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This bachelor's thesis focuses on the dilemma of narcissistic leadership by examining how it influences organizational citizenship behaviors of employees. Narcissism is approached here through the concept of sub-clinical narcissism via leaders who score particularly high on the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. The perceptions of their employees are studied when they have the ability to reflect their experiences to leadership in the same context that does not display the typical traits of narcissistic personality disorder.

Theoretically the research approaches topic by examining how leader's narcissistic personality influences the dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors through the mechanisms of transformational leadership. The 7 dimension model of organizational citizenship behaviors by Podsakoff et al. was utilized here in association with the combined 3 mechanism model of transformational leadership by Bass. Instead of assuming the general viewpoint that narcissistic leadership is purely a form of toxic leadership, the research does take into consideration the possibility that not all tendencies associated are simply counterproductive.

The research offers a qualitative empirical viewpoint to the subject, which has been surprisingly rare inside the research debate that has been dominated by quantitative studies. The narcissistic leaders were identified using structured questionnaires and information was gathered from their employees using semi-structured theme interviews. This was to specifically gain deep understanding on the topic from the perspective of employees.

The results underline the importance of personality-fit in leadership positions. They suggest that when unaware of the true nature of narcissistic leadership, the seemingly charismatic and visionary traits elevate some of the organizational citizenship behavior dimensions. However, when the employees come in touch with the long-term effect of such leadership, it will affect negatively primarily the behavior performed towards organization, indicating that satisfaction towards leaders is closely linked to the prevailing level of organizational citizenship behaviors.

The three primary ways how narcissism impaired the behaviors were unethical conducts, leader's inability to formulate a realistic vision, and reluctance to consider feedback and viewpoints of others. All of these impacted negatively organizational loyalty, civic virtue, sportsmanship, and individual initiative. Organizational compliance, self-development, and for most part helping behavior remained at stable levels despite narcissistic leadership, showing that employees can still strongly relate themselves to other organizational citizens and continue the exhibition of the related citizenship behaviors towards them, but not necessity towards their organization.
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1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins the thesis by overviewing the background of the research topic and the reasoning behind its importance. The paper continues by positioning the research within the existing research debate and formulates the research problem and the utilized research perspective. As a conclusion, the research contribution and the achieved results of this study are briefly discussed here and the structure of the thesis is presented to the reader.

1.1 Introduction to the Research Topic

Employees do much more in their work than what their contracts or individual job descriptions depict and demand. These often silent additional efforts, called organizational citizenship behaviors, are carried out for the shared benefit their organizations and their work communities. As such, these actions will benefit the individual, but the core reasoning behind the behavior patterns are not primarily selfish by nature. It raises from the perception of being an organizational citizen where collective good is nurtured and shared benefits are given a priority.

Narcissism on the other hand involves inflated self-interest with fragile self-image where individual benefit is pursued often at the expense of other people or an organization. The internal drivers of narcissism emancipate when the perceived reality and self-image of a narcissists do not align with their internal conception. This can lead to behavior that is counterproductive for the collective good of other organizational citizens.

The aforementioned conflict between the interests of narcissists and organizational citizenship behaviors can become especially problematic when those in the position of authority begin to misbehave and misuse their power. What becomes of interest in this research is what happens to the organizational citizenship behaviors of employees when malignant narcissism is present among their organizational leaders. The research conducts an empirical study within a media production company joint venture to see how employees perceive the difference in the prevailing level of
organizational citizenship behaviors within their work community when they become shadowed under narcissistic leadership.


The main focus in leadership research has for a long time been on the positive role of leadership, leaving narcissism predominantly as a research subject to the fields of personal and social psychology (Burton & Hoobler 2011: 389; Campbell et al. 2011: 272; Meier & Semmer 2013: 461-462). The raise of interest on the dark sides of leadership in the fields of organizational behavior and business ethics during the last 15 years has however brought the subject into the interest of organization and business researchers (Burton & Hoobler 2011: 389). Here the research has mainly focused on topics such as what are the personality characteristics of narcissistic leaders in relation to charismatic and visionary leadership (Campbell et al. 2011: 274), how the traits affect organizational effectiveness via hindering strategic leadership and organizational performance (e.g. Kaiser & Hogan 2007: 173-176), and how narcissism impacts team dynamics and work performance of an individual (Meier & Semmer 2013: 461-463). However what characterizes narcissism studies within leadership research is the inconsistency among empirical results (Grijalva & Harris 2014: 115). In addition to many other research efforts still needed here, Grijalva & Harris (2014: 115) and Resick et al. (2009: 1369) among others argue that much more empirical research contribution is needed to understand better how narcissists perform as leaders and how it affects organizational performance. Furthermore, only a small number of studies have concentrated particularly on narcissism since it has often been categorized under the more generic concepts of counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) or toxic/dark/bad leadership instead of being the main focus of a research (Wasylyshyn 2012: 63; Takala 2010: 59).

The research considering organizational citizenship behavior on the other hand has resided mainly within organizational behavior and organizational psychology research. The leading themes within this field of research have been topics such as how organizational citizenship behavior benefits team and organizational performance, and how it is affected by factors such as attitudes like job satisfaction,
motivation and different personality traits (Spitzmuller et al. 2008: 106-109, 111-117; Elanain 2007: 31-34; Podsakoff et al. 2009: 122-130). What becomes of interest for the sake of this thesis is the notion that the subject of narcissism within the field of organizational citizenship behavior research has gone largely unnoticed. This was confirmed during the literature study that was conducted for this research. The study, which focused solely on peer-reviewed scientific articles to maximize source reliability as suggested by Metsämuuroinen (2006: 27), indicated that there have been a number of studies which have concentrated for example on the broader concept of counterproductive work behaviors without focusing on any particular type of personality trait or behavior pattern, and thus the related research precisely aimed at narcissism is heavily lacking. Furthermore, the tiny partition of qualitative empirical research among these studies consolidates the need for the research conducted in this thesis. The results of investigating keyword popularity on three of the most important themes of this research in four major academic publication databases are illustrated in appendix 1. A separate literature study was also targeted to national theses publication databases. No theses were found that would have studied the effects of narcissism on leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors (Aaltodoc 2017; Doria 2017; Juuli 2017; Jultika 2017; Thesaus 2017).

While no past researches appear to have studied the precise subject of this research, a number of past research papers have in a way or another touched the surface of this research. In separate studies O’Boyle et al. (2012: 564) and Penney & Spector (2012: 126-127) studied narcissism's relation to toxic workplace behavior and found out that narcissistic persons had a greatly elevated likelihood to cause harm to their organizations and other organization citizens. Narcissism has also been shown to be negatively related to several variables crucial to leadership behavior such as commitment and willingness to alter self-enhancing behaviors (Campbell et al. 2011: 276). What makes this even more interesting for the purpose of this research is that according to Hoffman & Woehr (2011: 348-350, 370-378) leadership effectiveness is closely tied to leader's personality. A regression analysis on empirical employee data by Elanain (2007: 37-39) studied personality's effect on the exhibition on organizational citizenship behaviors pointing out that characteristics such as conscientiousness and emotional stability predicted higher level of organizational citizenship behaviors. Similarly trustful and honesty-based leader-follower
relationship has been shown to increase organizational citizenship behaviors and further performance (Dionne et al. 2004: 398-403). Brunell et al. (2014: 369) argue that narcissists have a lower probability to display volunteerism especially for unselfish reasons. This indicates that narcissistic leaders should be less prone to supporting and displaying organizational citizenship behaviors. Resick et al. (2009) studied the effects of narcissism on transformational leadership and business metrics-related organizational effectiveness among 75 American Major League Football CEOs. Their results indicated in reverse that positive self-conception has a clear positive impact on the three aforementioned variables (Resick et al. 2009: 1373-1376). Yildiz & Öncer (2012) studied narcissism's impact between employee organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviors by analyzing quantitative results of a survey targeting 190 employees. They identified narcissism as a mediator causing negative correlation between the two entities where narcissism had direct negative relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors (Yildiz & Öncer 2012: 217-219). The research of Felty et al. (2014: 162-165) focused on the effects of narcissism on organizational citizenship behaviors on team level and the results indicated it's ability to damage effective team performance. Similar results were achieved by Qureshi et al. (2015: 107-113) who conducted a research on employee narcissism's effects on organizational citizenship behaviors that was evaluated by their supervisors. Finally Michel & Bowling (2012: 93, 100-103) studied the impact of narcissistic outbursts and their results suggest that exhibiting narcissistic traits will elevate narcissistic characteristics also in other colleagues and lower their job satisfaction.

1.3 Research Problem, Research Perspective and Research Contribution

An essential question that needs to be answered here right away is why is narcissism such an important topic to study when it comes to leadership? Chapter 2 will describe the concept of narcissism in more detail, but the main motivation of this research is the impact that toxic leaders such as narcissistic leaders can have on their organizations and to the people around them. Past scandals and individual exploitations have shown that such leadership can derail complete businesses, poison work communities causing severe emotional distress to colleagues, and perform frauds and scams only to boost their own fragile self-image (Meier & Semmer 2013:
Understanding the mechanisms of such leadership can also benefit the kind of leadership that is considered as good and ethical. Johnson (2011: 30) reminds that the knowledge on understanding the dark side of leadership is vital for being able to promote and foster good leadership. Lack of consideration towards dark leadership can also in itself pave way for more abusive leadership (Johnson 2011: 4).

The amount of narcissists in the society is growing. Studies have estimated the amount of population suffering from narcissistic personality disorder (NPD) being 1% and the number being between at least twice as large among the clinical population when specifically sampled for narcissism (Angstman & Rasmussen 2011: 1256). The number is unfortunately on the rise as has already been the direction since the mid 1980's (Twenge & Campbell 2014: 227; Campbell et al. 2011. 274). The current generations beginning their work careers are displaying more ill-featured narcissistic traits than ever (Deal et al. 2010: 192). An American study that sampled almost 35000 interviewees found three times as much persons with NPD traits in young adults in their twenties in comparison to those in the retirement age (Stinson et al. 2008: 1033-1035, 1040-1045). Researchers such as Takala (2010: 59) consider the rise of narcissism among western leaders as one of the most concerning acute leadership problems.

What links narcissism directly to leaders is that due to their inner craving for power, privileges, praise and self-entitlement, narcissist frequently pursue the highest levels of organizational authority (Resick et al. 2009: 1367; Campbell et al. 2011: 272-273). Narcissists have been shown to possess an elevated probability of becoming leaders (Brunell et al. 2008: 1663, 1672-1674). Grijalva & Harms (2014: 111) listed several studies which argue that many influential CEOs and presidents of the United States have displayed high levels of narcissistic traits. Also as the discussion in oncoming chapters will show, many of their traits aid the narcissists in becoming leaders since many narcissistic traits are to some degree related to positive leader qualities.

The literature study revealed how there is currently an insufficient amount of research on the effects of narcissism on organizational citizenship behaviors. What
further defines the purpose of this paper are the conclusions of Campbell et al. (2011: 273) that only a tiny number of the existing researches that study narcissism effects on leadership are empirical by nature. The results of the literature study strongly support this statement. These conclusions together formulate the research problem of this thesis – to gain empirical knowledge on how narcissistic leadership affects organizational citizenship behaviors.

The discussion above leads to the formulation of the following research questions that will guide the research process. The third research question is the main question which this thesis seeks to answer. The two former questions function as mediating research steps that guide the study by building a theoretical framework on how to approach the research subject with the empirical research.

1. How leader's personality traits are connected to employees' organizational citizenship behaviors?

2. What are the characteristics of narcissistic (transformational) leadership?

3. In what way narcissistic (transformational) leadership affects employee organizational citizenship behaviors?

To limit the scope of the research, this paper focuses solely on the form of narcissism that meets the definition of narcissistic personality disorder. Furthermore, this research is conduct by examining the phenomena only from the employee point-of-view. Although the concept of narcissism is shrouded with negative tonality practically in every single research paper or book that were analyzed for the benefit of this thesis, this research takes the viewpoint that narcissism may also impact leadership, and further organizational citizenship behaviors, positively to at least some degree. This still rather rare view is promoted by researchers such as DuBrin (2012: 109), Yildiz & Öncer (2012: 212, 215), and Kets de Vries & Miller (1997: 211). When it comes to the nature organizational citizenship behaviors, this research acknowledges their possible dualistic nature of producing asymmetric (both positive and negative) outcomes as recently proposed by Reynold et al. (2015: 80-82, 90-91).
However for the sake of limiting the scope of the research this paper focuses only on the possible positive outcomes organizational citizenship behaviors.

This research approaches the concept of narcissism through the definition of sub-clinical narcissism and the measure of Narcissistic Personality Inventory which when combined together allow focusing on the traits of narcissistic personality disorder without the need for clinical assessment and verification. Leadership is theoretically considered here through transformational leadership theory which recognizes the empowering and transforming nature of leadership concept and considers the all-encompassing nature of the leader-follower relationship where they both can achieve higher levels in end values such as performance and morality (Bass & Riggio 2006: 4, 50-56, 127, 202-203).

The constructed theoretical framework links leader's personality traits conceptually to employee organizational citizenship behaviors. This is done by assessing how individual personality traits impact leadership style, and how the resulting behavior and decision making influence the individual, group and organizational-level context of the leadership. The context will here specifically cover the employee citizenship behaviors.

As the research goal is to get deep understanding on the nature of the research subject, instead of pursuing larger scale numeric validity for the achieved results that focus on statistical significance of conceptual interconnections and thus suits the description of a quantitative research (Alasuutari 1999: 37), this research is qualitative by nature. Furthermore, the research approach in this paper is deductive as existing general-level theories are used as the basis for building a theoretical framework which is then applied to analyze empirical research results and to draw conclusions (Hirsjärvi & Hurme 2009: 136; Eskola & Suoranta 2008: 81).

The socially constructed nature of reality is assumed as the ontological viewpoint of this research. This means that multiple interpretations of the world exist instead of a single truth that could be objectively attained (Hirsjärvi & Hurme 2009: 22). However to be able to achieve saturation on empirical results that is vital for the ability to draw conclusions, shared realities are assumed to exist in the form of inter-
subjectivity (Hirsjärvi & Hurme 2009: 18). As interviews are used to gather the empirical data, from epistemological point of view the fact is accepted in this research that the researcher is in active two-way interaction with the interviewees. This is thought to influence both the researcher and the research subject. This includes both how the interviewees output their own interpretations of the reality and how they perceive the request for the input which the researcher is asking, but it also influences the way how the interviewer interprets and receives the output from the interviewees and how objectively he is able to transmit the questions (Hirsjärvi & Hurme 2009: 22).

The empirical research is in paper based on a case study within a media production company joint venture. It was initialized by using structured questionnaires based on narcissistic personality index (NPI) to sample and validate a set of both narcissistic and non-narcissistic leaders. Once they were identified, a selected amount of their employees were interviewed using semi-structured interviews. The questionnaires and interview frameworks can be found from the appendices at the end of this paper.

The results of this research indicate that narcissistic leadership will essentially hinder the organization-targeted citizenship behavior dimensions and those aspects of individual-targeted dimensions that are not directly linked to well-being and self-interest of the organizational citizen in question. The strongest negative impact comes from leader's unethical behavior, whereas distorted charismatic-inspirational mechanism of transformational leadership especially in the form of inability to formulate a realistic vision and considering feedback and viewpoint of others will contribute to decreased organizational loyalty, civic virtue and sportsmanship. On the other hand employees linked self-development and organizational compliance to personal well-fare as organizational citizens and their respective dimensions remained at stable levels despite narcissistic leadership.

The results of this research support the view that narcissistic leadership is not completely malignant form of leadership in the short-run. Such leadership can be positively met by employees that are only able to perceive the positively charismatic and visionary traits of such leadership. Similarly the achieved results are aligned with
the view that in the long-run the effect becomes reversed and negative as the weaknesses of narcissistic leaders will eventually surface.

1.4 Structure of Thesis

This sub-chapter ends the general overview of the research by presenting briefly the structure of the rest of this paper. The paper continues with chapter 2 which is dedicated to building a theoretical framework. It begins by defining the main concepts and constructs and builds an aggregated model to illustrate their interconnections to explain theoretically the phenomena that is studied in this research.

Chapter 3 is dedicated to overviewing the design of the empirical study. The discussion will cover topics such as empirical research methodology and data gathering methods, and the analysis process. Also discussed here are the case organization and the interviewees.

Chapter 4 focuses entirely on presenting and analyzing the empirical research results. Conclusions from these results are also drawn here by reflecting them with the used theory and past research results.

Theoretical and managerial conclusions and the contributions of the research are finally presented in chapter 5. The chapter will also reflect the validity, reliability and limitations of this research. Also presented on the final pages are a set of possible future research topics that may continue the study related to this paper.
Chapter 2 will focus on building a theoretical basis for the research. This begins by building definitions for the central concepts of the research. This is followed by the construction of the theoretical perspective on the researched phenomena by building an aggregated theoretical model to explain the concepts and their inner-connections.

2.1 Main Concepts

To support the construction of the theoretic framework required to conduct the empirical study, it is important to first define the main concepts to which it will be based on. This will be done in the following sub-chapters. The central concepts for the purpose of this research are narcissism, leadership, narcissistic leadership, and organizational citizenship behaviors.

2.1.1 Narcissism

The origin of the word *narcissism* is coined with the ancient myth of Narcissus, a tragic story of a man who falls in love with his own image reflected on water, perishing away slowly to his death because of his own vanity as he refuses to take his eyes off from his own image (Grijalva & Harm 2014: 109). Near the end of the 19th century narcissism (then used under the term Narcissus-like) (Yildiz & Öncer 2012: 215) became a concept in psychology to describe a personality disorder with the tendencies of overflowing quantities of self-admiration (Resick et al. 2009: 1367; Grijalva & Harm 2014: 109).

In modern psychology moderate and non-intrusive levels of narcissism are considered to be a part of a normal persona as it contributes to the construction of a healthy self-image (Raskin & Hall 1981: 890; Kaiser & Hogan 2007: 174-176; Resick et al. 2009: 1366-1367). This means that every person is a narcissist to some degree because of naturally selfish tendencies and the degree to which a person is considered as a malignant narcissist is defined by where he is situated on a
continuum that represents the expression of the related characteristics (Grijalva & Harm 2014: 109; Kaiser & Hogan. 2007. 184). As only a qualified health professional is able to verify the existence of a mental health condition, in this research the concept of narcissism is approached through so called sub-clinical narcissism, which means that the narcissistic tendencies are evaluated outside clinical conditions as an extension to normal every day behavior, but which still reflect closely the characteristics of narcissistic personality disorder, as suggested by Felty et al. (2014: 149). This type of narcissism is also often called as grandiose narcissism (Grijalva & Harm 2014: 110).

The diagnosis of the clinical condition, narcissistic personality disorder (NPD), is based on the assessment of fulfilling and being impaired by 5 out of 9 of the evaluation criteria that describe the associated tendencies (Campbell et al. 2011: 269). The first three criteria are related to perceptions of self in relation to others. Narcissists can display an inflated degrees of self-importance, they fantasize of ideal and ultimate superiority, accomplishment, physical beauty, or love, and they perceive themselves as truly special and unique who thus should be treated in a such way and is to be associated with high-status persons and organizations (American Psychiatric Association 2000: 706-717). These further lead to narcissists possibly having an exorbitant need for admiration and possessing a sense of entitlement (American Psychiatric Association 2000: 706-717). Narcissism is associated with having the tendency to exploit other people for the benefit of their own personal ends and they are also described as lacking empathy towards others (American Psychiatric Association 2000: 706-717). The set of criteria further include that narcissists may display arrogant and selfish behavior and attitude, and a characteristic feature for narcissism is the feeling of strong envy towards others or being assured that others are envious towards the narcissist (American Psychiatric Association 2000: 706-717).

Generally at least the large majority of existing research publications use the definition given by American Psychiatric Association. It portrays narcissism as

"A preoccupation with grandiose fantasies of self-importance, a need for admiration, and a lack of empathy, which appears by early adulthood and
Narcissism is therefore a rather permanent personality trait with a specific set of stable preoccupied mental patterns that control behavior that is further influenced by context dependent triggers. In the very core of narcissism is a fragile self-image causing distorted perception of the self, that is inside the research community generally believed to be a result of a childhood trauma from parental coldness or parental overvaluation towards their child (Campbell et al. 2011: 270; Takala 2010: 60). The self-importance refers to narcissists' tendency to sincerely believe that they are better than other people, meaning that they believe to be entitled to better treatment and everything else in their self-absorbed universe revolves around them (Grijalva & Harm 2014: 113). This is further related to the fact that narcissist are unable to construct a self-image autonomously by themselves and thus they constantly use external sources such as comments and admiration from other people to define who they are (Takala 2010: 59-60; American Psychiatric Association 2000: 717-718). The self-importance leads to arrogance and vanity (American Psychiatric Association 2000: 717-718; Raskin & Terry 1988: 898-900), and in combination with the lack of empathy towards others it involves exploitativeness, anti-social behavior, and devaluation of others (Morf & Rhodewalt 2001: 177-179, 189-193 ; Michel & Bowling. 2012: 94; Meier & Semmer 2013: 464). These erupt when narcissists feel their ego being threatened and when their self-image and expectations do not meet with the external inputs from other people and their surroundings (Twenge & Campbell 2003: 262; Grijalva & Harms 2014: 111). Such behavior remains otherwise camouflaged under good first impressions, precisely maneuvered manipulative social skills and seemingly well executed social behavior, all of which are performed to sooth the egos of the narcissists and to provide themselves with the sense of power and admiration from others (Twenge & Campbell 2009: 1-6; Kaiser & Hogan 2007: 184).

Due to these characteristics, narcissism is in business-related organization and behavior research categorized often as subset of counterproductive work behaviors (abbreviated as CWB) (O’Boyle et al. 2011: 41). The reasons for this further include the associated impulsiveness and aggression which lead to their tendency to lash out
on others when they face failure or discomfort (Gordon & Them 2008: 62-64, 73), their habit to blame others for their mistakes, being overly competitive, and disobedience towards rules (Bergman et al. 2010: 119-122, 225-229; Campbell et al. 2011: 270-271, 279); Michel & Bowling 2012: 93-94, 101-102; Wu & LeBreton 2011: 593-594, 614-622). Researchers such as Penney & Spector, (2002: 126–132) and Meier & Semmer (2013: 461) have found evidence on the positive and in some researches significant linkage between narcissism and CWB. However, in this research narcissism is not further approached through the concept of CWB because researchers such as Meier & Semmer (2013: 462) argue that there is not yet enough empirical and conceptual validation on narcissism's effects on CWB.

2.1.2 Transformational Leadership

There are literally thousands and thousands of different definitions for the general concept of leadership (Winston & Patterson 2009: 7), all of which serve their different contexts for which they were defined in the first place. Therefore instead of trying to generate here another generic definition for leadership, it is wiser to choose an appropriate type of definition for leadership that best serves the context of this research. Based on the research problem, the goal of the research is to focus on the pervasive interaction process between a leader and his employees. This goes beyond the complexity of a simple leader-employee transactions process, thus hinting towards the concept of transformational leadership.

According to Bass (2000: 21) and Bass & Riggio (2006: 4) the purpose of a transformational leader is to

"motivate others to do more than they originally intended and often even more than they thought possible."

“move followers to go beyond their own self-interests for the good of their group, organization or community, country or society as a whole.”

Both segments of the definition are exactly aligned with the essence of the concept OCB. This is because by the definition of Bass a transformational leader is expected to function as a facilitator and empowerer for the endeavor and objectives such as
those associated with citizenship behaviors. Finding competitive advantage through personnel requires leaders to excel in facilitation of the full potential of their employees by making each member to go through the extra mile. In other words, this means maximizing the utilization of organization citizenship behaviors. Furthermore, Resick et al. (2009: 1366) comment that transformation leadership allows “focusing on leadership behaviors that appeal intrinsically to followers”. This is perfectly in parallel with the perspective taken in the definition of the research problem. The latter part of Bass' definition touches several of the traits associated with narcissism as portrayed earlier in chapter 2.1.1. According to Kaiser & Hogan (2007: 176) “leadership involves persuading individuals to give up their purely selfish interest for a while and contribute to the overall performance of the organization”. A narcissist is driven by self-interest and selfish motivation whereas transformational leadership considers unselfish pursue for a larger common good that is shared with others. Transformational leadership also considers achieving all-encompassing enhancement in employee motivation and morality which might clash with narcissist as their own selfish purposes are the source of motivating others. Bass & Riggio (2008: 201) argue that transformational leadership enables both the leader and the follower to reach a higher level of morals.

Hereby, the concept of transformational leadership provides a perfect basis for monitoring how narcissism influences employee OCB. Leadership context in itself is a natural playground for narcissists as they crave for success, power, status, and entitlement (Resick et al. 2009: 1367; Campbell et al. 2011: 272-273; Meier & Semmer 2013: 464). Due to their positions as leaders, narcissists are able to puppeteer other people for their own benefit, they have the ability to bend and define the rules and set who and how people are being rewarded (Yildiz & Öncer 2012: 215). Because of their inner drive to execute narcissistic tendencies, narcissists’ leadership in the form of transformational leadership is expected to become especially distorted.

2.1.3 Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Before the concept of organizational citizenship behaviors (abbreviated as OCB) was introduced in the 1980's (Spitzmuller et al. 2008: 107), academic research
community had already recognized similar concepts that ultimately lead to the introduction of OCB. The earliest of such concepts is often referred to be the willingness to cooperate by Barnard in 1938 (1954: 83) that described additional efforts performed outside of what a work contract recognized. This was followed by Roethlisberger & Dickson’s 1939 concepts of informal collaboration, and innovative and spontaneous behavior by Katz & Kahn in 1966 (Podsakoff et al. 2000: 513). These lead to the most widely known definition of organizational citizenship behaviors in its early form by Organ (1988: 1,4), who studied the relationship between job satisfaction and performance and defined the concept to describe

“individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate, promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization”.

Here OCB is seen as a behavior performed by individuals for the benefit of the organization as a whole, which is not separately emphasized or promoted by the official organization. The OCB related behavior is typically considered as spontaneous and being preloaded with sensitivity to respond to situations that are triggered through situational cues (Ilies et al. 2009: 945) This very same general idea is present almost 20 years later in their modern version of the definition where Organ et al. (2006: 34) portray OCB as

“discretionary contributions that go beyond the strict description and that do not lay claim to contractual recompense from the formal reward system”.

The main difference is that this definition emphasizes even more the voluntary nature of the associated behavior. What was present already in the very first definition of OCB is that it is thought to be closely related to the idea of seeing organization personnel as a source for competitive advantage. Because of this the linkage between OCB and team/organizational/group level performance has been eagerly studied inside the OCB research and has since been verified in several researches “(e.g. Podsakoff & MacKenzie 1997: 10; Reynolds et al. 2015: 81).

What is a central idea in the concept of OCB is the separation between what is considered to be the actual job task and what are separate additional efforts
performed to support the task performance. OCB is typically thought to be related strongly on the latter, but also different kind of opinions exist. A similar concept that is frequently mentioned in the same context with OCB is extra-role behavior. Researchers such as Ilies et al. (2009: 945) use it synonymously with OCB, but there are also those who support the separation between the two concepts. The view that supports the separation is mainly based on the empirical difficulty of how research subjects are able to distinguish whether their behavior that is thought to be OCB is a part of their contractual task or not (Spitzmuller et al. 2008: 107; Van Dyne et al. 1995: 215-219). This problem was solved through reconceptualization of OCB and is not present in the above illustrated form of the definition by Organ et al. from 2006. Another important separation needs to be done between pure altruism and OCB. Performing OCB involves always a motive that benefits the organization or it's members, whereas pure altruism is performed without any selfish thoughts (Organ et al. 2006: 4-7). This describes the difference between pure altruism and the type of altruism that is considered as a part of OCB. Finally regarding the viewpoint to OCB as conceptual construct, this research assumes the perspective of Dalal (2005) and others in that OCB and CWB are not opposite concepts but instead separate entities that are negatively related. CWB has been found to be linked negatively to organizational citizenship behavior, (e.g. Baker. 2005: 1241-1242, 1247-1251).

2.2 Theoretical Framework

Based on the concepts presented in chapter 2.1, this chapter is dedicated for the construction of a theoretical framework. It will combine the aforementioned concept together to gain understand on how they are connected to explain the phenomena that is under the research in the thesis.

2.2.1 Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Organizational citizenship behaviors have been shown to be linked with several variables related to the research problem of this thesis. These include individual, team and organizational level performance, leadership behavior, employee attitudes and expectation, and perceived level justice and fairness (Reynolds et al. 2015: 81; Yildiz & Öncer 2012: 214). These connections are typically examined through a set
of dimensions which are thought to reflect the essence of organizational citizenship behaviors. Although there is still a lack of general consensus (Yildiz & Öncer 2012: 214), the dimensionalization of OCB is largely based on the original work of Organ (1988: 8, 10-12), who formulated 5 dimensions then called as altruism, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, courtesy, and civic virtue. The amount of recognized dimensions has since then been multiplied several times although many of them have been considered to be conceptually overlapping (Podsakoff et al. 2000: 516). Some of the original dimensions have also been altered, renamed, or reformulated. In this research it was decided to use the dimensionalization constructed Podsakoff et al. (2000) because it has since then achieved a widely recognized status inside the research community (Podsakoff et al. 2009). The 7 dimensions recognized in their model are listed in table 1.

Table 1. Dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors

| 1. Helping behavior                        |
| 2. Individual initiative                  |
| 3. Sportsmanship                           |
| 4. Organizational loyalty                 |
| 5. Organizational compliance              |
| 6. Civic virtue                           |
| 7. Self-developing                        |

Source: Podsakoff et al. (2000: 518-528)

*Helping behavior* refers to altruism at work that includes helping others based on helper's free will and preventing work-related problems from occurring (Podsakoff et al. 2000: 516-517). Included here is also the concept of courtesy of not making other colleagues' work harder or causing them extra work (Organ et al. 2006: 24). Being creative in improving one's work and the performance of the organization, doing more than what is formally required and showing voluntarism towards additional tasks are together what is considered to reflect the dimension of *individual initiative*
Sportsmanship has been simply defined as refraining from complaining when facing setbacks or unexpected obstacles (Organ et al. 2006: 22-23; Podsakoff et al. 2000: 517). Organizational loyalty is a much broader concept than what the name first indicates. In addition to remaining as a member of the organization through hard times, it also includes defending the company and its reputation from those who might harm it, supporting and promoting organizational objects, and sharing goodwill (Podsakoff et al. 2000: 517). Organizational compliance is related to obeying organizational rules and regulations (Podsakoff et al. 2000: 517). Organ et al. (2006: 18) however point out that from the point of view of the citizenship behaviors the focus on this dimension is more on staying true to commonly agreed but less penalized way of working. Podsakoff et al. (2000: 525) define civic virtue as active participation of all organization citizen on all opportunities to positively influence organization life, execution of work and the success of the organization. The concept also covers guarding the well-being of the organization by monitoring the status of the environment and the inner workings of the organization (Podsakoff et al. 2000: 525). Self-development means voluntarily developing new, fostering, and improving work-related skills (Podsakoff et al. 2000: 525).

2.2.2 Narcissistic Transformational Leadership

The reasons for specifically choosing transformation leadership as the lens through which narcissistic leadership is studied were already discussed in chapter 2.1.2. What still remains yet to be done is to define how narcissism affects this particular leadership style. Bass & Riggio (2006: 5-7) describe 4 different transformational leadership mechanisms which leaders use to transform their employees. They include idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration (Resick et al. 2009: 1366). Like in this research, often the two closely related mechanisms of idealized influence and inspirational motivation are combined to one mechanism which is called charismatic-inspirational.

Idealized influence consists of a leader becoming and functioning as a role model for his employees (Bass & Riggio 2006: 5). Employees are supposed to admire and relate themselves with their leader through his persistence and example that grow
into admiration, respect and trust towards him (Bass & Riggio 2006: 5). Further the mechanism involves controlled risk taking, assurance of others that situation is at hand, and the leader being an example in following rules and displaying appropriate levels of associated ethics (Bass & Riggio 2006: 5).

**Inspirational motivation** involves the leader being inspiring to his followers and him providing them with challenging, stimulating and enabling environment both mentally and physically (Bass & Riggio 2006: 5-6). He is expected to communicate a clear inspiring vision, goals and strategies (Bass & Riggio 2006: 5-6).

The mechanism of **intellectual stimulation** consists of the leader being open to new ideas and ways of doing things. This includes promoting creative problem solving, new working methods, and him allowing mistakes to happen and not blaming anyone for doing them (Bass & Riggio 2006: 6).

Finally, **individual consideration** means that the leader becomes a mentor for his employees. The leader needs to take into consideration the personal needs and goals of his followers and then enable and empower them, but also himself, to reach a higher level (Bass & Riggio 2006: 6-7). This further involves being a good listener and delegator (Bass & Riggio 2006: 6-7).

When all these individual transformational leadership-specific ways of leading are reflected against the characteristics of narcissists, the possible influence of narcissism on the leaders ability perform transformational leadership starts to become clearer. Table 2 includes an evaluation on the possible strengths and weaknesses of the narcissistic transformational leaders. In the table the different ways of how leaders utilize in practice the individual mechanisms of transformational leadership. They are reflected against the characteristics of narcissistic personality traits presented throughout chapter 2.
Table 2. Strengths and weaknesses of narcissistic transformational leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformational mechanisms</th>
<th>Narcissists excel in</th>
<th>Narcissists fall short in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHARISMATIC-INSPIRATIONAL</td>
<td>Constructing and selling followers an exciting vision</td>
<td>Formulating a realistic vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thinking big</td>
<td>Dividing larger problems efficiently into smaller tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not afraid to take risks</td>
<td>Often extreme risk takers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Showing confidence. Have strong self-confidence</td>
<td>Overestimate personal and organizational capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attracting new clients, employees and followers</td>
<td>Maintaining long-term social relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruthlessly pursuing goals</td>
<td>Arrogance and lack of empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION</td>
<td>Hypersensitivity to criticism, blame others for mistakes</td>
<td>Hold grudges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defending their own views</td>
<td>Considering feedback and viewpoint of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seemingly charismatic and sociable</td>
<td>Require constant notice and admiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION</td>
<td>Tendency to spend time and resources on self-promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are self-sufficient</td>
<td>Lack of concern for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not afraid to speak up their minds</td>
<td>Self-centered communication. Are poor listeners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Few additional characteristics are also added. DuBrin (2012: 26) and Yildiz & Öncer (2012: 215) argues that narcissistic leaders tend to focus time and effort on self-promotion and they have particular problems in seeing how their grandiose visions could be realized and chopped into smaller sub-tasks. It is noteworthy that several of the positive traits are linked to what are generally considered as positive leader characteristics.
This research recognizes the difference between individual- and organization-targeted citizenship behaviors (abbreviated as OCB-I and OCB-O) as presented by Williams & Anderson (1991) and also recognized by Podsakoff et al. (2009). This division helps to see whether leadership narcissism will affect citizenship behavior that happens towards other organization citizens, or if there is a change in citizenship behavior towards the organization, or in both. Similarly to Ilies et al. (2009: 945), helping behavior (the combination of altruism and courtesy in Organ's original dimensionalization as described above) is considered here as behaviors towards fellow citizens, whereas conscientiousness, individual initiative, sportsmanship, organizational compliance, organizational loyalty, and civic virtue are behaviors benefiting primarily the organization.

2.2.3 Leader Personality to Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Linkage

Edgar Schein (2004: 26, 299) argues that in organizational context the personality characteristics of leaders – especially so if the leaders are also founding members of their organizations – have considerable amounts of power to influence the shape, direction and the state of existence of their organizations because inside social structure of their organizations they stand at the position of supreme authority towards their employees. Because of the positions of the leaders within the organization culture, the personalities of the leaders will first shape the organizational culture level of underlying assumptions, which then dictates the higher level of espoused beliefs and values that manifest themselves as strategies, goals, and shared philosophies (Schein 2004: 26). They further shape the tangible characteristics of the organization on the level of artifacts (Schein 2004: 26). All this together commits to the performance of the organization.

Personality characteristics of leaders can also be linked conceptually to organizational outcomes without focusing specifically on organizational culture, although the linkage is easily perceivable. First of all, as a short recap from the previous discussion in this paper, it has so far been determined that narcissism is a set of specific personality traits which are stable unconsciously driven mental patterns. These traits then shape and control behavior and decision making through situational factors, as already discussed before. Kaiser & Hogan (2007: 176-177), who have
specifically focused their efforts onto studying how the connection between personality and organizational effectiveness is conceptually linked (Resick et al. 2009: 1366), then argue that their effects are further mediated to organizational effectiveness through so called proximal impact, which refers to the context that the leader's behavior and decisions effect. On individual level the context considers individual attitudes and behaviors (Kaiser & Hogan 2007: 176). On team level their influence will be on team dynamics and team climate, and on organizational level organizational strategy and structure are the ones that will be influenced (Kaiser & Hogan 2007: 176). This chain between the concepts now links the personality traits of narcissism into their leadership style and behavior which then further influence organization citizens and their behaviors. The inter-connectivity of the concepts is illustrated in figure 1.

Figure 1. Influence of leader's personality on employee organizational citizenship behaviors through leadership style
3. EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

Chapter 3 is dedicated to the presentation of the empirical research. First, the research methods, empirical setting and execution of the research process are discussed. Then an overview is laid out on the design of the analysis process that paves the way for the actual analysis of the empirical results in the next chapter.

3.1 Empirical Research Strategy and Research Methods

Based on the formulation of the research problem and the conclusion made during the literature study as discussed in chapter 1 about how low is the number of qualitative empirical researches that have studied the related themes of this research, it was decided that the contribution of a case study would provide a much needed perspective to understanding the researched phenomena in real-life. While a case study is not applicable for drawing general-level conclusions as the results are strictly tied to a specific single occurrence a set of events, the number of sampled events is low, and as in the case of this research the monitored cases are not completely randomly selected, a case study however has the ability to gain deep knowledge on a subject to understanding better the inner-connectivity of the concepts (Metsämuuroinen 2006: 90-92).

Further the deductive nature of this research also dictates the fact that the constructed theoretical framework in association with the research problem largely pre-specify what type of data needs to be collected (Alasuutari 1999: 83-84). Therefore, data needs to be collected from the perspective of other persons, here employees of narcissistic leaders, and the data gathering method needs to allow the respondents to express their views as freely as possible, but in relation to the specific themes of the research problem. Time constraints also set limitations on the applicable types of research. These in combination with the desire of minimizing the influence of the researcher in affecting the output of the research subjects (although such influence is still present in the type of data gathering method chosen for this research (Eskola & Suoranta 2008:85)), lead to the conclusion of excluding the possibility of an observation research. This further lead to the conclusion that a case study involving
theme interviews as the main data gathering methods would best serve the purpose of this research. Such data gathering method makes it possible to monitor the output of the data sources (responses of the interviewees in this case) in real-time and allows the possibility for reformulating questions and asking additional questions, which were all thought as big advantages since for example organizational citizenship behaviors as a concept is not easy to explain to someone who has never heard about it before. Additionally, according to Hirsjärvi & Hurme (2009: 35) interview as a data gathering method is especially suitable when studying sensitive and difficult subjects, and when the desire is to gain deep knowledge on a topic that is further shrouded with uncertainly on the kind responses that the data sources would give. Interviews also allow to monitor non-linguistic expressions of the participants (Hirsjärvi & Hurme (2009: 119). The theme interview were more specifically executed as semi-structured interviews so that each interview would have the same fixed theme and general content, but no precise formulation for the interview questions as described by Metsämuuroinen (2006: 115) and the possibility for making additional questions was still there. Additionally a structured questionnaire was used to identify the narcissistic leaders. Because the purpose of the research was to give comparable results, the questionnaire was based on an existing model with predefined set of questions that have a strong academic research support and verification (e.g. Campbell et al. 2011: 270).

3.2 Research Design and Design of the Analysis Process

The empirical research process began by constructing the structured questionnaires based on the Narcissistic Personality Inventory by Raskin & Terry (1988) which has achieved a strong academic support for its validity (Miller et al. 2010: 624). The original questionnaire consists of 40 items, but this was thought to be too much for the initial participation of the possible leaders and could have possibly repelled them from participating further into the study. Instead, a shorter 16-item version of the questionnaire by Ames et al. (2005: 449) was used, since it has been verified to mirror well the core measurement of the original questionnaire. The leaders who participated to the research were later given the full 40-item questionnaire to answer to comprehensively determine their level of narcissism. All of the questionnaires
used were in their original English language and parts were translated to the leaders when needed. The questions used can be found from appendix 2.

The suitable narcissistic leaders were identified by sending the 16-item questionnaire to 7 companies and then analyzing their responses to the questionnaires. When companies with both types of leaders were identified, meaning those with particularly high levels of narcissism and those with normal level of narcissistic traits, the leaders were approached in person and asked to participate to the research. The employees who participated to the interviews were then assigned to the research by their employers as a part of their normal work. This helped significantly in the arrangement of the interviews.

The interviews were performed inside the companies in a separate meeting room to minimize disturbances and remove possibility that someone could have listened to the confidential information that was discussed. Every interviewee was interviewed separately to remove the element of group pressure, the possible feeling of shame towards others, and the probability that someone could have influenced the opinions of others by dominating the discussion (Alasuutari 1999: 153; Eskola & Suoranta 2008: 97). No pre-interviews were performed since the time for the research was limited. Each of the participants were interviewed twice, once to discuss the effects of narcissistic leadership on OCB and once to discuss the level of OCB when they were under the leadership of non-narcissistic leaders. Each interview lasted approximately between 2 and 2.5 hours. They were recorded with a pocket audio recorder that was put on a desk to make it visible for the interviewees. Each time the recorder was turned on and off it was told to the interviewees and their permission was asked for it. All of the interviews were performed in Finnish.

The interview questions were carefully formulated using a variety of general guidelines given for qualitative studies. For example Samovar et al. (2014: 19) underline that questions should not approach any topic through contrasting between the possible extremes. Because of this, the interviewees were never directly asked to reflect their experiences between narcissistic leadership and non-narcissistic leadership. During the formulation any word-choices and expressions that could have been thought as leading were excluded as suggested by Hirsjärvi & Hurme (2009:
Similarly all scientific expressions and concepts that were thought to be hard to understand from the perspective of the interviewees were left out with best possible efforts. Since the structured questionnaires and the interview questions were not linked on level that included mathematical units, there was no need to pay special attention to unit conversions. Also, no useful previous qualitative researches were found that would have performed a similar interview on an associated topic that could have functioned as a reference for this research when it came to the formulation of the interview questions.

To address the ethical viewpoints of research making, all participants of the research were informed separately about the topic, purpose, length of data storage, and confidentiality of this research. Several interviewees addressed their desire to participate only if they and their employer cannot be identified from the published paper. Also, all interviewees required that the audio recording of their interviews need to be destroyed once the transcription process is completed.

The analysis process followed the general guidelines of Hirsjärvi & Hurme (2009: 143-143) and was based on the consequent phases of description, coding, categorization, synthesis, and reporting. Each of the interviews were carefully transcribed from audio to text-format right after they were performed so that all non-verbal cues were still freshly in memory. Every word in addition to every non-verbal cue that was considered to be important were processed and only those words or phrases were left out which were considered to be irrelevant for the purpose of the research. Once all interviews were in text-format, they were combined into a single text file where answers from different interviewees were categorized under each of the questions that they were expected to answered. Highlighting with different colors was used to find contextual similarities and differences both in answers and in their expressions. Among the answers to each individual question, theme categorization as suggested by Eskola & Suoranta (2008: 174-180) was utilized to see what reoccurring themes such as transformational leadership mechanisms rose up in different contexts. This decision made the interpretation process easier by giving a basis for determining how the leadership mechanisms were linked to the different dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors.
3.3 Case Organization, Leaders and Interviewees

The case organization is a joint venture of three different media production companies that were actively working on four separate large television productions during the time of this research and on numerous other smaller projects. Each of the companies has a slightly different balance in their portfolio between the services they provide, but together they can be said to offer the full spectrum of services needed for a television production from casting and on-location filming to editing and visual effects. The initial decision to use media production companies in the empirical study was based on the conclusions of Kaiser & Hogan (2007: 175) that smaller and younger organizations with lower level of governance, and which operate especially in the entertainment industry, offer their leaders more discretion and thus narcissists leaders less restrictions in how they can express and exploit their narcissistic tendencies.

The largest of the three companies has two leaders (leader A and leader B) who own an equal share of the company and have equal amounts of power to make decisions. They both use mainly the title of a producer. They have worked as producers and directors in several domestic television productions and together they have over 30 years of experience from their field of work. During the research their company had 15 employees and 7 freelancers. The employees with regular contracts included video editors, artists, camera operators, and production assistants. Many of them work under a variety of tasks and titles based on the project that they are assigned to. The freelancers consisted of artists and editors. The second company used in the research has only one leader (leader C) with 15 years of work experience in the field and he uses the title of a producer or a director. The company has 8 employees with permanent contracts that include artists, film editors, audio engineers and camera operators. Similarly to the first company, several of the employees in this company are working under a variety of titles and tasks based on the project at hand. The third company is the smallest with 7 employees who are artists that have specialized in film editing and visual effects. The leader of the company (leader D) uses the title of a director and editor and he has 20 years of experience from his field of work.
The two leaders of the largest company, leader A and leader B, were verified to be highly narcissistic using the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. They received respectively the scores of 34 and 31. On the other hand the leaders from the two smaller production companies, leader C and leader D, received normal average scores of 15 and 17. To have something to compare with, for general population the average score is nowadays considered to be 15.3 (Pinsky & Young 2010: 255). This means that the scores of leader A and leader B are both situated within the highest 5 percentile partition of the population and the probability of them displaying ill-featured narcissistic traits are very high.

Based on these evaluations the interview group was arranged so that it included 10 of the joint venture's long-term employees representing all of the different work titles within the companies and 5 of the freelancers. The total quantity of interviewees matches exactly the average amount of participants recommended for a qualitative research as suggested by Hiršjärvi & Hume (2009: 53). The long-term employees had between two and ten years of experience from working with their leaders. The freelancers on the other hand were hired specifically for the present productions. Their work experience varied between 2 to 10 years and they had been working inside the joint venture for 4 to 9 months. At the time of the first interviews all members of the interview group worked mainly under the leadership of the narcissistic leaders in the editing and post production phases of the first large television production. After the first interviews were performed, the production was finished and the members of the interview group were assigned to work on two separate television productions that were handled concurrently. The first of the two productions was directed and produced by leader C, who is a non-narcissistic leader, and the second production was an editing and post production job that was lead by the second non-narcissistic leader, leader D. The second interviews were performed when the interview group had worked 3 months on the new projects. At the time of the second interviews several of the interview group's member worked also under the leadership of the two narcissistic leaders on smaller productions and in pre-production of a larger incoming television project. In general the setting where all of the interviewed persons, and the freelancers for the first time, were imposed under both narcissistic and non-narcissistic leadership, was through to provide an
interesting setting for the research to see how the employees would perceive the differences in their organizational citizenship behaviors.
4. ANALYSIS OF THE EMPIRICAL RESEARCH RESULTS

Chapter 4 looks deep into analyzing the empirical data that was collected during the interviews. The chapter is divided into sub-chapters based on the individual dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors and will discuss separately how each of them are influenced by narcissistic leadership.

4.1 Organizational Loyalty

An organizational citizenship behavior dimension, to which the traits of narcissistic leadership had a particularly strong negative impact, turned out to be organizational loyalty. Already during the very first interviews two employees began the discussion about their leaders by sharing a same equally extreme opinion about their work ethics of their narcissistic leaders. One of them introduced the narcissistic leaders by saying

“These people (leader A and leader B) don't have any morals.”

Throughout the discussions their unethical conducts were told to include heavily price skimming their own clients for increased profits, dishonesty and exaggeration of things, stealing other people's ideas, exploitation of external fundings and using company assets for personal ends. The narcissistic leaders were not silent about such acts either. Instead, they were told to sometimes openly brag about some of the things that they had done during in-house meetings to get a laugh from their employees. Those employees who did not see the truth in their words were told have to often laughed at such stories, whereas those who were aware of the true nature of things felt uneasy.

The members in the interview group who were closest to the narcissistic leaders in project management and decision making voiced the strongest disapproval towards the unethical behavior. The employees who were mostly excluded from decision making processes working with highly specialized tasks did not have such a negative impression of the leaders. Each employee who voiced particularly strong disagreement told in the interviews that they had planned in their minds changing
their employer in the future, but had not yet executed their plans due to difficulties in finding a similar job. Diminishing incomes was another major reason for holding on to their current job. A large majority of the interview group's members described the two leaders as highly effective in finding and securing new production deals which meant steady income for their employees. However, less effective they were told to be in holding on to their old clients. Leader A was told to blame their old clients for disloyalty for not continuing their business relations.

Both of the narcissistic leaders, but especially leader A, were described as highly envious towards others and they were told to have burned several bridges towards past clients. This had also happened with past employees when the two leaders had learned about their plans to move on to another company. Based on the discussions, leader A seemed to be more prone to turning the feelings of discomfort and envy into narcissistic rampage, whereas envy seemed to make leader B extremely competitive. What illustrates this is the yearly game day that the joint venture has for its personnel. Leader A is told to despise it because he does not benefit anything from it. Because of this, he does not participate to the game day events. Leader B on the other hand loves the idea. This can be explained by the fact that the day is originally his idea and he is told to be extremely competitive during the day typically beating his employees in most of the games. In general the expressions of envy were more obvious to those who worked more closely with the two leaders. The feeling was told in incarnate vocally especially as trash-talking about other people.

When it comes to promoting organizational objects and company's reputation, a similar dissonance was present that echoed the negative impact of unethical leadership on organizational loyalty. An employee described that

“Having seen a thing or two they've done...I see that we (employees) still equally promote our work when it comes to any kind of positive effect we're attempting to do. Like promoting the work we release or promoting our company to our clients. Because it brings food to our table. But when it comes to any of the negativity...I prefer to steer away from it...It's not my responsibility to clean up any mess that they do.”

Another thing affecting negatively organizational loyalty was the visionary role of the leaders. Among long-term employees within the interview group the strongest
expression of discomfort came again from those involved closely in the decision making process. They described the visions of the two narcissistic leaders as “grandiose” or as “detached from the reality we're living in” when it came to their most daring plans. This was described to include not only the extent of labor and financial assets needed to accomplish the ideas, but also the skills possessed by the company. Interestingly both of the narcissistic leaders were described as the less technically capable members of the joint venture.

While the opinions of the employees with long-term contracts had consolidated, the opinions of the freelancers changed between the two interviews. During the first interview the leaderships of the two narcissistic leaders were praised. They were described as leaders who “get the job done”, as highly charismatic and popular, displaying almost child-like enthusiasm towards projects contributing positively to the overall spirits of the employees, and having interesting visions. At the time of the second interview the tone had taken a negative turn. One of the freelancers described the change in impression by saying

“Of course you get very excited and psyched to work as hard as you can...you know... when someone whose job is to say what we're doing and where we're heading is constantly saying “We're going to make millions with this!” or “We're going to be millionaires!”...It's good that he's optimistic but I think there should be some kind of realism behind those projections...he exaggerated things a lot and when I came abroad (when he was employed) I thought I was going to be part of something truly amazing...It was devastating when we saw the first sales numbers. I was so close to leaving the company at that point.”

The similar conducts of showmanship by the narcissistic leaders were told to take place also in the presence of clients, possible new employees, and also in the public. A number of newspaper articles and radio interviews were published during the time of the research where both leader A and leader B presented comments that were not based on facts. This was met with silent disapproval at the time by those inside the company who were aware of the facts. In the interview the employees commented that

“For me the turning point was when he said that the project would triple our turnover and make us a serious players in the world wide media market. What world wide market? We are essentially a domestic company.”
“(Leader A) for example was not telling the truth in the news article about how many countries we had sold our production to. The real number is a lot lower than what he said and so are the sales in euros that we received from the deals.”

What also pointed to the direction of weaker organizational loyalty under the leadership of the narcissistic leaders was the way how some of the employees who mainly worked under their leadership had changed their approach towards visiting clients. An employee said that

“Yeah I do tend to go to greet clients that come around here more often than I did for example when I first started here...In this profession contacts are very important...You never know if someone is going to be one day your employer...”

Few of the members in the interview group pointed out the fact that the narcissistic leaders had the tendency to maneuver the social contacts of their employees when it came to clients. One of the employees described an occasion where an important client of the joint venture had voiced desire to talk face-to-face with him about the execution of a project during the next meeting. He had briefed both of the narcissistic leaders more than once about his preference to be present in the meeting, but instead the two leaders did not inform him about the upcoming meeting and arranged his work in a such way for that particular day that made him unable to be present in the meeting. This experience had left him seriously reconsidering whether to continue working for the narcissistic leaders in the future.

4.2 Organizational Compliance and Sportsmanship

Interestingly while the narcissistic leaders were both accused of unethical behavior, nothing came up during the interviews that would have point out in a way or another that this would have increased careless behavior towards organizational rules among the employees. Here the discussions typically turned towards the importance of helping behavior and how one employee causing problems would backslash by ending up causing stress and problems also for other colleagues.

Neither the joint venture nor any of the individual companies had a written set of company rules which the personnel were to follow. There were however a number of
non-written protocols which the employees were to follow. Such as, nobody was allowed talk about or publish footage that was not yet released, everybody were expected to remain quiet while filming or recording was taking place nearby, and any accidental damage made to equipment was to be reported immediately. Similarly, all members of the joint venture were allowed to seek new clients and they were encouraged to do so. Still, only the four leaders were allowed to negotiate prices and approve deals. This rule was enforced especially by leader A and leader B. As a side effect, this was told to have lead to situations where the two narcissistic leaders had maneuvered deals so that their part of the joint venture received larger proportions of income than leader C and leader D. They were also told to be more eager to hoard themselves privileges in comparison to the other leaders such as changes to meet famous and powerful people.

When it came to sportsmanship, employees that had specific tasks and who were not a part of project management or decision making did not perceive a significant difference in the level how employees complained about problems or work-related issues. On the other hand the employees who were most concerned about the negative side effects of the leadership of leader A and leader B did describe that people inside the company were complaining more, but the complaints were directed towards the behavior of the two leaders. To put this in perspective, nobody described anything negative during the interviews about leader C. Leader D was only described as ineffective in comparison to leader A and leader B when it came to securing the companies with new projects. Particularly complaining about work assignments was more common among the freelancers at the time of the second interview, but is was not possible to link the reasons to leadership narcissism.

4.3 Helping Behavior

Helping behavior turned out to be the strongest and most frequently mentioned dimension of organizational citizenship behavior among the employees. Helping others in solving problems and preventing work-related problems from happening were thought to be not only important, but vital for the success of their work. This was emphasized in comments that underlined the mentality of group work in their job such as
“There are two main things which pretty much thoroughly define if we succeed. The first one is if we can deliver by make our customers happy and the second one is if we can meet the deadlines. We don't get slack when it comes to deadlines. If we miss it we'll then miss it for good and we'll lose that particular customer...I mean we ALL lose that customer“.

The linkage to helping behavior becomes more obvious when the employees discussed the differences in helping behavior among themselves when they were working for narcissistic or non-narcissistic leaders. An employee described that

“I can't see any difference <in the level of helping others between working for the narcissistic or non-narcissistic leaders>...no. Because we all do very few things that are possible in the end to do solo. We do have our individual responsibilities in each project, but pretty much all of our individual tasks are related to someone else's work too...For example, I begin my work from the raw material that I get from (another employee) and then when I'm finished I'll pass it on to (names of employees) who will do the final touches. So if one person would start slacking then everybody else would have problems too...We always help our each other and that's what I like about our crew (other employees) here.“

There was however a difference in the activity of helping behavior of the narcissistic leader. When it came to work-related problems several members of the interview group commented that

“I don't really go to ask help from (leader A). Rarely from (leader B) either. I would rather ask help or opinion from these guys here (other employees) or (leader D), or leader (C). He (leader A) has more of the attitude that he has his own job, we have ours and we don't interfere. He rarely comes around here to watch us work and stays most of the time in the other floor in his office... (leader B) comes around here, but I wish he would come here more often...They're not like (leader D) and (leader C) who drop by more or less every day.“

Another difference was perceived in feedback how helping behavior was encouraged by the leader and how the occurrence of work-related problems was approached.

“I don't think (leader A) has ever said 'thank you' when I've helped him with something...neither do I now remember that he has said he's sorry when he made an obvious mistake. (leader B) on the other hand is very flirtatious when he thanks the female colleagues...or someone who he thinks he needs to please like a new client for example...And he doesn't apologize for his mistakes either...The fault is always someone else's.”
“...(leader A) does give us the silent treatment sometimes when he's angry...There's nobody here who will start throwing chairs but when he's not happy with someone...he will avoid the person and won't make an eye contact with him...”.

Creative criticism was described as vitally important by all interview group's members. It was also widely utilized among the employees which came obvious from arguments such as

“I like to ask other employees' opinions often about important decisions in my work. Getting a second opinion helps to see things that your own eyes don't catch.”

The narcissistic leaders on the other hand, especially leader B, were told to sometimes give unnecessary criticism. Two employees described a situation where leader B wanted to move a scenery object within a digital composition to the side by few pixels, which made artistically or practically absolutely no difference from the point-of-view of the whole composition. Additional questions revealed that such events tended to happen in the presence of external people. One employee commented

“You know, I think I've noticed this. Especially when new people are around...he (leader B) likes to boss us around then by telling us where to go or to change few trivial things to make himself look like he's the boss.”

4.4 Civic Virtue

Civic virtue turned out to be a dimension influenced by narcissistic leadership. All interviewees described their enthusiasm to make their voice actively heard in decision making, but this was not met with similar enthusiasm by all of the leaders. Leader A and leader B were both described as being more careless towards other people's opinions and ideas than leader C and leader D. Leader A was even told to have an ignorant attitude towards employees ideas. In the past the desire from the employees to participate into production brainstorming had resulted a company day within the joint venture when all employees were allowed to come up with production ideas. As a result, leader A had rejected every single idea and has ever since used that as an excuse for his conclusion that employees are a useless source
for idea creation. In practice this meant that employees were not allowed to influence any decisions that were related to the responsibilities of leader A. The employees felt they had limited possibilities to influence the decisions of leader B, but the interviews indicated that he was more eager to showing green light toward ideas that benefited also him personally. Leader C and D were described as more capable of considering the viewpoints of the employees and making less-selfish decisions.

Sensitivity to criticism was another separating factor between non-narcissistic and narcissistic leaders. Leader A was described as practically intolerant to any kind of criticism which resulted him sometimes using silent treatment towards those whose feedback he did not like. Leader B did not show such extreme hostility towards criticism, but defended strongly his viewpoints in ways that some of the employees felt as childish. As a result, the majority of the employees felt they had reduced their activity towards attempting to influence organizational life and execution of work in ways that involved the narcissistic leaders.

Guarding the well-being of the organization by monitoring the operating environment and the inner workings of the organization on the other hand could be described as being on equal levels under the leadership of all of the leaders. The employees saw the well-being of the organization being positively linked to their own well-being as organizational citizens. Thus from their perspective it would be considered as acting against their own personal best to seize from guarding the inner and outer environment of the organization.

4.5 Self-development and Individual Initiative

Self-developing was another dimension of organizational citizenship behaviors that narcissistic leadership did not seem to distort. During the interviews each and every interviewee commented that self-development had a major role in their profession. Self-development was described as a constant process which was essential to keeping up with the latest trends, techniques and technologies used in the field. An employee said that
“Our profession is all about continuous self-learning...I'm constantly sucking influences from TV, movies, art festivals, other types of art, nature, paintings....to get new ideas and to also see what colleagues are doing elsewhere.”

Another employee commented similarly saying

“Stopping learning or developing skills are among the worst things one can do in this profession for one's own future. Stagnation means becoming obsolete. Everything is evolving, the methods, the equipment, the applications, the tastes of the audience, everything.”

Self-developing was described equally necessary for securing customer projects where the customer typically wanted the production to reflect the latest trends. The same applied for in-house productions, but in this case was more related to learning new technologies and techniques instead of copying existing trends as the freedom for artistic impression was then greater.

While discussing the usefulness of reducing self-development one employee compared it to self-harming by saying

“It's as useful as cutting your own arm off.”

Such comments together with previous conclusions gave hints of why leadership narcissism did not affect employee self-development negatively in the research case. It seems that self-development is among the interview group's employees done primarily for self-benefiting reasons. It will then benefit other colleagues and finally then organization and its leaders. Therefore employees in such a case do not have a strong enough motive for reducing the level of self-development since it will equally harm the individual and his colleagues as it will harm the organization and the leaders.

The very same analysis is also coherent with the dimension of individual initiative. Creativity in problem solving in employees' work, general level of their artistic impression and voluntarism for additional work were not negative affected by narcissistic leadership. The response of one of the employees reflects the plausible core reason for this when he said
“Every single piece of work that I do here I can put into my portfolio and show to a client or a future employer...”.

So once again, if the employees would reduce their creativity in improving their own work, improving the performance of the organization, or would not commit to additional tasks that in the end may also benefit them personally in ways such that projects are finished faster or achieve higher quality, they would harm their selves by doing so since what they do artistically, how they do it and how much they do it, reflect their level of professionalism. Majority of the employees in the interview group considered their portfolio as more important than their curriculum vitae.

What was however affected by narcissistic leadership was to some degree the creative ways how individual organizational citizens improved performance of the organization. This was because leader A and leader B were more reluctant to hear about such ideas if the ideas did not benefit them personally. And because leader A believed that such tasks are the responsibility of the leaders and not of the employees. Therefore similarly civic virtue, the employees were here limited to improving the performance of the organization in ways that did not directly involve their narcissistic leaders.
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This final chapter of the paper will conclude the research. It will evaluate the research process by reflecting the achieved answers to the research questions and assesses the validity, reliability, and limitations of the research. Here are also briefly discussed the theoretical and managerial conclusions of this research. Finally, suggestions for future studies are given to further continue the research on the research topic of narcissistic leadership and its impact on organizational citizenship behaviors.

5.1 Theoretical and Managerial Conclusions

The first research question was essentially theoretical by nature. It was established to help the construction of the theoretical framework. It was formulated as

1. How leader's personality traits are connected to employees' organizational citizenship behaviors?

The answer to this question is concluded and illustrated in figure 1 in chapter 2.2. Personality traits, which are specific sets of stable preoccupied mental patterns, shape individual's leadership style through affecting decision making and behavior. These further impact organizational effectiveness via a proximal impact on the context of the leadership. On individual level this will shape attitudes and behaviors of individual employees. On team level team dynamics and team climate will be affected. On organizational level the leadership style shaped by leader's personality traits influences organizational structure and strategy. The proximal effect on organizational level also further shape the individual and group level contexts, which together commit to the level and form of employee organizational citizenship behaviors.

The second research question pursued answer to the question

2. What are the characteristics of narcissistic (transformational) leadership?
This research found out that narcissism distorted severely several characteristics of transformational leadership. The individual characteristic which were studied in this research were listed earlier in table 2 in chapter 2.2.2. The extent of the list made this research one of the most exhaustive studies on the topic today.

Among the employees who were less in contact with narcissistic leaders were only able to see the positive image of such leadership. Here the narcissistic leaders were idolized as charismatic and inspiring, being full of enthusiasm, having solid authority and a strong execution in their role. They delivered daring visions with child-like enthusiasm. The far-reaching yet simple nature of such visions made them sound like the leader knew exactly what they were doing and that the employees were going to be part of something big. Therefore narcissistic leadership in its early stage clearly boosted the transformational leadership mechanisms of idealized influence and inspirational motivation. These conclusions give support to the views of DuBrin (2012: 109), Yildiz & Öncer (2012: 212), and Kets de Vries & Miller (1997: 211) that narcissistic leadership is not solely a form of dark leadership since it can also to some limited degree be beneficial. Therefore the results of this research are contradictory to the significant majority of narcissistic leadership studies. The results suggest that future researches should not automatically assume narcissism having only a negative effect on leadership. Neither should narcissistic leadership be assumed to have a negative impact on the performance of employees by default.

However, narcissistic leadership did not appear to have a similar positive early-stage influence on the mechanisms of intellectual stimulation and individual consideration. The narcissistic leaders did not appear as particularly open to new ideas, or to promote creative problem solving, or new ways of working. Nor did they appear as tolerable towards mistakes but instead blamed everybody else but themselves for problems or denied them all together. The employees did not perceive the narcissistic leaders as mentors, but separate players in the team with a large power distance. The relationship to non-narcissistic leaders was closer. There was no real individual consideration from narcissistic leaders towards employees in addition to complimenting.
Longer time-frame made the employees more aware of the true nature of narcissistic leadership. This happened when the employees began to see the negative side effects of such leadership and it became apparent that narcissistic leaders were not able to sustain anymore the illusion they had made of themselves. The employees started to see the leaders' inability to achieve unrealistic visions and this was also linked to unnecessary and unsuccessful risk taking. It increased the impression that the leaders were not equally in control of the situation as they should be and in control of the heading of the projects as they had assured. When knowledge on unethical conducts of the leaders surfaced, the respect, admiration and trust towards the narcissistic leaders sunk drastically. These together indicate clearly that the transformational leadership mechanisms of idealized influence and inspirational motivation were significantly negatively affected by narcissistic leadership in the long run. Therefore in long-run the results support the arguments of Judge et al. (2006: 768-773) in that narcissism is negatively related to leadership efficiency evaluations that are given by other people than the narcissistic leaders themselves.

Also the mechanisms of intellectual stimulation and individual consideration became increasingly negatively affected, but not to the same degree as the two prior transformational mechanisms. Narcissistic leaders were not keen on new ways of working and doing things unless the ideas were beneficial for them personally or the ideas were their creations to begin with. Ideas competing with their personal ideas were not met with open minds. Especially criticism was the heel of Achilles for narcissistic leaders. They provided unnecessary creative criticism, were resistant to blame and used denial when they were accused of making a mistake. No mentor relationship evolved between the narcissistic leaders and their employees. On the other hand the non-narcissistic leaders were seem as mentors by few employees who had an especially close professional relationship with them. Narcissistic leaders were able to delegate tasks efficiently, but fell short in being good listeners and considering the views of their colleagues. Therefore these conclusions together support the arguments of Resick et al. (2009: 1365) that narcissistic leaders fall short in displaying and executing successfully transformation leadership.

Finally, the third research question was formulated as
3. In what way narcissistic (transformational) leadership affects employee organizational citizenship behaviors?

The achieved empirical results indicate that narcissistic leadership can have a significant negative impact on employee organizational citizenship behaviors. The effect is however not straightforward in any sense. First of all, the influence is dependent on the stage to which the employee's perception of the narcissistic leadership has evolved. The level of interaction between an employee and a narcissistic leader becomes crucial. Those employees who only see the side of narcissistic leadership where such leaders seem to seemingly excel can perceive it as positively stimulating for their expression of organizational citizenship behaviors. Those who on the other hand are aware of the dark characteristics of narcissistic leadership seem as even more eager to inhibit the expression of their organizational citizenship behaviors.

Secondly and most importantly, not all dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors are equally affected by narcissistic leadership. Instead there appears to be a specific pattern of what organizational citizenship behavior dimensions are influenced by narcissism and to which extent. This is illustrated in figure 2 and it is the most important research contribution of this research since similar conclusions especially based on empirical qualitative data appear not to have been published before. All of the narcissism-flavored transformation mechanisms affect the organizational citizenship behavior dimension of organizational loyalty, but especially influential is the skewed charismatic-inspirational mechanism. Of the individual conducts, unethical behavior has the most dramatic negative effect on organizational loyalty. The dimension of helping behavior is primarily affected by narcissism distorted mechanism of individual consideration. Employees that find themselves unable to influence their work and organizational life through decision making and feedback due to their narcissistic leaders are likely to tone down their participation to related helping behavior that is directed towards the organization, but not towards other employees. The same reason, employees' lack of ability to affect their , is also behind the negative effect which narcissistic intellectual stimulation has on individual initiative. Under narcissistic leadership civic virtue is mainly negatively influenced by the lack of execution of the leader behavior related to the
mechanism of intellectual stimulation. The dimension of sportsmanship is primarily influenced by the charismatic-inspirational mechanism and similar to organizational loyalty the strongest negative effect results from unethical leadership behavior. Interestingly none of the transformational leadership mechanisms seemed to have a particularly all-encompassing negative influence on the dimensions of organizational compliance, and self-development. As discussed in chapter 4, it appears that employees are reluctant to reduce the exhibition of those citizenship behaviors that can cause self-harm. Instead, they choose to truncate organizational citizen behaviors which have their primary negative effects on the leader and on the parts of the organizational entity that do not consider the employees personally as organizational citizens.

![Figure 2. Influence of narcissistic transformational leadership mechanisms on employee organizational citizenship behavior dimensions](image)

### 5.2 Reliability, Validity and Limitations of the Research

As the conducted research was a qualitative study that concentrated on subjective perceptions the abilities to verify its reliability are rather limited although not completely exhausted. According to Hirsjärvi & Hurme (2009: 186) reliability can be achieved through repeatability of the research results. In this research the structured questionnaire that was based on Narcissistic Personality Inventory provides full repeatability since the results can be effortlessly repeated can recreated using the questions found from appendix 2. Also, all of the leaders who participated to this research answered the questionnaire twice, first using the shorter 16-item version of the questionnaire and later the full 40-item version. Comparison between the results
of the questionnaires indicated reliability of the data collection method since variance between the answers was +/-1 point for an individual respondent. When it comes to the semi-structured theme interviews, each of the interviewees were interviewed twice to increase the reliability. Employees that had worked at least a year with the narcissistic leaders gave consistent answers between the two interviews which indicates for example that the questions were successfully formulated and executed. There was a variance between the results of the two interviews among the freelancers, but this was thought to result from changed perception and from change in leader-follower relationship rather than from faulty data collection method. What supported this was the fact that neither of the data collection methods seemed to provide random or thoroughly inconsistent results. Still, the social constructionist nature of an interview and the interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee during the data gathering impacted reliability negatively (Hirsjärvi & Hurme 2009: 189). Reliability is further attempted to increase by describing the research process in this paper in detail. This gives other researchers the ability to replicate the research setting. However, the fact that the interviewees do not wish to identify themselves or the case organization means that the exact setting and the results of this research cannot be exhaustively repeated.

Similarly, several efforts were made to increase the validity of the research (Hirsjärvi & Hurme 2009: 187). Used source literature was based on either peer-reviewed scientific articles published in major scientific databases or on books that were published by widely recognized publisher with expertise specifically in academic literature. No articles with less than 100 citations were used. Structural validity was fostered by basing all concepts used in the theoretical framework on existing researches that enjoyed wider academic verification. Validity of the structured questionnaires was maximized by using pre-formulated questions that had been widely academically verified. The validity of the semi-structured theme interview questions was enhanced by formulating the questions using the guidelines of Hirsjärvi & Hurme (2009: 48-53) as described earlier in chapter 3. All the questions were further build around the academically verified concepts that were used in the theoretical framework. When it comes to collected data, the validity of the data gathered using the theme interviews is supported by the fact that all of the interviewees worked in the same physical place at the same time and under the
leadership of the same leaders. Full internal validity was impossible to achieve since all external factors affecting the research setting was impossible to exclude. The presence and influence of the interviewer on the interviewees during the interviews is one such example. Based on the type of data that the interviews were able to collect, the interviewees seemed to be able to freely express their opinions without external influence. External validity of the research is hindered by the fact that the results of this research cannot be directly generalized because of its quantitative nature and limited size of the sample. However, the number of people participating to the interviews was optimized by using 15 persons which corresponds the recommended amount of participants that Hirsjärvi & Hume (2009: 53) suggest for a qualitative study. The number further seems fitting since it represents a large partition of the total number of employees working under the leadership of the narcissistic leaders as described in chapter 3. Another important measure for external validity is if interpretations and conclusions are aligned with the collected data (Eskola & Suoranta 2008: 213). To support this the source data, data collection methods, analysis process, and the reasoning behind the conclusions were explained in detail in the past chapters.

Finally, a number of limitations apply to the conducted research. The level of narcissism of the employees was not assessed due to time constraints. Because of this it is impossible to say if elevated narcissism among the employees has affected their responses during the interview, or their organizational citizenship behavior under narcissistic leadership. Michel & Bowling (2012: 93, 100-103) argue that exhibiting narcissistic behavior can yield similar behavior in other highly narcissistic persons. Further, the chosen research perspective dictated that this study will explore narcissistic leadership and employee organizational citizenship behavior only through the perspective of employees. As leader were not interviewed and their behavior was not monitored for the purposes of this research, it is not possible to conclusively say whether or not the employee perceptions on the narcissistic characteristics of their leader were accurate. Using multi-stakeholder perspective could solve this problem. What supports this is also the notion that the narcissistic leaders seemed to direct specifically some of the negative traits of narcissistic transformational leadership towards other targets than their current employees. For example the inability to sustain long-term relationships seemed more common
towards clients and past employees. This made it difficult to measure such occurrences among current employees. Also what may have further altered the results is the fact that none of the employees in the interview group had conceptual knowledge of narcissistic leadership and their prior knowledge on narcissism was very limited.

5.3 Suggestions for Future Research

This research paved way for further studies around the same topic. The discovery that narcissistic leadership affects the dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors asymmetrically is a specific way needs further quantitative and qualitative validation. More empirical studies are needed to see if employees deploy similar tactics concerning the preservation of certain organizational citizenship behavior dimensions to avoid self-harm, while reducing of those citizenship behaviors that benefit primarily the organization and the leader. More research is also needed to see how strongly employees associate their leader to resemble the totality of the organization when they inhibit the latter type organizational citizenship behaviors.

The results achieved in this research clearly indicate that future researches on narcissistic leadership need to consider also the seemingly positive characteristics of such leadership and not solely see it as a form of toxic leadership. Further, the results suggest that the power distance between leader and follower should be taken into consideration. This is because the empirical results showed that those employees, who more actively interacted with their leader, can have a completely different perception of their narcissistic leader and of the effectiveness of such leadership, than those employees who more seldom are in such contact with their leader.
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# LITERATURE RESEARCH RESULTS

## Table 3. Search results for EBSCO Business Source Complete – All result types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms</th>
<th>Publication period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership AND narcissism / narcissistic</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational citizenship behaviors AND narcissism /</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narcissistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB AND narcissism / narcissistic</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EBSCO Business Source Complete (2017)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms</th>
<th>Publication period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership AND narcissism / narcissistic</td>
<td>46 / 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational citizenship behaviors AND narcissism / narcissistic</td>
<td>72 / 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB AND narcissism / narcissistic</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: JSTOR (2017)
Table 5. Search results for SAGE Journals – All result types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms</th>
<th>Publication period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1987 – 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997 – 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007 – 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership AND narcissism / narcissistic</td>
<td>418 / 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>769 / 782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1348 / 1309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational citizenship behaviors AND narcissism / narcissistic</td>
<td>78 / 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110 / 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>265 / 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB AND narcissism / narcissistic</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 / 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SAGE Journals (2017)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms</th>
<th>Publication period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership AND narcissism / narcissistic</td>
<td>212 / 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational citizenship behaviors</td>
<td>10 / 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND narcissism / narcissistic</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Springer Link (2017)
QUESTIONNAIRE USED TO IDENTIFY NARCISSISTIC LEADERS

Answer the following questions by choosing either A or B based on which of the two alternatives best describes you as a person and a leader.

QUESTION 1

A) I have a natural talent for influencing people.
B) I am not good at influencing people.

QUESTION 2

A) Modesty doesn't become me.
B) I am essentially a modest person.

QUESTION 3

A) I would do almost anything on a dare.
B) I tend to be a fairly cautious person.

QUESTION 4

A) When people compliment me I sometimes get embarrassed.
B) I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so.

QUESTION 5

A) The thought of ruling the world frightens the hell out of me.
B) If I ruled the world it would be a better place.

QUESTION 6

A) I can usually talk my way out of anything.
B) I try to accept the consequences of my behavior.
QUESTION 7
A) I prefer to blend in with the crowd.
B) I like to be the center of attention.

QUESTION 8
A) I will be a success.
B) I am not too concerned about success.

QUESTION 9
A) I am no better or worse than most people.
B) I think I am a special person.

QUESTION 10
A) I am not sure if I would make a good leader.
B) I see myself as a good leader.

QUESTION 11
A) I am assertive.
B) I wish I were more assertive.

QUESTION 12
A) I like to have authority over other people.
B) I don't mind following orders.

QUESTION 13
A) I find it easy to manipulate other people.
B) I don't like it when I find myself manipulating people.

QUESTION 14
A) I insist upon getting the respect that is due me.
B) I usually get the respect that I deserve.
QUESTION 15

A) I don't particularly like to show off my body.
B) I like to show off my body.

QUESTION 16

A) I can read people like a book.
B) People are sometimes hard to understand.

QUESTION 17

A) If I feel competent I am willing to take responsibility for making decisions.
B) I like to take responsibility for making decisions.

QUESTION 18

A) I just want to be reasonably happy.
B) I want to amount to something in the eyes of the world.

QUESTION 19

A) My body is nothing special.
B) I like to look at my body.

QUESTION 20

A) I try not to be a show off.
B) I will usually show off if I get the chance.

QUESTION 21

A) I always know what I am doing.
B) Sometimes I am not sure of what I am doing.
QUESTION 22

A) I sometimes depend on people to get things done.
B) I rarely depend on anyone else to get things done.

QUESTION 23

A) Sometimes I tell good stories.
B) Everybody likes to hear my stories.

QUESTION 24

A) I expect a great deal from other people.
B) I like to do things for other people.

QUESTION 25

A) I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve.
B) I take my satisfactions as they come.

QUESTION 26

A) Compliments embarrass me.
B) I like to be complimented.

QUESTION 27

A) I have a strong will to power.
B) Power for its own sake doesn't interest me.

QUESTION 28

A) I don't care about new fads and fashion.
B) I like to start new fads and fashion.

QUESTION 29

A) I like to look at myself at the mirror.
B) I am not particularly interested in looking at myself in the mirror.
QUESTION 30
A) I really like to be the center of attention.
B) It makes me uncomfortable to be the center of attention.

QUESTION 31
A) I can live my life in any way I want to.
B) People can't always live their lives in terms of what they want.

QUESTION 32
A) Being an authority doesn't mean that much to me.
B) People always seem to recognize my authority.

QUESTION 33
A) I would prefer to be a leader.
B) It makes little difference to me whether I am a leader or not.

QUESTION 34
A) I am going to be a great person.
B) I hope I am going to be successful.

QUESTION 35
A) People sometimes believe what I tell them.
B) I can make anybody believe anything I want them to.

QUESTION 36
A) I am a born leader.
B) Leadership is a quality that takes a long time to develop.

QUESTION 37
A) I wish somebody would someday write my biography.
B) I don't like people to pry into my life for any reason.
QUESTION 38

A) I get upset when people don't notice how I look when I go out in public.
B) I don't mind blending into the crowd when I go out in public.

QUESTION 39

A) I am more capable than other people.
B) There is a lot that I can learn from other people.

QUESTION 40

A) I am much like everybody else.
B) I am an extraordinary person.

Source: Rasking & Terry (1988: 894)
Appendix 3

SEMI-STRUCTURED QUESTION TEMPLATE USED TO INTERVIEW EMPLOYEES

PREPARATIONS

1) Give interviewee an introduction to research purpose, data collection methods, data confidentiality

2) Turn on the recorder

INTERVIEW

1) Employee introduction
   • Position in the joint venture + skills
   • Work experience with current leader + general amount of work experience
   • Participation to present projects
   • Participation to project management + decision making

2) Describe your leaders when it comes to
   • First impression and charisma
   • Style of leadership
   • Interesting visions vs. realistic execution
   • Giving and getting feedback
   • Receiving and giving criticism
   • Asking for opinion + asking for help
   • Risk taking
   • Concern for others
   • Showmanship
   • Long-term relationships with clients and employees
OCB UNDER LEADERSHIP

1) Discuss the exhibition of organizational leadership behaviors

- Organizational loyalty
- Organizational compliance
- Sportsmanship
- Helping behavior
- Civic virtue
- Self-developing
- Individual initiative