

MANAGEMENT DERAILMENT

Personality Assessment and Mitigation

Joyce Hogan, Hogan Assessment Systems
Robert Hogan, Hogan Assessment Systems
Robert B. Kaiser, Kaplan DeVries Inc.



THE SCIENCE OF PERSONALITY

Introduction

The vast body of research on management and leadership that has accumulated over the past 100 years leads to two very different conclusions. On the one hand, many people believe that the effort has largely been wasted. For example, Hamel (2008) argued that the modern study of management is stagnant and out of date, and Khurana (2007) argued that attempts to create a science of management have failed. In an effort to provide guidance to practitioners, Kramer (2008, p. 26) reviewed the leadership literature, commented that it is "a strange mixture of alchemy, romantic idealism, and reason," and concluded that the lack of consistent, actionable findings prompts some business people "to wash their hands of the whole subject, talent shortage or no talent shortage."

Other reviewers believe that there are recognized principles of management that can be used to enhance organizational performance (cf. Fayol, 1949). For instance, Bloom and Van Reenen (2007) studied the performance of 732 manufacturing firms in the United States, Great Britain, France, and Germany and found that a firm's financial performance was a function of the degree to which it followed "well-established management practices" in the areas of operations, performance management, and talent management. The more profitable companies enhanced operations through continuous improvement, setting clear performance goals, monitoring and reviewing performance, and aligning incentives with performance. Bloom and Van Reenen replicated these findings using an additional 3,268 firms, including a large sample from Asia. Four of their conclusions are worth noting. First, there are, in fact, some well established principles of management. Second, the companies that use these principles are more profitable than those who do not. Third, senior leadership decides whether or not to use effective management practices. And finally, the best run companies are multinationals; the worst run companies are government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and companies managed by second generation family members.

The economic literature clearly shows that good management enhances organizational performance and that some managers are better than others. However, Kramer (2008) and other critics are also right—there is little consensus in the psychological literature regarding the characteristics of good managers (cf. Hogan, 2007, pp. 106-109). In contrast, the research on bad managers converges rather well. Across studies with different methodologies and in different organizations and national cultures, and across organizational level, the data show that failed managers have bad judgment, can not build teams, have troubled relationships, and can not manage themselves or learn from their mistakes. This research is important for both economic and moral reasons.

The Cost of Bad Managers

When managers fail, it costs time and resources to replace them. Lombardo reported that, in 1985, two *Fortune 500* organizations asked him for advice on preventing leadership failure (cf. Lombardo, Ruderman, & McCauley, 1988, p. 201). These organizations estimated the cost of a failed executive was \$500,000. Adjusted for inflation, that figure is about \$1 million in 2009. Similarly, a poll of senior human resource executives estimated the cost of derailment to be between \$750,000 and \$1.5 million per senior manager (DeVries & Kaiser, 2003). Another study estimated the cost of a failed executive to be as high as \$2.7 million (Smart, 1999). These costs will grow as the talent pool shrinks (Michaels, Handfield-Jones, & Axelrod, 2001). There are also hidden costs of bad management in the form of golden parachutes, lost intellectual and social capital, missed business objectives, and disengaged employees.

Managerial incompetence has serious moral implications because bad managers cause great misery for their subordinates (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), a division of the Centers for Disease Control (itself a division of the National Institutes of Health), published a report in 1999 containing some alarming data

(NIOSH, 1999). For example, 40% of American workers report that their jobs are very or extremely stressful, and NIOSH concluded that problems at work are more strongly associated with health complaints than any other life stressor, including finances and family problems. Next, consider that organizational climate surveys routinely show that about 75% of working adults report that the most stressful aspect of their job is their immediate boss (Hogan, 2007, p. 106).

Academic research supports these findings. Ashforth (1994), Tepper (2000), and Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, Aasland, and Hetland (2007) trace the empirical links between bad managers and employee stress—Kelloway, Sivanathan, Francis, and Barling (2005) provide a fine review of this literature. Bad managers are a major health hazard; they impose enormous medical costs on society and degrade the quality of life of many people.

Base Rate of Bad Managers

In the 1980s, the conventional wisdom held that the base rate of managerial incompetence was less than 10% (D.P. Campbell, personal communication, 1982). More recent research indicates that this figure was a serious underestimate. In an internet survey of 245 employed adults, Curphy asked: (a) how many bosses have you worked for? and (b) how many of those bosses would you be willing to work for again? Respondents reported that they were willing to work for only 38% of their former bosses (Curphy, 2008). These results are consistent with several published estimates of the frequency of managerial failure.

Table 1 summarizes 12 published estimates of the base rate of managerial failure, which range from 30% to 67%, with an average of about 50%. These estimates are remarkably consistent despite the fact that they come from distinctly different sources, including documented failure rates in publicly traded companies (e.g., Bentz, 1985a; Shipper & Wilson, 1992), estimates provided by senior executives from a variety of for-profit and nonprofit organizations (e.g., Sessa, Kaiser, Taylor, & Campbell, 1998), estimates provided by organizational

consultants (e.g., Charan, 2005; Smart, 1999), and estimates provided by organizational researchers (e.g., Milliken-Davies, 1992). Based on the data, we conclude that two-thirds of existing managers are insufferable and at least half will eventually be fired.

Causes of Incompetence

Where It Started

V. Jon Bentz (1967, 1985a, 1985b, 1990) pioneered the study of managerial derailment. In a 30-year study of failed managers at Sears Roebuck and Company, Bentz (1985a) noted that they were uniformly bright and socially skilled. They failed because they: (1) lacked business skills, (2) were unable to deal with complexity, (3) were reactive and tactical, (4) were unable to delegate, (5) were unable to build a team, (6) were unable to maintain relationships with a network of contacts, (7) let emotions cloud their judgment, (8) were slow to learn, and (9) had an "overriding personality defect."

The Center for Creative Leadership's Research

In the 1980s, the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) began studying derailment. McCall and Lombardo (1983) replicated Bentz's findings by interviewing 20 senior executives from three corporations. Each executive gave two interviews, one about a "successful" executive and one about a "derailed" executive, all of whom were male. Derailed executives were defined as "people who were very successful in their careers (spanning 20-30 years and reaching very high levels) but who, in the eyes of the organization, did not live up to their full potential... One thing they had in common, however, was that their halted progression was not voluntary" (McCall & Lombardo, 1983, pp. 1-2). The successful and the derailed executives were all bright, were identified early, had outstanding records of achievement, had few faults, and were ambitious and willing to sacrifice. The groups differed in that the successful executives had more

diverse accomplishments, handled stress with composure, handled mistakes with grace, involved others in problem solving, and could get along with a wide range of people.

In contrast, the derailed executives failed for ten reasons: (1) specific business problems; (2) insensitivity (abrasive, intimidating, bully); (3) cold, aloof, arrogant; (4) betrayed trust; (5) overmanaging—failed to delegate; (6) overly ambitious; (7) failed to staff effectively; (8) unable to think strategically; (9) unable to adapt to a boss with a different style; and (10) overly dependent on an advocate or mentor. McCall and Lombardo (1983, p. 6) pointed out that the "most frequent cause for derailment was insensitivity to others. Under stress, the derailed managers became abrasive and intimidating." Crucially, every derailed manager in this sample had relationship problems (reported in Morrison, White, & Van Velsor, 1987).

Morrison et al. (1987) replicated and extended the McCall and Lombardo (1983) study by comparing derailed and successful women executives in 25 organizations. The results closely paralleled the findings with men. The problems, in order of most frequently mentioned, were: (1) unable to adapt to a new boss, (2) performance problems, (3) too ambitious, (4) can't manage subordinates, (5) poor relationships, (6) not strategic, and (7) having a poor image. Only the last theme was unique to women, and relationship problems were somewhat less common for the derailed women. These results suggest that, although there may be some differences in emphasis, the causes of derailment are similar for male and female managers.

Lombardo, et al. (1988) extended and replicated their interview studies using quantitative methods. noting that early research defined failure as a lack of success (see, for example, Boyatzis, 1982; Bray & Howard, 1983; Dunnette, 1967; Thornton & Byham, 1982). They proposed that failure may be less about lacking "the right stuff" and more about having "the wrong stuff"—dysfunctional characteristics associated with failure. They also proposed focusing on failure at the middle to executive level, not on the "weeding out process that occurs at the lower levels" (p. 200). Lombardo, et al. reviewed four well done qualitative studies which

concluded that derailment results from personality defects, troubled relationships, inability to build a team, and failures of leadership. Note the personality and relationship themes in these derailment factors.

Lombardo et al. (1988) then conducted two studies to develop a standardized survey for evaluating behaviors that distinguished successful from derailed managers. The first study concerned right stuff factors and was based on bosses' ratings for 169 upper-level managers, 83 of whom had derailed. Factor analysis of behavioral items reflecting positive skills, knowledge, and attitudes yielded eight scales: (1) Handling business complexity; (2) Directing, motivating, and developing subordinates; (3) Honor; (4) Drive for excellence; (5) Organizational savvy; (6) Composure; (7) Sensitivity; and (8) Staffing. The average scores for all eight scales were lower for the derailed managers compared to the other managers; the greatest difference was for Directing, motivating, and developing subordinates.

In the second study, McCauley and Lombardo (1990) created a survey to measure the wrong stuff using six scales derived from factor analysis of bosses' ratings on items intended to represent the themes found in the qualitative studies by McCall and Lombardo (1983) and Morrison et al. (1987). A subsequent review by Zedeck (1995) concluded that the psychometric properties of these scales were adequate. The scales were (1) Problems with interpersonal relationships (sample item, "Has left a trail of bruised people"), (2) Difficulty in molding a staff ("Is not good at building a team"), (3) Difficulty in making strategic transitions ("Can't make the mental transition from technical manager to general manager"), (4) Lack of follow-through ("Makes a splash and moves on without really completing a job"), (5) Over-dependence ("Has chosen to stay with the same boss too long"), and (6) Strategic differences with management ("Could not handle a conflict with a bad boss"). Using bosses' ratings for over 300 middle- to upper-level managers from eight organizations, the researchers found that five of the six scales were significantly correlated with independent assessments made by senior management of

likelihood to derail in the next five years. The sixth scale, Strategic differences with management, was only weakly related to such likelihood.

Van Velsor and Leslie (1995) replicated the earlier research to determine whether the findings generalized across other national cultures and time. They conducted an interview study using the same methodology as the McCall and Lombardo (1983) and Morrison et al. (1987) studies. The sample included successful and derailed executives from 39 organizations in Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Two noteworthy findings stood out: first, the themes that distinguished derailed executives mirrored those found in the prior studies, including the problem of troubled relationships. Second, the same themes appeared in the European and the American samples. Thus, derailment research generalizes across time, organizations, and cultures.

Van Velsor and Leslie (1995) also compared the results of their cross-cultural study with the previous studies and identified four themes to classify the specific behaviors associated with derailment in each: (1) Problems with interpersonal relationships, (2) Failure to meet business objectives, (3) Failure to build and lead a team, and (4) Inability to change or adapt during a transition. Van Velsor and Leslie (1995) also noted that the four themes were related—"the inability to build and lead a team may have led to a failure to meet business objectives... (or) be a function of some of the more personality- or relationship-oriented factors" (p. 66). They also noted that the stress associated with adapting to change—be it organizational complexity, uncertainty, downsizing, etc.—increases the relationship problems associated with derailment.

McCall and Hollenbeck (2002) studied a sample of global executives living and working in foreign cultures and found that the usual behaviors were linked to derailment abroad. McCall and Hollenbeck made two further observations. First, the causes of derailment for the global executives seemed paradoxical: some failed expatriate executives were arrogant, while others were too humble; some were autocratic dictators, while others delegated too much; some were

mired in technical details and tactical problems, while others were "too visionary" to get anything done. Second, a strength in one culture could become a fatal flaw elsewhere: "What worked splendidly in one culture could bring disaster in the next. Global transitions required reassessing, sometimes letting go, sometimes adding to, sometimes both, but rarely staying the course" (McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002, p. 6). They concluded that expatriate leadership requires adapting to the local customs and culture, again pointing to the role of versatility and adapting to change.

Eichinger and Lombardo (2003) conducted a predictive study of managerial failure in the U.S. Based on 360-degree feedback ratings for over 1,000 managers and subsequent changes in employment status during a two-year period, they reported that managers fail for the following reasons: (1) poor administrative skills, (2) difficulty making tough choices, (3) lack of strategic thinking, (4) failure to build a team, (5) lack of interpersonal savvy, (6) poor political skills, (7) an inability to deal with conflict, (8) questionable integrity, and (9) low self-awareness. Again, note the prevalence of interpersonal themes. The authors also reported that derailed managers gave themselves better ratings than their coworkers did. Eichinger recently summarized their findings as indicating that "derailment is mostly fueled by a lack of emotional intelligence and learning agility" (Eichinger, Dai, & Tang, 2009, p. 25), emphasizing interpersonal problems and difficulty adapting to change.

In more recent CCL research, Gentry and colleagues have shown how relationship problems, leadership problems, and failure to adapt lead to the derailment of middle managers (Gentry, Hannum, Ekelund, & de Jong, 2007), university administrators (Gentry, Katz, & McFeeters, in press), managers of Hispanic descent (Gentry, Braddy, Fleenor, & Howard, 2008), and managers throughout the European Union (Gentry, Hannum, et al., 2007), as well as how derailing behaviors are linked to personality (Gentry, Mondore, & Cox, 2007). They also showed

that coworker ratings of self-awareness predict risk for derailment (Gentry et al., in press) and getting fired up to five years later (Gentry et al., 2007).

Gentry and Chappelow (2009) regard this more recent research as supporting McCall and Lombardo's (1983) original findings about the dynamics of derailment—that is, strengths that get managers promoted can become liabilities in more senior jobs, weaknesses that were tolerated early in a career eventually matter at more senior levels, success can go to one's head, and events beyond a manager's control can overwhelm intention and effort (i.e., bad luck). The authors noted that failure to adapt is more prominent in the later research; they attributed this to increased complexity and pace of change. Cross-cultural expatriate assignments, merger and acquisition activity, more sophisticated technology and capital markets, and faster rates of promotion that require shifts in behavior and perspective have put a premium on versatility. The old Darwinian rule applies to modern managers: adapt, migrate, or die.

In summary, CCL's derailment research was methodologically diverse, using quantitative and qualitative data, inductive and deductive approaches, and retrospective, cross-sectional, and predictive designs. Nonetheless, the research produced consistent findings across time, organizations, organizational levels, national culture, and even gender. The reasons managers fail involve poor business performance, leadership, self-control, and especially, relationship management. Moreover, these problems are often exacerbated by major change and periods of increased stress.

Other Perspectives

The popular literature contains many examples of failed leaders. Dixon's (1976) book, *On the Psychology of Military Incompetence*, provides heartbreaking accounts of military disasters caused by incompetent leadership. Finkelstein's (2003) review of business failures contains stories less tragic than Dixon's accounts, but reveals many of the same themes. Finkelstein

summarized his findings in terms of "the seven habits of spectacularly unsuccessful people" (p. 238):

1. Overestimating their strength and underestimating the strength of the competition
2. Putting personal interests ahead of company interests
3. Being arrogant and making reckless decisions
4. Eliminating anyone who might challenge their decisions
5. Ignoring operations while trying to manage their company's image
6. Minimizing difficult obstacles and not planning accordingly
7. Relying on outdated strategies and tactics

Pundits often attribute business failure to flawed strategy, but Charan and Colvin (1999) think it is poor execution, defined as "not getting things done, being indecisive, not delivering on commitments." Bossidy and Charan (2002) identify four causes of poor execution. In the first case, poor execution is caused by CEOs (and other executives) who do not understand the business and the capabilities of their staff. The second concerns not using sound management practices: setting clear goals, following up, rewarding good performance, and growing talent. The third cause is a culture that doesn't value execution. Finally, execution depends on putting the right people in the right jobs. Ultimately, then, poor execution results from a CEO's failure to fix "people problems" in a timely way. Charan and Colvin (1999) list several reasons CEOs typically give for not dealing with people problems, ranging from blind loyalty, to the belief that the problems are temporary, to pointing out how a problem executive is liked by Wall Street and the press. Berglas (2009) notes that CEOs use these reasons to excuse their bad staffing decisions and justify their unwillingness to assume responsibility for correcting those bad decisions.

Dotlich and Cairo (2003) list 11 characteristics associated with CEO failure: (1) arrogance, (2) melodrama, (3) volatility, (4) excessive caution, (5) habitual distrust, (6) aloofness, (7) mischievousness, (8) eccentricity, (9) passive resistance, (10) perfectionism, and

(11) eagerness to please. They further suggest that everyone has some of these tendencies, that CEOs are more vulnerable to them because of the pressure at the top of the pyramid, and that self-awareness can mitigate the influence of these tendencies on organizational effectiveness.

Rasch, Shen, Davies, and Bono (2008) developed a taxonomy of ineffective leadership behavior based on accounts provided by employees subjected to those behaviors. The study is notable for its methodological rigor: the researchers began with a content analysis of a large sample of subordinates' descriptions of observed destructive leadership behavior. They developed a coding scheme to classify these behaviors, and then confirmed the categories using survey items reflecting the behaviors in each. The resulting taxonomy is consistent with prior research: (1) Persistent people problems; (2) Poor emotional control; (3) Over-controlling; (4) Poor task performance; (5) Poor planning, organization, and/or communication; (6) Rumor-mongering and inappropriate use of information; (7) Procrastination; (8) Failure to consider human needs; and (9) Failure to manage and nurture talent. Three of their findings warrant special attention. First, they found no sex differences in the frequency of these behaviors. Second, the category of bad behavior that had the most toxic impact on staff morale was "Failure to consider human needs." Finally, the frequency of this behavior increased with organizational status; the more senior the manager, the more abusive the behavior.

Future directions

The research on managerial incompetence and derailment has produced consistent results. Study after study finds that a lack of self-awareness, relationship problems, poor leadership, bad business decisions, and trouble adapting to change predict failure. The relative importance of these themes differs somewhat from context to context (e.g., across cultures, women versus men). Future research should ask which derailment factors matter most in different circumstances, and why this is the case. For example, research suggests that relationship problems are prominent among middle managers, whereas failing to transition from

a tactical to a strategic mindset is more detrimental for executives (Kaiser, Craig, Overfield, & Yarborough, 2009). It is also likely that the relative importance of derailment risk factors varies across organizations with different cultures, similar to the cross-cultural findings (McCall & Hollenbeck, 2001). For example, a large financial institution with whom we worked concluded that volatile and unpredictable executives were most likely to derail whereas a high tech firm determined that arrogant, self-absorbed, and non-communicative executives were most likely to derail.

Summary

We have now come full circle. Every study of managerial failure reviewed above points to "overriding personality defects" (Bentz, 1985a) as a key issue. The reason these defects matter lies in the definition of leadership—the ability to build, maintain, and guide a team that can outperform the competition (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994; Hogan, 2007). Personality defects disrupt the interpersonal relationships needed to build and maintain a team and corrupt the judgment needed to guide its performance.

Deconstructing Bentz's Insight:

Defining Flawed Interpersonal Performance

In the early 1980s, a consensus emerged regarding the structure of normal personality. Following Goldberg (1981), this consensus is described as the Five-Factor Model (FFM) or the Big-Five. This model reflects the structure of observer ratings and the components are defined as follows: Factor I, Surgency (or Extraversion); Factor II, Agreeableness (or Interpersonal Sensitivity); Factor III, Conscientiousness (or Prudence), Factor IV, Emotional Stability (or Adjustment); and Factor V, Openness to Experience (or Inquisitiveness) (John, 1990). The FFM is a useful way to organize research on personality and leadership (cf. Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002).

The Dark Side of Personality

The FFM themes characterize people when they are at their best, and they define the "bright side" of personality (Hogan et al., 1994). Personality flaws, as identified by Bentz (1985a), characterize people when they are behaving badly; these flaws are referred to as the "dark side" of personality (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan, Raskin, & Fazzini, 1990). Both sets of characteristics are in the realm of normal personality; the dark side characteristics are undesirable in managers but do not meet clinical criteria for personality disorders.

Behaviors associated with the dark side include emotional outbursts, bullying, intimidation, arrogance, and excessive deference to authority (Furnham & Taylor, 2004). Persistently engaging in these behaviors will undermine a manager's ability to lead a high-functioning team. Everyone has a bright side and a dark side, and most aspiring managers have attractive bright sides that effectively mask their dark sides.

Dysfunctional dispositions, or the dark side of personality (cf. Conger, 1990), erode the effectiveness of managers and executives over time (Hogan, 2007; Hogan & Hogan, 2001). There are individual differences in the degree to which these tendencies emerge in any given situation—some people are more prone to such behavior than others. Moreover, status in organizations allows people more discretion in their actions; the more discretion, the more likely that the dark side will emerge (Kaiser & Hogan, 2007).

The Nature of Dysfunctional Dispositions

Where do dysfunctional dispositions come from? Sigmund Freud suggested that everyone is somewhat "neurotic," i.e., plagued by fear, guilt, and anxiety caused by a child's relations with its parents in the first five years of life (Hogan & Smither, 2001). Later theorists (Alfred Adler, Karen Horney, Harry Stack Sullivan, and others) argued that people's insecurities are caused by flawed interpersonal strategies, and that these flawed strategies can be best understood in terms

of peoples' expectations about how others will treat them, rather than in terms of unconscious conflicts.

Freud's claim that everyone is neurotic is empirically false (e.g., Renaud & Estes, 1961). However, the claim that early experience (in the family, school, and peer group) leaves almost everyone feeling inadequate about something is probably true. Analyses of the biographies of high-achieving managers and executives routinely identify themes of early life trauma and feelings of inadequacy (e.g., Berglas, 1986; Kaplan, Drath, & Kofodimos, 1991; Kaplan & Kaiser, in press; Kaiser & Kaplan, 2006). Thus, most people, including managers, feel insecure in certain situations, and they develop strategies for coping with these insecurities.

We encode our theories about other people in terms of *schemas*, which then allow us to navigate the social environment (Fong & Markus, 1982; Kihlstrom & Klein, 1994; Markus, 1977; Sedikides, 1993; Young, Klosko, & Weishaar, 2003). Schemas function automatically and outside conscious awareness; they serve as mental filters and heuristics that cause us to interpret information in ways that fit schema-relevant expectations (Baldwin, 1992); thus, schemas tend to be self-perpetuating. For example, people who were frequently criticized in childhood may develop schemas about how criticism is inevitable in social interaction and then interpret even innocuous feedback as criticism. To avoid being criticized, they may become perfectionistic and overly accommodating, which invites critique.

Dysfunctional dispositions reflect the effects of maladaptive schemas. Certain contingencies activate these schemas. First, the probability of dysfunctional behavior reflects the strength of the relevant underlying schema (Ayduk et al., 2000). Second, certain situational variables will elicit dysfunctional behavior. For example, fatigue, illness, and stress tax the mental resources needed for self-regulation, mindful behavioral choices, and impulse control (Baumeister & Heatherton, 1996). Boredom and a lack of social vigilance are also associated with troublesome interpersonal behavior—that is, "just being oneself." Dysfunctional behavior is

also more likely to appear in weak or ambiguous situations (Green & Sedikides, 2001; Koch, 2002), when a lack of checks and balances gives leaders too much latitude and discretion (Kaiser & Hogan, 2007), or in situations that resemble those that produced the schema in the first place (Kaiser & Kaplan, 2006). Finally, dysfunctional organizational culture can elicit dysfunctional behavior (Balthazard, Cooke, & Potter, 2006; VanFleet & Griffin, 2006). Thus, personality, situational, and organizational influences interact to potentiate dysfunctional behaviors (cf. Tett & Burnett, 2003; Tett & Guterman, 2000).

Taxonomies of Derailing Characteristics

We find it convenient to distinguish between derailing behaviors and their underlying interpersonal schemas—to distinguish what people do from why they do it. This parallels the distinction in philosophy of science between prediction and explanation. We can use current behavior to predict future behavior, and we can use schemas to explain the behavior. This distinction also runs through the empirical literature. For example, derailment research based on coworker interviews and 360-degree performance ratings focuses on behavior, whereas research in the personality tradition concerns syndromes—clusters of behavioral tendencies organized by schemas (e.g., Horney, 1950).

Behaviors Related to Derailment

Starting with Bentz (1985a), each of the studies reviewed above provided lists of behaviors associated with bad management. These data can be used to develop a taxonomy of derailment behavior. Hogan and Warrenfeltz (2003) offer a "domain model" as a way to organize leadership competency models—which themselves define clusters of behaviors related to effectiveness. Specifically, they propose that all existing leadership competency models can be organized in terms of four broad categories as follows:

1. Intrapersonal skills: self-awareness and self-control, emotional maturity, integrity
2. Interpersonal skills: social skill, empathy, and relationship development

3. Business skills: ability to plan, organize, monitor, and use resources
4. Leadership skills: ability to build and maintain a team, and lead through others

According to Hogan and Warrenfeltz (2003), this list reflects a developmental hierarchy beginning with intrapersonal skills and ending with leadership skills. Skills in each successive category build on those developed in previous categories: for example, maintaining positive relationships depends on self-control, effective leadership depends on knowing something about the business, and so on. Table 2 provides a taxonomy of derailment behaviors based on this domain model.

Three points about Table 2 are worth noting. First, all of the derailment factors can be classified in terms of the domain model. Second, the number of behaviors in each domain does not necessarily reflect the importance of the domain for failure. For example, relationship problems figure prominently in derailment (McCall & Lombardo, 1983; Morrison et al., 1987; Van Velsor & Leslie, 1995) and bad leadership (Rasch, et al., 2008), but there are fewer entries for the interpersonal skills than for business skills. Third, most analyses of derailment focus on proximal causes and ignore distal causes. This is especially so in the business press. For example, Charan and Colvin (1999) argue that CEOs fail primarily due to their unwillingness to remove ineffective managers, a problem in the leadership domain. However, a deeper analysis suggests that the real cause is that failed CEOs can not admit that they have made bad staffing decisions (Berglas, 2009), a problem in the intrapersonal domain.

Derailment can almost always be traced to relationship problems (cf. Van Velsor & Leslie, 1995). When relationships are strong, people will forgive mistakes; but when relationships erode, tolerance disappears and mistakes get managers fired.

Dark Side Personality Factors

We used Horney's (1950) taxonomy of flawed interpersonal tendencies to organize the literature on personality and derailment. Horney later summarized her taxonomy in terms of

three general themes: (1) Moving away from people—managing insecurities by intimidating and avoiding others, (2) Moving against people—managing self-doubts by manipulating and charming others, and (3) Moving toward people—managing insecurities by ingratiating others and building alliances.

There are four published typologies of the dark side of personality (cf. Dotlich & Cairo, 2003; Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Moscosco & Salgado, 2004; Schmit, Kilm, & Robie, 2000). Table 3 shows that they all fit nicely inside Horney's categories of Moving Away, Moving Against, and Moving Toward other people. We now describe these themes in more detail using the categories described by Hogan and Hogan (2001).

Moving Away from People (Intimidation)

1. Excitable. High Excitable people expect to be disappointed in relationships—as a result, they are alert for signs that others may treat them badly. When they think they have been mistreated, they erupt in emotional displays that may involve yelling, throwing things, and slamming doors. From the observer's perspective, that which is most distinctive about these people is their emotional eruptions; they are the people for whom the term "Emotional Intelligence" (Goleman, 1997) was devised. Because they are so volatile and unpredictable, they have difficulty building and maintaining a team—the fundamental task of leadership

At their best, these people have a great capacity for empathy; because they know that life is not always fair, they can genuinely feel others' pain. At their worst, however, they require a lot of personal attention and reassurance, and they are very hard to please.

2. Skeptical. High Skeptical people expect to be betrayed, cheated, or deceived in some way. They specialize in conspiracy theories, stay alert for signs of mistreatment, and when they think they detect it, they retaliate directly. This may involve physical violence, accusations, or litigation, actions announcing that they are prepared to defend themselves. From the observer's

perspective, that which is most distinctive about these people is their suspiciousness, argumentativeness, and lack of trust in others.

At their best, they are insightful about organizational politics and the motives of their counter players, and they can be the source of good intelligence regarding the real agendas of others, and the real meaning of events. At their worst, their stubbornness and inability to compromise or trust others erode their ability to build a team.

3. *Cautious*. High Cautious persons fear being criticized, blamed, or possibly disgraced; as a result, they are constantly on guard against making mistakes that might cause them public embarrassment. To avoid criticism, they follow rules and precedents, resist innovation, and cling to that which worked in the past. Their cautiousness sometimes extends to their staff, whom they fear will embarrass them, and whom they often discourage from taking any initiative.

At their best, they are prudent and careful about evaluating risk; they rarely make rash or ill-advised moves, and they provide sound advice about intended courses of action. At their worst, however, they avoid innovation, resist change, stall, drag their feet, and are indecisive—even when it is apparent that something needs to be done.

4. *Reserved*. High Reserved people seem indifferent to the expectations of others—especially their staff. As a result, they seem formal, aloof, introverted, and lacking in social insight. They prefer to work alone, and are more interested in data and things than in people. They communicate poorly, if at all, they are unrewarding to deal with, and they have trouble building or maintaining a team.

At their best, they are tough in the face of adversity; they are unfazed by criticism, rejection, and opprobrium; they can stay focused and not be distracted by emotional upheavals, and stressful meetings. At their worst, however, they are insensitive to others needs, moods, or feelings, and can be tactless, imperceptive, and gauche.

5. *Leisurely*. High Leisurely people seem overtly pleasant and cooperative, but privately they expect to be mistreated and unappreciated. They are stubborn and independent, cynical about the talents and intentions of others—especially superiors—and insist on working at their own pace. When pressed for additional output, they tend to slow down even more. They express their resentment indirectly, in the form of procrastination and excuse making.

At their best, they have good interpersonal skills; at their worst, they are peevish and stubborn, focus on their own agendas, and refuse to support their colleagues and subordinates. Their prickly sensitivity, subtle uncooperativeness, and stubbornness make them unrewarding to deal with.

Moving Against People (Manipulation)

6. *Arrogant*. High Arrogant people expect to be admired, praised, indulged, and obeyed. They expect to be successful in everything they do, they believe in their own legacy, and when their expectations are frustrated, they explode with "narcissistic rage." From the observer's perspective, that which is most distinctive about these people is their self-assurance, which often gives them a certain social presence—they are the first to speak in a group, and they do so with great confidence, even when they are wrong.

At their best, these people are energetic, charismatic, leader-like, and willing to take the initiative to get projects moving. They are fearless about taking on any task, and some elevation on this characteristic is needed for success in management, sales, and entrepreneurship. At their worst, they are arrogant, demanding, self-deceived, and pompous. Because they are so confident and aspirational, they often attract followers. But they take more credit for success than is warranted; they refuse to acknowledge failure, errors, or mistakes; they are unable to learn from experience; and, ultimately, they alienate their colleagues and subordinates.

7. *Mischievous*. High Mischievous people expect other people will find them charming, clever, even irresistible—as a result, they are willing to ask for favors, exceptions, allowances,

and to do so without incurring obligations. Also, they see themselves as bulletproof, they enjoy risk taking for its own sake, and they often live on the edge. From the observer's perspective, that which is most distinctive about these people is that they are bright, witty, and engaging, which is why they are able to extract favors, promises, money, and resources from other people with relative ease. They see others as utilities to be exploited, and therefore have problems maintaining commitments, and are unconcerned about violating expectations.

At their best they are self-confident and have an air of daring that others often find attractive and even intriguing. At their worst, they are impulsive, reckless, faithless, exploitative, and manipulative. Their self-confidence and recklessness lead to many mistakes, but they seem unable to learn from experience; as a result, they tend to be underachievers, relative to their talent and capabilities.

8. *Colorful*. High Colorful people expect others will find them attractive and entertaining, and the natural focus of attention. They are good at calling attention to themselves—they know how to make dramatic entrances and exits, they carry themselves with flair, wear attention grabbing clothes, and are constantly on stage. Some elevation on this characteristic is essential for a career in sales, politics, or the theater. From an observer's perspective, what is most distinctive about these people is their stage presence—they perform well in interviews, in assessment centers, and other public settings. They are also impulsive and unpredictable; that which makes them good at sales (and selling themselves) makes them poor managers—they are unfocused, distractible, overcommitted, and always in search of the spotlight.

At their best, they are bright, entertaining, flirtatious, and the life of the party. At their worst, they won't listen or plan; they self-nominate and overcommit themselves. Although they are entertaining, they are also easily distracted, impulsive, hyperactive, and unproductive.

9. *Imaginative*. High Imaginative people think about the world in different and often interesting ways, and they enjoy entertaining others with their unusual perceptions and insights.

They are alert to new ways of seeing, thinking, and expressing themselves, and they enjoy the reactions they elicit in others with their unexpected forms of self-expression. From the observer's perspective, these people often seem bright, insightful, playful, and innovative, but also as eccentric, odd, and flighty.

At their best, these people are visionary, creative, and insightful. At their worst, they can be self-absorbed, insensitive to feedback, and indifferent to the social and political consequences of their egocentric focus on their own agendas. They communicate poorly, and as managers, they often leave people confused regarding their directions or intentions.

Moving Toward People (Ingratiation)

10. Diligent. High Diligent people expect their performance to be rigorously evaluated. As a result, they have high standards of performance for themselves and others; they are concerned with doing a good job, being a good citizen, and pleasing authority. When they think they have not lived up to their standards, they redouble their efforts and try even harder. They are hardworking, careful, and planful; they live by the rules and expect others to do so, too, and become irritable when others do not follow their rules. From the observer's perspective, that which is most distinctive about these people is their conservatism, their detail orientation, their risk aversion, but also the degree to which they are steady, dependable, and predictable. They are model organizational citizens who can be relied upon to maintain standards, do their work competently and professionally, and treat their colleagues with respect.

At their best, these people are good role models who uphold the highest standards of professionalism in performance and comportment; they are typically popular with their bosses because they are so reliable. At their worst, however, they are fussy, particular, nit-picking micromanagers who deprive their subordinates of any choice or control over their work. The micromanagement alienates their staff who soon refuse to take any initiative and simply wait to be told what to do and how to do it.

11. Dutiful. High Dutiful people think others expect them to behave well. As a result, they are concerned about being accepted, being liked, and getting along, especially with authority figures. They are alert for signs of disapproval, and equally alert for opportunities to ingratiate themselves, to be of service, and to demonstrate their fealty and loyalty to the organization. When they think they have given offense, they redouble their efforts to be model citizens. From the observer's perspective, that which is most distinctive about these people is their good nature, their politeness, their cordiality, and their indecisiveness. As managers, they will do anything their boss requires; this means that they are reluctant to support their staff or challenge authority, and this inevitably erodes their legitimacy as leaders.

At their best, these people are polite, conforming, and eager to please. Because they are so agreeable, because they seldom criticize anyone, complain about anything, or threaten anybody, they rarely make enemies and tend to rise in organizations. But they have problems making decisions, taking initiative, or taking stands; consequently, the units for which they are responsible tend to drift, their staff feels unsupported, and they have trouble maintaining a team.

Mitigating and Preventing Derailment

Although bad management is widespread, it is to a degree preventable. Specifically, the research suggests that derailment can be minimized through closer attention to the problem in selection, development, and job transitions (cf. Gabbaro, 1987; Hellervik, Hazucha, & Schneider, 1992; Lombardo & Eichinger, 1999; McCauley & Lombardo, 1990; Watkins, 2003).

Selection

There are two challenges in trying to minimize derailment through selection. First, derailed executives resemble successful executives. Typically both groups are bright and ambitious, with good technical and problem-solving skills and successful track records, and are identified early as "high potential" (Lombardo & Eichinger, 1999; McCall & Lombardo, 1983). In addition,

successful managers are not perfect; they all have flaws and have experienced career setbacks. Consequently, it is often hard to pick the winners with ordinary background information.

Nonetheless, certain characteristics reliably distinguish successful from unsuccessful executives. Failed managers are less self-aware, have inflated self-evaluations, lose their composure easily, handle mistakes defensively, are unable to learn from experience, and have a less varied history of job assignments (Eichinger & Lombardo, 2003; Lombardo & Eichinger, 2006; McCall & Lombardo, 1983; Shipper & Dillard, 2000). Assessing these qualities may identify problem candidates. Additionally, executive selection rarely involves personality testing (Sessa, et al, 1998), and when it does, it typically focuses on bright side characteristics. Thus, assessing dark side characteristics could help identify derailment potential (cf. Khoo & Burch, 2008; Knights & Kennedy, 2007).

The second problem with trying to minimize derailment through selection is that there are not enough good managers to go around. The base rate for managerial incompetence is about 50% and the management talent pool is shrinking. Selection can help improve an organization's level of talent up to a point; after that, organizations have to survive with the managers they have, which points to the importance of development.

Development

The key to development is self-awareness (Hogan & Warrenfeltz, 2003; Kaiser & Kaplan, 2006; Mintzberg, 2004). Eichinger and Lombardo (2003) found that managers whose self-ratings were higher than the ratings from coworkers were more likely to fail. Shipper and Dillard (2000) found that managers who were about to derail were more likely to recover to the extent that their evaluations of their own skills matched those provided by coworkers. Similarly, Kovach (1989) reports that derailed managers can recover if they are able to evaluate honestly their performance and learn from the failure. However, self-awareness alone is not sufficient; flawed managers must also improve their skills at self-regulation and social interaction.

Self-awareness. Managers need to develop self-awareness in two areas: (1) how others perceive them; and (2) their dark side tendencies. Coworker feedback is the most efficient way to help managers understand how their behavior is perceived. Most *Fortune 1000* corporations and many medium and small companies, nonprofits, and government agencies use a 360-degree feedback process, which compares performance ratings provided by superiors, peers, and subordinates with self-ratings. The peer and subordinate information is crucial because they are the people most exposed to the behaviors associated with derailment.

Meta-analyses indicate that feedback enhances self-awareness and promotes desirable behavior change, although the overall effects are moderate to small in magnitude (e.g., *standardized difference scores* of .41 for feedback interventions in general [Kluger & DeNisi, 1996] and .25 for coworker ratings used specifically for management development [Smither, London, & Reilly, 2005, p. 54]). The overall effects are diluted by a sizable number of poorly designed interventions, which actually degrade performance (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). However, feedback usually leads to positive results, and certain conditions are conducive. Feedback is most effective in improving performance (a) for the lowest rated managers, (b) when the feedback is intended to be used for development (as opposed to administrative decisions), (c) when coaches help managers review their feedback and set specific improvement goals, and (d) when managers share their development plans with coworkers and ask for suggestions (Smither, London, Flautt, Vargas, & Kucine, 2003; Smither, London, Reilly, Flautt, Vargas, & Kucine, 2004; Smither et al., 2005). Supplementing feedback ratings with written comments also improves performance, especially when the comments focus on negative behaviors (Smither & Walker, 2004).

The standard 360-degree feedback process could be improved in two ways. First, 360 surveys typically assess factors associated with success—the right stuff (Leslie & Fleenor, 1998). But the literature shows that failure is more often due to having the wrong stuff rather than lacking the right stuff (Lombardo et al., 1988). Thus, 360 surveys need to assess both desirable

and undesirable factors (cf., Lombardo & Eichinger, 2006; Lombardo & McCauley, 1994).

Second, the literature shows that overused strengths—*too much* of the right stuff—are often associated with ineffectiveness and derailment (Kaiser & Kaplan, 2009; Kaplan & Kaiser, 2009; Lombardo & Eichinger, 2006; McCall & Lombardo, 1983; McCall, 1998). Because 360 rating forms typically assume higher ratings are better and distinguish only between shortcomings and strengths, they could be enhanced by providing a way to indicate when performance problems are due to strengths overused (Kaiser & Kaplan, 2006; Kaplan & Kaiser, 2006).

Another aspect of raising self-awareness is that managers need to understand their dark side tendencies, which can be assessed using competent psychometric tests and are less resource-intensive than the 360 process. However, few psychometric tests focus on the dark side and many of the well-known inventories that assess dysfunctional personalities are not appropriate in the workplace (e.g., the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Inventory; Hathaway & McKinley, 1943). However, a few inventories recently constructed for use in the workplace can provide managers with insight into counterproductive dispositions. For instance, the *Hogan Development Survey* (Hogan & Hogan, 1997, 2001; 2009) and the *Questionnaire of Personality Styles* (Moscocco & Salgado, 2004; Salgado, 2000) have been validated for use with normal adult working populations.

Intrapersonal skills. As noted above, self-awareness is a necessary but insufficient condition for development. As Freud suggested, insight merely transforms clueless neurotics into enlightened neurotics. Moreover, development efforts focusing on behavior rarely deal with the cognitive, emotional, and motivational causes of the behavior. Behavioral approaches to mitigating derailment are limited because they do not improve the *intrapersonal skills* needed to regulate the impulses and emotional reactions that can degrade performance in the interpersonal, business, and leadership domains (Hogan & Warrenfeltz, 2003; Kaiser & Kaplan, 2006). It is important to go beyond behavior to identify the causes of flawed performance.

Methods for helping managers develop intrapersonal skills have six features in common (e.g., Davies, 2009; Kaiser & Kaplan, 2006; Kegan & Lahey, 2001; Kilburg, 2000). First, they begin with competent assessments and are facilitated by coaches. Second, they help managers identify their implicit theories of social interaction and desired personal goals. Third, they focus on the faulty assumptions, emotional hot-buttons, and self-defeating schemas of which the managers are usually unaware. Fourth, they show how the self-defeating schemas may have been adaptive in the context in which they were developed, but are no longer adaptive. Fifth, they reprogram the faulty schemas and replace the associated counterproductive behaviors with more constructive behavioral alternatives. Finally, these methods address the difficulty of changing habitual behavior. Change is also difficult because derailed managers are often self-absorbed, unwilling to take responsibility for their shortcomings, and unable to learn from their mistakes—factors that make them resistant to feedback and development.

Personalized coaching is probably more effective for preventing derailment than leadership development training programs because such programs focus on training leadership and business skills (Burke & Day, 1986; Csoka, 1997) rather than the interpersonal and intrapersonal deficits at the root of derailment (Kaiser & Kaplan, 2006). Training programs rely on subjective reactions for evaluation ("smile sheets;" Goldsetin & Ford, 2002), focus on positive themes, and neglect derailment and dysfunctional behavior—they try to improve the right stuff rather than ameliorate the wrong stuff. The recent faddish enthusiasm for maximizing strengths rather than fixing weaknesses is a good example of this bias toward the positive (Kaiser, 2009). However, increasing public awareness of corporate malfeasance, high-level derailments, and a global financial crisis have raised concerns about the dark side of leadership.

Transition Management

McCall and Lombardo (1983, p. 11) noted that the causes of derailment are "all connected to the fact that situations change as one ascends the organizational hierarchy." Others have also

observed that most derailment occurs after a transition to a more senior job (cf. Gentry & Chappelow, 2009; Kovach, 1989; Watkins, 2003). Promotion brings more responsibility and scrutiny, more ambiguous performance expectations, and more complex politics (Zaccaro, 2001). Further, senior jobs require a strategic perspective and the ability to build coalitions, negotiate, delegate, empower, and use more participative decision making to accomplish goals (Charan, Drotter, & Noel, 2001; Kaiser et al., 2009).

As managers are promoted, strengths can become liabilities, and weaknesses that might not have mattered become important (McCall & Lombardo, 1983). Research suggests that executives need three to six months to adjust to a new job (Gabbaro, 1987; Downey, March, & Berkman, 2001; Watkins, 2003), which adds to the stress level. Further, increased status diminishes the ability to appreciate another person's perspective (Galinski, Magee, Inesi, & Gruenfeld, 2006). All this can catalyze dark side tendencies and undermine social performance and key relationships. Ironically, when the stakes are highest, executives may be at their worst (Kaiser & Hogan, 2007).

Organizations rarely prepare managers for promotion or support them afterwards (Freedman, 2005; Watkins, 2003). However, an increased focus on talent management and retention has produced methods for facilitating transitions, based on experience at American Express, General Electric, Johnson & Johnson, Pfizer, Pitney-Bowes, and Wal-Mart (e.g., Downey et al., 2001; Vollhardt, 2005; Watkins, 2003). Anecdotal evidence suggests that onboarding programs and transition coaching (Witherspoon & Cannon, 2004) can reduce the failure rate of managers and decrease the time needed for them to adjust to a new job.

Preparation. Transition management takes place in two phases: preparation for a new role and integration into that new role. Preparation involves creating a plan based on a realistic job preview, assessing risk factors, and building a relationship with the new boss. A realistic job preview helps the new manager understand the new job (Popovich & Wanous, 1982). It is

important to evaluate the context of the new assignment; for instance, start-ups, turnarounds, realignments, and sustaining situations require different approaches (Watkins, 2003). Risk factors can be determined by comparing the new manager's personality, skill, and experience profile with the demands of the new job. Special attention should be paid to strengths that could become liabilities (e.g., a reliance on technical skills) and seemingly innocuous weaknesses that could become liabilities (e.g., a narrow range of experience and limited perspective).

Freedman (2005) suggests that newly promoted executives need to let go of tactical details and technical problem solving, and adopt a big picture perspective, prioritize strategically, and learn team-based decision making. Freedman provides a practical model for helping managers change behaviors that were previously successful and replace them with more appropriate behaviors while also managing the internal issues of emotion and identity that often produce stress and anxiety.

Integration. The most important part of a successful transition is dealing with a new boss. There are few general rules for doing this because it depends on the personalities of the parties involved. Introverted managers have more trouble than extraverts with this, and it is a risk factor for their derailment (Bauer, Erdogan, Liden, & Wayne, 2006). In the practitioner literature, best practices include setting expectations and regularly clarifying them, developing mechanisms for monitoring progress, and learning to navigate the political landscape (Gabbaro, 1987; Watkins, 2003).

In addition to developing a relationship with new bosses, executives need to establish good relations with subordinates and to form alliances with peers in other parts of the organization (Downey et al., 2001; Gabarro, 1987; Vollhardt, 2005; Watkins, 2003). A study by Right Management Consultants (reported in Fisher, 2005) found that 61% of new hires who failed to build relationships with peers and subordinates subsequently derailed.

Failure usually involves a buildup of little problems that eventually reach a critical mass (Lombardo & Eichinger, 1999; McCall & Lombardo, 1983). Table 4 presents common signs of derailment potential organized in terms of the Hogan and Warrenfeltz (2003) domain model. Organizations can minimize derailment by periodically evaluating whether managers-in-transition are having problems with leadership and business performance, working relationships, and self-management, then intervening before it is too late.

Conclusions

Historically, the leadership literature has been little more than a hymn in praise of the corporate elite (e.g., Charan, 2007). At a professional conference in the early 1980s, the authors proposed that the base rate of bad management was about 50%, and they met fierce resistance from psychologists in the leadership development industry. Nonetheless, we persisted, Bentz published his data on failed managers at Sears, systematic research soon followed, and the phenomenon is increasingly recognized as important.

The essence of this chapter can be summarized in terms of four points. First, the academic literature on leadership leads to few useful generalizations about the distinguishing characteristics of good leaders. Fiedler's (1967) work is a metaphor for the field—namely, the defining features of good leadership depend on "the situation" and this leaves practitioners with little clear guidance about how to help managers.

Second, research on the characteristics of bad leaders converges quite nicely. The behaviors associated with managerial derailment are well documented and are relevant to most organizations and most managers. Being unable to get along with coworkers is a key reason managers fail. The dark side personality factors help explain why managers have these relationship problems. The derailment research also points to the role of change, stress, and a lack of self-awareness as potentiating factors. The research leads to some useful generalizations, offers taxonomies of causes and early warning signals, and provides remedial recommendations.

Third, the data are quite clear that there are a large number of bad managers in the private and public sector. Estimates of the base rate of bad managers have been surprisingly consistent since research on this topic first started; the problem is real and worthy of serious research attention.

Finally, if organizations observe the principles of good management, including how they manage their managers, then they are more profitable. When organizations ignore the principles of good management, they are less profitable, and they subject their employees to unnecessary stress and abuse.

References

- Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyrants in organizations. *Human Relations, 47*, 755-778.
- Ayduk, O, Mendoza-Denton, R., Mischel, W., Downey, G.; Peake, P. K., & Rodriguez, M. (2000). Regulating the interpersonal self: Strategic self-regulation for coping with rejection sensitivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 776-792.
- Baldwin, M. W. (1992). Relational schemas and the processing of social information. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 461-484.
- Balthazard, P. A., Cooke, R. A., & Potter, R. E. (2006). Dysfunctional culture, dysfunctional organization: Capturing the behavioral norms that form organizational culture and drive performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*, 709-732.
- Bauer, T. N., Erdogan, B., Liden, R. C., & Wayne, S. J. (2006). A longitudinal study of the moderating role of extraversion: LMX, performance, and turnover during new executive development. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 298-310.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Heatherton, T. F. (1996). Self-regulation failure: An overview. *Psychological Inquiry, 7*, 1-15.
- Bentz, V. J. (1967). The Sears experience in the investigation, description, and prediction of executive behavior. In F. R. Wickert & D. E. McFarland (Eds.), *Measuring executive effectiveness* (pp. 147-206). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Bentz, V. J. (1985a, August). *A view from the top: A thirty-year perspective on research devoted to discovery, description, and prediction of executive behavior*. Paper presented at the 93rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles.
- Bentz, V. J. (1985b). Research findings from personality assessment of executives. In J. H. Bernardin & D. A. Bownas (Eds.), *Personality assessment in organizations* (pp. 82-144). New York: Praeger.
- Bentz, V. J. (1990). Contextual issues in predicting high-level leadership performance. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 131-144). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Berglas, S. (1986). *The success syndrome*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Berglas, S. (2009). Victims of their own success. In R. B. Kaiser (Ed.), *The perils of accentuating the positive* (pp. 77-96), Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.
- Bloom, N., & Van Reenen, J. (2007). Measuring and explaining management practices across firms and countries. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 22*, 1341-1408.
- Bossidy, L., & Charan, R. (2002). *Execution: The discipline of getting things done*. New York: Crown Business.
- Boyatzis, R. A. (1982). *The competent manager: A model for effective performance*. New York: Wiley.

- Bray, D. W., & Howard, A. (1983). The AT&T longitudinal studies of managers. In K. W. Shaie (Ed.), *Longitudinal studies of adult psychological development* (pp. 266-312). New York: Guilford Press.
- Burke, M. J., & Day, R. R. (1986). A cumulative study of the effectiveness of managerial training. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 232-246.
- Charan, R. (2005). Ending the CEO succession crisis. *Harvard Business Review, 83*(2), 72-81.
- Charan, R. (2007). *Leaders at all levels*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Charan, R., & Colvin, G. (1999, June 21). Why CEO's fail. *Fortune, 69*-82.
- Charan, R., Drotter, S., & Noel, J. (2001). *The leadership pipeline: How to build the leadership-powered company*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Conger, J. A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 19*(2), 44-55.
- Csoka, L. S. (1997). *Bridging the leadership gap*. New York: The Conference Board.
- Curphy, G. J. (2008). *Dr. Gordy test results*. Retrieved May 20, 2008, from <http://www.leadershipkeynote.net/>
- Davies, M. R. (2009). Unlocking the value of exceptional personalities. In R. B. Kaiser (Ed.), *The perils of accentuating the positive* (pp. 135-158). Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.
- DeVries, D. L., & Kaiser, R. B. (2003, November). *Going sour in the suite: What you can do about executive derailment*. Workshop presented at the Maximizing Executive Effectiveness meeting of the Human Resources Planning Society, Miami, FL.
- Dixon, N. F. (1976). *On the psychology of military incompetence*. London: Pimlico.
- Dotlich, D. L., & Cairo, P. C. (2003). *Why CEOs fail: The 11 behaviors that can derail your climb to the top-and how to manage them*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Downey, D., March, T., & Berkman, A. (2001). *Assimilating new leaders: The key to executive retention*. New York: AMACOM.
- Dunnette, M. D., (1967). Predictors of executive success. In F. R. Wickert & D. E. McFarland (Eds.), *Measuring executive effectiveness* (pp. 147-206). New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.
- Eichinger, R. W., Dai, G., & Tang, K. Y. (2009). It depends upon what you mean by a strength. In R. B. Kaiser (Ed.), *The perils of accentuating the positive* (pp. 13-26). Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.
- Eichinger, R. W., & Lombardo, M. M. (2003). Knowledge summary series: 360-degree assessment. *Human Resource Planning, 26*(4), 34-44.
- Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management*. London. Pitman Publishing.
- Fernandez-Araoz, C. (1999). Hiring without firing. *Harvard Business Review, 77*(4), 109-120.

- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Finkelstein, S. M. (2003). *Why smart executives fail: And what you can learn from their mistakes*. New York: Portfolio.
- Fisher, A. (2005, March 7). Starting a new job? Don't blow it. *Fortune Magazine*, 48.
- Fong, G. T., & Markus, H. (1982). Self-schemas and judgments about others. *Social Cognition*, 1, 191-204.
- Freedman, A. (2005). Swimming upstream: The challenge of managerial promotions. In R. B. Kaiser (Ed.), *Filling the leadership pipeline* (pp. 25-44). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Furnham, A., & Taylor, J. (2004). *The dark side of behavior at work: Understanding and avoiding employees leaving, thieving, and deceiving*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Gabarro, J. J. (1987). *The dynamics of taking charge*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Galinski, A. D., Magee, J. C., Inesi, M. E., & Gruenfeld, D. H. (2006). Power and perspectives not taken. *Psychological Science*, 17, 1068-1074.
- Gentry, W. A., Braddy, P. W., Fleenor, J. W., & Howard, P. J. (2008). Self-observer rating discrepancies on the derailment behaviors of Hispanic managers. *The Business Journal of Hispanic Research*, 2(1), 76-87.
- Gentry, W. A., & Chappelow, C. (2009). Managerial derailment: Weaknesses that can be fixed. In R. B. Kaiser (Ed.) *The perils of accentuating the positive* (pp. 97-114). Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.
- Gentry, W. A., Hannum, K. M., Ekelund, B., Z., & de Jong, A. (2007). A study of the discrepancy between self- and observer-ratings on managerial derailment characteristics of European managers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16, 295-325.
- Gentry, W. A., Katz, R. B., & McFeeters, B. (in press). The continual need for improvement to avoid derailment: A study of college and university administrators. *Higher Education Research and Development*.
- Gentry, W. A., Mondore, S. P., & Cox, B. D. (2007). An exploratory study of managerial derailment characteristics and personality preferences. *Journal of Management Development*, 26, 857-873.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual difference: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. W. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 141-165). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Goldstein, I. L., & Ford, K. (2002). *Training in organizations: Needs assessment, development, and evaluation*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Goleman, D. (1997). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

- Green, J. D., & Sedikides, C. (2001). When do self-schemas shape social perception?: The role of descriptive ambiguity. *Motivation and Emotion, 25*, 67-83.
- Hamel, G. (2007). *The future of management*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. (1943). *Manual for the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory*. New York: Psychological Corporation.
- Hellervik, L. W., Hazucha, J. F., & Schneider, R. J. (1992). Behavior change: Models, methods, and a review of the evidence. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 823-895). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Hogan, R. (2007). *Personality and the fate of organizations*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist, 49*, 493-504.
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1997). *Hogan Development Survey manual*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view of the dark side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*, 40-51.
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2009). *Hogan Development Survey manual* (2nd ed.). Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology, 9*, 169-180.
- Hogan, R., Raskin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 343-354). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Hogan, R., & Smither, R. (2001). *Personality: Theories and applications*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Hogan, R., & Warrenfeltz, R. (2003). Educating the modern manager. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 2*, 74-84.
- Horney, K. (1950). *Neurosis and human growth: The struggle toward self-realization*. New York: Norton.
- John, O. P. (1990). The "Big Five" factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 66-100). New York: Guilford Press.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 765-780.
- Kaiser, R. B. (2009). *The perils of accentuating the positive*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.

- Kaiser, R. B., Craig, S. B., Overfield, D., & Yarborough, P. (2009). *Testing the leadership pipeline: Do the behaviors related to managerial effectiveness change with organizational level?* Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Kaiser, R. B., & Hogan, R. (2007). The dark side of discretion: Leader personality and organizational decline. In R. Hooijberg, J. Hunt, J. Antonakis, & K. Boal (Eds.), *Being there even when you are not: Leading through strategy, systems and structures. Monographs in leadership and management* (Vol. 4, pp. 177-197). London: Elsevier Science.
- Kaiser, R. B., & Kaplan, R. E. (2006). The deeper work of executive development. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 5, 463-483.
- Kaiser, R. B., & Kaplan, R. E. (2009). When strengths run amok. In R. B. Kaiser (Ed.), *The perils of accentuating the positive* (pp. 57-76), Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.
- Kaplan, R. E., Drath, W. H., & Kofodomis, J. R. (1991). *Beyond ambition: How driven managers can lead better and live better*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kaplan, R. E., & Kaiser, R. B. (2006). *The versatile leader: Make the most of your strengths—without overdoing it*. San Francisco: Pfeiffer.
- Kaplan, R. E., & Kaiser, R. B. (2009). Stop overdoing your strengths. *Harvard Business Review*, 87(2), 100-103.
- Kaplan, R. E., & Kaiser, R. B. (in press). Towards a positive psychology for leaders. In A. P. Linley, S. Harrington, & N. Page (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology and Work*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (2001). *How the way we talk can change the way we work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kelloway, E. K., Sivanathan, N., Francis, L., & Barling, J. (2005). Poor leadership. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of work stress* (pp. 89-112). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Khoo, H. S., & Burch, G. St. J. (2008). The 'dark side' of leadership personality and transformational leadership: An exploratory study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44, 86-97.
- Khurana, R. (2007). *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kihlstrom, J. F., & Klein, S. B. (1994). The self as a knowledge structure. In R. S. Wyer Jr. & T. K. Strull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition* (pp. 153-208). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kilburg, R. R. (2000). *Executive coaching*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. S. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: Historical review, meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, *119*, 254-284.
- Knights, J. A., & Kennedy, B. J. (2007). Medical school selection: Impact of dysfunctional tendencies on academic performance. *Medical Education* *2007*, *41*, 362-368.
- Koch, E. J. (2002). Relational schemas, self-esteem, and the processing of social stimuli. *Self and Identity*, *1*, 271-279.
- Kovach, B. E. (1989). Successful derailment: What fast-trackers can learn while they're off the track. *Organizational Dynamics*, *18*(2), 33-47.
- Kramer, R. J. (2008, June). Have we learned anything about leadership development? *Conference Board Review*, *45*, 26-30. \
- Leslie, J. B., & Fleenor, J. W. (1998). *Feedback to managers: A review and comparison of multi-rater instruments for management development*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Lombardo, M. M., & Eichinger, R. W. (1999). *Preventing derailment: What to do before it's too late*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Lombardo, M. M., & Eichinger, R. W. (2006). *The leadership machine* (3rd ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Lominger Limited, Inc.
- Lombardo, M. M., & McCauley, C. D. (1994). *Benchmarks®: A manual and trainer's guide*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Lombardo, M. M., Ruderman, M. N., & McCauley, C. D. (1988). Explanations of success and derailment in upper-level management positions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *2*, 199-216.
- Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 63-78.
- McCall, M. W., Jr. (1998). *High flyers: Developing the next generation of leaders*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- McCall, M.W., Jr., & Hollenbeck, G. P. (2002). *Developing global executives: The lessons of international experience*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- McCall, M. W., Jr., & Lombardo, M. M. (1983). *Off the track: Why and how successful executives get derailed*. Technical Report No. 21. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- McCauley, C. D., & Lombardo, M. M. (1990). Benchmarks: An instrument for diagnosing managerial strengths and weaknesses. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 535-545). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Michaels, E., Handfield-Jones, H., & Axelrod, B. (2001). *The war for talent*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

- Millikin-Davies, M. (1992). *An exploration of flawed first-line supervision*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tulsa.
- Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers not MBAs*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Van Velsor, E. (1987). *Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations?*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Moscoseo, S., & Salgado, J. F. (2004). "Dark side" personality styles as predictors of task, contextual, and job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12, 356-362.
- NIOSH (1999). *Stress at work*. U.S. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHHS (NIOSH). Publication Number 99-101. Washington, DC: Author.
- Popovich, P., & Wanous, J. P. (1982). The realistic job preview as a persuasive communication. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 570-578.
- Rasch, R., Shen, W., Davies, S. E., & Bono, J. (2008, April). *The development of a taxonomy of ineffective leadership behaviors*. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Francisco, CA.
- Renaud, H., & Estes, F. (1961). Life history interviews with one hundred normal American males: Pathogenicity of childhood. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 31, 786-802.
- Salgado, J. F. (2000) *Manual técnico del cuestionario de estilos de personalidad (CEP)* [*Technical manual of the questionnaire of personality styles*]. Vigo (Spain): Metis.
- Sedikides, C. (1993). Assessment, enhancement, and verification determinants of the self-evaluation process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 317-338.
- Schmit, M. J., Kilm, J. A., & Robie, C. A. (2000). Development of a global measure of personality. *Personnel Psychology*, 53, 153-193.
- Sessa, V. I., Kaiser, R., Taylor, J. K., & Campbell, R. J. (1998). *Executive selection: A research report on what works and what doesn't*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Shipper, F., & Dillard, J. (2000). A study of impending derailment and recovery of middle managers across career stages. *Human Resource Management*, 39, 331-347.
- Shipper, F., & Wilson, C., (1992). The impact of managerial behaviors on group performance, stress and commitment. In K. E. Clark, M. B. Clark, & D. Campbell (Eds.), *Impact of leadership* (pp. 119-129). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Smart, B. D. (1999). *Topgrading: How leading companies win by hiring, coaching, and keeping the best people*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Smither, J. W., London, M., Flautt, R., Vargas, Y., & Kucine, I. (2003). Can working with an executive coach improve multisource feedback ratings over time? A quasi-experimental field study. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 23-44.

- Smither, J. W., London, M., & Reilly, R. R. (2005). Does performance improve following multisource feedback? A theoretical model, meta-analysis, and review of empirical findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 33-66.
- Smither, J. W., London, M., Reilly, R. R., Flautt, R., Vargas, Y., & Kucine, I. (2004). Discussing multisource feedback with raters and performance improvement. *Journal of Management Development*, 23, 456-468.
- Smither, J. W., & Walker, A. G. (2004). Are the characteristics of narrative comments related to improvement in multi-rater feedback ratings over time? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 575-581.
- Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12, 80-92
- Sorcher, M. (1985). *Predicting executive success: What it takes to make it into senior management*. New York: Wiley.
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 178-190.
- Tett, R. P., & Burnett, D. D. (2003) A personality trait-based interactionist model of job performance . *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 500-517.
- Tett, R. P., & Guterman, H. A. (2000). Situation trait relevance, trait expression, and cross-situational consistency: Testing a principle of trait activation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 34, 397-423.
- Thornton, G. C., & Byham, W. C. (1982). *Assessment centers and managerial performance*. New York: Academic Press.
- VanFleet, D. D., & Griffin, R. W. (2006). Dysfunctional organization culture: The role of leadership in motivating dysfunctional work behaviors. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 698-708.
- Van Velsor, E., & Leslie, J. B. (1995). Why executives derail: Perspectives across time and cultures. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(4), 62-72.
- Vollhardt, C. (2005). Pfizer's prescription for the risky business of executive transitions. *Journal of Organizational Excellence*, 25(1), 3-15.
- Walker, A. G., & Smither, J. W. (1999). A five-year study of upward feedback: What managers do with their results matters. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 393-423.
- Watkins, M. (2003). *The first 90 days*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- White, R. P., & DeVries, D. L. (1990). Making the wrong choice: Failure in the selection of senior-level managers. *Issues & Observations*, 10 (1), 1-6.

- Witherspoon, R., & Cannon, M. D. (2004). Coaching leaders in transition: Lessons from the field. In A. F. Buono (Ed.) *Creative consulting: Innovative perspectives on management consulting* (pp. 201-227). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Young, J. E., Klosko, J. S., & Weishaar, M. E. (2003). *Schema therapy*. New York: Guilford.
- Zaccaro, S.J. (2001). *The nature of executive leadership: A conceptual and empirical analysis of success*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Zedeck, S. (1995). Review of Benchmarks. In J. C. Conoley, J. C. Impara, & L. L. Murphy (Eds.), *The twelfth mental measurements yearbook* (Vol. 1, pp. 128-129). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental. Measurements.

Table 1

Estimated Base Rates for Management Failure

<i>Source</i>	<i>Estimate</i>
Bentz, 1985a	50%
Sorcher, 1985	33%
White & DeVries, 1990	50%
Millikin-Davies, 1992	50%
Shipper & Wilson, 1992	60%
Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994	55%
Sessa, Kaiser, Taylor, & Campbell, 1998	30%
Fernandez-Araoz, 1999	40%
Smart, 1999	50%
Lombardo & Eichinger, 1999	40%
Hogan & Hogan, 2001	67%
Charan, 2005	40%
	<i>Mean</i> 47%
	<i>Median</i> 50%

Table 2

An Integrative Summary of Behaviors Related to Derailment in Terms of the Hogan and Warrenfeltz (2003) Domain Model

Skill domain Definition	Research Study					
	Bentz (1985a)	McCall & Lombardo (1983)	Morrison, White, & Van Velsor (1987)	McCauley & Lombardo (1990)	Lombardo & Eichinger (2006)	Rasch, Shen, Davies, & Bono (2008)
Leadership Ability to build and maintain a team, and lead through others	Unable to build a team Unable to delegate	Over-managing— failing to delegate Unable to staff effectively	Can't build a team Can't manage subordinates	Difficulty molding a staff	Failure to build a team	Over-controlling Failure to nurture or manage talent
Business Ability to plan, organize, monitor, and use resources	Unable to deal with complexity Reactive and tactical Lacked business skills	Unable to think strategically Specific business problems	Not Strategic Poor results Limited business experience	Difficulty in making strategic transition Strategic differences with management	Lack of strategic thinking Difficulty making tough choices Poor administrative skills	Poor planning, organization, and/or communication Poor task performance

— Table 2 Continues —

Table 2 *continued*

<p>Interpersonal Social skill, empathy, and maintaining relationships</p>	<p>Unable to maintain relationships</p>	<p>Insensitive (abrasive, intimidating, bully) Cold, aloof, arrogant</p>	<p>Poor relationships</p>	<p>Relationship problems</p>	<p>Unable to deal with conflict No interpersonal savvy Poor political skills</p>	<p>Avoiding conflict and people problems Failure to consider human needs</p>
<p>Intrapersonal Self- awareness and self-control, emotional maturity, integrity</p>	<p>Lets emotions cloud judgment Slow learner An "overriding personality defect"</p>	<p>Too ambitious Unable to adapt Too dependent on an advocate Betrayal of trust</p>	<p>Too ambitious Unable to adapt (to a new boss, to change) Having a "poor image"</p>	<p>Lack of follow- through Too dependent on an advocate</p>	<p>Questionable integrity Low self- awareness</p>	<p>Procrastination, time delays Poor emotional control Rumor-mongering, inappropriate use of information</p>

Table 3

An Integrative Summary of Dark Side Personality Dimensions Related to Derailment

Horney's (1950) orientation Definition	Author			
	Hogan & Hogan (2001)	Moscocco & Salgado (2004)	Dotlich & Cairo (2003)	Schmit, Kilm, & Robie (2000)
Moving away				
Trying to succeed by intimidation and avoiding others	Excitable	Ambivalent	Volatile	
	Skeptical	Suspicious	Distrust	Intimidating ¹
	Cautious	Shy	Excessive Caution	
	Reserved	Lone	Aloofness	Intimidating ¹
	Leisurely	Pessimistic	Passive Resistance	Passive Aggressive
Moving against				
Trying to succeed by charm and manipulation	Arrogant	Egocentric	Arrogant	Ego-centered
	Mischievous	Risky	Mischievous	Manipulation
	Colorful	Cheerful	Melodrama	
	Imaginative	Eccentric	Eccentricity	
Moving toward				
Trying to succeed by ingratiating others and building alliances	Diligent	Reliable	Perfectionism	Micro-managing
	Dutiful	Submitted	Eagerness to please	

Note. Scales presented in the same row are measures of the same personality dimension. ¹The Intimidating scale from Schmit, Kilm, & Robie (2000) blends elements of the Skeptical and Reserved dimensions from Hogan & Hogan (2001).

Table 4

Identifying Potential for Derailment

Early Warning Sign Indicators	Skill Domain
<hr/> Leadership Domain	
Trouble Building and Maintaining a Team	
Micromanagement, doesn't delegate or empower	
Authoritarian and autocratic	
Inability to motivate and develop subordinates	
Poor team morale, high turnover	
Poor staffing decisions	
Business Domain	
Narrow Perspective/Not Strategic	
Overwhelmed by business complexity	
Consumed with details and meetings	
Too reliant on technical skills	
Unable to prioritize	

— Table 4 Continues —

Table 4 *continued*

Interpersonal Domain

Poor Working Relationships

Insensitive, abrasive, and abusive

People avoid working with the person

Blaming others for problems

Frequent political missteps

Intrapersonal Domain

Inappropriate or Immature Behavior

Outbursts, over-reacting and losing composure

Unable to handle stress

Unable to accept responsibility for problems

Doubtful integrity, loyalty, and sincerity

Gossiping and rumor mongering

Exchanging information inappropriately

Note. Based on a literature review reported in DeVries, D. L. & Kaiser, R. B. (2003, November). *Going sour in the suite: What you can do about executive derailment*. Workshop presented at the Maximizing Executive Effectiveness meeting of the Human Resources Planning Society, Miami, FL.