The Consequences of “Dark” Leadership: Perspective of Generation Z

The paper examines the relationship between the Dark Triad personality traits and leadership outcomes from the perspective of Generation Z. A quasi-experiment with hypothetical leaders’ scenarios as stimulus was applied in this empirical research.
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Introduction

The leader is seen as one of the most important figures in the organization responsible for its success. However, can every leader be successful? Since the beginning of research on leadership (more than 100 years ago), a lot of different leadership models and theories have been developed. All of them strived for the main aim – to define an effective leader (Northouse, 2009). However, we still lack clear and unambiguous recommendations of how leaders could become more effective in the future, especially, considering a new generation of employees and their opinion about the leader they would like to follow.

Research on personality traits experiences a period of Renaissance in the context of effective leadership, e.g., extraversion, consciousness, openness to experience were found to be positively related to leadership effectiveness (Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman, Humphrey, 2011; Spain, Harms, Lebreton, 2013). However, the majority of researchers (and practitioners) are concerned about the positive side of the leader’s personality and its effect on different leadership outcomes such as leader effectiveness, satisfaction with a leader or extra efforts of employees. But what about the negative personality traits of leaders? For the last decade, researchers started paying more attention to the “dark”
side of personality when D. L. Paulhus and K. M. Williams (2002) presented the Dark Triad model of personality. After that, leadership is no longer understood only as a positive construct. However, there is still lack of empirical data about relationships between the Dark triad and leadership. Moreover, recent years have become a real struggle for human resource managers and team leaders because they had to face a new group of employees – Generation Z. There is little information about this specific employee group in the workplace, especially about their attitudes and beliefs. So, if we take into account that some leaders might be “dark” – do they matter for Generation Z employees?

Therefore, the research object in this article is the perception of “dark” leadership outcomes from the perspective of Generation Z.

The aim of the research is to analyse the effect of the “dark” side of the leader’s personality on leadership outcomes from the perspective of Generation Z.

The research methods. A quasi-experiment research design was applied to reach the aim of this investigation. Scenarios developed by the authors of this article were used as stimulus material in the research. A multifactorial leadership questionnaire (Bass, Avolio, 2004) was used to assess leadership outcomes, while Dirty dozen (Jonason, Webster, 2010) was used to assess the leader’s Dark Triad traits.

Generation Z – new challenges in the workplace?

“Post millennials”, “iGeneration”, “Facebook generation” or “Lost generation”, that is how the newest employees’ generation entering workplaces all around the world, is being called (Fratričová, Kirchmayer, 2018). They are better known as Generation Z. It is mostly agreed that Generation Z (further – Gen-Z) is a generation of persons, born from mid-90’s till 2010 (we chose this period because it is mostly used in the literature although different years or even names for this generation may be found) (McCrindle, Wolfinger, 2009; Csobanka, 2016). Gen-Z raise a lot of questions and very often are defined as challenges for leaders and HR specialists, who do not know how to work with this specific group of employees (Wiedmer, 2015; Bencsik, Horváth-Csikós, Juhász, 2016). Therefore, researchers are invited to study Gen-Z attitudes about leadership and to share their recommendations with organizations (Anderson, Baur, Griffith, Buckley, 2017).

Gen-Z is considered to be the least researched employees’ generation (Dolot, 2018), thus we may highlight only a few characteristics of Gen-Z that is already known from other studies. The main characteristic of Gen-Z is the use of electronic devices: smartphones, laptops, smart TV’s, etc. (Wiedmer, 2015; Turner, 2015). Because of such an active use of technologies, members of Gen-Z are considered not to know how to communicate “face to face” and to lack interpersonal skills (Bejtkovsky, 2016). However, they use different communication devices and platforms, e.g., Facebook, Skype, Instagram, etc., in order to keep in touch with their friends, schoolmates and even co-workers (Turner, 2015; Wiedmer, 2015).

V. Targamadzé et al. (2015) highlights that Gen-Z members have high self-interest and self-esteem, lack of interest for others and seek for independence.
It is obvious, Gen-Z employees like to act individually and are not very keen on team playing. In the workplace, Gen-Zs like to be in charge of something, want to feel satisfied with their jobs and are oriented to achieve their personal goals (Ozkan, Solmaz, 2015; ChillaKuri, Mahanandia, 2018; Bencsik et al., 2016). Quite often they choose careers of their own interest and even change job if it does not fill their needs e.g., work-family balance (Bencsik et al., 2016). Gen-Z members are not afraid of changes. On the contrary, Gen-Zs see changes as a necessity and even like to be in charge while handling them (Bencsik et al., 2016; Ozkan, Solmaz, 2015).

T. Wiedmer (2015) states that Gen-Z employees do not need directive leaders, because they can find all the necessary information and instructions on how to do the tasks by themselves. It is believed that members of Gen-Z admire leaders who are warm, encouraging, good listeners and reward employees for achievements (Singh, Dangmei, 2016; Ozkan, Solmaz, 2015; Wiedmer, 2015). Gen-Z employees want to be independent and make their own decisions. They seek a job they love and need recognition from a leader in the organization. But what if the culture of an organization is not like that? What if the leader tends to manipulate, has a lack of remorse and empathy and could be called a “dark” leader? As was mentioned, there is a lack of knowledge about Gen-Z attitudes towards leaders in general and also the major gap is about attitudes towards “dark” leaders who supposed to be a real problem for organizations and employees. GenZ is the future (and nowadays even present) of labour force for every organization that is why studying their attitudes and beliefs is important for both researchers and practitioners. After all, employees behave according to their attitudes and their behaviour is related to the particular outcomes of an organization.

“Dark” leadership – the role of the Dark Triad personality

Typically, researchers and practitioners concentrate on the positive side of leadership. There are many books, articles, presentations, Ted talks, etc., that report about “being a good leader”. But what about “not being a bad leader”? In the last few decades, interest in the “dark side” of personality has increased. The best-known personality model that describes the “dark side” of personality is Dark triad personality model (Paulhus, Williams, 2002). Three personality traits are defined in the model: Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy (Paulhus, Williams, 2002). Machiavellianism is related to manipulation while seeking personal goals, narcissism is associated with a grandiose sense of self-importance, high egoism, and psychopathy is linked to the impulsivity, unethical behaviour and emotional shallowness (Muris, Meesters, Timmermans, 2013; Kapoor, 2015; Jones, Figueredo, 2013). In addition, all three traits have common characteristics such as a lack of empathy, higher aggression, and the pursuit of power (Jonason, Webster, 2010; Zeigler-Hill, VoNk, 2015).

P. K. Jonason, S. Slomski and J. Partyka (2012) state that the pursuit of power is one of the main goals of Dark triad personalities. That is why the Dark Triad personalities quite often take leading positions (Krick et al. 2016). As leaders, the Dark Triad personalities (or “dark” leaders) are
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described as aggressive, prone to exploit subordinates and brake rules, showing a lack of involvement (Krick et al. 2016; Myung, Choi, 2017). These leader characteristics can lead to worse job performance, unproductive job behavior, lower job satisfaction and higher stress level of employees (Furnham, Trickey, Hyde, 2012; Wisse, Sleebos, 2016). The authors have already stated that Dark triad personality is negatively associated with leadership effectiveness, although these statements are hypothetical because they lack empirical evidence (Volmer, Koch, Göritz, 2016).

Perhaps, it would be logical to say that “dark” leadership is always associated with undesirable outcomes, but there is also another side of the Dark Triad. The Dark Triad leaders could be described as charismatic, fearless, and good at creating a positive first impression (Chung, Charles, 2016). They feel confident in the negotiation process; they are good entrepreneurs and always seek to win (Jauk et al., 2016). In addition, while able to manipulate others, Dark triad leaders may be useful for stimulating others to work faster, more efficiently, etc. (Sendjaya et al., 2016). Looking from the other (more subtle) angle, it is known that each Dark triad trait has its own positive side. Leaders who, for example, possess a higher level of Machiavelianism show better time management skills, can be seen as reliable co-workers or leaders, can easily motivate other people while using different influence tactics (Forsyth, Banks, McDaniel, 2012; Jonasen, Slomski, Partyka, 2012). Leaders who possess a higher level of narcissism are described as charismatic, ambitious, they easily inspire others to follow their vision (Ehrich, Ehrich, 2014; Forsyth, Banks, McDaniel, 2012). Finally, leaders who possess a higher level of psychopathy are able to make rational (most of the time risky) decisions, are able quickly to adapt to different situations and even adapt situations to their own needs (Boddy, 2010; Boddy, 2006). Despite this small “bright” side, “dark” leaders are mostly associated with negative leadership outcomes. However, which leadership outcomes should be studied in the context of “dark” leadership?

Outcomes of “dark” leadership

During the long period of research, many different leadership outcomes have been studied. N. J. Hiller et al. (2011) completed wide leadership literature review and distinguished 4 major leadership outcome domains and the 10 individual criteria subsumed within them, e.g., effectiveness (e.g., leadership effectiveness, performance rating), attitude (e.g., emotion, motivation), behaviour (e.g., group process, organizational citizenship behaviour) and cognition (e.g., perceptual). After the research Hiller and colleagues (2011) stated, that attitude is one of the most popular outcomes in leadership literature followed by leadership effectiveness. However, one model has already become the most popular in leadership research to test leadership outcomes (van Knippenberg, Sitkin, 2013). The full-range leadership model (FRLM) developed by B. J. Avolio and B. M. Bass (2004) includes three leadership outcomes from different earlier mentioned domains: leadership effectiveness, extra efforts, and satisfaction with a leader.
The scale of leadership effectiveness in FRLM assesses if subordinates see a leader as effective in organization; the scale of extra efforts evaluates if a leader is perceived to be able to influence followers to do more than they are expected to do; the scale of satisfaction with a leader assesses if subordinates are satisfied with their leader’s methods of working with others (Avolio, Bass, 2004). Despite the popularity of FRLM, there is still a lack of empirical data about the relationships between leadership outcomes and “dark” leadership.

Researchers and practitioners agree that everyone in the organization benefits from effective leadership and suffers from ineffective or destructive leadership (Gaddis, Foster, 2015). But what are these benefits or damages in particular, and what aspects of leadership lead to them the most? GLOBE research program identified universal impediments (e.g., being asocial, irritable, dictatorial) and facilitators (e.g., being trustworthy, visionary, charismatic, inspirational and effective team-builder) of leadership effectiveness in the sample of 62 cultures (Javidan et al., 2006). With reference to B. H. Gaddis and J. L. Foster’s (2016) research, emotionally volatile, mistrustful and insensitive leaders tend to perform poorly in managerial roles. However, leaders who command attention and draw others to them are rated with higher performance indices.

While talking about the particular aspects of “dark” personality, Machiavellianism is related with more directive leadership, lower employees’ job satisfaction and employee’s exploitation (Dahling, Whitaker, Levy, 2009; Wisse, Sleebos, 2016; Furtner, Maran, Rauthmann, 2017). Narcissism is associated with unethical behaviour in the workplace and ineffective, authoritarian leadership (Ehrich, Ehrich, 2014; Furtner et al., 2017). Psychopathic leaders create a toxic work environment with a higher rate of conflicts, employees’ harassment, low job satisfaction (Boddy, 2010). Research also indicates that psychopathy is negatively related to leadership effectiveness, leadership satisfaction and extra efforts (Mathieu et al., 2014). It can be seen, the results about the “dark” characteristics of a leader and leadership outcomes are controversial.

It also seems that nowadays employees care more about the leader as a person than about his/her competences (Gaddis, Foster, 2015), so intrapersonal characteristics of a leader matter a lot, e.g., satisfaction with a hostile, antisocial leader is low. Besides, when subordinates perceive the manipulative intention of a leader, their willingness to demonstrate contextual performance activities declines (Lin et al., 2017).

Nevertheless, the same “dark” personality traits can lead both to success and failure in leadership (Spain et al., 2013; Smith et al. 2018). Quite often it depends on the work context, e.g., the raters’/employees’ perception. Therefore, in this current research, the main aim is to investigate the relationships between the leader’s Dark Triad personality and leadership outcomes, described in FRLM, from the Generation Z perspective.

**Research hypothesis:**

1. From the Generation Z perspective, the leader’s Dark Triad traits are negatively related with leadership outcomes:

1.1. From the Generation Z perspective, leadership effectiveness is negatively related with leader’s Dark Triad traits;
1.2. From the Generation Z perspective, satisfaction with a leader is negatively related with the leader’s Dark Triad traits;

1.3. From the Generation Z perspective, subordinates’ extra efforts are negatively related to the leader’s Dark Triad traits.

Research methods

Participants and procedure. In the research, participated 110 people (82% of them were females). They were members of GenZ (18-24 years old, M=21.20, SD=1.52). Almost half of the participants (48%) studied during the research (40.9% were studying social science). The majority of GenZs (75%) had work experience (from 1 to 84 months). They were invited to participate in the research via Facebook platform and through e-mails (administrators of different faculties in universities helped to send an invitation to students). During the research, participants were asked to answer sociodemographic questions, read 1 out of 5 scenarios that they chose randomly (they had to choose a number in order to show that they were not a robot; scenarios were assigned automatically to the particular number), and rate the leaders in scenarios with Dirty Dozen and Multi-factorial leadership questionnaires. Confidentiality of their individual answers in the research was assured.

Methods. A quasi-experiment research design (with scenarios as stimulus) was used in the research. For the research, authors created five scenarios that represented hypothetical leaders with different patterns of the Dark Triad traits’ expression. Scenarios were: 1) “The bad leader” scenario with highly expressed all three Dark triad traits (Machiavellianism high, psychopathy high and narcissism high); 2) “The good leader” scenario (Machiavellianism low, psychopathy low and narcissism low); 3) “The Machiavellian leader” (Machiavellianism high, psychopathy low and narcissism low); 4) “The Psychopathic leader” (Machiavellianism low, psychopathy high and narcissism low) and 5) “The Narcissist leader” (Machiavellianism low, psychopathy low and narcissism high). Scenarios described a casual leader’s X work-weak (scenarios were gender-neutral). FRLM (Bass, Avolio, 2004) was used as a theoretical background to describe the common situations of leader behaviour, while the Dark triad personality model was used as a theoretical background to describe the leader’s Dark Triad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The good leader”</td>
<td>“Leader reviews project’s interim report and notices a few mistakes. Leader invites the staff member who is responsible for the project, shows him the mistakes and starts a mutual discussion about the ways how to solve the problem”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The bad leader” / “The narcissistic leader”</td>
<td>“Leader reviews project’s interim report and notices a few mistakes. Leader invites the staff member who is responsible for the project and starts a monologue on how to solve the problem. While speaking leader tries to get an approval from the staff member that his/her ideas are good and waits for a praise”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. A fragment of scenarios

traits (an example in Table 1). To learn more about the development of scenarios used in this research, see A. Stelmokienė and T. Vadvilavičius (2019).

Scenarios were tested in a pilot study to make sure they met reliability and validity criteria. So, 40 psychology bachelor and master students from Vytautas Magnus University, Vilnius University and Lithuanian University of Health Sciences university participated in the pilot study. After it, scenarios were improved and tested again in the main study. Data of 40 participants from all the sample (110 people) was randomly chosen using computerized software. Reliability and validity testing procedures were run again. Results showed that improved scenarios had high reliability (Awg index more than 0.80) (see Table 2). They also confirmed expected construct validity (see Table 3): results revealed that the expression of all Dark triad traits was the highest in “The bad leader” scenario and the lowest in “The good leader” scenario. “The Machiavellian leader” was rated as the most Machiavellian; “The Psychopathic leader” as the most psychopathic and “The Narcissistic leader” was rated significantly higher for narcissism.

The 12-item Dirty Dozen scale was used to assess the leader’s Dark triad traits (Jonason, Webster, 2010). It measures general Dark triad traits expression and includes three subscales: Machiavellianism (e.g., “the leader tends to manipulate others to get his way”), Psychopathy (e.g., “the leader tends to lack remorse”) and Narcissism (e.g., “the leader tends to want others to admire him”). Participants were asked to indicate how much do they agree with the statements about

Table 2. Inter-rater agreement for the evaluation of the Dark Triad traits in different scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader’s scenario</th>
<th>Awg index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The bad leader”</td>
<td>0.73 (n=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The good leader”</td>
<td>0.93 (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Machiavellian leader”</td>
<td>0.87 (n=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Narcissistic leader”</td>
<td>0.92 (n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Psychopathic leader”</td>
<td>0.91 (n=6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Evaluation of the Dark Triad traits’ expression in different scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader’s scenario</th>
<th>Chi-square test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The bad leader”</td>
<td>( \chi^2=18.79^*, \text{ df}=4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The good leader”</td>
<td>( \chi^2=5.25^*, \text{ df}=4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Machiavellian leader”</td>
<td>( \chi^2=15.62^*, \text{ df}=4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Narcissistic leader”</td>
<td>( \chi^2=8.81, \text{ df}=4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Psychopathic leader”</td>
<td>( \chi^2=21.43^*, \text{ df}=4 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < 0.05 \)
the described leader on a seven-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Cronbach Alpha coefficients were as follows: for the general Dark Triad scale – 0.930; for Machiavellianism – 0.831; for Psychopathy – 0.823; for Narcissism – 0.797.

Leadership outcomes were assessed with a Multifactorial leadership questionnaire (MLQ, Avolio, Bass, 2004). MLQ consists of 45 items about leader behaviour that are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (from 0 = ‘never’ to 4 = ‘always’). MLQ is mostly used to assess leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire), but it also assesses three leadership outcomes: extra efforts of subordinates (Cronbach α in this study=0.885), satisfaction with a leader (Cronbach α=0.771) and leadership effectiveness (Cronbach α=0.869) (MLQ manual, Avolio, Bass, 2004).

Results

In order to test the relationship between the Dark Triad traits and leadership outcomes, two types of statistical procedures were applied. Firstly, correlations between the perceived Dark Triad traits of hypothetical leader and leadership outcomes were measured (see Table 4). Results revealed, that from the Generation Z perspective, the Dark Triad traits of hypothetical leaders were significantly negatively related to satisfaction with a leader, leadership effectiveness and extra efforts: higher expression of the Dark Triad traits were related with lower leadership effectiveness, less satisfaction with a leader and fewer extra efforts. These results confirm the theoretical assumptions presented in the literature analysis. Besides, the strength of the relationship between variables analysis (Blalock, 1972) confirmed that negative correlations between leadership effectiveness and narcissism were significantly weaker in comparison with correlations between leadership effectiveness and psychopathy (t=2.84; p<0.01) or whole dark triad (t=2.45; p<0.01). The same tendency was true for extra efforts and satisfaction with a leader. So, narcissism was evaluated as a significantly better trait for a leader from the worst in the context of leadership outcomes. These results partially confirm that leaders with expressed higher narcissism are perceived as more effective leaders (Owens, Wallace,
Waldman, 2015) at least compared with leaders who possess higher Machiavellianism and/or higher psychopathy.

Secondly, leadership outcomes in different scenarios were compared (see Figure 1). Results revealed that “The good leader” scenario was associated with the highest level of all leadership outcomes. “The narcissistic leader” scenario was associated with higher scores of leadership effectiveness and extra efforts when compared with “The Machiavellian leader” (respectively Mean Difference (MD)=0.88, p<0.005 and MD=0.86, p<0.04) and “The psychopathic leader” (respectively MD= 1.11 and MD= 1.33, both p<0.001) scenarios. Besides, Gen Zs were less satisfied with “The psychopathic leader” in comparison with “The Machiavellian leader” and “The narcissistic leader” (respectively MD= -1.30, p<0.001 and MD= -0.84, p<0.03).

So, the results of the research confirmed that Gen Z members were not satisfied with leaders who possessed the Dark triad traits, they were not willing to make extra efforts and evaluated leadership effectiveness with low scores.

**Conclusions**

Leadership is one of the most popular research objects in the fields of organizational psychology and management. During a long period of research, different perspectives about effective leadership have emerged (Northouse, 2009). However, the majority of researchers focused their attention only on the positive side of leadership from the leader-centred view. Follower centric perspective and Dark traits of a leader came to stage only before less than ten years. It was acknowledged that employees’ attitudes towards leaders: their behaviour and traits, really mattered (Oc, Bashshur, 2013). Moreover, Generation Z employees are starting their careers in organizations and the lack of understanding of how this specific group perceives leaders create daily challenges at work (Anderson et al., 2017).
Therefore, the aim of this research was to evaluate the relationships between “dark” leadership and leadership outcomes from the perspective of GenZ. To do that, the authors conducted a quasi-experiment and assessed relationships between Dark triad personality traits (Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy) of hypothetical leaders and three leadership outcomes (leadership effectiveness, extra efforts and satisfaction with a leader) from Full-range leadership model.

As it was expected (with reference to Mathieu et al., 2014; Furtner et al., 2017; Boddy, 2010) the research revealed significant negative relationships between hypothetical leaders’ the Dark Triad traits and satisfaction with a leader, leadership effectiveness and extra efforts: GenZ representatives were less satisfied with “dark” hypothetical leaders, poorly rated their effectiveness and were not planning to make extra efforts for such leaders. Results also confirmed that those leaders, who possessed the lowest levels of Dark triad traits, gathered the highest scores in all leadership outcomes. So, dark personality traits are really harmful to leadership from the GenZ view.

Finally, a comparison between “The Machiavellian”, “The Narcissistic” and “The Psychopathic” leaders revealed that GenZ rated “Narcissistic” leaders with highest scores in two leadership outcomes: leadership effectiveness and extra effort, while “The Psychopathic” leaders got lowest scores in leadership satisfaction. Analysis of the particular Dark triad traits showed that GenZ’s were more willing to show extra efforts when a leader was narcissistic in comparison of The Machiavellian and psychopathic leader. The same tendency was for the evaluation of leadership effectiveness. It seems that narcissism is the best among the worst (Dark triad) and the research results are in line with Ehrich, Ehrich (2014) and Furtner et al. (2017) insights about the positive side of narcissistic leaders. It could be that grandiose sense of self-importance in Narcissists is more associated with leadership position and is more tolerated by GenZ.

Besides, it was confirmed that psychopathic leader could be named as the worst type of a leader, leastwise when evaluating satisfaction with a leader. C. R. Boddy (2010) and C. Mathieu with colleagues (2014) proposed the same view of a psychopathic leader who creates a toxic environment. So, it seems that manipulation from Machiavellian leaders and even high egoism from a narcissistic leader is better than psychopathy related to impulsivity and unethical behaviour.

Implications and limitations

These findings are a nice contribution to leadership literature while it was one of the first attempts to show the relationships between Dark triad and leadership outcomes from the Full-range leadership model using a quasi-experiment research design. Results confirmed theoretical statements that the Dark Triad leaders are ineffective. The quasi-experiment showed causal relationships between leader traits and leadership outcomes.

These results can also be applied to practice. Firstly, HR specialists who are working in recruitment should pay more attention to personality traits of potential leaders/managers, and especially – the Dark Triad traits. If organizations want
high satisfaction with a leader and extra efforts from their employees, especially GenZ’s, they should recruit those leaders/managers who possess low levels of Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy. Secondly, practitioners can apply these findings in leadership training sessions. HR specialists should train leaders/managers how to act and react properly while working with members of GenZ, e.g., do not be directive or harass employees, react in a calm manner, try to be supportive, etc. Finally, practitioners should consider the evaluation of leaders’ traits when assessing leadership effectiveness. With reference to the research results (the Dark Triad traits were related to lower leadership effectiveness), the Renaissance of Trait theory in leadership research is worthy of attention from practitioners, as well.

Like all research, this one is not without limitations. The first limitation of it is that only the perception of employees was employed to assess “dark” leaders’ effectiveness. Future research should try to adapt 360° assessment and include objective leadership effectiveness criteria, e.g., profit or number of turnovers. The second limitation is related to the design of the research. Although quasi-experiment that enables to reveal causality effect was employed, scenarios with hypothetical leaders were used as a simulation material. It is recommended to use experiment design in organizations with real stimulus (e.g., actors or even real leaders). Also, this quasi-experiment may not show a long-lasting effect of working directly under “dark” leader supervision because in this study participants just read a scenario about one leader and assessed him/her. Finally, with reference to the follower centred perspective, not only traits of a leader but also traits of assessors (Gen Z) should be included in future research while predicting assessment of leadership outcomes.
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„TAMSIOSIOS“ LYDERYSTĖS PASEKMĖS: Z KARTOS POŽIŪRIS

S a n t r a u k a


Rezultatai patvirtino teorines prielaidas, kad aukšta vadovų tamsiosios triados asmenybės savybų išraiška yra susijusi su mažiau papildomų darbuotojų pastangų, žemesniu vadovavimo efektyvumo vertiniu ir mažesniu pasitenkinimu vadovu. Taigi, Z kartos atstovų požiūriu, tamsiosios triados asmenybės savybės yra tikrai kenksmingos vadovavimo kontekste. Be to, rezultatai atskleidė, kad vadovai, pasižymintys aukštesniu pasitenkinimu lygiu, yra vertinami kaip efektyvesni ir labiau skatinantys papildomos darbuotojų pastangas, lyginant su vadovais, pasižymintais dišnų Makiavelizmo ar psichopatijos išreikštimu. Tuo tarpu vadovai, pasižymintys aukštesniu pasitenkinimu lygiu, yra vertinami kaip mažiausiai skatinantys darbuotojų pasitenkinimą vadovu, lyginant su vadovais, pasižymintais aukštesniu Makiavelizmo ar pasitenkinimu lygiu.