



CRAIG E. JOHNSON

MEETING THE
ETHICAL CHALLENGES
OF LEADERSHIP

CASTING LIGHT OR SHADOW

SIXTH EDITION



Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership

Sixth Edition

To my students

Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership

Casting Light or Shadow

Sixth Edition

Craig E. Johnson

George Fox University



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne



FOR INFORMATION:

SAGE Publications, Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320
E-mail: order@sagepub.com

SAGE Publications Ltd.
1 Oliver's Yard
55 City Road
London EC1Y 1SP
United Kingdom

SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.
B 1/I 1 Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area
Mathura Road, New Delhi 110 044
India

SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte. Ltd.
3 Church Street
#10-04 Samsung Hub
Singapore 049483

Acquisitions Editor: Maggie Stanley
Development Editor: Abbie Rickard
eLearning Editor: Katie Ancheta
Editorial Assistant: Neda Dallal
Production Editor: Olivia Weber-Stenis
Copy Editor: Erin Livingston
Typesetter: C&M Digitals (P) Ltd.
Proofreader: Ellen Howard
Indexer: Diggs Publication Services
Cover Designer: Candice Harman
Marketing Manager: Ashlee Blunk

Copyright © 2018 by SAGE Publications, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America.

ISBN 978-1-5063-2163-9

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

17 18 19 20 21 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Brief Contents

PART I. THE SHADOW SIDE OF LEADERSHIP 1

CHAPTER 1. The Leader's Light or Shadow 2

CHAPTER 2. Stepping Out of the Shadows 36

PART II. LOOKING INWARD 69

CHAPTER 3. The Leader's Character 70

CHAPTER 4. Combating Evil 110

PART III. ETHICAL STANDARDS AND STRATEGIES 145

CHAPTER 5. General Ethical Perspectives 146

CHAPTER 6. Ethical Decision Making and Behavior 175

CHAPTER 7. Exercising Ethical Influence 211

CHAPTER 8. Normative Leadership Theories 244

PART IV. SHAPING ETHICAL CONTEXTS 289

CHAPTER 9. Building an Ethical Small Group 290

CHAPTER 10. Creating an Ethical Organizational Climate 328

CHAPTER 11. Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership
in a Global Society 372

CHAPTER 12. Ethical Crisis Leadership 414

Detailed Contents

PREFACE	xiii
KEY FEATURES	xiv
Examples and Case Studies	xiv
Leadership Ethics at the Movies	xiv
Self-Assessments	xiv
Focus on Follower Ethics	xiv
Implications and Applications	xiv
For Further Exploration, Challenge, and Self-Assessment	xiv
WHAT'S NEW TO THIS EDITION?	xv
ANCILLARIES	xvi
Instructor Teaching Site	xvi
Student Study Site	xvi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	xvii
INTRODUCTION	xix
LEADERS: THE BAD NEWS AND THE GOOD NEWS	xix
DEFINING TERMS	xxi
OVERVIEW OF THE BOOK	xxiv

PART I. THE SHADOW SIDE OF LEADERSHIP 1

CHAPTER 1.	The Leader's Light or Shadow	2
	WHAT'S AHEAD	2
	A DRAMATIC DIFFERENCE/THE DARK SIDE OF LEADERSHIP	2
	THE LEADER'S SHADOWS	7
	The Shadow of Power	7
	The Shadow of Privilege	12
	The Shadow of Mismanaged Information	13
	The Shadow of Inconsistency	17
	The Shadow of Misplaced and Broken Loyalties	18
	The Shadow of Irresponsibility	20
CHAPTER 2.	Stepping Out of the Shadows	36
	WHAT'S AHEAD	36
	SHADOW CASTERS	38
	Unhealthy Motivations: Internal Enemies or Monsters	38
	Personality Disorders	40
	Faulty Decision Making	43

Failure of Moral Imagination 47
Moral Disengagement 48
Lack of Ethical Expertise 50
Contextual Pressures 51

STEPPING OUT OF THE SHADOWS 52

PART II. LOOKING INWARD 69

CHAPTER 3. The Leader's Character 70

WHAT'S AHEAD 70

ELEMENTS OF CHARACTER 70

Courage 72
Temperance 74
Wisdom and Prudence (Practical Wisdom) 75
Justice 76
Optimism 77
Integrity 78
Humility 78
Compassion (Kindness, Generosity, Love) 79
Forming a Moral Identity 80

CHARACTER BUILDING 83

Finding Role Models 83
Hearing Stories/Living Shared Stories 86
Learning from Hardship 87
Developing Habits 89
Developing Personal Mission Statements 91
Identifying Values 93

CHAPTER 4. Combating Evil 110

WHAT'S AHEAD 110

THE FACES OF EVIL 110

Evil as Dreadful Pleasure 111
Evil as Exclusion 111
Evil as Deception 114
Evil as Bureaucracy 114
Evil as a Choice 115
Evil as Ordinary 116

FACING EVIL 117

MAKING A CASE FOR FORGIVENESS 118

Breaking the Cycle of Evil 118
The Forgiveness Process 120
Seeking Forgiveness 122

SPIRITUALITY AND LEADERSHIP 125

PART III. ETHICAL STANDARDS AND STRATEGIES 145

CHAPTER 5. General Ethical Perspectives 146

WHAT'S AHEAD 146

UTILITARIANISM: DO THE GREATEST GOOD FOR THE GREATEST
NUMBER OF PEOPLE 146

Applications and Cautions 147

KANT'S CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE: DO WHAT'S RIGHT NO
MATTER THE COST 149

Applications and Cautions 150

JUSTICE AS FAIRNESS: GUARANTEEING EQUAL RIGHTS AND
OPPORTUNITIES BEHIND THE VEIL OF IGNORANCE 151

Applications and Cautions 153

PRAGMATISM: ETHICS AS INQUIRY 155

Applications and Cautions 157

ALTRUISM: LOVE YOUR NEIGHBOR 158

Applications and Cautions 162

CHAPTER 6. Ethical Decision Making and Behavior 175

WHAT'S AHEAD 175

ETHICAL DECISION MAKING: A DUAL PROCESS APPROACH 175

COMPONENTS OF MORAL ACTION 177

Component 1: Moral Sensitivity (Recognition) 177

Component 2: Moral Judgment 179

Component 3: Moral Focus (Motivation) 183

Component 4: Moral Character 185

DECISION-MAKING FORMATS 188

Kidder's Ethical Checkpoints 189

Nash's 12 Questions 192

The Lonergan/Baird Method 194

The Foursquare Protocol 197

CHAPTER 7. Exercising Ethical Influence 211

WHAT'S AHEAD 211

ETHICAL ISSUES IN INFLUENCE 211

Compliance Gaining 211

Communication of Expectations 213

Argumentation 217

Negotiation 221

RESISTING INFLUENCE 227

Reciprocation (Give and Take) 228

Commitment and Consistency 229

Social Proof 230

Liking 230
Authority 230
Scarcity 231

CHAPTER 8. Normative Leadership Theories 244

WHAT'S AHEAD 244

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP: RAISING
THE ETHICAL BAR 245

Applications and Cautions 247

SERVANT LEADERSHIP: PUT THE NEEDS OF
FOLLOWERS FIRST 249

Applications and Cautions 253

AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP: KNOW YOURSELF AND
TO YOUR OWN SELF BE TRUE 255

Applications and Cautions 258

AESTHETIC (BEAUTIFUL) LEADERSHIP 260

Applications and Cautions 262

RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP: PROMOTING
GLOBAL GOOD THROUGH ETHICAL
RELATIONSHIPS 263

Applications and Cautions 265

TAOISM: LEAD NATURE'S WAY 267

Applications and Cautions 269

PART IV. SHAPING ETHICAL CONTEXTS 289

CHAPTER 9. Building an Ethical Small Group 290

WHAT'S AHEAD 290

THE LEADER AND THE SMALL GROUP 290

FOSTERING INDIVIDUAL ETHICAL
ACCOUNTABILITY 292

PROMOTING ETHICAL GROUP INTERACTION 294

Comprehensive, Critical Listening 294

Defensive versus Supportive Communication 296

Emotional Intelligence 298

Productive Conflict 299

Minority Opinion 302

AVOIDING MORAL PITFALLS 305

Groupthink 305

False Agreement 309

Escalation of Commitment 310

ESTABLISHING ETHICAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH
OTHER GROUPS 312

CHAPTER 10. Creating an Ethical Organizational Climate 328

WHAT'S AHEAD 328

THE LEADER AS ETHICS OFFICER 328

ETHICAL CLIMATES 329

SIGNS OF HEALTHY ETHICAL CLIMATES 330

Recognition of Risk 331

Zero Tolerance for Individual and Collective
Destructive Behaviors 333

Justice 337

Integrity 338

Trust 340

Process Focus (Concern for Means and Ends) 341

Structural Reinforcement 341

Organizational Citizenship 342

CLIMATE-BUILDING TOOLS 344

Discovering Core Ideology 344

Codes of Ethics 348

Ethical Socialization Processes 351

Ethics Training 354

CHAPTER 11. Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership in a Global Society 372

WHAT'S AHEAD 372

THE DARK SIDE OF GLOBALIZATION 372

The Global Shadow of Power 373

The Global Shadow of Privilege 373

The Global Shadow of Mismanaged Information 374

The Global Shadow of Inconsistency 375

The Global Shadow of Misplaced and Broken Loyalties 375

The Global Shadow of Irresponsibility 376

CULTURAL DIFFERENCES AND ETHICAL VALUES 377

Defining Culture 377

Programmed Value Patterns 378

Project GLOBE 381

Moral Foundations 383

FACING THE CHALLENGES 386

Overcoming Attitudinal Obstacles 386

Finding Common Moral Ground 388

Making Ethical Choices in Culturally Diverse Settings 395

CHAPTER 12. Ethical Crisis Leadership 414

WHAT'S AHEAD 414

CRISIS: AN OVERVIEW 415

The Three Stages of a Crisis 416

COMPONENTS OF ETHICAL CRISIS MANAGEMENT	425
Assume Broad Responsibility	425
Practice Transparency	429
Demonstrate Care and Concern	431
Engage the Head as Well as the Heart	434
Improvise from a Strong Moral Foundation	435
Build Resilience	436
THE ETHICAL DEMANDS OF EXTREME LEADERSHIP	437
 EPILOGUE	457
REFERENCES	459
INDEX	507
ABOUT THE AUTHOR	517

Preface

You have chosen an excellent time to study ethical leadership. Interest in the topic is greater than ever, generating a constant stream of new books, articles, and research studies as well as the creation of new leadership ethics units and courses. We are learning much more about the factors that make up ethical (and unethical) leadership, how leaders make moral choices, how leaders create ethical groups and organizations, how leaders can behave more ethically in a global society, and so on. You have a rapidly growing body of knowledge to draw from in your efforts to become a more ethical leader and follower.

This edition of *Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership* incorporates the latest developments in the field but, like previous versions, is guided by seven principles. First, there are few topics as important as leadership ethics. To highlight that fact, I've adopted Parker Palmer's metaphor of light and shadow as the book's central metaphor. Palmer reminds us that leaders have the power to do significant benefit or substantial harm. In extreme cases, leaders literally make the difference between life and death for their followers.

Second, we need to recognize the reality of bad leadership. Understanding why and how leaders cast shadows can help us prevent destructive behaviors and promote positive leadership. At the same time, we can also learn a great deal from the example of good leaders. Models of ethical and unethical leadership are found throughout the text.

Third, there are important ethical demands associated with the leadership role. Those who want to serve as leaders have a responsibility to exercise their authority on behalf of others. There are also ethical challenges associated with the follower role.

Fourth, the study of leadership ethics must draw from a wide variety of academic disciplines and traditions. Philosophers have been interested in the moral behavior of leaders for centuries. In the modern era, they have been joined by social scientists, resulting in significant advances in our understanding of moral and immoral leadership. As a consequence, material for this text is drawn not only from philosophy but also from political science, psychology, social psychology, neuroscience, management, business ethics, communication, education, sociology, and other fields. This multidisciplinary approach introduces readers to (1) how moral decisions are made (what scholars describe as the descriptive perspective on ethics) and (2) how to lead in a moral manner (the prescriptive or normative perspective).

Fifth, both theory and practice are essential to learning. I try to balance presentation of important concepts and research findings with opportunities for application through self-assessments, case analyses, and exploration exercises.

Sixth, texts should be readable. My objective is to write in an informal, accessible style. I don't hesitate to bring in my own experiences and, in some cases, my biases in the hope of engaging readers and sparking discussion and disagreement.

Seventh, improvement is the bottom line. The ultimate goal of teaching and writing about ethics is to produce more ethical leaders. I believe that ethical development is part of leadership (and followership) development. Leaders and followers can develop their

ability to make and carry through on their moral decisions, just as they develop their other competencies. *Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership* is designed to help students build their ethical expertise through theoretical understanding, skill development, case and film analysis, group and class discussions, personal assessment and reflection, research projects, and writing assignments.

KEY FEATURES

Examples and Case Studies

Whatever their specific contexts, leaders face similar kinds of ethical choices. For that reason, I draw examples from a wide variety of settings: business, medicine, sports, law enforcement, education, government, nonprofit organizations, and the military. Cases continue to play an important role in this edition. Discussion probes at the end of each case encourage readers to reflect on key ethics issues and concepts and to apply what they have learned from that chapter to these narratives.

Leadership Ethics at the Movies

Each of these short summaries introduces a feature film or documentary (new to this edition) that illustrates principles related to the chapter discussion. This feature is designed to encourage students to (1) identify the important ethical principles portrayed in the film, (2) analyze and evaluate how the characters respond to moral dilemmas, and (3) draw ethical implications and applications from the movie. I provide discussion questions for each film to get you started.

Self-Assessments

The self-assessments are designed to help readers measure their performance with respect to important behaviors, skills, or concepts discussed in the chapters. Two self-assessments are found at the end of each chapter.

Focus on Follower Ethics

This feature addresses the ethical challenges facing followers. Followers are critical to the success of any enterprise. The “Focus on Follower Ethics” box in each chapter helps students recognize and master the ethical demands of the follower role.

Implications and Applications

This section, found immediately after the body of each chapter, reviews key ideas and their ramifications for readers.

For Further Exploration, Challenge, and Self-Assessment

This feature encourages interaction with chapter content. Activities include brainstorming exercises, small-group discussions, conversational dyads, debates, self-analysis, personal reflection, and application and research projects.

WHAT'S NEW TO THIS EDITION?

The most significant addition is a new chapter on exercising ethical influence. Leadership is the exercise of influence, and moral considerations should guide leaders' selection of influence tactics. Chapter 7 introduces the ethical issues surrounding four sets of important leader influence tools: compliance gaining, the communication of expectations (the Pygmalion Effect), argumentation, and negotiation. The chapter concludes with a look at leader resistance to persuasion.

Along with the additional chapter, there is new/revised/expanded coverage of the following:

- Leader hypocrisy
- Leader personality disorders
- Moral identity
- Duty orientation
- Developing leadership virtues
- Values
- Personal mission statements
- Story and character development
- Administrative evil
- Ethical followership
- Decision-making formats
- Intelligent disobedience
- Ethics of virtual teams
- Corporate citizenship
- Corporate governance
- Ethical socialization
- Common morality
- Crisis preparation
- Organizational resilience
- Extreme leadership

Most of the case studies from previous editions have been replaced. Some of the new cases in this edition involve Malala Yousafzai, Team Foxcatcher, Bill Cosby, Turing Pharmaceutical, Volkswagen, retired Duke track coach Al Buehler, the Flint Michigan water crisis, Subway's Jared Fogle, the Ashley Madison website, the National Football League concussion epidemic, Scotland's HBOS bank, Amazon, The Container Store, Apple and Foxconn, the Ebola epidemic, New Orleans hurricane recovery, and explorer Ernest Shackleton. Cases based on real-life events, held over from the fifth edition, have been updated. Other fictional cases have been added. There are new self-assessments related to narcissism, apology, altruism, duty orientation, argumentation, negotiation, class project social loafing, moral foundations theory, and corporate Samaritans.

ANCILLARIES

Instructor Teaching Site

A password-protected instructor's manual is available at study.sagepub.com/johnsonmecl6e to help instructors plan and teach their courses. These resources have been designed to help instructors make the classes as practical and interesting as possible for students:

- **Overview for the instructor** offers the author's insights on how to use this book most effectively in a course on leadership ethics.
- **Chapter tests** offer a variety of questions to assist with assessment of student learning.
- **PowerPoint slides** capture key concepts and terms for each chapter for use in lectures and review.
- **Leadership ethics sample course syllabus** provides a model for structuring a course.
- **Leadership seminar sample syllabus** is an additional course option for a seminar format.
- **Teaching strategies** offer ideas and insights into various approaches to teaching and learning.
- **Assignments and projects** provide unique and highly creative activities for meaningful involvement in learning.
- **SAGE journal articles** give access to full journal articles that instructors can assign and use as further teaching tools in class.
- **Case notes** provide an essential reference and teaching tool for using the case studies in the book.

Student Study Site

An open-access student study site can be found at study.sagepub.com/johnsonmecl6e. The site offers **SAGE journal articles**, with access to recent, relevant, full-text articles from SAGE's leading research journals. Each article supports and expands on the concepts presented in the book. This feature also provides discussion questions to focus and guide student interpretation.

Acknowledgments

Colleagues and students provided practical and emotional support during the writing of this edition, just as they did for earlier versions. Kristina Findley and Michelle and Paul Shelton contributed ancillary materials. Students enrolled in my leadership seminar, doctoral ethics seminar, business ethics, and leadership communication classes shaped this and earlier editions by responding to chapter content, exercises, and cases. I am particularly grateful to instructors who adopted the first five editions of *Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership*, which made this sixth edition possible. I also want to thank readers, both faculty and students, who have e-mailed me with comments and corrections. I've had the opportunity to meet some of you at International Leadership Association conferences, where you introduced yourselves and offered encouragement and feedback. Five reviewers provided insightful responses that guided my revisions for this edition. Editor Maggie Stanley ably picked up where her predecessors at SAGE left off, assisted by the rest of the SAGE staff. Finally, I want to once again thank my wife, Mary, who continues to encourage my writing efforts, though it often means less time together.

SAGE gratefully acknowledges the contributions of the following reviewers: Cheryl L. Evans, University of Central Oklahoma; Rita Fields, Madonna University; Carolyn J. Thompson, University of Missouri–Kansas City; and LaVonne Williams-Fedynich, Texas A&M University–Kingsville.

Introduction

LEADERS: THE BAD NEWS AND THE GOOD NEWS

When it comes to leaders, there is both bad news and good news. The bad news is that wherever we turn—business, military, politics, medicine, education, or religion—we find leaders toppled by ethical scandals. Nearly all have sacrificed their positions of leadership and their reputations. Many face civil lawsuits, criminal charges, and jail time. The costs can be even greater for followers. Consider, for example, the following:

- Seventy-eight senior executives from J.P. Morgan, Goldman Sachs, Merrill Lynch, Deutsche Bank, Citigroup, Wells Fargo, and other banks have been charged with concealing risks and lying to investors, which contributed to the world financial crisis of 2007–2008. Millions lost their jobs and homes during the global recession.
- Executives at air bag manufacturer Takata refused to acknowledge that the company's air bags could explode, sending metal shrapnel into drivers and passengers. At least six people were killed, and 100 were injured; nearly 35 million vehicles were recalled.
- Riots broke out in Ferguson, Baltimore, Chicago, Minneapolis, and other American cities after police were accused of the unjustified killings of black suspects.
- Owners and managers of a Massachusetts pharmacy allegedly failed to sterilize a pain drug shipped to hospitals and other health care providers, triggering a meningitis outbreak. Two company executives face murder charges.
- The Islamic terrorist group Boko Haram has driven 1.5 million people from their homes in Nigeria through killings and kidnappings. The militants force kidnapped girls, such as the nearly 300 abducted from the Chibok school, to convert to Islam and to marry Boko Haram soldiers. Some become fighters themselves.
- Executives at Mitsubishi admitted to overstating the fuel economy ratings of hundreds of thousands of the company's cars.
- Officials at Swiss food giant Nestle acknowledged that the seafood it buys from Thailand is caught and processed by slave laborers.
- Fans around the world were disillusioned when South African runner Oscar Pistorius, the first double amputee to participate in the Olympics and a champion of the disabled, was convicted of murdering his girlfriend.

- Former Detroit Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick was jailed for taking \$9.6 million in kickbacks for steering city contracts to a friend and using nonprofit funds to pay for personal expenses. His corrupt administration helped push the city into bankruptcy.
- A West Virginia coal mine explosion took the lives of 29 miners after officials at Massey Energy failed to follow basic safety procedures. The company's founder was convicted of lying to safety authorities.
- Coaches and administrators at Baylor University ignored or downplayed sexual assault allegations against football players who were later convicted of rape. Instead of reporting the accusations as required by law, officials discouraged victims from filing reports, leaving them in continued danger from their assailants.

The misery caused by unethical leaders drives home an important point: Ethics is at the heart of leadership.¹ When we assume the benefits of leadership, we also assume ethical burdens. I believe that as leaders, we must make every effort to act in such a way as to benefit rather than damage others, to cast light instead of shadow. Doing so will significantly reduce the likelihood that we will join the future ranks of fallen leaders.

Fortunately, we can also find plenty of examples of leaders who brighten the lives of those around them. That's the good news. Consider these examples:

- When health authorities were slow to respond to the Ebola crisis in West Africa, local residents and international volunteers stepped in to care for the sick. They were honored as *Time* magazine's 2014 People of the Year.
- Former president Jimmy Carter, in his 90s, continues to work with Habitat for Humanity and his humanitarian Carter Center, even after a brain cancer diagnosis.
- Ordinary citizens of New Orleans spearheaded restoration of the city after Hurricane Katrina, the largest natural disaster in United States history.
- The 2015 winners of the CNN Hero Award are involved in helping others through a variety of community efforts ranging from providing free medical care to the homeless in Pittsburgh to harvesting rainwater in India to offering support to single mothers stricken with cancer in Arizona.
- Myanmar's Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, after decades under house arrest, is now assisting with the country's transition from military rule to a democracy.
- Managers and employees at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant in Japan risked massive radiation exposure to prevent a meltdown following a tsunami that severely damaged the facility.

- Two teachers were hailed as heroes during a theater shooting in Louisiana. The first teacher jumped in front of the second to shield her from bullets and was wounded. The second teacher, though shot in the leg, was able to crawl to a fire alarm and pull it to summon help.
- Pope Francis has inspired millions of Catholics and non-Catholics alike through his humble lifestyle and compassion for the world's poor.

You should find this book helpful if you are a leader or an aspiring leader who (1) acknowledges that there are ethical consequences associated with the leadership role, (2) wants to exert positive influence over others, (3) seeks to make more informed ethical choices and to follow through on your decisions, and (4) desires to foster ethical behavior in others. You will also find useful insights if you are a follower who wants to behave ethically and bring out the best in your leaders.

There is no guarantee that after reading this book, you will act in a more ethical fashion in every situation. Nor can you be sure that others will reach the same conclusions as you do about what is the best answer to an ethical dilemma or that you will succeed in improving the ethical climate of your group or organization. Nevertheless, you can increase your ethical competence and encourage others to do the same. This book is dedicated to that end.

DEFINING TERMS

Because this is a book about leadership ethics, we need to clarify what both of these terms mean. *Leadership* is the exercise of influence in a group context.² Want to know who the leaders are? Look for the people having the greatest impact on the group or organization. Leaders are change agents engaged in furthering the needs, wants, and goals of leaders and followers alike. They are found wherever humans associate with one another, whether in social movements, sports teams, task forces, nonprofit agencies, state legislatures, military units, or corporations.

No definition of leadership is complete without distinguishing between *leading* and *following*. Generally, leaders get the most press. The newfound success of a college football team is a case in point. The head coach gets most of the credit for changing a losing team into a winner, but the turnaround is really the result of the efforts of many followers. Assistant coaches work with offensive and defensive lines, quarterbacks, and kicking teams; trainers tend to injuries; academic tutors keep players in school; athletic department staff members solicit contributions for training facilities; and sports information personnel draw attention to the team's accomplishments.

In truth, leaders and followers function collaboratively, working together toward shared objectives. They are relational partners who play complementary roles.³ Whereas leaders exert a greater degree of influence and take more responsibility for the overall direction of the group, followers are more involved in implementing plans and doing the work. During the course of a day or week, we typically shift between leader and follower roles—heading up a project team at work, for example, while taking the position of

follower as a student in a night class. As a result, we need to know how to behave ethically as both leaders and followers.

Moving from a follower role to a leadership role brings with it a shift in expectations. Important leader functions include establishing direction, organizing, coordinating activities and resources, motivating, and managing conflicts. Important follower functions include carrying out important group and organizational tasks (engineering, social work, teaching, accounting), generating new ideas about how to get jobs done, working in teams, and providing feedback.⁴

Viewing leadership as a role should put to rest the notion that leaders are born, not made. The fact that nearly all of us will function as leaders at some point if we haven't already done so means that leadership is not limited to those with the proper genetic background, income level, or education. Ordinary people emerged as leaders during the shooting that seriously injured Arizona congresswoman Gabby Giffords and killed six others, for instance. An intern on the congresswoman's staff applied pressure to Giffords's head wound, saving her life. One member of the crowd prevented the killer from reloading his weapon by grabbing a loaded magazine he had dropped and another clubbed the shooter in the back of his head with a folding chair. One of the wounded, a seventy-four-year-old army colonel, tackled the gunman, and he and other bystanders subdued him. A doctor and nurse shopping at the Safeway where the attack occurred provided treatment for victims.

Leadership should not be confused with position, although leaders often occupy positions of authority. Those designated as leaders, such as a disillusioned manager nearing retirement, don't always exert a great deal of influence. On the other hand, those without the benefit of a title on the organizational chart can have a significant impact. Angela Merkel was a quiet East German scientist who went on to become Chancellor of the reunited Germany. Under her direction, the country has taken the lead in addressing Europe's Syrian refugee crisis. Erin Brockovich was a poor single mother in California without legal training who helped victims of chemical poisoning reach a multimillion-dollar legal settlement with Pacific Gas and Electric. Mohamed Bouazizi was a Tunisian fruit vendor who burned himself alive to protest political oppression and lack of economic opportunity. His dramatic act launched the Arab Spring, a popular uprising that toppled several dictatorships in the Middle East. (See Case Study 0.1 at the end of this introduction for another example of an unlikely leader.)

Human leadership differs in important ways from the pattern of dominance and submission that characterizes animal societies. The dominant female hyena or male chimpanzee rules over the pack or troop through pure physical strength. Each maintains authority until some stronger rival (often seeking mates) comes along. Unlike other animals, which seem to be driven largely by instinct, humans consciously choose how they want to influence others. We can rely on persuasion, rewards, punishments, emotional appeals, rules, and a host of other means to get our way. Freedom of choice makes ethical considerations an important part of any discussion of leadership. The term *ethics* refers to judgments about whether human behavior is right or wrong. We may be repulsed by the idea that a male lion will kill the offspring of the previous dominant male when he takes control of the pride. Yet we cannot label his actions as unethical because he is driven by a genetic imperative to start his own bloodline. We can and do condemn the actions of leaders who decide to lie, belittle followers, and enrich themselves at the expense of the less fortunate.

Some philosophers distinguish between *ethics*, which they define as the systematic study of the principles of right and wrong behavior, and *morals*, which they describe as specific standards of right and wrong (“Thou shall not steal”; “Do unto others as they would do unto you”). Just as many scholars appear to use these terms interchangeably, I will follow the latter course.

The practice of *ethical leadership* is a two-part process involving personal moral behavior and moral influence.⁵ Ethical leaders earn that label when they act morally as they carry out their duties and shape the ethical contexts of their groups, organizations, and societies. Both components are essential. Leaders must demonstrate such character traits as justice, humility, optimism, courage, and compassion; make wise choices; and master the ethical challenges of their roles. In addition, they are responsible for the ethical behavior of others. (Complete Self-Assessment 0.1 to determine how well your leader fills each of these roles.) These dual responsibilities intertwine. As we’ll see later in the book, leaders act as role models for the rest of the organization. How followers behave depends in large part on the example set by leaders. Conversely, leaders become products of their own creations. Ethical climates promote the moral development of leaders as well as that of followers, fostering their character and improving their ability to make and follow through on ethical choices. Ethical organizational environments are marked by integrity, justice, trust, a concern for how goals are achieved, and a sense of social responsibility. They also have safeguards that keep both leaders and followers from engaging in destructive behaviors.

There is a widespread misconception that ethics and effectiveness are incompatible. Many believe that in order to be effective, leaders have to sacrifice their ethical standards. They are convinced of the truth of the old adage “Nice guys (or gals) finish last.” However, investigators report that ethical leaders are frequently more, not less, effective than their unethical colleagues; for example:⁶

- Ethical leaders are rated as more promotable and effective.
- Those working for ethical leaders are more satisfied and are more committed to their organizations and their managers. They work harder, are more willing to report problems to management, and are more productive.
- Members of work groups led by moral leaders are less likely to engage in theft, sabotage, cheating, and other deviant behaviors. In addition, they are less likely to engage in workplace incivility—putting others down, making demeaning remarks, excluding others, and so on.
- Ethical leadership enhances organizational trust levels, fostering perceptions that the organization is competent, open, concerned for employees, and reliable. Such trust leads to improved organizational performance and greater profitability.
- Ethical chief executive officers (CEOs) encourage their companies to engage in socially responsible behavior.
- Employees who consider their leaders to be moral persons and moral managers also believe that their organizations are effective.

- Ethical leadership is linked to follower creativity and innovation.
- Ethical leadership fosters an ethical organizational climate, which, in turn, increases job satisfaction and commitment to the organization.
- Ethical leadership can have a positive impact beyond the workplace. Spouses of employees working for ethical leaders report higher family satisfaction.
- Followers in both Western and non-Western cultures want leaders of high character who respect the rights and the dignity of others.

In sum, while unethical leaders can prosper, a growing body of evidence suggests that if you strive to be an ethical leader, you are more likely to be a successful one as well.

OVERVIEW OF THE BOOK

Part I of this book, “The Shadow Side of Leadership,” examines the important topic of leadership’s dark side. Chapter 1 outlines common shadows cast by leaders: abuse of power and privilege, mismanagement of information, misplaced and broken loyalties, inconsistency, and irresponsibility. Chapter 2 explores the reasons leaders often cause more harm than good and then outlines strategies for stepping out of the shadows and into the light.

After identifying the factors that cause us to cast shadows as leaders, the discussion turns to mastering them. To do so, we will need to look inward. Part II, “Looking Inward,” focuses on the inner dimension of leadership. Chapter 3 examines the role of character development in overcoming our internal enemies and faulty motivations, and Chapter 4 explores the nature of evil, forgiveness, apology, and spirituality.

Part III, “Ethical Standards and Strategies,” addresses moral decision making and provides the theory and tactics we need to develop our ethical expertise. Chapter 5 surveys a wide range of ethical perspectives that can help us set moral priorities, while Chapter 6 describes the process of ethical decision making as well as formats that we can use to make better moral choices and follow through on our decisions. Chapter 7 (new to this edition) looks at how to choose ethical influence tactics. Chapter 8 introduces theories specifically developed to guide the ethical behavior of leaders.

Part IV, “Shaping Ethical Contexts,” looks at ways in which leaders can shed light in a variety of situations. Chapter 9 examines ethical group decision making. Chapter 10 describes the creation of ethical organizational climates. Chapter 11 highlights the challenges of ethical diversity. Chapter 12 provides an overview of ethical leadership in crisis situations.

Expect to learn new terminology along with key principles, decision-making formats, and important elements of the ethical context. This information is drawn from a number of different fields of study—philosophy, communication, theology, history, psychology, neuroscience, sociology, political science, and organizational behavior—because we need insights from many different disciplines if we are to step out of the shadows. You can anticipate reading about and then practicing a variety of skills, ranging from information gathering to listening and conflict management.

With these preliminaries out of the way, let’s begin with Chapter 1, which takes a closer look at some of the ethical hurdles faced by leaders.

Case Study 0.1

A GIRL TAKES ON THE TALIBAN (AND WORLD LEADERS)

One of the world's most powerful advocates for children's education is also one of the youngest. Malala Yousafzai began her career as an activist in 2008, at age 11, in the remote Swat Valley of Pakistan. After the Taliban began attacking girls' schools in her region, she gave a radio interview in which she declared, "How dare the Taliban take away my basic right to education?"¹ The next year, she began blogging for the BBC, describing what it was like to live under Taliban rule. Malala wrote under an assumed name but her identity was revealed, making her a target for the Taliban. Despite the risk, she continued to speak out about the right of girls and women. Malala and her father, an educator and anti-Taliban activist, received death threats from the militant group. On October 12, 2012, a Taliban gunman boarded the bus she was taking home from school and shot her in the left side of the head. (Two other girls were also injured.) Yousafzai was transferred to a Birmingham, England, hospital after initially receiving treatment in a Pakistani military facility. The young advocate suffered no permanent brain damage, though part of her skull had to be removed to relieve brain swelling. She still suffers partial paralysis on the left side of her face as well as loss of some hearing in her left ear.

The Taliban's attempt to silence Malala had the opposite result. More people than ever were drawn to her cause. Citizens from around the world expressed their support for her during her recovery. She gave a speech to the United Nations (UN) on her 16th birthday and became the youngest winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, at age 17, in 2014. (She shared the prize with Indian children's rights champion Kailash Satyarthi.) Yousafzai and her father created the Malala Fund, which promotes twelve years of free education for all the world's children, particularly girls. (An estimated 63 million children, over 5 million in Pakistan, don't receive an education, and millions of others learn in substandard conditions.) In one project, the Malala Fund covered the costs of opening up a school for 200 Syrian girl refugees.

Malala does not hesitate to take on world leaders in her fight for universal education. She faults the UN for seeking to provide only an elementary and middle school education to children. She told UN members to make twelve years of schooling their goal: "Your dreams were too small. Now it is time that you dream bigger."² Malala notes that just an eight-day halt to military spending would pay for "12 years of free, quality education to every child on the planet."³ When she visited the White House, she told President Obama to stop drone warfare and to invest in education instead. She criticized the president of Nigeria for not doing enough to rescue schoolgirls kidnapped by Boko Haram.

Due to Taliban death threats, Malala and her family will not be able to return to their homeland from Britain in the foreseeable future. Tragically, she is not the only Pakistani child to be shot by the Taliban. Taliban gunmen murdered 140 teachers and children, most of them boys between the ages of 12 and 16, at a school in the city of Peshawar. In other attacks, the militant group used bombs to blow up girls on a school playground and on a school bus.

(Continued)

(Continued)

How do you account for the fact that a girl from rural Pakistan became a leading spokesperson for worldwide childhood education?

Can you think of any other examples of leaders, like Malala, who overcame humble circumstances and significant barriers to become leaders?

What gives Malala Yousafzai the courage to speak boldly to world leaders?

Is Malala more effective as an advocate for children's education because she is young?

Is Malala's goal of universal 12-year education too ambitious?

Yousafzai, M., & Lamb, C. (2013). *I am Malala: The girl who stood up for education and was shot by the Taliban*. New York, NY: Back Bay Books, p. 142.

Kristof, N. (2015, September 26). Malala Yousafzai's fight continues. *The New York Times*, Op-Ed.

Malala Yousafzai biography. (2015, December 9). *Biography.com*.

Baker, A. (2013, December 19). Runner-up: Malala Yousafzai, the fighter. *Time.com*

Boone, J. (2015, December 15). Peshawar school attack: One year on 'the country is changed completely.' *The Guardian*.

Kellaway, K. (2015, October 15). Malala Yousafzai: 'I want to become prime minister of my country.' *The Guardian*.

SELF-ASSESSMENT 0.1

Ethical Leadership Scale

Instructions: In responding to the following items, think about your chief executive officer (CEO) or top leader at work. Indicate your level of agreement with the statements in the next section by circling your responses.

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = neutral

4 = agree

5 = strongly agree

My organization's CEO/top leader

1.	listens to what employees have to say.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	disciplines employees who violate ethical standards.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	conducts his or her personal life in an ethical manner.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	has the best interests of employees in mind.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	makes fair and balanced decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	can be trusted.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	discusses business ethics or values with employees.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	sets an example of how to do things the right way in terms of ethics.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	defines success not just by results but also by the way that they are obtained.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	asks, "What is the right thing to do?" when making decisions.	1	2	3	4	5

Scoring: Add up your responses to the 10 items. Total score can range from 10 to 50. The higher the score, the more ethical you believe your leader to be.

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

NOTES

1. See Ciulla, J. B. (2004). Leadership ethics: Mapping the territory. In J. B. Ciulla (Ed.), *Ethics, the heart of leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 3–24). Westport, CT: Praeger.

2. Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

3. Hollander, E. P. (1992). The essential interdependence of leadership and followership. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 1, 71–75; Kellerman, B. (2008). *Followership: How followers are creating change and changing leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

4. Johnson, C. E., & Hackman, M. Z. (1997). *Rediscovering the power of followership in the leadership communication text*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois.
5. Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 595–616.
6. Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Socialized charismatic leadership, values congruence, and deviance in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 954–962; Brown, M. E., Trevino, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97, 117–134; Davis, A. L., & Rothstein, H. R. (2006). The effects of the perceived behavioral integrity of managers on employee attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67, 407–419; Eisenbeiss, S. A., van Knippenberg, D., & Fahrback, C. M. (2015). Doing well by doing good? Analyzing the relationship between CEO ethical leadership and firm performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128, 635–651; Johnson, C. E., Shelton, P. M., & Yates, L. (2012). Nice guys (and gals) finish first: Ethical leadership and organizational trust, satisfaction, and effectiveness. *International Leadership Journal*, 4(1), 3–19; Khuntia, R., & Suar, D. (2004). A scale to assess ethical leadership of Indian and public sector managers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 49, 13–26; Liao, Y., Liu, X-Y., Kwan, H., & Jinsong, L. (2015). Work–family effects of ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128, 535–545; Neubert, M. J., Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Roberts, J. A., & Chonko, L. B. (2009). The virtuous influence of ethical leadership behavior: Evidence from the field. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90, 157–170; Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2014). Ethical leadership: Meta-analytic evidence of criterion-related and incremental validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 948–965; Resick, C. J., Hanges, P. J., Dickson, M. W., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2006). A cross-cultural examination of the endorsement of ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 63, 345–359; Rubin, R. S., Dierdorff, E. C., & Brown, M. E. (2010). Do ethical leaders get ahead? Exploring ethical leadership and promotability. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20, 215–236; Taylor, S. G., & Pattie, M. W. (2014). When does ethical leadership affect workplace incivility? The moderating role of follower personality. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 24, 595–616; Wu, L-Z., Kwan, H. K., Hong-kit, F., Chiu, R. K., & He, X. (2015). CEO ethical leadership and corporate social responsibility: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130, 819–831; Yidong, T., & Xinxin, L. (2013). How ethical leadership influences employees' innovative work behavior: A perspective of intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116, 441–455.

PART I

The Shadow Side of Leadership

The Leader's Light or Shadow

Stepping Out of the Shadows

The Leader's Light or Shadow

We know where light is coming from by looking at the shadows.

—HUMANITIES SCHOLAR PAUL WOODRUFF

WHAT'S AHEAD

This chapter introduces the dark (bad, toxic) side of leadership as the first step in promoting good or ethical leadership. The metaphor of light and shadow dramatizes the differences between moral and immoral leaders. Leaders have the power to illuminate the lives of followers or to cover them in darkness. They cast light when they master ethical challenges of leadership. They cast shadows when they (1) abuse power, (2) hoard privileges, (3) mismanage information, (4) act inconsistently, (5) misplace or betray loyalties, and (6) fail to assume responsibilities.

A DRAMATIC DIFFERENCE/THE DARK SIDE OF LEADERSHIP

In an influential essay titled “Leading from Within,” educational writer and consultant Parker Palmer introduces a powerful metaphor to dramatize the distinction between ethical and unethical leadership. According to Palmer, the difference between moral and immoral leaders is as sharp as the contrast between light and darkness, between heaven and hell:

A leader is a person who has an unusual degree of power to create the conditions under which other people must live and move and have their being, conditions that can be either as illuminating as heaven or as shadowy as hell. A leader must take special responsibility for what's going on inside his or her own self, inside his or her consciousness, lest the act of leadership create more harm than good.¹

For most of us, *leadership* has a positive connotation. We have been fortunate enough to benefit from the guidance of teachers or coaches, for example, or we admire noteworthy historical leaders. As we saw in the introduction, ethical leaders brighten the lives of those around them significantly by building trust, commitment, and satisfaction; by reducing

negative behavior; and by increasing individual and collective performance. However, Palmer urges us to pay more attention to the shadow side of leadership. Political figures, parents, clergy, and business executives have the potential to cast as much shadow as they do light. Refusing to face the dark side of leadership makes abuse more likely. All too often, leaders “do not even know they are making a choice, let alone how to reflect on the process of choosing.”²

Other scholars have joined Palmer in focusing on the dark or negative dimension of leadership. Claremont Graduate University professor Jean Lipman-Blumen uses the term *toxic leaders* to describe those who engage in destructive behaviors and who exhibit dysfunctional personal characteristics.³ These behaviors and qualities (summarized in Table 1.1) cause significant harm to followers and organizations.

Harvard professor Barbara Kellerman believes that limiting our understanding of leadership solely to good leadership ignores the reality that a great many leaders engage in destructive behaviors.⁴ Overlooking that fact, Kellerman says, undermines our attempts to promote good leadership:

I take it as a given that we promote good leadership not by ignoring bad leadership, nor by presuming that it is immutable, but rather by attacking it as we would a disease that is always pernicious and sometimes deadly.⁵

According to Kellerman, bad leaders can be ineffective, unethical, or ineffective and unethical. She identifies seven types of bad leaders:

Incompetent. These leaders don’t have the motivation or the ability to sustain effective action. They may lack emotional or academic intelligence, for example, or be careless, distracted, or sloppy. Some cannot function under stress, and their communication and decisions suffer as a result. Former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld failed as leader of the invasion of Iraq. He didn’t understand the political situation and that the war wasn’t over when American troops entered Baghdad. He was unable to generate an effective strategy for waging an extended campaign against highly motivated insurgents.

Rigid. Rigid leaders may be competent, but they are unyielding, unable to accept new ideas, new information, or changing conditions. Thabo Mbeki is one such leader. After becoming president of South Africa in 1999, he insisted that HIV does not cause AIDS and withheld antiretroviral drugs from HIV-positive pregnant women. These medications would have dramatically cut the transmission of the disease to their babies.

Intemperate. Intemperate leaders lack self-control and are enabled by followers who don’t want to intervene or can’t. The political career of Toronto mayor Rob Ford demonstrates intemperate leadership in action. Ford admitted to using illegal drugs, sometimes while drunk, and was photographed using crack cocaine. Despite calls for his resignation, he stood for reelection until cancer forced him to withdraw from the race. He ran instead for his old district seat and won by a large margin.

Callous. The callous leader is uncaring or unkind, ignoring or downplaying the needs, wants, and wishes of followers. Former hotel magnate Leona Helmsley personifies the

TABLE 1.1
The Behaviors and Personal Characteristics of Toxic Leaders

Destructive Behaviors	Toxic Qualities
Leaving followers worse off	Lack of integrity
Violating human rights	Insatiable ambition
Feeding followers’ illusions; creating dependence	Enormous egos
Playing to the basest fears and needs of followers	Arrogance
Stifling criticism; enforcing compliance	Amorality (inability to discern right from wrong)
Misleading followers	Avarice (greed)
Subverting ethical organizational structures and processes	Reckless disregard for the costs of their actions
Engaging in unethical, illegal, and criminal acts	Cowardice (refusal to make tough choices)
Building totalitarian regimes	Failure to understand problems
Failing to nurture followers, including successors	Incompetence in key leadership situations
Setting constituents against one another	
Encouraging followers to hate or destroy others	
Identifying scapegoats	
Making themselves indispensable	
Ignoring or promoting incompetence, cronyism, and corruption	

Source: Adapted from Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). *The allure of toxic leaders: Why we follow destructive bosses and corrupt politicians—and how we can survive them*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, pp. 19–23.

callous leader. She earned the title “the Queen of Mean” by screaming at employees and firing them for minor infractions such as having dirty fingernails. Helmsley later served time in prison for tax evasion. (She once quipped, “Only the little people pay taxes.”)

Corrupt. These leaders and (at least some of their followers) lie, cheat, and steal. They put self-interest ahead of the public interest. The top officers of FIFA, the governing body of world soccer, are exemplars of this type of leader. Most of the group's leaders are targets of a corruption probe. They are accused of taking bribes from cities hoping to host the World Cup as well as from broadcasters and athletic apparel companies.

Insular. The insular leader draws a clear boundary between the welfare of his or her immediate group or organization and outsiders. Former U.S. President Bill Clinton behaved in an insular manner when he didn't intervene in the Rwandan genocide that took the lives of 800,000 to 1 million people in 1994. He later traveled to Africa to apologize for failing to act even though he had reliable information describing how thousands of Tutsis were being hacked to death by their Hutu neighbors.

Evil. Evil leaders commit atrocities, using their power to inflict severe physical or psychological harm. Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi is one example of an evil leader. He heads ISIS, the Middle Eastern terrorist group known for beheading male captives and turning female captives into sex slaves for Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) soldiers. Al-Baghdadi told his followers that Muslim believers have the right to enslave all nonbelievers.

Lipman-Blumen and Kellerman developed their typologies based on case studies of prominent leaders. Now investigators are shifting the focus to ordinary leaders. In one project, two researchers at Bond University in Australia (along with a colleague from the United States) asked employees to explain why they would label someone as a bad leader, describe how a bad leader made them feel, and describe the impact bad leaders had on them and the organization as a whole.⁶ Respondents reported that bad leaders are incompetent (they are unable to use technology, for example, and can't work with subordinates or plan strategy) and unethical (they demonstrate poor ethics as well as poor personal and interpersonal behavior). Such leaders made respondents angry and frustrated while lowering their self-esteem. Individual and collective performance suffered as a result. Those working under bad leaders reported feeling more stress at home. They had trouble sleeping, for instance, and felt fatigued. Negative emotions toward their leaders consumed their thoughts and hurt their family relationships. According to the survey, bad leaders often go unpunished; instead, many are promoted or rewarded.

Using information generated by this study, the researchers developed a tool to measure destructive organizational leadership. They discovered that demonstrating just a couple of bad behaviors was enough to label a leader as destructive, even though he or she might also have lots of positive qualities. The Bond scholars identified seven clusters of destructive leader behaviors:⁷

Cluster 1: This type of leader makes poor decisions (often based on inadequate information), lies and engages in other unethical behavior, cannot deal with new technology, and typically fails to prioritize and delegate.

Cluster 2: This type of leader lacks critical skills. She or he is unable to negotiate or persuade and cannot develop or motivate subordinates.

Cluster 3: This type of leader makes good decisions and has the necessary leadership skills but is overly controlling and micromanages followers.

Cluster 4: This type of leader can't deal with conflict but plays favorites and behaves inconsistently.

Cluster 5: This type of leader isn't all that bad but isn't all that good either. Leaders in this category don't seek information from others, don't change their minds, and don't do a good job of coordinating followers.

Cluster 6: This type of leader isolates the group from the rest of the organization.

Cluster 7: This type of leader creates a situation of "significant misery and despair." Leaders in this group are brutal and bullying, frequently lying and engaging in other unethical behavior.

Ståle Einarsen and his Norwegian colleagues offer an alternative classification of bad leadership based on its negative effects either on the organization or on followers. Destructive leaders can be antiorganization, antisubordinates, or both.⁸ *Tyrannical leaders* reach organizational goals while abusing followers. *Supportive-disloyal leaders* care for the welfare of subordinates at the expense of organizational goals. They may tolerate loafing or stealing, for example. *Derailed leaders* act against the interests of both subordinates and the organization. As they bully, manipulate, deceive, and harass followers, they may also be stealing from the organization, engaging in fraudulent activities, and doing less than expected. *Laissez-faire leaders* engage in passive and indirect negative behavior. They occupy leadership positions but don't exercise leadership, therefore hurting followers and their organizations. *Constructive leaders*, on the other hand, care about subordinates and help the organization achieve its goals while using resources wisely. Einarsen and his fellow researchers found a high rate of bad leadership in Norwegian organizations, with 61% of respondents reporting that their immediate supervisors engaged in ongoing destructive behavior over the past six months. Laissez-faire behavior was by far most common form of bad leadership, followed by supportive-disloyal leadership, derailed leadership, and tyrannical leadership.⁹ (Turn to Self-Assessment 1.1 at the end of this chapter to determine whether your leader engages in destructive leadership behavior.)

Evidence that bad leaders can cause significant damage continues to grow. In an analysis of the results of 57 studies, investigators found that destructive leader behavior is linked to a wide range of negative outcomes.¹⁰ Those serving under destructive leaders have negative attitudes toward their superiors, resist their leaders' influence attempts, and engage more frequently in counterproductive work behaviors. In addition, these followers have negative attitudes toward their jobs and their organizations. Their personal well-being also suffers as they experience negative emotions and stress.

In sum, Palmer was right to emphasize the importance of the shadow side of leadership. Followers from around the world have lots of firsthand experience with bad leaders and report that such leaders cause significant damage. It apparently takes only a few destructive behaviors to overcome a leader's positive qualities. In addition, the shadows

cast by destructive leaders extend beyond the workplace; the home lives of followers are damaged as well.

THE LEADER'S SHADOWS

When we function as leaders, we take on a unique set of ethical burdens in addition to a set of expectations and tasks. These involve issues of power, privilege, information, consistency, loyalty, and responsibility. How we handle the challenges of leadership determines whether we cause more harm than good or, to return to Palmer's metaphor, whether we cast light or shadow. Unless we're careful, we're likely to cast one or more of the shadows described in this section. (For a list of the ethical challenges faced by those in the follower role, see "Focus on Follower Ethics: The Ethical Challenges of Followership.")

The Shadow of Power

Power is the foundation for influence attempts. The more power we have, the more likely others are to comply with our wishes. Power comes from a variety of sources. One typology, for example, divides power into two categories: hard and soft.¹¹ *Hard power* uses inducements (bonuses, raises) and threats (arrests, firings) to get people to go along. *Soft power* is based on attracting others rather than forcing them or inducing them to comply. Leaders use soft power when they set a worthy example, create an inspiring vision, and build positive relationships with subordinates. Typically, those without formal authority rely more heavily on soft power, but even those in formal leadership positions, such as military officers, try to attract followers by acting as role models and emphasizing the group's mission. Effective leaders combine hard and soft power into *smart power* to achieve their goals. For instance, a manager may try to persuade an employee to follow a new policy while at the same time outlining the penalties the subordinate will face if he or she does not comply.

The most popular power classification system identifies five power bases.¹² *Coercive power* is based on penalties or punishments such as physical force, salary reductions, student suspensions, or embargoes against national enemies. *Reward power* depends on being able to deliver something of value to others, whether tangible (bonuses, health insurance, grades) or intangible (praise, trust, cooperation). *Legitimate power* resides in the position, not the person. Supervisors, judges, police officers, drill sergeants, instructors, and parents have the right to control our behavior within certain limits. A boss can require us to carry out certain tasks at work, for example; but in most cases, he or she has no say in what we do in our free time. In contrast to legitimate power, *expert power* is based on the characteristics of the individual regardless of that person's official position. Knowledge, skills, education, and certification all build expert power. *Referent (role model) power* rests on the admiration one person has for another. We're more likely to do favors for a supervisor we admire or to buy a product promoted by our favorite sports hero.

Leaders typically draw on more than one power source. The manager who is appointed to lead a task force is granted legitimate power that enables her to reward or punish. Yet in order to be successful, she'll have to demonstrate her knowledge of the topic, skillfully direct the group process, and earn the respect of task force members through hard work and commitment to the group. ("Leadership Ethics at the Movies: *Selma*" describes one leader who skillfully uses his power, and the power used by his opponents, to achieve a worthy objective.)

Focus on Follower Ethics

THE ETHICAL CHALLENGES OF FOLLOWERSHIP

Followers, like leaders, face their own set of ethical challenges. Followers walk on the dark side when they fail to meet the moral responsibilities of their roles. Important ethical challenges confronted by followers include those described below.

The Challenge of Obligation. Followers contribute to a shadowy atmosphere when they fail to fulfill their minimal responsibilities by coming to work late, taking extended breaks, not carrying out assignments, undermining the authority of their leaders, stealing supplies, and so on. However, they can also contribute to an unethical climate by taking on too many obligations. Employees forced to work mandatory overtime and salaried staff at many technology and consulting firms work 70–80 hours a week, leaving little time for family and personal interests. They experience stress and burnout, and their family relationships suffer.

Followers also have ethical duties to outsiders. Carpenters and other tradespeople involved in home construction have an obligation to buyers to build high-quality houses and to meet deadlines, for example. Government employees owe it to taxpayers to spend their money wisely by working hard while keeping expenses down.

These questions can help us sort out the obligations we owe as followers:

- Am I doing all I reasonably can to carry out my tasks and further the mission of my organization? What more could I do?
- Am I fulfilling my obligations to outsiders (clients, neighbors, community, customers)? Are there any additional steps I should take?

- Am I giving back to the group or organization as much as I am taking from it?
- Am I carrying my fair share of the workload?
- Am I serving the needs of my leaders?
- Am I earning the salary and benefits I receive?
- Can I fulfill my organizational obligations and, at the same time, maintain a healthy personal life and productive relationships? If not, what can I do to bring my work and personal life into balance?

The Challenge of Obedience. Groups and organizations couldn't function if members refused to obey orders or adhere to policies, even the ones they don't like. As a result, followers have an ethical duty to obey. However, blindly following authority can drive followers to engage in illegal and immoral activities that they would never participate in on their own. Obeying orders is no excuse for unethical behavior. Therefore, deciding when to disobey is critical. To make this determination, consider the following factors: Does this order appear to call for unethical behavior? Would I engage in this course of action if I weren't ordered to? What are the potential consequences for others, and for myself, if these directions are followed? Does obedience threaten the mission and health of the organization as a whole? What steps should I take if I decide to disobey?

The Challenge of Cynicism. There is a difference between healthy skepticism, which prevents followers from being exploited, and unhealthy cynicism, which undermines individual and group performance. Followers darken the atmosphere when they become organizational cynics. That's because cynicism destroys commitment and

undermines trust. Collective performance suffers as a result. Few give their best effort when they are disillusioned with the group. Cynical employees feel less identification with and commitment to their employers while being more resistant to change; they are less likely to go beyond their job duties to help their colleagues and their organizations. The greater the degree of cynicism, the more effort is directed toward attacking the organization at the expense of completing the task at hand.

The Challenge of Dissent. Expressing disagreement is an important ethical duty of followership. Followers should take issue with policies and procedures that are inefficient, harmful, or costly and with leaders who harm others or put the organization at risk. Doing so serves the mission of the organization while protecting the rights of its members and the larger community. Although followers contribute to a shadowy environment when they fail to speak up, they can go too far by generating a constant stream of complaints. Ethical followers know when to speak up (not every issue is worth contesting) and when to wait until a more important issue comes along. They must also determine whether the problem is significant enough to justify going outside the organization (becoming a whistle-blower) if leaders don't respond.

The Challenge of Bad News. Delivering bad news is risky business. Followers who tell their bosses that the project is over budget, that sales are down, or that the software doesn't work as promised may be verbally abused, demoted, or fired. Organizations and leaders pay a high price when followers hide or cover up bad news, deny responsibility, or shift blame. Leaders can't correct problems they don't know exist. Failure to address serious deficiencies such as accounting fraud, cost overruns, and product contamination can destroy an organization. Leaders who don't get feedback about their ineffective

habits—micromanaging, poor listening skills, indecisiveness—can't address those behaviors. When leaders deny accountability and shift blame, this undermines trust and diverts people's focus from solving problems to defending themselves.

To avoid contributing to a shadowy environment, followers must deliver bad news and accept responsibility for their actions. They also need to pay close attention to how they deliver bad tidings, selecting the right time, place, and message channel. Significant problems should be brought to the leader's attention immediately, when he or she is most receptive, and delivered face-to-face whenever possible, not through e-mail, faxes, and other, less personal channels.

Source: Adapted from Johnson, C. E. (2015). *Organizational ethics: A practical approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, Ch. 9.

Additional Sources

- Bedian, A. G. (2007). Even if the tower is "ivory," it isn't "white": Understanding the consequences of faculty cynicism. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 6, 9–32.
- Dean, J. W., Brandes, P., & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 341–352.
- Hajdin, M. (2005). Employee loyalty: An examination. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 59, 259–280.
- Roberts, T. P., & Zigarmi, D. (2014). The impact of dispositional cynicism on job-specific affect and work intentions. *International Journal of Psychology*, 49, 381–389.
- Roloff, M. E., & Paulson, G. D. (2001). Confronting organizational transgressions. In J. M. Darley, D. M. Messick, & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Social influences on ethical behavior in organizations* (pp. 53–68). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Schrag, B. (2001). The moral significance of employee loyalty. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 11, 41–66.
- Stanley, D. J., Meyer, J. P., & Topolnytsky, L. (2005). Employee cynicism and resistance to organizational change. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19, 429–459.

Leadership Ethics at the Movies

SELMA

Key Cast Members: Davis Oyelowo, Carman Ejogo, Tom Wilkinson, Oprah Winfrey, Andre Holland

Synopsis: In 1965, the American civil rights movement is in full swing. Congress has outlawed segregation, but poll taxes and other restrictions keep blacks from registering to vote. Martin Luther King (played by Oyelowo) organizes a voting rights march from Montgomery to Selma, Alabama. King and his followers face resistance from Alabama governor George Wallace, National Guardsmen, county sheriffs, and President Lyndon Johnson (Wilkinson), who wants King to stop the march. King refuses, insisting instead that Johnson introduce a voting rights bill to Congress. King wins the battle of wills, and the march goes forward with the support of federal authorities.

Johnson then sends Congress voting rights legislation that is passed into law.

Rating: PG-13 for vivid scenes of violence and mature themes

Themes: types of power, use and abuse of power, courage, justice and injustice, vision, shadow of misinformation

Discussion Starters

1. What types of power do the major figures in the film use?
2. How does the abuse of power by King's opponents contribute to his success?
3. How does King appeal to white audiences?
4. What character weaknesses do you note in President Johnson? Do you find anything in his character to admire?

The use of each power type has advantages and disadvantages. For instance, the dispensing of rewards is widely accepted in Western culture but can be counterproductive if the rewards promote the wrong behaviors (see Chapter 10) or go to the wrong people. U.S. workers are more satisfied and productive when their leaders rely on forms of power that are tied to the person (expert and referent) rather than forms of power that are linked to the position (coercive, reward, and legitimate).¹³ In addition, positional power is more susceptible to abuse. Coercive tactics have the potential to do the most damage, threatening the dignity as well as the physical and mental health of followers. Leaders, then, have important decisions to make about the types of power they use and when. (Complete Self-Assessment 1.2 to determine the types of power you prefer to use.)

The fact that leadership cannot exist without power makes some Americans uncomfortable. We admire powerful leaders who act decisively, but we can be reluctant to admit that we have and use power. Sadly, our refusal to face up to the reality of power can make us more vulnerable to the shadow side of leadership. Cult leader Jim Jones presided over the suicide–murder of 909 followers in the jungles of Guyana. Perhaps this tragedy could have been avoided if cult members and outside observers had challenged Jones's abuse of power.¹⁴ Conversely, ignoring the topic of power prevents the attainment of worthy objectives, leaving followers in darkness. Consider the case of the community activist

who wants to build a new shelter for homeless families. He can't help these families unless he skillfully wields power to enlist the support of local groups, overcome resistance of opponents, raise funds, and secure building permits.

I suspect that we are suspicious of power because we recognize that power has a corrosive effect on those who possess it. We've seen how U.S. President Richard Nixon used the power of his office to order illegal acts against his enemies and how Russian president Vladimir Putin used military force to take over part of the neighboring country of Ukraine. Many corporate leaders have been intoxicated by their power, using their positions to abuse their subordinates. One such boss kept an employee in an all-day meeting even as her mother was dying. Another called the paramedics when an employee had a heart attack and then ordered everyone else to go back to work even as the victim was still lying on the floor. Yet another berated and humiliated a subordinate who suffered an emotional breakdown and had to be hospitalized. His response? "I can't help it if she is overly sensitive."¹⁵

Unfortunately, abuse of power is an all-too-common fact of life in modern organizations. In Europe, 3%–4% of employees report being the victim of bullying behavior at least once a week and 10%–15% say that they have been the targets of psychological aggression in the past six months.¹⁶ In one U.S. survey, 90% of those responding reported that they had experienced disrespect from a boss at some time during their working careers; 20% said they were currently working for an abusive leader. "Brutal" bosses regularly engage in the following behaviors, some of which will be discussed in more detail later in the chapter:¹⁷

- *Deceit*: lying and giving false or misleading information
- *Constraint*: restricting followers' activities outside work, such as telling them whom they can befriend, where they can live, with whom they can live, and the civic activities they can participate in
- *Coercion*: making inappropriate or excessive threats for not complying with the leader's directives
- *Selfishness*: blaming subordinates and making them scapegoats
- *Inequity*: supplying unequal benefits or punishments based on favoritism or criteria unrelated to the job
- *Cruelty*: harming subordinates in such illegitimate ways as name-calling or public humiliation
- *Disregard*: ignoring normal standards of politeness; obvious disregard for what is happening in the lives of followers
- *Deification*: creating a master–servant relationship in which bosses can do whatever they want because they feel superior

The cost of the petty tyranny of bad bosses is high. Victims suffer low self-esteem and psychological distress, are less satisfied with their jobs and lives, are less productive, and are more likely to quit. The work unit as a whole is less trusting and cohesive, reducing collective performance.¹⁸ The majority of employees in one study reported spending 10 or more hours every month complaining about abusive and other kinds of bad bosses or listening to the complaints of fellow workers.¹⁹ In addition to complaining, workers

respond to tyranny by surrendering their personal beliefs, keeping a low profile, engaging in revenge fantasies, taking indirect revenge (i.e., not supporting the boss at a critical moment), challenging the supervisor directly, or bringing in outsiders (such as the human resources department or the boss's boss) to get help in dealing with the abusive leader.²⁰

The greater a leader's power, the greater the potential for abuse. This prompted Britain's Lord Acton to observe that "power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." The long shadow cast by absolute power, as in the case of North Korea's Kim Jong-Il (see Chapter 4) and, until recently, the military junta in Burma, can be seen in censorship, repression, torture, imprisonment, murder, and starvation. Businesses and other organizations foster centralization of power through top-down structures that emphasize status differences, loyalty, dependence, fear, and obedience while celebrating "tough" bosses and business practices like hard bargaining and aggressive marketing tactics.²¹

Psychologists offer several explanations for why concentrated power is so dangerous.²² First, power makes it easier for impulsive, selfish people to pursue their goals without considering the needs of others. They are likely to justify their actions by claiming that their personal rights and interests take priority over obligations to others. Second, those in power protect their positions by attacking those they perceive as threats. Third, powerful leaders are prone to biased judgments.²³ They generally make little attempt to find out how followers think and feel. As a result, they are more likely to hold and act on faulty stereotypes that justify their authority. Powerful people believe that they deserve their high status because powerless people aren't as capable as they are. Fourth, possessing power makes individuals more resistant to feedback from others.

Power deprivation exerts its own brand of corruptive influence.²⁴ Followers with little power become fixated on what minimal influence they have, becoming cautious, defensive, and critical of others and new ideas. In extreme cases, they may engage in sabotage, such as when one group of fast-food restaurant employees took out their frustrations by spitting and urinating into the drinks they served customers.

To wield power wisely, leaders have to wrestle with all the issues outlined here. They have to consider what types of power they should use and when and for what purposes. They also have to determine how much power to keep and how much to give away. Finally, leaders must recognize and resist the dangers posed by possessing too much power while making sure that followers aren't corrupted by having too little. Fortunately, there is evidence, when it comes to power, that a number of leaders are casting light rather than shadow. They recognize that sharing power prevents power abuses and improves organizational performance. Executives at Zappos, Johnsonville Sausage, Patagonia, Harley-Davidson, McCormick & Company, and other successful organizations have relinquished much of their legitimate, coercive, award, and expert power bases to lower-level leaders. At a great many other companies, self-directed work teams have taken over functions—hiring, scheduling, quality control—that used to be the province of mid- and lower-level managers.

The Shadow of Privilege

Leaders almost always enjoy greater privileges than followers do. The greater the leader's power, generally the greater the rewards he or she receives. Consider the earnings of corporate chief executive officers (CEOs), for example. Top business leaders in the United States are the highest paid in the world. Over the past thirty-five years, the average

salary for chief executives of large U.S. firms skyrocketed to \$15.2 million (including salary, bonuses, stock, and stock option grants), up an inflation-adjusted 937%.²⁵ In a recent salary survey, the highest-paid CEOs were David Zaslav of Discovery Communications (\$156.1 million), followed by Michael Fries of Liberty Global (\$111.9 million) and Mario Gabelli of GAMCO Investors (\$88.5 million). A number of CEOs can expect generous payouts even if their companies are taken over. Stephen Wynn of Wynn Resorts is guaranteed \$431.9 million, Zaslav \$266.8 million, and Yahoo's Marissa Mayer \$157.9 million. As the pay of top leaders soared, the paycheck of the average American was left in the dust. Typical U.S. workers now make less, when adjusted for inflation, than did their counterparts in the 1970s. The top 1% of Americans makes approximately 22% of all income, which exceeds the share made by the bottom 50% of the population.

Nonprofit leaders can also abuse the perks that come from their positions of influence. Take the pay of not-for-profit healthcare executives, for example. In one year, the compensation of the top 20 nonprofit hospital CEOs jumped 29.6%, including major increases for Ascension executive Anthony Tersigni (who earned \$7.1 million) and Ronald Peterson of the Johns Hopkins Health System (who took home \$1.7 million).²⁶ Greg Mortenson, who founded the Central Asia Institute, which builds schools for girls in Afghanistan and Pakistan, had to repay \$1 million to the charity. He purchased luxury items and vacations for himself and his family using Central Asia Institute credit cards. He also billed Central Asia Institute for travel expenses where he was paid up to \$30,000 to speak.²⁷

Most of us would agree that leaders deserve more rewards than followers do because leaders assume greater risks and responsibilities; many would also agree that some leaders get more than they deserve. Beyond this point, however, our opinions are likely to diverge. Americans are divided over questions such as these: How many additional privileges should leaders have? What should be the relative difference in pay and benefits between workers and top management? How do we close the large gap between the world's haves and the have-nots? We will never reach complete agreement on these issues, but the fact remains that privilege is a significant ethical burden associated with leadership. Leaders must give questions of privilege the same careful consideration as questions of power. The shadow cast by the abuse of privilege can be as long and dark as that cast by the misuse of power. (Turn to Case Study 1.1 for evidence of the dangers of privilege.) Conversely, sharing privilege can cast significant light. Every year, for example, thousands of Americans (often members of religious congregations) leave their comfortable homes to spend their vacations serving in developing nations. There they build schools and homes, dig wells, and provide medical care. Some of the world's richest people, including Warren Buffet, Bill and Melinda Gates, Sheryl Sandberg, Mark Zuckerberg, and Paul Allen, have pledged to give the vast majority of their wealth to philanthropic causes.

The Shadow of Mismanaged Information

Leaders have more access to information than do others in an organization. They are more likely to participate in decision-making processes, network with managers in other units, review personnel files, and formulate long-term plans. Knowledge is a mixed blessing. Leaders must be in the information loop in order to carry out their tasks, but possessing knowledge makes life more complicated. Do they reveal that they are in the know? When should they release information and to whom? How much do they tell? Is it ever right for them to lie?

No wonder leaders are tempted to think ignorance is bliss! If all these challenges weren't enough, leaders face the very real temptation to lie. For instance, government and industry officials denied that the Rocky Flats nuclear facility outside Denver posed a health risk even as the facility continued to release plutonium and toxic chemicals into the air and water.²⁸ Managers at the Veterans Administration falsified patient access records to disguise the long wait times facing veterans seeking medical treatment.²⁹ At other times, leaders are eager to hide the truth. The Panama Papers, a massive data leak, revealed that political leaders and wealthy individuals from around the world are secretly sheltering billions in assets in offshore companies.³⁰ Other leaders don't want to reveal that their judgment might be clouded by conflicts of interest. Executives at the nonprofit Global Energy Balance Network argue that exercise, not diet, is the key to weight loss. However, they failed to mention on their website that the organization is largely funded by Coca Cola, which produces sugary drinks that many experts believe contribute to the obesity epidemic.³¹ Three psychiatrists at Harvard medical school advocated for the use of antipsychotic drugs with children while failing to disclose that they had received \$4.2 million in payments from the drug industry.³²

The issues surrounding access to information are broader than deciding whether to lie, to hide the truth, or to tell the truth. Although leaders often decide between lying and truth telling, they are just as likely to be faced with questions related to the release of information. Take the case of a middle manager who has learned about an upcoming merger that will mean layoffs. Her superiors have asked her to keep this information to herself for a couple of weeks until the deal is completed. In the interim, employees may make financial commitments—such as home and car purchases—that they would postpone if they knew that major changes were in the works. Should the manager voluntarily share information about the merger with such employees despite her orders? What happens when a member of her department asks her to confirm or deny the rumor that the company is about to merge? (Turn to Case Study 1.2 to see how leaders at several organizations wrestled with a controversial decision about how much information to release.)

Privacy issues raise additional ethical concerns. E-commerce firms routinely track the activity of Internet surfers, collecting and selling information that will allow marketers to target their advertisements more efficiently. Supermarkets use “courtesy” or “club” cards to track the purchases of shoppers. Children use popular apps for smartphones and tablets to share personal information without their parents' knowledge.³³ Hundreds of thousands of video cameras track our movements at automated teller machines, in parking lots, at stores, and in other public places (and even in not-so-public places, such as high school bathrooms and hospital rooms). Drones now make it possible for law enforcement officials and private citizens to secretly film our homes and backyards from the sky. Our interactions with police officers are likely to be recorded now that body cameras are becoming standard equipment for many police departments.³⁴

Employers are also gathering more and more information about employee behavior both on and off the job. Technology allows supervisors to monitor computer keystrokes and computer screens, phone calls, website use, voice mail, and e-mail. According to one survey, at least 66% of U.S. companies track employee Internet use, 45% log key strokes, and 43% track employee e-mails.³⁵ One digital program tracks every move of every waiter and every order at restaurants. Sociometric Solutions conducts research in the banking, pharmaceutical, health care, and technology industries using sensors embedded in ID

badges. These microphones, location sensors, and accelerometers track the communication behaviors of workers—tone of voice, posture, body language, and which employees talk to other employees and for how long. Employers also monitor worker behavior outside the workplace. Employees have been fired for posting offensive comments and pictures on blogs and social networking sites. Employers use personal information on Facebook and other social networking sites to screen out job applicants. In a few cases, companies have asked applicants to provide their social media user names and passwords or to log on to their accounts during job interviews so interviewers can look over their shoulders as they scroll through their sites. Applicants can refuse these requests, but many may not because they fear they won't get hired.

Companies have a right to gather information in order to improve performance and eliminate waste and theft. Organizations are also liable for the inappropriate behavior of members, such as when they send sexist or racist messages using their companies' e-mail systems. Investigators discovered that the restaurant monitoring not only reduced employee theft but increased revenue substantially as staff, knowing they were being observed, encouraged more patrons to order drinks and dessert. Truck sensors enabled UPS to deliver 1.4 million additional packages a day with 1,000 fewer drivers. And monitoring can also lead to better working conditions. Bank of America added a 15-minute shared coffee break after a Sociometric Solutions study revealed that employees who took breaks together were more productive and less likely to quit.³⁶ However, efforts to monitor employee behavior are sometimes done without the knowledge of workers and are inconsistent with organizational values such as trust and community. Invading privacy takes away the right of employees to determine what they reveal about themselves; unwanted intrusion devalues their worth as individuals.³⁷

In conclusion, leaders cast shadows not only when they lie but also when they mismanage information and engage in deceptive practices. Unethical leaders

- deny having knowledge that is in their possession,
- hide the truth,
- fail to reveal conflicts of interest,
- withhold information that followers need,
- use information solely for personal benefit,
- violate the privacy rights of followers,
- release information to the wrong people, and
- put followers in ethical binds by preventing them from releasing information that others have a legitimate right to know.

Patterns of deception, whether they take the form of outright lies or the hiding or distortion of information, destroy the trust that binds leaders and followers together. Consider the popularity of conspiracy theories, for example. Many Americans are convinced that the U.S. Air Force is hiding the fact that aliens landed in Roswell, New Mexico. Many also believe that law enforcement officials are deliberately ignoring evidence that John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr. were the victims of elaborate assassination plots. More than one-third of Americans polled (and the majority of

respondents between the ages of 18 and 29) believe that the George W. Bush administration either planned the attacks on the World Trade Center in 2001 or did nothing after learning in advance of the terrorist plot. These theories may seem illogical, but they flourish in part because government leaders have created a shadow atmosphere through deceit. It wasn't until after the first Gulf War that we learned that our "smart bombs" weren't really so smart and missed their targets. The president and other cabinet officials overstated the danger posed by Saddam Hussein in order to rally support for the second Gulf War.

University of California, Davis history professor Kathryn Olmsted argues that many Americans believe that the government is out to get them in large part because government officials have previously engaged in secret conspiracies.³⁸ In 1962, for example, the Joint Chiefs of Staff cooked up a plan to get citizens to support a war on Fidel Castro's Cuba by sending a drone plane painted to look like a passenger airliner over the island to be shot down. Fortunately, this plot (dubbed "Operation Northwoods") never went into effect. However, many others were implemented. According to Olmsted,

By the height of the Cold War, government agents had consorted with mobsters to kill a foreign leader, dropped hallucinogenic drugs into the drinks of unsuspecting Americans in random bars, and considered launching fake terrorist attacks on Americans in the United States. Public officials had denied potentially life-saving treatment to African American men in medical experiments, sold arms to terrorists in return for American hostages, and faked documents to frame past presidents for crimes they had not committed. . . . Later, as industrious congressmen and journalists revealed these actual conspiracies by the government, many Americans came to believe that the most outrageous conspiracy theories about the government could be plausible.³⁹

Leaders must also consider ethical issues related to the image they hope to project to followers. In order to earn their positions and to achieve their objectives, leaders carefully manage the impressions they make on others. Impression management can be compared to a performance on a stage.⁴⁰ Leader-actors carefully manage everything from the setting to their words and nonverbal behaviors in order to have the desired effects on their follower audiences. For example, presidential staffers make sure that the chief executive is framed by visual images (Mount Rushmore, the Oval Office) that reinforce his (or her) messages and presidential standing. Like politicians, leaders in charge of such high-risk activities as mountain climbing and whitewater kayaking also work hard to project the desired impressions. In order to appear confident and competent, they stand up straight, look others in the eye, and use an authoritative tone of voice.

Impression management is integral to effective leadership because followers have images of ideal leaders called *prototypes*.⁴¹ We expect that the mountain climbing guide will be confident (otherwise, we would cancel the trip!), that the small-group leader will be active in group discussions, and that the military leader will stay calm under fire. The closer the person is to the ideal, the more likely it is that we will select that person as leader and accept her or his influence. Nonetheless, some people (including a number of students) find the concept of impression management ethically troubling. They

particularly value integrity and see such role-playing as insincere because a leader may have to disguise his or her true feelings in order to be successful.

There is no doubt that impression management can be used to reach immoral ends. Disgraced financier Bernie Madoff, for example, convinced investors that he was a financial genius even as he was stealing their money in a gigantic fraud scheme. Careerists who are skilled at promoting themselves at the expense of others are all too common.⁴² It would be impossible to eliminate this form of influence, however. For one thing, others form impressions of us whether we are conscious of that fact or not. They judge our personality and values by what we wear, for instance, even if we don't give much thought to what we put on in the morning. Most of us use impression management to convey our identities accurately, not to conceal them or to manipulate others.

When considering the morality of impression management, we need to consider its end products. Ethical impression managers meet group wants and needs, not just the needs of the leaders. They spur followers toward highly moral ends. These leaders use impression management to convey accurate information, to build positive interpersonal relationships, and to facilitate good decisions. Unethical impression managers produce the opposite effects, subverting group wishes and lowering purpose and aspiration. These leaders use dysfunctional impression management to send deceptive messages, to undermine relationships, and to distort information, which leads to poor conclusions and decisions.⁴³

The Shadow of Inconsistency

Leaders deal with a variety of constituencies, each with its own set of abilities, needs, and interests. In addition, they like some followers better than others. Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory is based on the notion that a leader develops a closer relationship with one group of followers than with others.⁴⁴ Members of the “in-group” become the leader's advisers, assistants, and lieutenants. High levels of trust, mutual influence, and support characterize their exchanges with the leader. Members of the “out-group” are expected to carry out the basic requirements of their jobs. Their communication with the leader is not as trusting and supportive. Not surprisingly, members of in-groups are more satisfied and productive than members of out-groups. For that reason, LMX theorists encourage leaders to develop close relationships with as many of their followers as possible.

Situational variables also complicate leader-follower interactions. Guidelines that work in ordinary times may break down under stressful conditions. A professor may state in a syllabus that five absences will result in a student's flunking the class, for instance. However, she may have to loosen that standard if a flu epidemic strikes the campus.

Diverse followers, varying levels of relationships, and elements of the situation make consistency an ethical burden of leadership. Should we, as leaders, treat all followers equally even if some are more skilled and committed or closer to us than others? When should we bend the rules and for whom? Shadows arise when leaders appear to act arbitrarily and unfairly when faced with questions such as these, as in the case of a resident assistant who enforces dormitory rules for some students but ignores infractions committed by friends. Of course, determining whether a leader is casting light or shadow may depend on where you stand as a follower. If you are the star player on your team, you may feel justified taking it easy during practices. If you are less talented, you probably resent the fact that the team's star doesn't have to work as hard as you.

Too often, inconsistency arises between what a leader advocates and how he or she behaves, such as when rabbis and pastors have affairs at the same time they are encouraging members of their congregations to build strong marriages. Employee postings on the website Glassdoor.com reveal that many business leaders fail to live up to the values they espouse. Ross Stores made the list of worst companies to work for (based on Glassdoor ratings) even though the company “makes it an ‘everyday priority’ to treat its associates with respect.” Employees complained about their extremely low salaries and heavy workloads even as the company’s profits increased dramatically. Dillard department store CEO William Dillard III urges his managers to bring out what is unique to each employee, but Glassdoor reviewers complained that top management doesn’t seem to care about what goes on at lower levels of the company.⁴⁵

In recent years, a number of prominent figures seem to have taken inconsistency to a new level. Former Speaker of the House Dennis Hastert advocated for stronger punishment for sex crimes and sexual abuse of children while paying hush money to a man he molested when working as a high school wrestling coach. Josh Duggar of the reality show *19 and Counting* (which promoted religious values) and employee of the conservative Family Research Council confessed to molesting girls when he was a teen, being addicted to pornography, and cheating on his wife.⁴⁶ (Turn to Case Study 1.3 to see yet another example of a celebrity whose private behavior failed to match his public persona.)

Issues of inconsistency can also arise in a leader’s relationships with those outside the immediate group or organization. Misgivings about the current system of financing political elections stem from the fact that large donors can buy access to elected officials and influence their votes. Take the sugar subsidy, for example. Under the federal subsidy program, a small number of mostly wealthy farmers are protected by tariffs on imported sugar and can repay their crop loans with raw sugar, which is then sold at a loss to ethanol producers. Economists estimate that American consumers could save \$3.5 billion if the sugar program ended because they could then buy cheaper, imported sugar. In addition, candy makers could add 17,000–20,000 new jobs if sugar prices dropped. However, Congress keeps renewing the subsidy program in large part because sugar producers make generous campaign contributions to representatives from both parties. In 2014, the American Chrystal Sugar Company, for example, donated over \$1.3 million to 221 members of Congress.⁴⁷

The Shadow of Misplaced and Broken Loyalties

Leaders must weigh a host of loyalties or duties when making choices. In addition to their duties to employees and stockholders, they must consider their obligations to their families, their local communities, their professions, the larger society, and the environment. Noteworthy leaders put the needs of the larger community above selfish interests. For example, outdoor clothing manufacturer Timberland receives praise for its commitment to community service and social responsibility. Company leaders pay employees for volunteer service, partner with community groups, and support nonprofit organizations through the sale of selected products. In contrast, those leaders who appear to put their own interests first are worthy of condemnation.

Loyalties can be broken as well as misplaced. If anything, we heap more scorn on those who betray our trust than on those who misplace their loyalties. Many of history’s villains are traitors: Judas Iscariot, Benedict Arnold, Vidkun Quisling (he

sold out his fellow Norwegians to the Nazis), and Tokyo Rose, a U.S. citizen who broadcast to American troops on behalf of the Japanese during World War II. More recent examples of leaders who violated the trust of followers include Enron CEO Kenneth Lay, who assured workers that the firm was in good shape even as it was headed toward collapse, and the leaders of Lehman Brothers, who told investors that the firm was strong even as it was struggling to raise money to stave off bankruptcy during the financial crisis.⁴⁸

Employees are often victimized by corporate betrayal motivated by the bottom line. Individuals commonly develop deep loyalties to their coworkers and to their employers. As a consequence, they may do more than is required in their job descriptions, turn down attractive job offers from other employers, and decide to invest their savings in company stock.⁴⁹ Unfortunately, companies and their leaders often fail to respond in kind. During economic downturns, they are quick to slash salaries and benefits and to lay off even the most loyal workers. Even if business is good, they don't hesitate to merge with other firms, eliminating positions, or to shut down domestic plants and research facilities in order to move their operations overseas, where labor costs are lower. Organizational leaders admit that their organizations aren't as loyal as they used to be. One survey of senior level North American managers found that only 13% believe that their organizations are more loyal than they were five years ago.⁵⁰ It's no wonder that leaders who stick by their workers shine so brightly. One such leader is Bob Moore, who turned over ownership of his Red Mill Natural Foods company to his employees on his 81st birthday. Another is oilman Jeffrey Hildebrand. He carried through on his promise to give bonuses to his 1,400 Hilcorp employees even though oil prices plummeted. Each worker received \$100,000 when the firm doubled oil production.⁵¹

As egregious as corporate examples of betrayal appear, they pale in comparison to cases where adults take advantage of children. Catholic priests in Massachusetts, Oregon, New Mexico, Brazil, Ireland, Germany, and elsewhere used their positions as respected spiritual authorities to gain access to young parishioners for sexual gratification.⁵² Church leaders, bishops, and cardinals failed to stop the abusers. In far too many instances, they let offending priests continue to minister and to have contact with children. Often, church officials transferred pedophile priests without warning their new congregations about these men's troubled pasts. Officials at Pennsylvania State University turned a blind eye to evidence that assistant football coach Jerry Sandusky was abusing young boys. In another example involving the betrayal of children, two Pennsylvania juvenile court judges sentenced undeserving young offenders to for-profit detention centers in return for cash payments.

The fact that I've placed the loyalty shadow after such concerns as power and privilege is not intended to diminish its importance. Philosopher George Fletcher argues that we define ourselves through our loyalties to families, sports franchises, companies, and other groups and organizations.⁵³ Fellow philosopher Josiah Royce contends that loyalty to the right cause produces admirable character traits like justice, wisdom, and compassion.⁵⁴ Loyalty is a significant burden placed on leaders. In fact, well-placed loyalty can make a significant moral statement. Such was the case with Pee Wee Reese. The Brooklyn Dodger never wavered in his loyalty to Jackie Robinson, the first black player in baseball's major leagues. In front of one especially hostile crowd in Cincinnati, Ohio, Reese put his arm around Robinson's shoulders in a display of support.⁵⁵

Pay particular attention to the shadow of loyalty as you analyze the feature films highlighted in the “Leadership Ethics at the Movies” boxes in each chapter. In many of these movies, leaders struggle with where to place their loyalties and how to honor the trust others have placed in them.

The Shadow of Irresponsibility

Earlier, we observed that breadth of responsibility is one of the factors distinguishing between the role of leader and that of follower. Followers are largely responsible for their own actions or, in the case of a self-directed work team, for those of their peers. This is not the case for leaders. They are held accountable for the performance of entire departments or other units. However, determining the extent of a leader’s responsibility is far from easy. Can we blame a college coach for the misdeeds of team members during the off-season or for the excesses of the university’s athletic booster club? Are clothing executives responsible for the actions of their overseas contractors who force workers to labor in sweatshops? Do employers owe employees a minimum wage level, a certain degree of job security, and safe working conditions? If military officers are punished for following unethical orders, should those who issue those orders receive the same or harsher penalties?

Leaders act irresponsibly when they fail to make reasonable efforts to prevent misdeeds on the part of their followers, ignore or deny ethical problems, don’t shoulder responsibility for the consequences of their directives, or deny their duties to followers. We don’t hold coaches responsible for everything their players do. Nonetheless, we want them to encourage their athletes to obey the law and to punish any misbehavior. Most of us expect Gap, Nike, Sears, Walmart, and Banana Republic to make every effort to treat their overseas labor force fairly, convinced that the companies owe their workers (even the ones employed by subcontractors) decent wages and working conditions. When a company’s employees break the law or make mistakes, we want the CEO to take accountability. That was the case at J.P. Morgan Chase when a London trader lost more than \$3 billion in risky trades. CEO Jamie Dimon first called the crisis a “tempest in a teapot,” a statement that drew heavy criticism from financial analysts. Only later did he take responsibility, saying, “I am absolutely responsible. The buck stops with me.”⁵⁶

Many corporate scandals demonstrate what can happen when boards of directors fail to live up to their responsibilities. Far too many boards in the past functioned only as rubber stamps. Made up largely of friends of the CEO and those doing business with the firm, they were quick to approve executive pay increases and other management proposals. Some board members appeared interested only in collecting their fees and made little effort to understand the operations or finances of the companies they were supposed to be directing. Other members were well-intentioned but lacked expertise. Now federal regulations require that the chair of a corporation’s audit committee be a financial expert. The compensation, audit, and nominating committees must be made up of people who have no financial ties to the organization. These requirements should help prevent future abuses, but only if board members take their responsibilities seriously. (I’ll have more to say about effective corporate governance in Chapter 10.)

These, then, are some of the common shadows cast by leaders faced with the ethical challenges of leadership. Identifying these shadows raises two important questions: (1) *Why is it that, when faced with the same ethical challenges, some leaders cast light and*

others cast shadows? (2) What steps can we take as leaders to cast more light than shadow? In the next chapter, we will explore the forces that contribute to the shadow side of leadership and outline ways to meet those challenges.

IMPLICATIONS AND APPLICATIONS

- Understanding the dark (bad, toxic) side of leadership is the first step in promoting good or ethical leadership.
- The contrast between ethical and unethical leadership is as dramatic as the contrast between light and darkness.
- Toxic or bad leaders engage in destructive behaviors. They may be ineffective, unethical, or both. Types of bad leaders include incompetent, rigid, intemperate, callous, corrupt, insular, and evil. Destructive leaders are common and have negative impacts on followers and organizations.
- Certain ethical challenges or dilemmas are inherent in the leadership role. If you choose to become a leader, recognize that you accept ethical burdens along with new tasks, expectations, and rewards.
- Power can have a corrosive effect on values and behavior. You must determine how much power to accumulate, what forms of power to use, and how much power to give to followers.
- If you abuse power, you will generally overlook the needs of followers as you take advantage of the perks that come with your position.
- Leaders have access to more information than do followers. In addition to deciding whether or not to hide or tell the truth, as a leader, you'll have to determine when to reveal what you know and to whom, how to gather and use information, and so on.
- A certain degree of inconsistency is probably inevitable in leadership roles, but you will cast shadows if you are seen as acting arbitrarily and unfairly. You must also attempt to match your behavior with your words and values—to “walk your talk.”
- As a leader, you'll have to balance your needs and the needs of your small group or organization with loyalties or duties to broader communities. Expect condemnation if you put narrow, selfish concerns first.
- Leadership brings a broader range of responsibility, but determining the limits of accountability may be difficult. You will cast a shadow if you fail to make a reasonable attempt to prevent abuse or to shoulder the blame, or deny that you have a duty to followers.
- Followers face their own set of ethical challenges. When filling a follower role, you will need to determine the extent of your obligations to the group, decide when to obey or disobey, combat cynicism, offer dissent, and deliver bad news to your leaders.

FOR FURTHER EXPLORATION, CHALLENGE, AND SELF-ASSESSMENT

1. Create an ethics journal. In it, describe the ethical dilemmas you encounter as a leader and as a follower, how you resolve them, how you feel about the outcomes, and what you learn that will transfer to future ethical decisions. You may also want to include your observations about the moral choices made by public figures. Make periodic entries as you continue to read this text.
2. Harvard professor Rosabeth Kanter argues that “powerlessness corrupts and absolute powerlessness corrupts absolutely.”⁵⁷ Do you agree? What are some of the symptoms of powerlessness?
3. What does your score on the Destructive Leader Behavior Scale (Self-Assessment 1.1) reveal about your leader? How can you use this information to become a more effective follower? As an alternative, reflect on your Personal Power Profile (Self-Assessment 1.2). What do your scores reveal about your attitude toward power and the ethical issues you might face in exercising power? Would you like to change your power profile? How can you do so?
4. What factors do you consider when determining the extent of your loyalty to an individual, a group, or an organization?
5. Debate the following propositions in class:
 - The federal government should set limits on executive compensation.
 - Coaches should be held accountable for the actions of their players in the off-season.
 - Corporate leaders have an obligation to be loyal to their employees.
 - Married politicians and religious figures who have extramarital affairs should be forced to resign.
 - Employers have the right to monitor the behavior of workers when the workers are not on the job.
6. Evaluate the work of a corporate or nonprofit board of directors. Is the board made up largely of outside members? Are the members qualified? Does the board fulfill its leadership responsibilities? Write up your findings.
7. Which shadow are you most likely to cast as a leader? Why? What can you do to cast light instead? Can you think of any other ethical shadows cast by leaders?
8. Write a research paper on the privacy issues surrounding drones and/or police body cameras. Conclude with a set of recommendations on how these issues should be resolved.
9. Look for examples of unethical leadership behavior in the news and classify them according to the six shadows. What patterns do you note? As an alternative, look for examples of ethical leadership. How do these leaders cast light instead of shadow?
10. What is the toughest ethical challenge of being a follower? How do you meet that challenge?

STUDENT STUDY SITE

Visit the student study site at study.sagepub.com/johnsonmecl6e to access full SAGE journal articles for further research and information on key chapter topics.

Case Study 1.1

THE TRAGEDIES OF TEAM FOXCATCHER

Sometimes great privilege puts leaders at great risk. That was the case for John Du Pont. Du Pont was the great grandson of the founder of the Du Pont Company, the creator of nylon, polyester, Kevlar, Lycra, Teflon and other products. Worth an estimated \$200 million, Du Pont grew up in a 40-room mansion modeled on President James Madison's home, set on 400 acres outside of Philadelphia.

Du Pont set his sights on becoming an Olympic champion, first in swimming and then in the five-event pentathlon. When it became obvious that he didn't have world-class talent, he set out to associate with those who did. He brought in top swimmers, wrestlers, and pentathletes to join his Team Foxcatcher (named after his estate), providing training facilities and housing them on his property. He paid the athletes' salaries and covered their expenses when they competed at world events. At the same time, Du Pont gave generously to Villanova University, helping to pay for its basketball arena and swimming facility and funding a new wrestling program. When the Villanova wrestling program folded, he gave to USA Wrestling and became a member of the association's board of directors. Du Pont also donated generously to the local Newtown Square police department. He outfitted every officer with body armor, offered the use of his helicopter, built a shooting range on his estate for the force to use, and allowed some police personnel to live at Foxcatcher Farm.

Mark and Dave Schultz put Team Foxcatcher on the sports map. They were the first brothers to both win Olympic gold medals in wrestling in 1992 and, between them, held several national and international titles. Younger brother Mark took the world championship when wrestling for Du Pont and was featured on the Foxcatcher team poster. However, John Du Pont's increasingly bizarre behavior meant that the team's success was short lived. A loner, he used his money to gain approval, to manipulate others, and to fuel his self-esteem. He paid for competitions where he was guaranteed to win, for example, and held award ceremonies where he was honored. Du Pont insisted that he be called "Coach" even though he had no wrestling credentials. He blatantly violated National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) recruiting rules by flying Villanova wrestling recruits on his private plane and housing them

(Continued)

(Continued)

in expensive hotels. A cocaine user and heavy drinker, his behavior could be friendly at one moment and demeaning the next.

As time went on, John Du Pont's behavior grew darker and darker. He claimed that there were spirits and spies residing in his home and hiding in the treetops. He had the treadmills removed from the training center because he was convinced that their clocks were transporting him back in time. He kicked all African Americans off the team because he determined that black was the color of death. He variously wanted to be called Jesus, the last czar of Russia, and the Dalai Lama. In one incident, he pointed a machine gun at a wrestler and threatened to kill him if he didn't leave the farm.

Fed up with John's manipulative, controlling behavior, Mark Schultz left Team Foxcatcher; but brother Dave, who tried to befriend Du Pont, stayed on. In June 1996, John Du Pont drove to the house on Foxcatcher Farm where Dave and his family were living. As Schultz's wife looked on in horror, John shot Dave three times, killing him. Following the shooting, Du Pont took refuge for 48 hours in his mansion, surrounded by Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) teams, until he surrendered. There was little doubt of his guilt; his trial centered on whether or not he was legally insane at the time of the killing. He was convicted of 3rd degree manslaughter (a lesser charge based on the fact that he was apparently a paranoid schizophrenic) and sentenced to 15 to 32 years in prison. After being denied parole in 2009, he died of emphysema in 2010.

Many different people might have prevented Du Pont's downward spiral by challenging his behavior and getting him treatment, but they failed to act because they were dependent on his wealth and influence. Officials at Villanova apparently let him break the rules as long as he paid for the basketball arena and the wrestling program. A security company was happy to bill him for checking his mansion for imaginary listening devices. Newton Square police, who used his shooting range and the body armor he supplied, didn't investigate the report that he brought a gun to practice. (The police department claims that the wrestler didn't file a full report on the incident.) Officials at USA Wrestling debated whether or not to break ties with Du Pont but didn't want to give up the \$400,000 he donated annually. The wrestlers were in the most vulnerable position because they had no way to support themselves as they trained between Olympics and world events. They needed proper facilities, world-class sparring partners, and income to compete at the highest levels, all of which Du Pont provided. They failed to intervene on behalf of their benefactor because they feared that they would be kicked off the team. As a consequence, John Du Pont's paranoia went unchecked, and Dave Schultz paid with his life. According to crime writer Tim Huddleston, "John's wealth enabled him to buy anything he wanted. It enabled him to set his own rules and vanquish his problems. It also kept him sheltered from everything, including the help he so desperately needed."¹

Who is most to blame for failing to stop John Du Pont's downward spiral?

Do you blame the members of Team Foxcatcher for staying on even as Du Pont's behavior became more erratic?

What are the costs of speaking up to powerful leaders? How do we equip ourselves to do so?

Can you think of other leaders whose power and/or wealth put them at great risk?

How can colleges and nonprofits ensure that donors don't exert too much influence over their activities?

Huddleston, T. (2013). *Wrestling with madness: Jon Eleuthere Du Pont and the Foxcatcher Farm murder*. Absolute Crime Books, p. 75.

Schultz, M. (2014). *Foxcatcher*. New York, NY: Dutton.

Case Study 1.2

KILLERS WITH CAMERAS

Body cameras and social media sites have added a new chilling dimension to murder. Killers can now film their crimes and post them for the world to see. That was the case when a disgruntled former television station employee used a body camera to film his murder of television reporter Alison Parker and cameraman Adam Ward during a live report in Roanoke, Virginia. He then wrote about the shooting on Twitter and uploaded his video to Facebook.

News sources were faced with an ethical dilemma: How much (if any) of the shooter's footage should they show to audiences? ABC News refused to show any of the video, as did CNN. According to ABC anchor George Stephanopoulos, "[It was] Something we wrestled with today: whether to grant the gunman his last wish by playing his video. We will not."¹ CBS News used video from Ward's camera (which was also filming during the attack), though stopping before the actual shooting. CBS news president David Rhodes explained, "Using the material we did, we helped people understand the degree of premeditation behind the attack. If you don't show some of what we showed, you can leave people with the impression that somebody just snapped."²

The *New York Daily News* received intense criticism for its decision to use three still photos from the shooter's video under the headline "Shocking slay of reporter, cameraman

(Continued)

(Continued)

EXECUTED.” In the first two pictures, a gun is aimed at Parker, interviewing a local chamber of commerce official. In the last frame, Parker displays her shock when seeing the gun’s muzzle flash. *Daily News* editors defended their use of the images, saying that the photos were a “definitive part of the story, however disturbing and horrific.”³ According to a spokesperson, the paper’s editors believe there should be stronger gun control laws and hoped to bring visibility to the issue “at a time when it is so easy for the public to become inured to such senseless violence.”⁴ In contrast, *The New York Times* decided not to run the pictures because they were so disturbing, as did the *Boston Globe*, which opted instead to use stills taken from Ward’s footage showing Flanagan standing over the cameraman.

Killers are apparently motivated to post videos of their deeds in hopes of drawing attention, as a way to say, “Look at me.” In so doing, they stand out from previous mass murderers like the Columbine killers or the Virginia Tech gunman who didn’t have the technology to easily film their crimes. As more shooters arm themselves with cameras as well as guns, editors can expect to make more decisions about what horrific images to broadcast or publish.

Would you watch the video of this or another shooting? Why or why not?

Does showing videos filmed by killers encourage others to imitate their behavior?

Was using the video of cameraman Ward a better option for media outlets than using the shooter’s video?

Do you think the *Daily News* was more motivated by principle or by the hope of attracting more readers?

Do you support the decision of *Daily News* editors to show the still shots of the shooting on its front page? Why or why not?

What ethical principles should editors and other leaders use when deciding what information to release?

Koblin, J. (2015, August 28). Front pages on killings in Virginia spur anger. *The New York Times*, p. A12.

Koblin.

Koblin.

Koblin

Armitage, C. (2015, August 28). Experts warn against switching on to graphic footage of human tragedy. *Sydney Morning Herald*, p. 2.