my way even when I do not mean it.

I want to have a lavish and extravagant lifestyle.

I am good at controlling my emotions.

I do not need a lot of fame and fortune to be content with my life. (R)

It would not bother me to be an average performer at work. (R)

I like people to think they are on an equal playing field when talking to me. (R)

When it comes to material possessions, I only want the most expensive items.

Conforming to ethical standards is important even when it does not benefit one to do so. (R)

I do not have a strong desire to accumulate lots of money and power. (R)

I always think carefully before I act.

I am content with doing just enough work to get by. (R)

Most people are honest and trustworthy. (R)

I am the type of person who only takes as much of something as I need. (R)
Table 3

*Pattern Loadings for EFA of the Conformer Scale from Study 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I often feel an intense need for more security in life.</td>
<td>-.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often yearn for a greater sense of certainty in my life.</td>
<td>-.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often wish for a greater feeling of comfort and reassurance about my life.</td>
<td>-.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I oftentimes experience a strong need for more stability in life.</td>
<td>-.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel plagued by a deep sense of insecurity in my life.</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often wish for a greater feeling of protection in life.</td>
<td>-.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often experience intense feelings of loneliness and alienation from others.</td>
<td>-.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often wish for a greater sense of group membership in my life.</td>
<td>-.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often wish for a greater feeling of belonging.</td>
<td>-.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often wish I received more love and affection in my life.</td>
<td>-.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel deprived of warmth and caring from others in my life.</td>
<td>-.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My needs for love and affection are usually met. (R)</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I frequently wish for a greater sense of purpose in my life. -.73
I often struggle for a greater sense of meaning in life. -.74
I frequently feel lost and in need of purpose in my life. -.53
I feel like my life is spiraling out of control lately. -.55
Recently I have been going through a rocky period emotionally. -.92
I have been experiencing a lot of emotional turmoil lately. -.93
I feel like I have been in a state of emotional chaos lately. -.88
I feel emotionally vulnerable in my life right now. -.75
I am currently experiencing emotional distress in my life. -.88
My life feels like an emotional rollercoaster as of late. -.84
I have been emotionally upset as of late. -.89
My opinion of myself changes on a regular basis. .43
I often struggle with who I am as a person. .52
My personal values often contradict one another. .51
I am unsure what I was like in the past. .52
I am very indecisive because I do not know what I really want. .47
I have difficulty describing my personality. .84
I sometimes feel like I am a mystery even to myself. .78
I often have difficulty answering others’ questions about myself. .81
Even if I wanted to, I do not think I could tell someone what I am really like. .87
I am certain I can achieve the success I deserve in life. (R) .57
I usually succeed whenever I try. (R) .53
I am capable of handling most of the problems I face. (R) .57
I feel like my success in my career is outside of my control. .43
I sometimes feel like I am not in control of my work. .47
I know if I work hard I will successful in my career. (R) .65
I am confident I can perform well in most situations. (R) .64
I determine my own destiny in life. (R) .63
I often feel worthless when I fail. .45
I tend to focus on the negative aspects of things. .49
I get stressed out easily. .61
I have a tendency to criticize myself a lot. .60

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring; Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization; Factor 1 = self-concept clarity; Factor 2 = personal life distress; Factor 3 = needs for safety and security; Factor 4 = self-efficacy/locus of control; Factor 5 = needs for belonging and companionship; Factor 6 = neuroticism/self-esteem; Factor 7 = needs for purpose and meaning
Table 4

*Pattern Loadings for EFA of the Colluder Scale from Study 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
<th>Factor 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have high aspirations for my career.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take advantage of every opportunity to further my career.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself a very ambitious person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancing ahead in my career is a top priority of mine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a burning desire to get ahead in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I constantly make plans and goals for my professional future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lying is a necessary means of gaining a competitive advantage over others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to engage in unethical behavior if I believe it will help me succeed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to undermine the efforts of others if they threaten my goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would cheat if there were little chance of being caught.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to gather information about others in order to use it to one's advantage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would spread lies about other people if I could benefit from doing so. .60

I am the type of person who likes giving orders when interacting with others. -.75

I take pleasure in exercising dominance and control over other people. -.77

I enjoy exerting control over the situations I am placed into. -.78

I have a strong desire to minimize the power of others in interpersonal situations. -.51

I tend to impose my will on other people when interacting with them. -.52

I like having authority over other people. -.78

I enjoy putting people in their place when I disagree with them. -.40

Having high status is a good sign of being successful in life. -.66

I want to be a rich and powerful person in life. -.79

I want to associate with wealthy and important people in life. -.75

Being seen as someone of high social status is very important to me. -.70

I want people to recognize me as a powerful and important person. -.65
I want to have a lavish and extravagant lifestyle. -.63

If I show any weakness at work, other people are certain to take advantage of it. .59

Colleagues and coworkers will not hesitate to backstab each other in order to get ahead. .71

Other people regularly plot ways to take advantage of the situation at my expense. .64

I would not be surprised if a coworker spread lies about me to gain a competitive advantage. .65

I rarely get too close to people because they will only betray me in the end. .68

I am always on the lookout for signs that people are trying to manipulate me. .63

I see nothing wrong with making a fortune without giving anything back. .54

When I want something of material value, I typically want as much of it as I can get. .59

I am always trying to get a penny for nothing. .59

When it comes to material possessions, I only want the most expensive items. .55
I have a tendency to act on my impulses. .62
I often have problems controlling my behavior. .74
I have difficulty controlling my wants and desires. .71
I sometimes act even when I should not. .69
I always think carefully before I act. (R) .57
I have trouble resisting temptation. .65

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring; Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization; Factor 1 = amoral manipulation; Factor 2 = personal ambition; Factor 3 = impulse control; Factor 4 = distrust of others; Factor 5 = desire for control; Factor 6 = desire for status; Factor 7 = greed.
Table 5

*Factor Loadings for CFA of the Conformer Scale from Study 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor</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>I often yearn for a greater sense of certainty in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often wish for a greater feeling of comfort and reassurance about my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I oftentimes experience a strong need for more stability in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel plagued by a deep sense of insecurity in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often experience intense feelings of loneliness and alienation from others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often wish for a greater sense of group membership in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often wish for a greater feeling of belonging.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I frequently wish for a greater sense of purpose in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often struggle for a greater sense of meaning in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I frequently feel lost and in need of purpose in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel like my life is missing a direction and purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel a strong need for greater meaning in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently I have been going through a rocky period emotionally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been experiencing a lot of emotional turmoil lately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel like I have been in a state of emotional chaos lately.  
I feel emotionally vulnerable in my life right now.  
I am currently experiencing emotional distress in my life.  
My life feels like an emotional rollercoaster as of late.  
I have been emotionally upset as of late.  
I often struggle with who I am as a person.  
I have difficulty describing my personality.  
I sometimes feel like I am a mystery even to myself.  
I often have difficulty answering others’ questions about myself.  
Even if I wanted to, I do not think I could tell someone what I am really like.  
I am certain I can achieve the success I deserve in life. R  
I know if I work hard I will be successful in my career. R  
I am confident I can perform well in most situations. R  
I often feel worthless when I fail.  
I tend to focus on the negative aspects of things.  
I sometimes feel depressed.  
There are times when things look pretty bleak and hopeless to me.
Table 6

*Inter-Factor Correlations Between Conformer Sub-Dimensions*

<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>1. Safe and Security</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Belonging and Companionship</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Purpose and Meaning</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personal Life Distress</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-Concept Clarity</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-Efficacy/Locus of Control</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Self-Esteem/Neuroticism</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* All correlations greater than an absolute value of .12 significant at $p \leq .05$. 
Table 7

*Factor Loadings for CFA of the Colluder Scale from Study 3*

<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>Lying is a necessary means of gaining a competitive advantage over others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to engage in unethical behavior if I believe it will help me succeed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to undermine the efforts of others if they threaten my goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am the type of person who likes giving orders when interacting with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take pleasure in exercising dominance and control over other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to impose my will on other people when interacting with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like having authority over other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to be a rich and powerful person in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to associate with wealthy and important people in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being seen as someone of high social status is very important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want people to recognize me as a powerful and important person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If I show any weakness at work, other people are certain to take advantage of it.
Colleagues and coworkers will not hesitate to backstab each other in order to get ahead.
Other people regularly plot ways to take advantage of the situation at my expense.
I would not be surprised if a coworker spread lies about me to gain a competitive advantage.
When I want something of material value, I typically want as much of it as I can get.
I am always trying to get a penny for nothing.
When it comes to material possessions, I only want the most expensive items.
I often have problems controlling my behavior.
I have difficulty controlling my wants and desires.
I sometimes act even when I should not.
Table 8

*Inter-Factor Correlations Between Conformer Sub-Dimensions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Amoral Manipulation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Desire for Control</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Desire for Status</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Distrust of Others</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Greed</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Impulse Control</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* All correlations greater than an absolute value of .12 significant at $p \leq .05$. 
Table 9

Model Comparison Results for the Conformer and Colluder Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Scaled $\chi^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-Factor Uncorrelated Model</td>
<td>3608.56**</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Factor Correlated Model</td>
<td>3557.50**</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>51.06**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Factor Hierarchical Model</td>
<td>3576.71**</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: * $p < .01$
Table 10

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between the Conformer Scale and Convergent and Discriminant Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</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>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conformer Scale</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Colluder Scale</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Neuroticism</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self Esteem</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self Efficacy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Locus of Control</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Extraversion</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Openness to Experience</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Authoritarianism</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Social Desirability</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: All correlations greater than an absolute value of .12 significant at p ≤ .05.*
Table 11

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between the Colluder Scale and Convergent and Discriminant Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</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>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Colluder Scale</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conformer Scale</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Narcissism</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Competition</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dominance</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Status Aspiration</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Extraversion</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Neuroticism</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Openness</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Authoritarianism</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Social Desirability</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All correlations greater than an absolute value of .12 significant at p ≤ .05.
Table 12

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Variables in Study 4’s Criterion Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</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>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>18.98</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Race</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work Experience</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conformer Measure</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Colluder Measure</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Willingness to Comply</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Desire to Work for the Leader</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Liking for the Leader</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Whistle-blowing Intentions</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* All correlations greater than an absolute value of .12 significant at $p \leq .05$. 
### Table 13

**Regression Analysis for the Conformer Measure and Each of Study 4’s Dependent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>Conformer Scale and Leader Styles</th>
<th>Interaction Terms</th>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>Conformer Scale and Leader Styles</th>
<th>Interaction Terms</th>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>Conformer Scale and Leader Styles</th>
<th>Interaction Terms</th>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>Conformer Scale and Leader Styles</th>
<th>Interaction Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Willingness to Comply</td>
<td>Desire to Work for the Leader</td>
<td>Liking for the Leader</td>
<td>Whistle-Blowing Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors and Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.18†</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformer Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Style (Charismatic)</td>
<td>.18†</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Style (Transactional)</td>
<td>.21†</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformer Measure x Leader Style (Charismatic)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformer Measure x Leader Style (Transactional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15†</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: †p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01
Table 14

Regression Analysis for the Colluder Measure and Each of Study 4’s Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>Colluder Scale and Leader Styles</th>
<th>Interaction Terms</th>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>Colluder Scale and Leader Styles</th>
<th>Interaction Terms</th>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>Colluder Scale and Leader Styles</th>
<th>Interaction Terms</th>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>Colluder Scale and Leader Styles</th>
<th>Interaction Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Willingness to Comply</td>
<td>Desire to Work for the Leader</td>
<td>Liking for the Leader</td>
<td>Whistle-Blowing Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors and Statistics</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colluder Measure</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.18†</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Style (Charismatic)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Styles (Transactional)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colluder Measure x Leader Style (Charismatic)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21†</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21†</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colluder Measure x Leader Style (Transactional)</td>
<td>.23†</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24†</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.37†</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09†</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.37†</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09†</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted ( R^2 )</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta R^2 )</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.04†</td>
<td>.08†</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: †\( p < .10 \), *\( p < .05 \), **\( p < .01 \)
Figure 1. Dimensions Underlying Follower Conformity to Destructive Leadership
Figure 2. Dimensions Underlying Follower Collusion with Destructive Leadership

Colluders

- Personal Ambition
- Machiavellianism
- Greed
- Low Impulse Control
Figure 3. Hypothesized Relationships of Convergent and Divergent Constructs with the Conformer Scale
Figure 4. Hypothesized Relationships of Convergent and Divergent Constructs with the Colluder Scale
Figure 5. Predicted best fitting model consisting of two correlated latent factors
Figure 6. CFA of the Conformer Measure
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