

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告 期末報告

威權與承諾續擴：自戀領導者的宿命？！

計畫類別：個別型計畫

計畫編號：MOST 106-2410-H-259-019-SSS

執行期間：106年08月01日至107年07月31日

執行單位：國立東華大學企業管理學系暨研究所

計畫主持人：林家五

計畫參與人員：學士級-專任助理：陳慧玲

碩士班研究生-兼任助理：吳彧菁

碩士班研究生-兼任助理：曾欣怡

碩士班研究生-兼任助理：邱莉婷

博士後研究-博士後研究：吳佳燕

報告附件：出席國際學術會議心得報告

中華民國 107 年 10 月 30 日

中文摘要：自戀領導者通常表現出驕傲與自吹自擂的領導作為，而領導者此種傾向會不會導致部屬將他們歸類為威權領導，或是華人社會中常講的專權領導？本研究利用兩個樣本，兩種不同的自戀量表（分別由領導者自評、部屬他評），並進行跨層次分析，來確認自戀與威權領導、專權領導之間的關係。研究結果指出，領導者自戀傾向與兩種威權領導風格，皆有顯著的正相關。相關的理論貢獻，與應用，也在文後有深入討論。

中文關鍵詞：威權領導、專權領導、自戀

英文摘要：Narcissistic leaders often express prideful and self-aggrandizing styles of leadership behavior; whether such leadership is related to authoritarian leadership or controlling juan-chiuan leadership among the Chinese remains to be examined. This study attempted to use two samples, two different types of narcissism scales, director self-evaluations, and employee evaluations to conduct a multiple-level analysis. The analytical results were significant: there was a high positive correlation between the narcissism of leaders and the two authoritarian leadership styles. The research findings can be used as the foundation for subsequent discussions of the effects of leader narcissism on subordinate behavior or be used to clarify how narcissism affects authoritarian leadership styles.

英文關鍵詞：Authoritarian Leadership, Juan-Chiuan Leadership, Narcissism

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NARCISSISM OF LEADERS AND AUTHORITARIAN LEADERSHIP

¹ CHIA-WU LIN, ²CHIA-YEN WU

^{1,2} Department of Business Administration, National Dong-Hwa University, Taiwan, R.O.C.

Email: ¹jwlin@gms.ndhu.edu.tw, ²chiayen@gms.ndhu.edu.tw

Abstract: Narcissistic leaders often express prideful and self-aggrandizing styles of leadership behavior; whether such leadership is related to authoritarian leadership or controlling Juan-Chiuan leadership among the Chinese remains to be examined. This study attempted to use two samples, two different types of narcissism scales, director self-evaluations, and employee evaluations to conduct a multiple-level analysis. The analytical results were significant: there was a high positive correlation between the narcissism of leaders and the two authoritarian leadership styles. The research findings can be used as the foundation for subsequent discussions of the effects of leader narcissism on subordinate behavior or be used to clarify how narcissism affects authoritarian leadership styles.

Keywords: Authoritarian Leadership, Juan-Chiuan Leadership, Narcissism.

1. INTRODUCTION

The personality traits of leaders affect the leadership forms that they adopt (Liborius, 2014; Ng et al., 2008). In the research on negative leadership, scholars have found that the dark-side personality characteristics of leaders play extremely important roles in organizational operations, management, and decision-making. Among dark-side personality traits, the most commonly explored is narcissism in leaders; this term has also gradually appeared in studies relating to leadership (Chatterjee and Hambrick, 2007; Grijalva et al., 2015; Judge et al., 2006; Kets de Vries, 2006; Resick et al., 2009).

The leadership behavior of narcissistic leaders shows that the leaders are often egotists focused on personal interest, who use leadership powers to win respect from others and a sense of superiority (Humphreys et al., 2010; Resick et al., 2009). These leaders pursue power, feel extremely superior, prideful, and outstanding, and possess excellent abilities that revolve around their self-centeredness (Maccoby, 2000, 2003; Resick et al., 2009). Moreover, narcissistic leaders do not accept or respond to the opinions of subordinates, and tend to act in their own ways and look down on subordinates, creating poor work atmospheres and interpersonal relationships, which in turn leads to a loss of talent and affects organizational performance (Hogan et al., 1990; Nevicka et al., 2011). This type of prejudicial and authoritarian leadership style constitutes the features of authoritarian leadership.

Even though the practical impressions of leaders such as Steve Jobs, Jack Ma, and Donald Trump can be summarized to suggest leader

narcissism and authoritarian leadership styles, it is still unclear whether narcissistic leaders are evaluated by subordinates as engaging in “authoritarian leadership” or the controlling “Juan-Chiuan leadership.” The correlation still needs further evaluation. This study will use two different sample sources, two different measurement tools, director self-evaluations, and employee evaluations to examine this research question on a multi-level analytical basis.

2. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NARCISSISM AND AUTHORITARIAN LEADERSHIP

Narcissistic people have excessive trust in their abilities in work (Griffin and Tversky, 1992), and would protect themselves by rejecting other voices in order to pursue maximum self-interest and power (Pickard et al., 2013); this is especially serious in successful narcissistic leaders (Maccoby, 2003). There are six types of narcissistic leaders: lying, misleading, raging, using coercive measures, manipulating, and using others to achieve recognition (Dean and Paul, 2002). Regardless of the type of narcissistic leader and regardless of whether the leadership mechanisms are used against subordinates, in carrying out affairs or management, the commonalities among narcissistic leaders include being driven by power and enterprise, lack of sympathy (Rosenthal and Pittinsky, 2006), lack of empathy for subordinates, and depriving others and taking advantage of privilege in order to establish authoritarian images (Judge et al., 2006).

Past studies on narcissistic leaders have shown that there was a high correlation between linguistic hostility and violence against others by narcissistic leaders (Barry et al., 2009; Reidy et al., 2008), with an inverted U correlation with leadership efficacy

(Grijalva et al., 2015), and a positive correlation to turnover intention (Resick et al., 2009). Therefore, this study asserts that because narcissistic leaders are excessively concerned with themselves, the control of power, and the neglect of others, they would use authoritarian methods to stabilize their own power in order to control subordinates or dominate the management of the organization, requiring employees to submit without reservation to express recognition, approval, admiration, and love for them. This study proposed the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: There is a positive correlation between leader narcissism and authoritarian leadership.

Hypothesis 2: There is a positive correlation between leader narcissism and Juan-Chiuan leadership.

3. METHODOLOGY

The business world has increasingly been paying attention to the interactive relationships between supervisors and subordinates. In order to effectively examine the relationship between supervisors and their subordinates while focusing on the authoritarian leadership among Chinese leadership styles, this study used employees and their supervisors in the finance industry as research subjects, employing the matching method to collect sample data from two types of banking businesses to separately confirm Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2.

Sample 1 was a bank that was restructured from a government-owned bank to a private bank. Sample 2 was made up of the top eight banks in terms of growth rate as published by *CommonWealth Magazine's* 2015 "2000 General Survey." In Sample 1, there were 39 valid director questionnaires and 177 valid subordinate questionnaires successfully matched; in Sample 2, there were 50 valid director questionnaires and 245 valid subordinate questionnaires successfully matched.

This study referred to the measurement scales already developed by domestic and foreign scholars for narcissistic, authoritarian, and Juan-Chiuan leadership. In Sample 1, the narcissism scale used was developed by Resick et al. (2009), which contained eight questions and was measured using the 5-point Likert scale (1 = does not describe him at all, 5 = describes him completely), to be filled out by the subordinates. Since narcissism is a team-level construct, it was necessary to aggregate the data measured from the employees regarding their directors and to compute the within-group interrater agreement (rwg). rwg greater than 0.7 meant consistency within the team-level construct. In Sample 1, the rwg of narcissism ranged from .65 to .89, which showed that it was suitable for aggregation to the team level, with ICC(1) at .22 and ICC(2) at .56. In this study, the scale's Cronbach's α was .90. The

authoritarian leadership scale used was developed by Cheng et al. (2000), which contained nine questions and was measured using the 6-point Likert scale (1 = highly disagree, 6 = highly agree), to be filled out by the subordinates. In this study, the scale's Cronbach's α was .91.

In Sample 2, the narcissism scale used was the abbreviated scale formulated by Ames et al. (2006), which contained 16 questions, all of which contained two narrative options (narcissistic/non-narcissistic) for the choice of one to be filled out by the directors. In this study, the scale's Cronbach's α was .80. Juan-Chiuan leadership was measured using the scale developed by Chou et al. (2010), which contained eight questions and was measured using the 6-point Likert scale (1 = always, 6 = never), to be filled out by the subordinates. In this study, the Cronbach's α reliability coefficient was .93. In addition, in order to ensure that the independent variables could effectively predict the dependent variables across levels, this study used the number of employees at the branch bank as the controlling variable at the director level and the amount of time a subordinate has worked with the director as the controlling variable at the subordinate level.

In Sample 1, 59% of the directors were female; the mean age was 52.62 years (SD=6.01 years); the mean seniority was 8.18 years (SD=10.70 years); the number of employees at the branch bank was 33.85 (SD=34.86 persons). 53.1% of the subordinates were female; the mean age was 38.47 years (SD=8.84 years); the mean seniority was 7.26 years (SD=6.30 years); the subordinates had spent 1.89 years working with the directors (SD=2.22 years).

In Sample 2, 70.6% of the directors were male; the mean age was 44.439 years (SD=6.63 years); the mean seniority was 14.42 years (SD=7.80 years); the number of employees at the branch bank was 37.14 (SD=53.23 persons). 51.8% of the subordinates were female; the mean age was 33.32 years (SD=6.38 years); the mean seniority was 5.78 years (SD=4.80 years); the subordinates had spent 2.64 years working with the directors (SD=2.337 years).

4. THE RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

Table 1 showed the descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients of the research constructs. Since the research constructs in Sample 1 were evaluated by the subordinates, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was applied in order to confirm that the measurements in this model were valid. The fit of two factor models ($\chi^2 = 328.93$, $df = 118$; SRMR = .06; GFI = .82; CFI = .91) was better than that of one factor model ($\chi^2 = 907.13$, $df = 119$; SRMR = .17; GFI = .48; CFI = .66), thereby demonstrating good discriminant validity.

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of the Study Variables

Variables		Means	SD	1	2
Sample1 ^a	Individual level				
	1. Length of cowork	1.89	2.22		
	2. Authoritarian leadership	3.02	.92	.05	(.91) ^c
	Team level				
	1. Number of people at branch	33.85	34.86		
2. Narcissism	1.83	.45	-.03	(.90)	
Sample2 ^b	Individual level				
	1. Length of cowork	2.64	2.33		
	2. Juan-chiuan leadership	2.66	1.05	-.01	(.93)
	Team level				
	1. Number of people at branch	37.14	53.23		
2. Narcissism	6.73	3.80	-.19	(.80)	

Note. ^a n = 177; N = 39; ^b n = 247; N = 51; ^c the numbers in parentheses are Cronbach's α values.

The research construct in this study involved the individual level (subordinates) and the team level (supervisors). This study applied regressive principles to hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) in a multi-level data structure to confirm the hypotheses. The HLM analytical results in Table 2 showed that there was a significant positive correlation between leader narcissism and authoritarian leadership ($\gamma = .43, p < .001$); therefore, H1 in this study was supported. The HLM analytical results in Table 3 showed a significant positive correlation between leader narcissism and Juan-chiuan leadership ($\gamma = .37, p < .05$); therefore, H2 in this study was supported.

Table 2. The Results of Hierarchical Linear Modeling Analysis from Sample 1

Independent variables	Authoritarian leadership Model
Individual level	
Intercept	.00
Length of cowork	.12
Team level	
Number of people at branch	-.06 ^{**}
Narcissism	.43 ^{***}
Model deviance	464.14

Note. n = 177, N = 39.

^{**} $p < .05$, ^{***} $p < .001$

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Narcissistic leaders tend to express authoritarian leadership in their behaviors and management decisions due to the desire to pursue maximum power and self-interest. This study was measured by two samples, two types of narcissistic qualities, and different scoring methods to demonstrate the relationship between leader narcissism and authoritarian leadership styles: authoritarian and Juan-chiuan styles of leadership showed a significant positive correlation with leader narcissism. Research

results could also explain why the leadership efficacy of narcissistic leaders is an inverted U-shape (Grijalva et al., 2015), and why these leaders verbally or physically attack others (Barry et al., 2009; Reidy et al., 2008). Their goal is to use an authoritarian image (Judge et al., 2006) to satisfy their narcissistic psychological state with an infinite sense of superiority.

Table 3. The Results of Hierarchical Linear Modeling Analysis from Sample 2

Independent variables	Juan-Chiuan leadership Model
Individual level	
Intercept	-.04
Length of cowork	.10
Team level	
Number of people at branch	-.04
Narcissism	.37 ^{**}
Model deviance	650.58

Note. n = 247, N = 51.

^{**} $p < .05$

The research results also suggested why narcissistic leadership is, in practice, a double-edged sword. Narcissistic leaders are sensitive to criticism and are unable to heed warnings and recommendations or accept dissent because criticism and dissent would affect their unique self-centered beliefs (Maccoby, 2003). These leaders defend themselves from objections, are extremely in need of approval and superiority, and control everything in authoritarian ways in order to accentuate their own importance (Judge et al., 2006; Rosenthal and Pittinsky, 2006). When subordinates do not want to accept authoritarian management from leaders and in turn offer affirmative and sycophantic responses, the organization tends to fall into dire straits or even destruction.

Flamholtz and Randle (2007) pointed out that in times of crisis, the short time available for response is insufficient for many people to participate in decision-

making processes, and thus a guiding style of leadership would be better for achieving optimal outcomes. In other words, subordinates do not necessarily react to authoritarian leadership negatively, and narcissistic leaders can bravely face challenges when an organization faces major changes (Gilley et al., 2002). As this study only examined the correlation between narcissism and authoritarian leadership, future studies can focus on the relationships between the adventurous spirit of narcissistic leaders and subordinate-perceived authoritarian leadership in times of organizational or team crisis. Future confirmation of the study results may also be derived from subordinates' perceptions from intentional attribution (Dasborough and Ashkanasy, 2004) of the manipulative and authentic intentions of narcissistic leaders.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research is partially supported by Ministry of Science and Technology, Taiwan, R.O.C. under Grant no. MOST 106-2410-H-259-019-SSS.

REFERENCES

1. D. R. Ames, P. Rose, and C. P. Anderson, "The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism", *Journal of Research in Personality*, vol.40,no.4,pp.440-450, 2006.
2. C. T. Barry, J. D. Pickard, and L. L. Ansel, "The associations of adolescent invulnerability and narcissism with problem behaviors", *Personality and Individual Differences*, vol.47,no.6,pp.577-582, 2009.
3. A. S. Bryk, and S. W. Raudenbush, "Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods", Newbury Park, CA: Sage,1992.
4. A. Chatterjee, and D. C. Hambrick, "It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers and their effects on company strategy and performance", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol.52,no.3,pp.351-386,2007.
5. B. S. Cheng, L. F. Chou, and J. L. Farh, "A triad model of paternalistic leadership: Constructs and measurement", *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, vol.14,pp.3-64, 2010.
6. W. J. Chou, L. F. Chou, B. S. Cheng, and C. K. Jen, "Juan-chiuan and shang-yan: The components of authoritarian leadership", *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, vol.34,pp.223-284, 2010.
7. M. T. Dasborough, and N. M. Ashkanasy, "Follower attributions of leader manipulative and sincere intentionality: A laboratory test of determinants and affective covariates", In M. J. Martinko (Ed.), *Attribution theory in the organizational sciences: Theoretical and empirical contributions*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age,pp.203-213, 2004.
8. B. M. Dean, and D. S. Paul, "Where egos dare: The untold truth about narcissistic leaders - and how to survive them", *Work Study*, vol.50,no.1,pp.5-13, 2002.
9. E. G. Flamholtz, and Y. Randle, "Growing pains: How to make the transition from a entrepreneurship to a professionally managed firm", San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2007.
10. J. M. George, "Personality, affect, and behavior in groups", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol.75,no.2,pp.107-116, 1990.
11. K. M. Gilley, B. A. Walters, and B. J. Olson, "Top management team risk taking propensities and firm performance: Direct and moderating effects", *Journal of Business Strategies*, vol.19,no.2,pp.95-114, 2002.
12. D. Griffin, and A. Tversky, "The weighing of evidence and the determinants of confidence", *Cognitive Psychology*, vol.24,no.3,pp.411-435, 1992.
13. E. Grijalva, P. D. Harms, D. A. Newman, B. H. Gaddis, and R. C. Fraley, "Narcissism and leadership: A meta-analytic review of linear and nonlinear relationships", *Personnel Psychology*, vol.68,no.1,pp.1-47, 2015.
14. R. Hogan, R. Raskin, and D. Fazzini, "The dark side of charisma", In K. E. Clark, & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measure of leadership*. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America,pp.343-354, 1990.
15. J. Humphreys, D. Zhao, K. Ingram, J. Gladstone, and L. Basham, "Situational narcissism and charismatic leadership: A conceptual framework", *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, vol.11,no.2,pp.118-136, 2010.
16. L. R. James, R. G. Demaree, and G. Wolf, "Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol.69,no.1,pp.85-98, 1984.
17. T. A. Judge, J. A. LePine, and B. L. Rich, "Loving yourself abundantly: relationship of the narcissistic personality to self- and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task and contextual performance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol.91,no.4,pp.762-776, 2006.
18. M. F. R. Kets de Vries, "The leader on the couch: A clinical approach to changing people and organizations", San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, 2006.
19. P. Liborius, "Who is worthy of being followed? The impact of leaders' character and the moderating role of followers' personality", *The Journal of Psychology*, vol.148,no.3,pp.347-385, 2014.
20. M. Maccoby, "Narcissistic leaders: The incredible pros, the inevitable cons", *Harvard Business Review*, vol.78,no.1,pp.68-78, 2000.
21. M. Maccoby, "The productive narcissist: The promise and peril of visionary leadership", New York, NY: Broadway Books, 2003.
22. B. Nevicka, A. H. B. De Hoogh, A. E. M. Van Vianen, B. Beersma, and D. Mcllwain, "All I need is a stage to shine: Narcissists' leader emergence and performance", *The Leadership Quarterly*, vol.22,no.5,pp.910-925, 2011.
23. K. Y. Ng, S. Ang, and K. Y. Chan, "Personality and leader effectiveness: a moderated mediation model of leadership self-efficacy, job demands, and job autonomy", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol.93,no.4,pp.733-743, 2008.
24. J. D. Pickard, C. T. Barry, M. T. Wallace, and V. Zeigler-Hill, "Ethnicity, ethnic identity, and adolescent narcissism", *Self and Identity*, vol.12,no.5,pp.489-503, 2013.
25. D. E. Reidy, A. Zeichner, J. D. Foster, and M. A. Martinez, "Effects of narcissistic entitlement and exploitativeness on human physical aggression", *Personality and Individual Differences*, vol.44,no.4,pp.865-875, 2008.
26. C. J. Resick, D. S. Whitman, S. M. Weingarden, and N. J. Hiller, "The bright-side and the dark-side of CEO personality: Examining core self-evaluations, narcissism, transformational leadership, and strategic influence", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol.94,no.6,pp.1365-1381, 2009.
27. S. A. Rosenthal, and T. L. Pittinsky, "Narcissistic leadership", *The Leadership Quarterly*, vol.17,no.6,pp.617-633,2006.

行政院國家科學委員會補助國內專家學者出席國際學術會議報告

107年07月11日

報告人姓名	林家五	服務機構及職稱	國立東華大學企業管理學系教授
時間	07/04-07/05/2018	本會核定	MOST 106-2410-H-259-019 -SSS
會議地點	Phnom Penh, Cambodia	補助文號	
會議名稱	(中文) 2018 進階商業管理、資訊科學國際研討會 (英文) 2018 International Conference on Advances in Business Management and Information Science(ICABMIS)		
發表論文題目	(中文) 領導者自戀與威權領導行為間的關係 (英文) THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NARCISSISM OF LEADERS AND AUTHORITARIAN LEADERSHIP		
<p>報告內容應包括下列各項：</p> <p>一、參加會議經過</p> <p>此研討會是小型、綜合性國際研討會，會議於7/04早上於柬埔寨金邊的High Sky Hotel舉行。此次研討會，計畫主持人的論文被安排在9:30第一場次、第一篇報告。許多學者對本研究有興趣，除了好奇性別在威權領導上是否有差異外，也好奇管理實務上的具體案例。</p> <p>二、與會心得</p> <p>此種小型研討會，過去皆在國際知名度假景點舉辦，吸引力比較高。此研討會可能基於，回饋低度開發國家的想法，在柬埔寨金邊舉辦，但相對參加人數較少。</p> <p>三、考察參觀活動(無是項活動者省略)</p> <p>無</p> <p>四、建議</p> <p>目前國際研討會的舉辦，似乎逐漸形成一個產業，建議台灣的各大學應可進行合作來舉辦國際性研討會，不僅可提升研究的能量、國際知名度，更可以將收入回饋給學校。</p> <p>五、攜回資料名稱及內容</p> <p>該研討會有出版會議論文集，也有申請正式的 SSSN 碼，所以，此文章可算是正式出版。</p> <p>六、其他</p>			

106年度專題研究計畫成果彙整表

計畫主持人：林家五			計畫編號：106-2410-H-259-019-SSS				
計畫名稱：威權與承諾續擴：自戀領導者的宿命？！							
成果項目			量化	單位	質化 (說明：各成果項目請附佐證資料或細項說明，如期刊名稱、年份、卷期、起訖頁數、證號...等)		
國內	學術性論文	期刊論文		0	篇		
		研討會論文		0			
		專書		0	本		
		專書論文		0	章		
		技術報告		0	篇		
		其他		0	篇		
	智慧財產權及成果	專利權	發明專利	申請中	0	件	
				已獲得	0		
			新型/設計專利		0		
		商標權		0			
		營業秘密		0			
		積體電路電路布局權		0			
		著作權		0			
		品種權		0			
		其他		0			
	技術移轉	件數		0	件		
		收入		0	千元		
	國外	學術性論文	期刊論文		0	篇	
			研討會論文		1		Chia-wu Lin & Chia-yen Wu (2018). The Relationship between the Narcissism of Leaders and Authoritarian Leadership. International Conference on Advances in Business Management and Information Science(ICABMIS), 07/04-07/05, Phnom Penh, Cambodia
			專書		0		本
專書論文			0	章			
技術報告			0	篇			
其他			0	篇			
智慧財產權及成果		專利權	發明專利	申請中	0	件	
				已獲得	0		
			新型/設計專利		0		
		商標權		0			
	營業秘密		0				

		積體電路電路布局權	0		
		著作權	0		
		品種權	0		
		其他	0		
	技術移轉	件數	0	件	
		收入	0	千元	
參與計畫人力	本國籍	大專生	0	人次	
		碩士生	3		3位碩班研究生皆因參與本研究，在研究方法上的知識上，有具體的進步
		博士生	0		
		博士後研究員	1		博士後研究員針對自戀與領導兩個概念，有更深入的認識，也著手進行多篇學術論文的撰寫
		專任助理	1		專任助理獲得穩定的生活保障，在協助研究的行政上更加純熟
	非本國籍	大專生	0		
		碩士生	0		
		博士生	0		
		博士後研究員	0		
		專任助理	0		
其他成果 (無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等，請以文字敘述填列。)					

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現（簡要敘述成果是否具有政策應用參考價值及具影響公共利益之重大發現）或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估

達成目標

未達成目標（請說明，以100字為限）

實驗失敗

因故實驗中斷

其他原因

說明：

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形（請於其他欄註明專利及技轉之證號、合約、申請及洽談等詳細資訊）

論文： 已發表 未發表之文稿 撰寫中 無

專利： 已獲得 申請中 無

技轉： 已技轉 洽談中 無

其他：（以200字為限）

本計畫已經完成一份英文文稿，已經在國際研討會中報告、發表。近期將投稿至期刊，進入審稿程序

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性，以500字為限）

本計畫原本規劃兩年期計畫，因被刪減為一年期計畫，故只能執行第一年的計畫。預計收集的問卷資料，皆已收集完畢。研究結果清楚發現，領導者的自戀傾向越高，越容易被部屬認為是威權領導者。此點對於各階層的領導者，皆有高度的意涵。尤其是在強調民主、開放價值觀的企業組織中，若高階主管的自戀特質越高，越應該注意自己的言行與決策風格，避免出現高度威權的作為。

4. 主要發現

本研究具有政策應用參考價值： 否 是，建議提供機關

（勾選「是」者，請列舉建議可提供施政參考之業務主管機關）

本研究具影響公共利益之重大發現： 否 是

說明：（以150字為限）