

Evaluating the Reliability and Validity of the Dark Side of Leadership Profile

International Leadership Studies Conference – August 2004

Justin A. Irving
Regent University

The past two decades have seen significant leadership failures across multiple sectors—business, government, military, nonprofit, and the church. These leadership failures often trace back to dark side shadow issues within a leader's personality (Rima, 1996). The Dark Side of Leadership Profile (DSLIP) was designed by Sam Rima to help leaders identify their dark side issues utilizing five scales: (a) compulsivity, (b) narcissism, (c) paranoia, (d) codependency, and (e) passive-aggressive behavior. In this study, the DSLIP was administered to a random sample of pastors in the Baptist General Conference along with the Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS) in order to assess the reliability and validity of the instrument. The results of this study are reported in the following sections: (a) overview of the constructs, (b) research methods, (c) research findings, and (d) discussion and implications.

Evaluating the Reliability and Validity of the Dark Side of Leadership Profile

From ministry leaders to corporate CEOs, the devastating effects of leadership failure are evident to most in this late-modern era. The highly publicized organizational failures of Enron, MCI WorldCom, and the Catholic Church serve as reminders to all of how vital it is for the dark side of leaders to be held in check. Because of this, Rima (1996) argues that there is a desperate need for leaders to engage in serious and sober self-examination in an effort to uncover the issues within their lives that have all too often created the unhealthy drives and motivations that end up in moral and ethical failure. If this plea were to be heeded among today's leaders, the extent to which such forms of self-leadership would benefit individual organizations and the world's societies in general would be astounding.

In order to assist in the process of leader self-examination, Rima (1996) developed the Dark Side of Leadership Profile (DSLIP) for use among ministry leaders. The DSLIP has been designed to measure five dysfunctional leader traits. These are: (a) compulsivity, (b) narcissism, (c) paranoia, (d) codependency, and (e) passive-aggressive behaviors. While the scales utilized by Rima have theoretical grounding, Rima's instrument has yet to be examined empirically. As such, the intent of this research project is to report on the instrument's reliability and validity, and has been driven by the following research question: "Is the *Dark Side of Leadership Profile* a valid and reliable instrument?" In order to assess the answer to this question, the study was designed to include a factor analysis, an analysis of reliability, and an analysis of the instrument's convergent validity. In order to report of the findings and implications of this study, the following areas will be covered: (a) overview of the constructs, (b) research methods, (c) research findings, and (d) discussion and implications.

Overview of the Constructs

Positive and Negative Affect Scale

Prior to introducing an overview of the DSLP constructs, it's important to briefly describe the comparison scale that was utilized in this study. The Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS) was designed by Watson, Clark, and Tellegen (1988) to provide a succinct measure of dispositional affect. In the current study, the PANAS has been utilized as a means for establishing some convergent validity based on predicted correlations between the PANAS and the DSLP. Because the DSLP was designed to measure dark side shadow tendencies in leaders, the PANAS—and particularly its scale measuring positive affect—may serve as an established measure against which to measure dark side traits, for most of the dark side traits would have an anticipated inverse relationship to positive affect.

Dark Side of Leadership Profile

As noted in the introduction, the DSLP includes five scales: (a) compulsivity, (b) narcissism, (c) paranoia, (d) codependency, and (e) passive-aggressive behaviors. Each of these scales includes 12 questions, thus forming a 60 item inventory. In order to better understand the five primary scales, a brief discussion of each is provided here.

Compulsivity. McIntosh and Rima (1998) summarize compulsivity in leadership as maintaining absolute control and order at all cost. Flowing out of a compulsive personality, leaders begin seeing their organizational context as another arena in their lives to be controlled, for organizational performance becomes a direct reflection on individual performance. Identifying this common characteristic of obsessive-compulsive personality disorder, the American Psychiatric Association (APA) notes that an “excessive devotion to work and productivity to the exclusion of leisure activities and friendships” (2000, p. 726) is consistent with compulsive behavior. While such behaviors in moderation be adaptive and rewarded in some contexts, obsessive-compulsive personalities can easily become upset or angry in situation in which they are not able to maintain control of their physical or interpersonal environment (APA). Recent work associating impulse control with leadership effectiveness serves as one example of how such tendencies to become easily upset or angry could be maladaptive for leaders (Goleman, McKee, & Boyatzis, 2002).

Narcissism. Identifying the mixed-nature of narcissism, Lowen (1983) notes that narcissistic leaders “present various combinations of intense ambitiousness, grandiose fantasies, feelings of inferiority and overdependence on external admiration and acclaim” (p. 6). As such, these leaders tend to overestimate their achievements and abilities due to their over-inflated sense of importance to the organization (McIntosh & Rima, 1998). This observation concurs with the APA's (2000) identification of Narcissistic Personality Disorder as essentially a pervasive pattern of grandiosity in which an individual believes that they are superior, special, or unique and so expect others to recognize them as such.

Based on such observations, it would seem that narcissistic leaders would tend to have a general tendency toward positive affect in their disposition. Robbins and Beer (2001) provided an important reminder that while the self-enhancing beliefs associated with narcissism may be adaptive in the short term, this is usually not the case from a long term perspective, and this may also be true for issues related to dispositional affect. Drucker (1992) argues for the danger of leaders that too closely associate themselves with the mission of the organization, and Collins (2001) identifies the power of leaders willing to look out the window rather than the mirror when apportioning success. Narcissistic leaders face challenges on both of these fronts.

Paranoia. Million (1981) notes that paranoid individuals, “are characteristically suspicious, hostile, and guarded in their relationships with others” (p. 372). Because of such characteristics, McIntosh and Rima (1998) note that, “paranoid leaders are desperately afraid of anything or anyone, whether real or imagined, they perceive to have even the remotest potential of undermining their leadership’ (p. 108). They further note that this leads to paranoid leaders being hypersensitive to the actions and reaction of those they lead, with a perpetual fear of potential rebellions. The APA (2000) associates Paranoid Personality Disorder primarily with a pattern of pervasive distrust and suspiciousness of others in which hidden meanings are read into benign remarks or events. The suspicious behaviors associated with dark side shadow issues in leaders can result in major hostility, quick counterattacks and argumentation, combativeness or hostile aloofness (APA). Because of

the importance of authentic relational engagement between leaders and followers (Laub, 1999; Goleman, McKee, & Boyatzis, 2002), leaders who exhibit paranoid behaviors possess dark side shadow issues that can adversely effect these vital leader-follower relationships.

Codependency. Codependency, or Dependent Personality Disorder (APA, 2000), is primarily associated with a general fear of separation in which “dependent and submissive behaviors are designed to elicit caregiving and arise from a self-perception of being unable to function adequately without the help of others” (APA, p. 721). Dependent personalities also tend to lack self-confidence, seek relationships as a source of care and support, are unrealistically preoccupied with fears of being left to take care of himself or herself, and fear the loss of support or approval from others (APA). Because of such tendencies, McIntosh and Rima (1998) note that, “codependents become repositories of repressed anger and frustration” (p. 122). Such behaviors are conducive for a general disposition of negative affect. Furthermore, repressed anger and frustration can harm the leader-follower relationship that is essential to leadership (Laub, 1999; Goleman, McKee, & Boyatzis, 2002).

Passive-Aggressive. Also referred to as Negativistic Personality Disorder (APA, 2000), according to McIntosh and Rima (1998) passive-aggressive individuals tend to exhibit impatience, irritability, and fidgeting. They further note that though passive-aggressive individuals perform the tasks that are expected of them, it may be with little or no enthusiasm, and with a harboring of anger and bitterness for being forced to perform the task. The APA associates this disorder with “sullen, irritable, impatient, argumentative, cynical, skeptical, and contrary” (p. 790) behaviors and “a pervasive pattern of negativistic attitudes” (p. 791). Such characteristics point toward an orientation toward negative dispositional affect. For leaders, such negativistic orientations can damage the leader credibility necessary to set visionary direction, a function central to the leadership process (Kouzes & Posner, 1986; Kotter, 1990).

As noted above, because the DSLP was designed to measure dark side shadow tendencies in leaders, the use of the PANAS to comparatively measure positive affect in light of these shadow tendencies is a logical choice for examining construct validity. Egloff, Schmukle, Burns, Kohlmann, and Hock (2003) note that according to the theoretical framework used for the PANAS instrument, “PA reflects the extent to which one is experiencing a positive mood, such as feelings of joy, interest, enthusiasm, or alertness” (p. 529). A strong presence of most of the DSLP profiles would likely be negatively correlated with such a description of personality mood. Of the five dark side traits measured by the DSLP, the narcissistic leader would be the most likely to exhibit characteristics of positive affect. Apart from this, it is likely that each of the other types would either be negatively correlated with positive affect or, as in the case of the compulsive leader, possibly exhibiting no necessary correlation, positive or negative, with positive affect. Table 1 provides an overview of these anticipated correlations between the DSLP scales and positive affect. These anticipated correlations are based on the literature identified for each of the DSLP scales, as well as a small Delphi sample of scholars and practitioners familiar with personality dysfunctions and shadow traits. These predictions of correlation were proposed as a means of providing a source of convergent validity in the evaluation of the DSLP.

Table 1
DSLP Correlations with Positive Affect

Scale	Correlation Prediction
Compulsive	No Necessary Correlation
Narcissistic	Positive Correlation
Paranoid	Negative Correlation
Codependent	Negative Correlation
Passive-Aggressive	Negative Correlation

Research Methods

Research Sample

The research sample— $N=47$ —was drawn from a broad pool of pastors and associate pastors of the Baptist General Conference (BGC). The above-noted instruments—DSLSP and PANAS—were housed in a web-based format and pastors of the BGC were invited by e-mail to participate in the study and were given a pass code that could be utilized to begin taking the survey instrument. This method was utilized to help insure that the sample would be a random sampling of pastors from the BGC.

Pilot Study

Prior to launching the study, a small pilot study— $N=9$ —was conducted in order to gain feedback on the instrument, instructions, and technologies being utilized in the primary study. Feedback from the pilot study led to several corrections in the final instruments. These changes included several basic typographical corrections, further explanation in the instructions including more information on the purpose of the study, and the addition of the password feature that was not ready for the pilot study.

Data Collection & Analysis

Factor Analysis. The study was designed to include a factor analysis of the DSLSP. In order to conduct this analysis, it was the aim of the study to have a minimum of 180 participants in the study.

Reliability. Once the data was collected the alpha coefficient—Cronbach's Alpha—was utilized as the means by which the reliability of the DSLSP was assessed. Cronbach's Alpha is the appropriate form of analysis to utilize in this case, for it can be used with tests that have items with more than two response options. This is the case for the DSLSP, which utilizes a five-point Likert-type scale. Alpha coefficients range from 0 to 1.0, and .70 is a recognized guideline for accepting that an index is measuring the same thing (Vogt, 1999).

Validity. As a measure of convergent validity, the PANAS was utilized as a means for observing correlations. Once collected, the data was analyzed utilizing the correlation coefficient, or the Pearson r correlation. Pearson r correlations are understood in light of the significance levels or p values. In this study the significance level was set at .05 in a one-tailed Pearson r correlation. In evaluating the correlations between the DSLSP and the PANAS, partial correlations controlling for age, education level, and church size were also utilized. These variables served as control variables in order to isolate the correlation findings in such a manner that could not be attributed to the variables of age, level of education, and the size of the church context.

Research Findings

The research findings will be focused around two primary dimensions: (a) the reliability of the DSLSP and PANAS, and (b) the validity of the DSLSP. As an introduction to this research findings section, Table 2 provides an overview of the descriptive statistics for each of the DSLSP scales along with the five control variables used in the study.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	47	2.00	5.00	3.6170	.92203
Education	47	1.00	5.00	4.1277	.64663
Church Size	46	1.00	6.00	3.0217	1.49799
Positive Affect	47	2.30	4.60	3.6495	.59290
Negative Affect	47	1.00	2.70	1.7553	.46802
Compulsive	47	1.50	3.67	2.3652	.44727
Narcissistic	47	1.25	3.25	2.2801	.47410
Paranoid	47	1.00	2.83	1.7199	.46929
Codependent	47	1.17	3.25	2.3704	.46923
Passive-Aggressive	47	1.00	3.58	2.0496	.49960

Reliability of the DSLP and PANAS

While analyzing the reliability of the PANAS is not the primary purpose of this study, the alpha coefficient for the two scales are included here. The alpha coefficient for the positive affect scale was .8815. The alpha coefficient for the negative affect scale was .7792.

The findings of the reliability analysis for the five scales of the DSLP are included in Table 3 along with the previously noted PANAS alpha coefficients. Within three of the DSLP scales, items have been deleted due to the findings of the of the reliability analysis. Cronbach's alpha is a measure of internal reliability within a scale.

Table 3
Reliability Analysis: Alpha Coefficient

Scale	Alpha	Deleted Items	New Alpha
Compulsive	.6243	6, 7, & 11*	.6800
Narcissistic	.7130	6, 8, & 12*	.7514
Paranoid	.8011	--	--
Codependent	.6262	1, 3, & 4*	.7215
Passive-Aggressive	.7497	--	--
Positive Affect	.8815	--	--
Negative Affect	.7792	--	--

*See Appendix for DSLP Items by Scale

The reliability analysis therefore provides a means for analyzing which of the items within a given scale contribute to a statistically higher degree of internal reliability, and which of the items within a given scale statistically lower the internal reliability of a given scale. Upon initial analysis, the scales for compulsivity and codependency fell below the .70 mark. These scales were .6243 and .6262 accordingly. In addition to these scales, the analysis also revealed that the alpha for the narcissism scale could also be statistically increased by removing the influence of those items which contributed to a lower degree of internal reliability.

The new alpha coefficients were calculated for these three scales, resulting in codependency falling within an acceptable level at .7215, narcissism improving from .7130 to .7514, and compulsivity improving from .6243 to .6800. These new alpha coefficient calculations support the reliability of the instrument on four out of five scales, and compulsivity falling just below the .70 mark for reliability at .6800. All correlations in the following section are calculated based on the modified scales which possess a higher alpha coefficient. Table 4 provides a matrix of intercorrelations for each of the DSLP scales along with the control and comparison scales and items.

Table 4
Matrix of Intercorrelations

		AGE	EDUC	SIZE	PA	NA	COM	PARA	NARC	COD	PASS
Age	Pearson <i>r</i>	1									
	Significance	-									
Education	Pearson <i>r</i>	.084	1								
	Significance	.288	-								
Church Size	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.124	-.095	1							
	Significance	.206	.265	-							
Positive Affect	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.116	.121	.193	1						
	Significance	.219	.210	.099	-						
Negative Affect	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.247	.127	-.115	-.316	1					
	Significance	.047	.197	.224	.015	-					
Compulsive	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.374	.042	-.072	-.220	.192	1				
	Significance	.005	.390	.317	.069	.098	-				
Paranoid	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.073	.001	-.345	-.281	.201	.279	1			
	Significance	.312	.497	.009	.028	.088	.029	-			
Narcissistic	Pearson <i>r</i>	-.176	.188	-.214	-.190	.220	.460	.656	1		
	Significance	.118	.103	.076	.100	.069	.001	.000	-		
Codependent	Pearson <i>r</i>	.045	-.052	-.096	-.282	.035	.486	.387	.427	1	
	Significance	.382	.365	.262	.028	.408	.000	.004	.001	-	
Passive-Aggressive	Pearson <i>r</i>	.078	-.076	-.305	-.603	.353	.235	.576	.638	.529	1
	Significance	.302	.306	.020	.000	.007	.056	.000	.000	.000	-

Validity of the DSLP

Correlations with PA. Table 5 provides the Pearson *r* and *p* values for the correlations between positive affect and the scales of the controlling variables and the DSLP scales. In this analysis the two significant findings are the negative correlations of paranoia and passive-aggressive behaviors with positive affect. These negative correlations provided convergent validity based on the proposed predictions indicated in Table 1. The correlation with paranoia has a *p* value that is <.05. The correlation with passive-aggressive behaviors has a *p* value that is <.001, indicative that this correlation is not attributable to chance or random error.

Table 5
Positive Affect Pearson Correlations

Scale	Pearson <i>r</i>	<i>p</i> Values*	Significance Level
Compulsive	-.185	.106	--
Narcissistic	-.228	.061	--
Paranoid	-.281	.028	Sig. at the .05 level
Codependent	-.240	.052	--
Passive-Aggressive	-.603	.000	Sig. at the .01 level
Age	-.116	.219	--
Education	.121	.210	--
Size of Church	.193	.099	--

* 1-tailed significance calculation

Partial Correlations with PA. Table 6 provides the Pearson r and p values for the correlations between positive affect and the DSLP scales while controlling for the influences of age, level of education, and size of church.

Table 6

Positive Affect Partial Correlations Controlling for Age, Education Level, & Size of Church

Scale	Pearson r	p Values*	Significance Level
Compulsive	-.2392	.061	--
Narcissistic	-.2545	.050	Sig. at the .05 level
Paranoid	-.2632	.044	Sig. at the .05 level
Codependent	-.2400	.061	--
Passive-Aggressive	-.5900	.000	Sig. at the .01 level

* 1-tailed significance calculation

Controlling for the influences of age, level of education, and the size of church, significant findings on the paranoia and passive-aggressive scales remain. In addition to this, narcissism is found to be significantly $-p = .50$ —correlated with positive affect in a negative manner. This finding is different that what was proposed in Table 1. Reflections on this point will follow in the discussion and implications section.

Correlations with Age. Table 7 provides the Pearson r and p values for the correlations between age and the scales of the PANAS and the DSLP.

Table 7

Age Pearson Correlations

Scale	Pearson r	p Values*	Significance Level
Compulsive	-.328	.012	Sig. at the .05 level
Narcissistic	-.169	.128	--
Paranoid	-.073	.312	--
Codependent	.013	.465	--
Passive-Aggressive	.078	.302	--
Positive Affect	-.116	.219	--
Negative Affect	-.247	.047	Sig. at the .05 level

* 1-tailed significance calculations

As identified previously, there is a negative correlation between age and negative affect that is significant $-p = <.05$. Additionally there is a significant $-p = <.05$ —negative correlation between age and compulsivity, meaning that as people grow older compulsive behaviors tend to decrease.

Correlations with Church Size. Finally, table 8 provides the Pearson r and p values for the correlations between church size and the scales of the PANAS and the DSLP. Two significant correlations are found in this table. These findings are that paranoia and passive-aggressive behaviors are negatively correlated with church size at significant $-p = <.01$ and $p = <.05$ accordingly—levels. In other words, leaders in larger churches tend to have fewer tendencies toward paranoid and passive-aggressive behaviors.

Table 8*Church Size Pearson Correlations*

Scale	Pearson r	p Values*	Significance Level
Compulsive	-.057	.353	--
Narcissistic	-.221	.070	--
Paranoid	-.345	.009	Sig. at the .01 level
Codependent	-.050	.372	--
Passive-Aggressive	-.305	.020	Sig. at the .05 level
Positive Affect	.193	.099	--
Negative Affect	-.115	.224	--

* 1-tailed significance calculations

Discussion and Implications*Reliability of the DSLP*

The findings for the reliability analysis indicate that the DSLP is an overall consistent instrument that has acceptable alpha coefficient levels on four of the five scales once some of the items are deleted from three of the scales. The fifth scale, while possessing an alpha coefficient that falls below the acceptable level, shows promise in that it is only .02 away from the acceptable level. Based on the reliability analysis, it is advisable that nine items be dropped (see Table 9) and that the compulsive scale be closely examined for improved wording and tightened connections to the literature.

Table 9*Items to Drop from the DSLP*

Scale	Items to Drop
Compulsive	6, 7, & 11
Narcissistic	6, 8, & 12
Codependent	1, 3, & 4

Validity of the DSLP

Convergent Validity from PANAS Correlations. Of the statistically significant findings, the paranoia and passive-aggressive scales of the DSLP performed as anticipated, providing convergent validity for these scales. The one additional finding that was statistically significant was the unanticipated negative correlation between positive affect and narcissism. Upon closer examination of some of the literature—such as Robins and Beer's (2001) observation noted earlier in the paper—as well as a closer examination of the DSLP items for narcissism, this finding begins to make sense. Table 9 illustrates some of the items that would bias the scale toward a correlation with negative affect.

Table 10
Narcissism Negative Affect Examples

Narcissistic Item #	Item Statement
3	“I find it difficult to receive criticism of any kind, reacting with anger, anxiety, or even depression when it does come.”
5	“In spite of achieving what others would consider significant success, I still find myself dissatisfied and driven to achieve greater things in and effort to feel good about myself.”
9	“Success or failure in a project has a direct bearing on my self-image and sense of worth.”

Convergent Validity from Controlling Variable Correlations. The two significant finding between the DSLP and the control variables are the negative correlation found between age and compulsivity and the negative correlation found between church size and paranoia and passive-aggressive behaviors. On the matter of age, this finding provides additional convergent validity, for it is logical to assuming that those maturing with age also would tend to mature out of some of their compulsive tendencies. As people grow older they generally become more settled in their life and work states, finding that there is less of a need to perform in such a way that they climb up the organizational ladder. On the matter of church size, this finding also provides additional convergent validity to the DSLP, for it's logical that those leading in larger church contexts would be less likely to possess behaviors that are paranoid or passive-aggressive, for these behaviors can possess self-selecting features that would not allow someone to succeed in a multi-staff environment where collaboration is necessary.

Practical Implication

Having highlighted the findings and discussion around this analysis of the reliability and validity of the DSLP, it's important to end the discussion with some practical observations. While the findings are not entirely conclusive, there is some support for both the reliability and validity of the DSLP. Practically, this means that ministry leaders may utilize the DSLP in a process of self-leadership with a moderate level of confidence that the instrument is consistently measure the intended constructs.

For leaders who take their fiduciary responsibilities seriously, this is a welcome addition for those seeking to manage the dark side tendencies that are a reality for most leaders. The DSLP provides one means for paying attention to these shadow tendencies, and serves as a means not only for identification of dark side issues, but likewise may used to point toward areas for focused developmental growth. While refining work on the DSLP should continue, the instrument—with the proposed changes—is trustworthy instrument for its intended function.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders DSM-IV-TR (Text Revision)*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap... and Others Don't*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- Drucker, P. F. (1992). *Managing the Non-Profit Organization: Principles and Practices*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- Egloff, B., Schmukle, S. C., Burns, L. R.; Kohlmann, C., & Hock, M. (2003). Facets of dynamic positive affect: Differentiating joy, interest, and activation in the positive and negative affect schedule. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 3, 528-540.
- Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.

- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1986). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Laub, J. (1999). *Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership (SOLA) instrument*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University.
- Lowen, A. (1983). *Narcissism: Denial of the true self*. New York: Macmillan.
- McIntosh, G. L., & Rima, S. D. (1998). *Overcoming the dark side of leadership: The paradox of personal dysfunction*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Million, T. (1981). *Disorders of personality*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rima, S. D. (1996). The dark side of leadership: Understanding the paradox of personal dysfunction in leadership (spiritual leaders). *Dissertation Abstracts International-A*, 57 (04), 1680. (UMI No. 9627782)
- Robins, R. W., & Beer, J. S. (2001). Positive illusions about the self: Short term benefits and long term costs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 2, 340-352.
- Vogt, W. P. (1999). *Dictionary of statistics & methodology: A nontechnical guide for the social sciences* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063–1070.
- Goleman, D., McKee, A., & Boyatzis, R. E. (2002). *Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of Emotional Intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Appendix

Compulsive Scale

1. I often worry that my superiors do not approve of the quality of my work.
2. I am highly regimented in my daily personal routines such as exercise schedule or devotions.
3. When circumstances dictate that I must interrupt my daily personal routines, I find myself out of sorts and feeling guilty for having "skipped" a day.
4. I frequently find myself conscious of my status in relationship to others.
5. It is difficult for me to take an unplanned day off from work responsibilities just to goof around or spend time with friends and family.
6. While away from work, I still find myself thinking about work-related topics, often sitting down to write out my ideas in length even if it disrupts family activities.
7. I like to plan the details of my vacation so that I don't waste time.
8. I often explode in anger after being cut off or irritated while driving or over petty issues.
9. I am meticulous with my personal appearance, keeping shoes shined, clothes perfectly pressed, hair carefully cut and groomed, and fingernails always clipped.
10. I frequently comment about the long hours I keep and my heavy workload.
11. When others make sloppy errors or pay little attention to detail, I become annoyed and judge that person.
12. I am obsessive about the smallest errors, worrying that they will reflect poorly on me.

Narcissistic Scale

1. Fellow leaders in my church or organization frequently question whether my proposed goals and projects are feasible and realistic.
2. I am obsessed with knowing how others feel about my sermons, lessons and performance.
3. I find it difficult to receive criticism of any kind, reacting with anger, anxiety, or even depression when it does come.
4. At times I feel myself thinking, I'll show them; they could never make it without me, when I experience conflict situations or opposition to my proposed plans.
5. In spite of achieving what others would consider significant success, I still find myself dissatisfied and driven to achieve greater things in an effort to feel good about myself.
6. I am willing to bend rules and press the envelope of acceptable behavior to accomplish my goals.
7. I find myself feeling jealous of the success and achievements of associates, other churches, or organizations in my area.
8. I am often unaware of or unconcerned about the financial pressures my goals and projects place on those I lead or the church or organization I serve.
9. Success or failure in a project has a direct bearing on my self-image and sense of worth.
10. I am highly conscious of how colleagues and those to whom I am accountable regard my accomplishments.
11. I need to be recognized or "on top" when meeting with a group of fellow pastors, denominational officials, or associates.
12. I see myself as a nationally own figure at some time in the future or I have plans to attain such a position.

Paranoid Scale

1. When I see two key church leaders discreetly talking in the lobby of the church, I worry that they may be talking about me.
2. It really bothers me to think about my church's board meeting without me being present.
3. When an associate receives rave reviews for a sermon or some special ministry, I experience intense feelings of jealousy rather than joy in the success and recognition he or she is receiving.
4. I require subordinates and associates to provide me with detailed reports of their activities.
5. I struggle when an associate, rather than me, is asked by church members to perform services such as weddings or funerals.
6. I have few intimate or meaningful relationships within my church or organizations and find myself avoiding such relationships.
7. I insist on absolute loyalty from those who work for me and prohibit staff from criticizing me in any way.
8. I often worry that there is a significant faction within my organization that would like to see me leave.
9. I have probed people for what they know or for special information they may relating to certain leaders in my organization.

10. Those I work with often complain about my lack of a healthy sense of humor.
11. I routinely refer to those I lead as "my people," "my board," or "my church" while bristling when the same designation is spoken by an associate.
12. I tend to take seriously even lighthearted comments and jokes directed at me.

Codependent Scale

1. I grew up in a family of one or more chemically dependent people (i.e. alcoholics, drug addicts, etc.).
2. I grew up in a strict, legalistic religious environment that held its members to an unrealistic standard of behavior and discouraged open communications about personal struggles and problems.
3. I am usually willing to put up with the bizarre or embarrassing behavior of others.
4. I often refrain from sharing my opinion in a group setting until I have heard the opinions of the others in the group.
5. I frequently worry about hurting people's feelings by sharing my true feelings.
6. I often feel responsible for problems I did not create.
7. I find it difficult to sleep because I worry about someone else's problems or behavior.
8. I find myself frequently overcommitted and feel my life is out of control.
9. I find it extremely difficult to say no to people even when I know that saying yes will result in difficulty for me or my family.
10. I constantly feel a sense of guilt but have difficulty identifying its source.
11. I feel like I never measure up to those around me and have self-deprecating thoughts.
12. When I receive compliments from others, I find it difficult to simply accept them without making qualifying statements.

Passive-Aggressive Scale

1. I find myself resisting standards and procedures for formal review of my performance.
2. It is common for me to procrastinate on major projects.
3. I regularly resist others' ideas that could translate into increased performance and responsibility for myself.
4. I find myself consistently underperforming.
5. I experience periodic but regular outbursts of anger and frustration that are just within the bounds of what is considered acceptable behavior.
6. Occasionally I intentionally forget suggested projects.
7. Sometimes I give others the silent treatment as an expression of my anger.
8. I find myself telling others that nothing is bothering me when in reality I am seething.
9. I tend to be generally pessimistic and feel negative about my future.
10. Others have expressed to me that I make them feel uncomfortable.
11. Strategic planning and goal-setting are difficult for me.
12. Sometimes I catch myself trying to manipulate others in group settings by venting my anger and emotions when facing an initiative or idea I do not support.