

# A Conceptual Framework on Impact of Dark Leadership Styles on Organizational Culture and Individual Well Being

Pallavi Tandon\*, Dr. Shikha Mishra and Dr. Jyotsna Diwan Mehta

**Abstract---** *The review paper on dark leadership styles aims to establish find out the relationship between core elements of study namely, dark leadership styles, organizational culture and individual well being. The paper comprises of extensive review of existing literature in the realm of dark leadership styles in order to draw the direct relationship between the variables and hence add to the humongous study of negative side of leadership styles. Dark leadership styles have far-reaching deep-seated psychological consequences on the well being of an individual. A negative leader with his negative traits can render an organization nonfunctional and nonexistent.*

**Keywords---** *Dark Leadership, Organizational Culture, Individual Well Being.*

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

Leadership is an important aspect of any social or collective organization. It is interpreted as a set of individuals who are influenced by a particular leader (1). The leader leads and the group follow. Leadership, according to (2), is a significant process that influences or motivates individuals or group to achieve predefined goals. It is believed that a better leader develops an effective team. Researchers ascertained that good or effective leadership led to positive role of leadership (3). Leaders having positive and negative traits avail them for their advantage 4 argues:

*“trusting, gentle, compassionate leader might earn the affection of her followers, but also might be vulnerable to being manipulated or duped by others. A shrewd, scheming, cunning leader might be despised and distrusted by those who know him well, but might gain many advantages at the expense of the uninitiated”* (4).

According to socioanalytic theory, individual motives of either getting along with the group or getting ahead of the group are characteristic of agreeableness and conscientious. Individuals with such personality traits tend to be a supportive leader or one that wants to overpower his team. Tendency to rule one’s team or group and emphasising on self goals rather than goals of the organization are dark traits of a leader and dark role of leadership. These leaders with continuous focus on self are perceived as untrustworthy and over ambitious (5) and (6).

Dark leadership styles have emerged as an independent field of study in leadership studies ((7); (8); (9); (10); (11); (12); (13); (14); (15)). Dark leadership styles or dark side of the leadership is described by researchers using several terms as “destructive leadership, abusive supervision, petty tyranny, narcissistic leadership, and authoritarian leadership” (16). Terms as destructive leadership, toxic leadership, and petty tyranny are used in place of other (17). Other types of dark leaders are the narcissistic leader, the compulsive leader, the paranoid leader, the co-dependent leader and the passive-aggressive leader. Schyns and Schilling (2013) (14) defined destructive leadership as “a

---

*Pallavi Tandon\*, Research Scholar, Sector-125, Noida (UP), Amity University, UP, India. E-mail: Pallavi0917@gmail.com  
Dr. Shikha Mishra, Associate Professor, Sector-125, Noida (UP), Amity University, UP, India  
Dr. Jyotsna Diwan Mehta, Professor, S.S. Jain Subodh Management Institute, Shipra Path, Mansarovar, Jaipur, India.*

*process in which over a longer period of time the activities, experiences and/or relationships of an individual or the members of a group are repeatedly influenced by their supervisor in a way that is perceived as hostile and/or obstructive” (14). Toxic leadership is defined as , “...a process in which leaders, by dint of their destructive behaviour and/or dysfunctional personal characteristics, inflict serious and enduring harm on their followers, their organizations, and non-followers, alike” (18). According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV-TR), “Narcissistic personality disorder is a pattern of grandiosity, need for admiration, and lack of empathy”(19). According to the DSM-IV-TR, “Obsessive-compulsive personality disorder is a pattern of preoccupation with orderliness, perfectionism, and control” (19). According to the DSM-IV-TR, “Paranoid personality disorder is a pattern of distrust and suspiciousness such that other’s motives are interpreted as malevolent” (19). According to Hemfelt, Minirth, and Meier (1996), “Codependency can be defined as an addiction to people, behaviors, or things. Codependency is the fallacy of trying to control interior feelings by controlling people, things, and events on the outside. To the codependent, control or lack of it is central to every aspect of life. The codependent may be addicted to another person. In this interpersonal codependency, the codependent has become so elaborately enmeshed in the other person that the sense of self - personal identity - is severely restricted, crowded out by that other person’s identity and problems” (Hemfelt, Minirth, and Meier, 1996) (20). According to Weaver and Yancey (2010) (77), “A person with a passive aggressive, or negativistic, personality disorder is characterized by the following behaviors: (1) the person passively resists fulfilling routine social and occupational tasks; (2) the person complains of being misunderstood and unappreciated by others; (3) the person is sullen and argumentative; (4) the person unreasonably criticizes and scorns authority; (5) the person expresses envy and resentment toward those apparently more fortunate; (6) the person voices exaggerated and persistent complaints of personal misfortune; and (7) the person alternates between hostile defiance and contrition ((21). Leaders resort to abusive behaviour or abusive supervision, which is defined as “subordinates’ perceptions of the extent to which their supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile, verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact” (Tepper, 2000) because of greater organizational positions and stronger decision making power. These abusive behaviour involve “ridiculing, yelling at, and intimidating subordinates; taking credit for subordinates’ achievements; and attributing undesirable outcomes to subordinates’ personal factors” (22).*

Dark leadership or negative leadership provokes negative work outcomes in their subordinates (23). Dark leadership styles namely, aversive, destructive, abusive, narcissistic, supervisor undermining, despotic, petty tyranny (24), transactional, autocratic, and Laissez-faire, involve behaviors that are harmful and destructive. Such leaders exhibit traits of being egoist, inept, uninformed, irresponsible, spiteful, wicked, toxic, offensive, yelling, threatening, maltreatment, and disorderly. Burns (2017) categorises toxic behaviour as,

*“bullies, enforcers, and street fighters, maladjusted, malcontent, and often malevolent and malicious people, who succeed by tearing others down and glory in turf protection, fighting, and controlling others rather than uplifting followers, that have deep-seated but well-disguised sense of personal inadequacy, selfish values, and cleverness at concealing deceit” (25).*

Schilling (2009) (26) categorised self centered behaviour of leaders as “dark.” de Vries RE (2018) categorised negative behaviours and named it “Three Nightmare Traits” (TNT). This study grouped leaders on the basis of their

traits low honesty-humility (henceforth called “*leader dishonesty*”), low agreeableness (“*leader disagreeableness*”), and low conscientiousness (“*leader carelessness*”), which is found to have significant negative effects on the functioning of the organization, subordinates and society.

Researchers are of the opinion that such feelings originate from a mix of inferiority coupled with narcissism ultimately results in devastating mix of toxic behaviour (8). Other researchers have also cited personality traits and situational factors at the root of change in behaviour from constructive to destructive. Aggression literature provides meaningful explanation to such behaviour that are said to be result of learning from role models in society (27) (28). Researchers also believe that there is strong relation between personality traits of an individual and his leadership style (29). However, there are contrary studies also that identified weak relationship between individual traits and their leadership styles ((30); (4); (31); (32); (33)).

### **1.1 Organizational Culture**

According to Hofstede (1980) (34) culture is “*the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another*”. Organizational culture is defined as “*The way things get done around here*” (35). Organizational culture is an apparatus to control and influence the behavior of individuals in an organization. Employees think, feel and behave according to the prevailing culture or socio-culture of the organization (36). It is a system that guides and directs them (37). Organizational culture is the set of collective values, beliefs, and norms that influence the way employees think, feel, and behave in the workplace (38). Morgan (1997) (39) described organizational culture as the collection of traditions, values, beliefs, policies and attitudes that comprise a enveloping context for everything one does and thinks in an organization. Collins and Porras (2000) (40) concluded that organizational culture refers to a system of shared meaning held by members that distinguish one organization from other organizations. They believe that “*this shared meaning consists of seven key characteristics: innovation and risk-taking, attention to detail, outcome orientation, people orientation, team orientation, aggressiveness and stability*” (36). Other definitions of organizational culture as summarised by Adwale and Anthonia (2013) (41) that highlights different perspectives are as follows:

*“Organizational culture is conceptualized as shared beliefs and values within the organization that helps to shape the behavior patterns of employees (Kotter and Heskett, 1992). Gordon and Cummins (1989) define organization culture as the drive that recognizes the efforts and contributions of the organizational members and provides holistic understanding of what and how to be achieved, how goals are interrelated, and how each employee could attain goals... Deal and Kennedy, (1982) recognizes the link between culture and organizational excellent performances via its human resource development programmes. These cultural values and human resource development programmes are consistent with organizational chosen strategies that led to successful organizations... According to Martins and Terblanche (2003), culture is deeply associated with values and beliefs shared by personnel in an organization. Organizational culture relates the employees to Organization’s values, norms, stories, beliefs and principles and incorporates these assumptions into them as activity and behavioural set of standards... Klein, (1996) positioned organizational culture as the core of organization’s activities which has aggregate impact on its overall effectiveness and the quality of its product and services... Schneider and Smith (2004) argues that*

*culture begins with leadership and passed on to the organizational members; it is seen as a set of forces that shape and determine human behavior... ” (41).*

Employees either feel attached to the organization or feel the urge to move out (36). Strong and weak culture in an organization reflects the mindset of its employees as:

*“A strong corporate culture indicates that employees are like-minded and hold similar beliefs/ethical values while a weak corporate culture indicates that employees are unlike-minded and hold dissimilar beliefs/ethical values. Thus, organizations can only achieve their goals by aligning their corporate culture with their performance management system” (Agwu, 2014).*

Nelson & Quick, (2011) (42), talks about the functions performed by organizational culture: *“gives members a sense of identity, increases their commitment, reinforces organizational values and serves as a control mechanism for shaping behaviour”*

Organizational culture has seven dimensions. A study conducted with IBM employees from around fifty countries helped to justify these dimensions by Hofstede in 1980. They are as follows:

*“In order to elaborate findings IBM employees were gathered from more than 50 countries so that organization culture on basis of dimensions would be perfectly analyzed. (Hofstede’s,1980) The four dimensions of organization culture were as followed:*

*Power distance: It is defined as degree of employee and management behaviour that have been based upon perfect relationship between formal and informal set of planning action.*

*Individualism: In this dimension difference between organization interest and self interest have perfectly been matched.*

*Uncertainty avoidance: The uncertainty and ambiguity based upon tolerance helps in mitigating willingness of people.*

*Masculinity: It comes in avoidance of caring and promotion rather than level of success based upon challenges, insolence and ambition.*

*In 1998 Hofstede and Bond identified fifth dimension in which 23 countries long and short term orientation have perfectly been analyzed. The organizational behaviour relates to practitioners values and beliefs based upon culture factors and norms that effects upon personality and performance of organization. (Sondergaard, 1994) The cultural factors and personality impacts upon behaviour and sustainability of organization (Schwartz,1994) The models developed by Hofstede in 1980 presents 38 countries studies in which strong relationships of culture have been identified.*

*From these classifications two different kind of dimensions have been identified such as: Affective & intellectual while secondly self enhancement and self transcendence. The standards based upon cultures and societies present contractual relationship between life and work. The standards based upon cultural association leads to perfect association between performance and management. More than 30 companies from 50 different countries have been*

identified (Trompanaars 1993). Seven different dimensions of cultures have also been identified such as universalism versus particularize, specific versus diffuse, emotional versus neutral, communication versus individualism, achievement versus ascription, attitude to environment and attitude to time. The Hofstede's model has seven dimensions that help in presenting effective relationship between different sets of norms and values" (43).

Studies have also found various types of organizational cultures based on their format and functions. Deal and Kennedy (1982) (35) described the culture based on their strategies and expectations from their employees:

*"The Tough-Guy, Macho culture: employees who belong to this type of culture usually work under a lot of pressure and are considered to be eager to take risks in order to fulfil their personal ambitions and their organization's goals.*

*The Work Hard/Play Hard culture: in organizations with this type of culture, the behaviour of employees revolves around the needs of customers and is characterized by high speed action in order to get quick results.*

*The Bet-Your- Company culture: this type of culture refers mainly to the character of the institution or company, which is likely to make carefully planned, yet risky, choices and investments.*

*The Process culture: the last type of organizational culture is based on precision, detail and technical perfection, low risk investments and low levels of anxiety among employees" (44).*

Another set of organizational culture as promulgated by Xenikou and Furnham (1996) (45) are based on organizational goals and decision making process:

*"The Openness to change/ innovation culture: this type of culture is human-oriented and promotes affiliation, achievement, self actualization, task support and task innovation.*

*The Task-oriented culture: organizations with this type of culture focus on detail and quality of products or services, while superiors are characterized by high ambitions and chase success.*

*The Bureaucratic culture: this type of culture is rather conservative and employees are characterized by centralized decision making.*

*The Competition/ Confrontation culture: organizations with this type of culture are highly competitive, goal-oriented, while superiors chase perfection and achievement" (45)*

Daft (2001) (46) suggested another four types of organizational culture, based on environmental requirements:

*"Entrepreneurial Culture: Organizational strategic focus is external so that it acts to meet needs and requirements of clientele and customers in a dynamic and variable environment. It creates changes and innovation, risk ability, prospect, group working, freedom and autonomy.*

*Involvement Culture: It is focused on participation and involvement of organizational members and environmental expectations which vary promptly and it creates sense of accountability, ownership and further commitment to organization in personnel.*

*Mission Culture: It takes service to customers in outside environment into consideration. It does not need to rapid changes and instead personnel are accountable for performance up to certain level.*

*Bureaucratic Culture: It is focused internally and adapted to a fix environment. In such a culture, personnel's involvement is low but supervision and control over environment are high. Some factors like organizational discipline and rank and position and observance of hierarchy are highly important in this culture” (46)*

Cameron and Quinn (2006) (47) suggested organizational culture based on employee relations:

*“The Hierarchical culture: this type of culture is considered to be well coordinated, characterized by formal rules and policies.*

*The Market culture: organizations that adopt this type of culture aim to be highly competitive, while winning is the “glue” that holds the employees and the organization together.*

*The Clan culture: this type of culture refers to a friendly and “cosy” working environment, where the working force is perceived as an extended family and the superiors are perceived as mentors; employees are characterized by high job and organization commitment and develop friendly relations.*

*The Adhocracy type: this type of culture is characterized by innovation and risk taking, assured by a highly creative and dynamic working environment” (47).*

Existing literature supports the correlation between organizational culture and employees performance. Researchers like Magee (2002) (48), Hellriegel & Slocum (2009) (49) hold the view that an employee is influenced by its work culture. Daft (2010) (50) feels that “*A positive culture supports adaptation and enhances employees’ performance by motivating, shaping and channelling their behaviours towards the attainment of corporate objectives (50)*” Organizational culture has the potential to enhance organizational performance, employee job satisfaction and a sense of certainty about problem solving (51). Researchers like Hellriegel and Slocum (2009), Schneider and Synder (1975) (52), Jiang and Klen (2000) (52); Mckinnon et al., (2003) (53); Navaie-Waliser et al., (2004); Arnold and Spell, (2006) (54); Chang and Lee, (2007) (55); Mansoor and Tayib, (2010) (56) found positive relationship between organizational culture and employee job satisfaction.

Several studies have also explored the relationship between employee job satisfaction and leadership as one of the dimensions of organizational culture. Commenting on various observations of this relationship made by researchers, Belias and Koustelios (2014) (44) is of the following opinion:

*“Studies have shown that in organizations which are flexible and adopt the participative management type, with emphasis in communication and employees’ reward, the latter are more likely to be satisfied, resulting in the organization’s success (Mckinnon et al., 2003). According to Schein (1992), there is an interactive relationship between the leader and the organizational culture. The leader creates an organization which reflects specific values and beliefs, a fact that leads to the creation of a specific culture. However, a culture is usually dynamic rather than static. As it evolves, therefore, it affects the actions and tactics of the leader. Hence, it could be said that, although the leader creates the culture primarily, he/ she is the one who evolves through this process, and so are the leadership tactics he/ she applies” (44).*

Researchers have promulgated that leadership styles have positive and negative impact on the wellbeing of an individual. There is plethora of studies that recount positive aspect of leadership styles but very scanty work records negative impact of leadership styles on working professionals (58); (59). Harmful and negative behaviour have far reaching consequences on individuals as well as the organization (60). Psychologists opine that individuals are psychologically more responsive towards negative behaviour than positive thus exerting stronger influence on human behaviour and attitudes than positive behaviours (61). Norton (2016) (62) sees toxicity in leaders as demotivating that adversely affects team and environment. This paper explores these consequences and examines the relationship that exists between well being of an individual and its impact on the organization.

## **II. OBJECTIVES**

Dark leadership styles have proved to be harmful for the organizations in the long run. It has negative effect on the well being of the employees and curbs the growth prospects of the organization. Keeping these aspects in mind, this paper aims to review the impact of dark leadership styles on the well being of an individual in service sector. Second, the paper will analyze with the help of existing literature, the impact of dark leadership styles on the growth of an organization; and third purpose of this review paper is to contribute to the existing literature of dark leadership by investigating the relationship between the well being of an employee and his contribution towards growth of an organization under the influence of dark leadership styles.

## **III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The study under consideration is conceptual in nature. The research offers understanding of human nature thereby providing interpretative paradigm to the study. On the basis of objectives of research, this study can be categorized as correlational in nature as it tries to establish relationship or dependence between the constructs under study namely, dark leadership styles, individual well being, organizational growth and culture. This research can be classified as fundamental or pure research as the study attempts to advance existing stock of knowledge about the subject. The work entails qualitative approach to research. The research makes use of secondary data by exploring extensive published material and online sources on the subject. Review of literature forms the basis of the research.

## **IV. IMPACT OF DARK LEADERSHIP STYLES ON THE WELL BEING OF AN INDIVIDUAL**

An individual is directly influenced by the work environment as he spends a major chunk of his day and larger part of his life at work place. Dark leadership involves poisonous, critical and rude leaders (63). Other debasing behaviors noted in leaders exhibiting dark traits are humiliating (64), blaming, discrimination, and favoritism. Several researchers have studied the impact of dark leadership styles on individual work performance and well being. They found that abusive leadership generates higher levels of turnover, conflict between work and family, emotional exhaustion, and psychological distress ((65); (66); (67); (68); (69)). Reed (2004) (8) describes working with a toxic leader as a challenge that a subordinates takes up every day. Dealing with the challenge culminates into “*unnecessary organizational stress, negative values, and hopelessness*” ((25);(70)). Gallus, et al. (2013) (16) explained the far-reaching impact of toxic leadership on individuals as,

*“Those who experience toxic leadership are more likely to have reduced job satisfaction and organizational commitment and are less likely to engage in organizational citizenship behaviours...Toxic leadership has even been found to negatively impact the target’s personal relationships in the form of increased partner conflict and higher work-life conflict...to drug and alcohol abuse to decreased job satisfaction, productivity and motivation. Targets have been found to have higher stress, greater instances of alcohol abuse, and reduced self-esteem” (16).*

Moreover, toxic leadership corrodes unity, punctures high spirit, decreases performance and commitment, induces turnover intent ((71); (72)) and mental agony, and negatively affects willingness to continue and satisfaction from work and life (60). Researchers consider abusive behavior to cause significant psychological distress for subordinates (73) and the abused show signs of depression, anxiety, emotional fatigue and distance from work ((74); (75); (7)).

Reed and Bullis (2009) (17), share fifteen most frequently experienced negative behaviours that takes a toll on the productivity (76) and well being of an employee in Figure 1

<b>Behaviour</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Played favourites	2.42	1.23
Relied on authority	2.32	1.11
Imposed his or her solution	2.23	1.24
Guarded turf against outsider	2.23	1.25
Lost temper	2.12	1.02
Insisted on one solution	2.02	1.17
Administered polices unfairly	2.00	1.05
Forced acceptance of his or her point of view	1.98	1.11
Would not take no for an answer	1.98	1.23
Treated subordinates in a condescending manner	1.97	1.16
Demand to get his or her way	1.92	1.16
Boasted bragged on showed off	1.89	1.13
Criticizer subordinates in front of other	1.89	1.09
Delegated work he or she did not want	1.84	1.05
Claimed credit for the work of others	1.77	1.10

When faced with such rude and intolerant behaviour, subordinates experience a lack of interest in work and poor job satisfaction ((77); (78); (71) & (7)), lower levels of trust in the supervisor (79), and lower affective commitment and effort (80). Individuals also experience psychological set back when exposed to unhealthy behaviour. Unfair and corrupt practices at workplace leaves an employee feeling isolated at work and among other colleagues. This feeling of isolation is referred to as Work Ostracism. Kanwal et al, (2019) (81) further explains about Work Ostracism, *“The WO is one of the destructive workplace behaviours that bring melancholy, low spirits, poor performance, cynical issues and mental disorders among employees.”* In addition to this, Work Ostracism also results in *“reduced levels of belongingness, low self-esteem, lack of personal control over emotions”* (81). Authoritarian leadership style causes stress and anxiety among employees because of their demanding nature such leaders neglect other familial responsibilities of their employees (81). Kolzow (2014) (82) in his book elaborates on the negative aspect of authoritarian leadership style: *“A danger in authoritarian leadership is the tendency toward negative motivation: using threats, coercion, and other non-reinforcing means to achieve results. This can create a culture of crisis in the organization, with the leader as either oppressor or rescuer or both”* (82). Aversive and destructive leadership leads

to decrease in job performance and work alienation ((24); (83); (84)). Researchers like Richman et al., (1992) (85); Ashforth, (1997) (86); Tepper, (2000); Aasland et al., (2010) (87); Hershcovis and Rafferty, (2012) (88); Schyns and Schilling, (2013) (14) have studied about the negative impact of destructive leadership and reported that such behaviour leads to lowered job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational performance, and increased emotional exhaustion, turnover intentions, work-family conflict, and psychological distress. Despotism (De Hoogh and Den Hartog, 2008) (32), which is characterised by autocratic behaviour, inconsiderate, exploitative, domineering, controlling, revengeful ((89); (90); (91)) has been found to be negatively related to job performance, OCB, employee creativity (92) and hampers personal life and home and family sphere of an employee. Another set of researchers who examined psychological aspect of despotism found evidences of anxiety, depression (7), and burnout ((7); (93); (94); (69)), create stress among their subordinates, resulting in burnout ((86); (11); (26); (95)). de Veirs RE (2018) (29) mentioned about harmful effects of abusive supervision:

*“Abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al., 2017), which has been found to be most strongly related to Big Five agreeableness (Tepper et al., 2001), has been found to be related to higher levels of supervisor-directed, organizational, and interpersonal deviance (Mitchell and Ambrose, 2007; Tepper et al., 2008, 2009), lower levels of perceived interactional or procedural justice and lower levels of employees’ OCB (Zellars et al., 2002; Aryee et al., 2007), lower job satisfaction (Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al., 2009), and higher psychological distress and emotional exhaustion (Tepper, 2000; Wu and Hu, 2009)”* (29).

Exploitative leadership and abusive supervision motivates turnover intentions. Exploitative leadership describes behaviors *“with the primary intention to further the leader’s self-interest by exploiting others, reflected in five dimensions: genuine egoistic behaviors, taking credit, exerting pressure, undermining development, and manipulating”* (96). Autocratic leadership results in lower levels of satisfaction (97), higher levels of cynicism (98), and higher levels of role conflict and role overload (99).

## **V. IMPACT OF DARK LEADERSHIP STYLES ON THE GROWTH OF AN ORGANIZATION**

Dark or negative leadership is detrimental to the growth and continued existence of an organization (100). Leadership styles *“influence organizational identification”* thereby developing association between employees and leaders and organization (81). Researchers have also found that a leader is instrumental in success of a project (63). Study conducted by Pelletier (2010) (60), as reported by Burns (2017) (25) *“found increases in workplace deviance by subordinates who report working for abusive supervisors”* (p. 377). These counterproductive behaviors tend to be attributed to negative reciprocity, that is, the employee’s effort to ‘balance the scale’ of perceived injustice by inflicting harm back onto the company” (25). Elle (2012) (70) is of the opinion that dark traits create negative organizational climate. Adding to Elle’s work (2012) (70), Gallus et al, (2013) (16) found decreasing workgroup cohesion resulting from negative leadership. Laissez-faire leadership style, promotes rare transactions, cohesion and no participation in decision making process (101) thereby culminating in workplace stress, role ambiguity, and interpersonal conflict at a peer level (102). Talking about Laissez-faire leadership style and its impact on the organization, Kanwal et al, (2019) (81) elaborates:

*“The Laissez-faire leadership style contributes to workplace stress (Skogstad et al., 2014) where stress is an element which can easily drain employee performance while at work. Furthermore, it creates a polluted workplace climate – an environment where justice fails (Schilling, 2013)” (81).*

Van Vugt et al., (2004) (103) summarised that autocratic style of leadership does not involve frequent interactions with their subordinates and encourage rare participation in decision making process. This infrequent involvement of the subordinates ends in poor work performance and feeling of isolation at work (104). Transactional leadership style as pointed out by researchers is inapt for organizations that require creativity and innovative ideas (105). Such leaders also work against emotional bond between leader and subordinates (106), impair clarity of goal and decrease performance (107). Highlighting the disadvantages of Leader Dishonesty, de Vries RE (2012) (29) mentions about the traits and problems faced by organizations:

*“Leader dishonesty, the first of the TNT as applied to leadership, is straightforwardly defined as the opposite pole of HEXACO honesty-humility, i.e., the tendency of somebody (in a leadership position) to be insincere, unfair, greedy, and immodest. Leader dishonesty may be especially problematic for organizations because it may induce, encourage, and/or exacerbate an unethical organizational culture with low trust, low satisfaction, and high turnover. Furthermore, when unchecked it may be associated with serious economic, organizational, and legal costs for an organization” (29).*

In addition to this, researchers also found counterproductive work behaviors ((108); (109)), workplace misbehaviour ((110); (111)), unethical business decisions ((112); (113)), lower levels of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) (114), and lower team effectiveness (11). Second of the TNT traits as proposed by (29), has lasting impact on organization:

*“Leader disagreeableness, the second TNT applied to leadership, is defined as the...tendency of somebody (in a leadership position) to be unforgiving, overly critical, inflexible, and impatient. Leader disagreeableness may be problematic for organizations because it may induce a culture of fear and retaliation, which may, in turn, lead to high levels of job dissatisfaction, turnover, and costs associated with conflict management and conflict-related lawsuits” (29).*

Third TNT trait that is unhealthy for organization culture is Leader Carelessness, which is defined as lazy, sloppy, negligent and impulsive by de Vries RE (2018) (29):

*“Leader carelessness, the third of the TNT traits applied to leadership, is defined as the opposite of HEXACO conscientiousness, i.e., the tendency of somebody (in a leadership position) to be sloppy, lazy, negligent, and impulsive. Leader carelessness may be problematic for organizations, because it may be associated with an accident-prone culture, in which rules and regulations are disregarded and in which industry standards, necessary for optimal performance, are violated. More generally, it may lead to a culture in which low, instead of high, performance is the norm” (29).*

Figure 2 present eight dimensions of harmful behaviour by leaders categorised by Pelletier (2010) (60) that are unhealthy for the organization and subordinates,

Dimensions	Behavioural Characteristics	Organisational Example
Attack on follower's self-esteem	Demeaning/Marginalizing or degrading Ridiculing  Mocking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asking employee. 'Is this the best you can do?'</li> <li>• Telling employee the assignment is way over his or her head</li> <li>• Telling employees their job is to work not think</li> </ul>
Lack of integrity	Being deceptive Blaming others for leader's mistakes Bending the rules to meet goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taking credit for someone else's work</li> <li>• Going against his or her word</li> <li>• Asking employees to bend rules</li> </ul>
Abusiveness	Display Anger Emotional volatility Coercing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yelling</li> <li>• Throwing tantrums</li> <li>• Slammings fist</li> </ul>
Social Exclusion	Excluding individuals from social functions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intentionally bypassing an employee in a round table</li> <li>• Failing to invite all work group members to an organisational outing</li> </ul>
Divisiveness	Ostracizing employee  Inciting employee to chastise another	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Telling an employee that he or she is not a team player</li> <li>• Pitting one employee of workgroup against another</li> </ul>
Promoting inequity	Exhibiting favouritism  Being selective in promotions Favouring members of entourage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distributing resources to the in-group disproportionately</li> <li>• Socializing with only a select few</li> <li>• Promoting based on cronyism</li> </ul>
Threat to follower's security	Using physical acts of aggression Threatening employees' job security Forcing people to endure hardships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shoving or making threatening gestures</li> <li>• Joking about firing an employee</li> <li>• Forcing employees to work extremely long hours</li> </ul>
Laissez-fair	Ignoring comments/ideas  Disengagement stifling dissent Being rigid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failing to respond when employees voice concerns that run counter to leader's objectives</li> <li>• Criticizing employees when they speak out</li> <li>• Insisting on doing things the old way</li> </ul>

Destructive and tyrannical leadership styles have been found to be consistently related to negative follower and organizational outcomes (14). Destructive leadership also “*violates established rules and social norms of conduct in an organization*” (96). Despot leaders work against their organizations' legitimate interests by indulging in self-serving and morally corrupt behavior (91).

Above study clearly shows the harmful aspect of dark leadership on the individuals and their well being. Based on the present literature review it is imperative to declare that negative leadership styles and traits are like parasites for an organization and its human resources that slowly and steadily sucks its fervour and motivation to work and be a part of the organization.

## **VI. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE WELL BEING OF AN EMPLOYEE AND HIS CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS GROWTH OF AN ORGANIZATION UNDER INFLUENCE OF DARK LEADERSHIP STYLES**

Existing literature supports the negative effect of dark leadership styles on the psychological well being of an employee, their performance at work and subsequent loss of job satisfaction and commitment (63). There is one suitable word to describe the relationship and that is negative. It negatively affects the overall performance of the employee and the organization thereby making it nonfunctional and incompetent.

## **VII. CONCLUSION**

Leaders and subordinates work closely in association to accomplish projects, a task at hand and fulfill organizational objectives. Deemed as one of the most important relations in organizations, leaders offer directives, assigns, guides handles conflict and resolves differences (115). His approach towards his team has a lasting influence on the subordinates. Extensive study and review of existing literature throw light on the harmful and dark effects of dark leadership traits and leadership styles on the performance and well being of the employees. It is also detrimental to the overall health of the organization. The evolving culture of an organization impacts works performance and job satisfaction. So, when a leader exhibits his dark side and exercises coercive power on his subordinates, thus marring their performance, creativity, level of satisfaction, tendency to stay with the organization, induces stress and anxiety, renders them weak and ineffective in the long run. An organization loses its charm and its human resource because of a dark or negative leader who for their selfish interest demotivates and exploits the employees and does not pay attention to the common goals and objectives of the organization. Use of the destructive and negative work environment. The study can also be used for analyzing the mental state of the subordinates and victims of workplace abuse. Such victims can be provided with self-development and self-love treatments and training to regain their confidence and rebuild a positive outlook towards life.

## **VIII. IMPLICATIONS**

Knowing about different traits and characteristics of dark leaders and their leadership styles will help the human resources department of an organization to identify such behaviours and provide timely intervention for curbing such harmful behavior. Spotting and rectifying such extreme and unhealthy behavior helps in minimizing the chances of the psychological downfall of an individual. It will also save organizational culture from defiling and uplift growth prospects.

Awareness about specific dark traits will help in the formulation of a tailored approach towards minimizing and controlling such behaviours. Customized coaching, training, online learning and development sessions can be helpful in improving hostile and unhealthy behavior. This will open future prospects of framing and creating training sessions for such individuals with negative leadership traits. The study can trigger deep insight into the unbalanced family life of the employees because of the destructive and negative work environment. The study can also be used for analyzing the mental state of the subordinates and victims of workplace abuse. Such victims can be provided with self-development and self-love treatments and training to regain their confidence and rebuild a positive outlook towards life.

## IX. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Despite adding to the existing knowledge of the subject, the research is not free from limitations. First of all, the work is confined to a review of the literature and does not involve primary data. The research does not make use of any primary data. Second, the absence of first-hand information prohibits the researcher from forming any new opinion and conclusion about the dark leadership styles and how they impact the organization and its employees. Third, real scenarios, observation, interaction provides in-depth information and would have assisted the researcher in coming up with a new approach to dealing with dark leadership styles.

However, this researcher has the scope of future research. It opens new avenues for organizations and their HR team to gain information about dark leadership types and formulate strategies to deal with them. Views, opinions, and findings of researchers analyzed and presented in this research paper form a treasure trove of knowledge for students of psychology, sociology, organizational management, organizational behavior, and human resources. They can extract relevant information about the different negative behaviours of individuals and its impact on the overall growth and functioning of organizations. Further research can be initiated to study the impact of the negative leader on the family life of an employee focusing on the emotional upheaval that is caused by constant belittling and ridicule that goes on at the workplace. A detailed study can be conducted to study the health implications of negative work behavior. Prolong suffering can lead to psychological as well as physical illness and can culminate in ailments. A study on the health of employees can be performed to improve the general health and wellness of such victimized employees. Future work can also be developed to study the different types of organizational culture and their impact on the health of the employees. Organizational culture can also be studied in-depth with context to dark leadership traits.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology*, 9(2), 169-180.
- [2] Northouse, P. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. New York: Sage Publications
- [3] Higgs, M. (2009). The Good, the bad and the ugly: Leadership and Narcissism. *Journal of Change Management*, 9(2), 165-178.
- [4] Judge, T. A. and Bono, J. E. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 901–910.
- [5] Hogan, R. (1994). Trouble at the Top: Causes and Consequences of Managerial Incompetence. *Consulting Psychology Journal*.
- [6] Benson, M., & Hogan, R. (2008). How Dark Side Leadership Personality Destroys Trust and Degrades Organisational Effectiveness. *Organisations & People*, 15(3), 10-18.
- [7] Tepper, B.J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 178-190.
- [8] Reed, G. E. (2004). Toxic leadership. *Military Review*. 84(4), 67–71.
- [9] Rosenthal, S. A., and Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 617–633.
- [10] Hauge, L. J., Skogstad, A., and Einarsen, S. (2007). Relationships between stressful work environments and bullying: results of a large representative study. *Work Stress*, 21, 220–242.
- [11] De Hoogh, A. H. B., and Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *Leadership Quarterly*. 19, 297–311.
- [12] Schmid Mast, M., Jonas, K., and Hall, J. A. (2009). Give a person power and he or she will show interpersonal sensitivity: the phenomenon and its why and when. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 835–850.
- [13] Ghorbani, N., Watson, P., Hamzavy, F., and Weathington, B. L. (2010). Self-knowledge and narcissism in Iranians: Relationships with empathy and self-esteem. *Current Psychology*, 29, 135–143.

- [14] Schyns, B., and Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 138–158.
- [15] Boddy, C. R. (2017). Psychopathic leadership a case study of a corporate psychopath CEO. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 145, 141–156.
- [16] Gallus, J. A., Walsh, B. M., Driel, M. v., Gouge, M. C., & Antolic, E. (2013). Intolerable Cruelty: A Multi level Examination of the Impact of Toxic Leadership on U.S. Military Units and Service Members. *Military Psychology*, 25(6), 88–601.
- [17] Reed, G. E., & Bullis, R. C. (2009). Impact of Destructive Leadership on Senior Military Officers and Civilian Employees. *Armed Forces & Society*, 36(1), 5-18.
- [18] Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). Toxic Leadership: A Conceptual Framework. *Claremont, CA: Claremont Graduate University*.
- [19] American Psychiatric Association. (2000). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- [20] Hemfelt, R., Minirth, F., & Meier, P. (1996). Love is a choice: Breaking the cycle of addictive relationships. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- [21] American Psychiatric Association. (1994). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- [22] Liu, D, Liao, H, and Loi, R. (2012). The dark side of leadership: a three-level investigation of the cascading effect of abusive supervision on employee creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 55, No. 5, 1187–1212.
- [23] McColl-Kennedy, J.R. and Anderson, R.D. (2002). Impact of leadership style and emotions on subordinate performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 13 (5), pp. 545-559.
- [24] Fatima, T., Majeed, M., and Shah, S. Z.A (2018). Jeopardies of Aversive Leadership: A Conservation of Resources Theory Approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*.
- [25] Burns, W. (2017). A descriptive literature review of harmful leadership styles: Definitions, commonalities, measurements, negative impacts, and ways to improve these harmful leadership styles. *Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership*, Vol. 3, No. 1. pp. 33–52.
- [26] Schilling, J. (2009). From ineffectiveness to destruction: A qualitative Study on the Meaning of Negative Leadership. *Leadership*, 5, 102-128.
- [27] Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression: A social learning analysis. *Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall*.
- [28] Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. *New York: General Learning*.
- [29] de Vries, R. E. (2012). Personality predictors of leadership styles and the self–other agreement problem. *Leadership Quarterly*. 23, 809–821.
- [30] Judge, T. A., and Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 751–765.
- [31] Lim, B.C., and Ployhart, R.E. (2004). Transformational Leadership: Relations to the Five-Factor Model and Team Performance in Typical and Maximum Contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 610–621.
- [32] De Hoogh, A. H. B., Den Hartog, D. N., and Koopman, P. L. (2005). Linking the Big Five-factors of personality to charismatic and transactional leadership; perceived dynamic work environment as a moderator. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 26, 839–865.
- [33] DeRue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N., and Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personal Psychology*, 64, 7–52.
- [34] Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture’s consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values. *Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications*.
- [35] Deal T. E. and Kennedy, A. A. (1982). Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life. *Harmondsworth: Penguin Books*.
- [36] Agwu, M. (2014). Organizational Culture and Employees Performance in the National agency for Food and Drugs Administration and Control (Nafdac), Nigeria. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research: Administration and Management*, 14 (2) Version 1.0.
- [37] Ritchie M. (2000). Organizational culture: An examination of its effect on the initialization process and member performance. *Southern Business Review*, 25, 1-13.
- [38] Schein, E. H. (2011). Leadership and organizational culture. *New York: Wiley*
- [39] Morgan, G. (1997). Images of Organization. *Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications*.
- [40] Collins, J.C. and Porras, J.I. (2000). Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies. *New York: Harper Business*.

- [41] Adwale, O and Anthonia, A. (2013). Impact of Organizational Culture on Human Resource Practices: A Study of Selected Nigerian Private Universities. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 5, (4).
- [42] Nelson, D. L., & Quick, J. C. (2011). Understanding Organizational behavior. *Belmont, CA: Cengage South-Western*
- [43] Awad, A. and Saad, A. (2013). Impact of Organizational Culture on Employee Performance. *International review of management and business research*, 2 (1).
- [44] Belias, D. and Koustelios, A. (2014). Organizational Culture and Job Satisfaction: A Review. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp.132-149.
- [45] Xenikou, A., & Furnham, A. (1996). A Correlational and Factor Analytic Study of Four Questionnaire Measures of Organizational Culture. *Human Relations*, 49, 349-371.
- [46] Daft, R. (2001). Understanding organization. *Harcourt Press*.
- [47] Cameron, K.S., Quinn, R.E. (2006). Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture Based on the Competing Values Framework. *The Jossey-Bass Business & Management Series*
- [48] Magee, K. C. (2002). The impact of organizational culture on the implementation of performance management (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No. 3047909).
- [49] Hellriegel, D. & Slocum, J. M. (2009). Organizational Behavior (9th Edition). *Sydney: Thomson Learners*.
- [50] Daft, R. L. (2010). Organization Theory and Design. *Singapore: Info Access & Distribution Ltd*.
- [51] Kotter, J. (2012). Corporate culture and performance. *New York: Free Press*.
- [52] Schneider, B & Snyder, R.A. (1975). Some relationship between job satisfaction and organizational climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(3), 318-328.
- [53] Jiang, J.J., Klein, G. (2000). A discrepancy model of information system personnel turnover, *J Manage Inform Sys*, 16 (3): 219-240.
- [54] McKinnon, L.J., Harrison, L.G., Chow, W.C., Wu, A. (2003), Organizational culture: association with commitment, job satisfaction, propensity to remain and information sharing in Taiwan, *International Journal of Business Studies*, 11(1), 25-44.
- [55] Arnold, T., Spell, S. C. (2006). The Relationship between Justice and Benefits Satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(4):599-620.
- [56] Chang, S., Lee, M.S. (2007). A study on relationship among leadership, organizational culture, the operation of learning organization and employees' job satisfaction. *The Learning Organization*, 14(2), 155-185.
- [57] Mansoor, M., & Tayib, M. (2010). An empirical examination of organizational culture, job stress, job satisfaction within the indirect tax administration in Malaysia. *International journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 1(1), 81-95.
- [58] Krasikova, D.V., Green, S.G. and Lebreton, J.M. (2013), "Destructive leadership: a theoretical review, integration, and future research agenda", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 39 No. 5, pp. 1308-1338.
- [59] Burke, R.J. (2017a), "Toxic leaders: Exploring the dark side", *Effective Executive*, Vol. 20, p. 10.
- [60] Pelletier, K. L. (2010). Leader toxicity: An empirical investigation of toxic behavior and rhetoric. *Leadership*, 6(4), 373-389.
- [61] Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, 5: 323-370.
- [62] Norton, R. J. (2016). Tarnished: Toxic Leadership in the U.S. Military (Book review). *Naval War College Review*, 69(2), 143-145.
- [63] Saleh, H.G.A., Hu, W., Hassan, H., and Khudaykulova, M. (2018). Dark Leadership Impact on Psychological Well-being and Work-Family Conflict: Implications for Project Success of Bahrain Companies. *Journal of International Business Research and Marketing*, Vol 3, Issue 3.
- [64] Keashly, L., & Harvey, S. (2005). Emotional abuse in the workplace. In S. Fox & P. Spector (Eds.), *Counter productive work behaviors: 201-236*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- [65] Ashforth, B.E., & Lee, R.T. (1997). Burnout as a process: Commentary on Cordes, Daugherty, and Blum. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 703-708.
- [66] Tepper, B.J., Duffy, M.K., Hoobler, J., & Ensley, M.D. (2004). Moderators of the relationship between coworkers' organizational citizenship behavior and fellow employees' attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 455-465.
- [67] Duffy, M.K., Ganster, D. & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining and social support in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 331-351.
- [68] Zellars, K.L., Tepper, B.J., & Duffy, M.K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 1068-1076.

- [69] Wu, T.-Y., and Hu, C. (2009). Abusive supervision and employee emotional exhaustion: dispositional antecedents and boundaries. *Group Organization Management*. 34, 143–169.
- [70] Elle, S. A. (2012). Breaking the Toxic Leadership Paradigm in the U.S. Army. *Carlisle Barracks, VA: US Army War College*.
- [71] Palanski, M., Avey, J. B., and Jiraporn, N. (2014). The effects of ethical leadership and abusive supervision on job search behaviors in the turnover process. *J. Bus. Ethics* 121, 135–146.
- [72] Demirtas, O., and Akdogan, A. A. (2015). The effect of ethical leadership behavior on ethical climate, turnover intention, and affective commitment. *J. Bus. Ethics* 130, 59–67.
- [73] Restubog, S. L. D., Scott, K. D., & Zagenczyk, T. J. (2011). When distress hits home: The role of contextual factors and psychological distress in predicting employees' responses to abusive supervision. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 713–729.
- [74] Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L. Y., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 191–201.
- [75] Hoobler, J. M., & Brass, D. J. (2006). Abusive supervision and family undermining as displaced aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 1125–1133.
- [76] Fascia, S. (2018). The Value of Dark Leadership. *Journal of Strategy, Operations & Economics*, 3,(2).
- [77] Weaver, S. G and Yancy, G.B. (2010). The Impact of Dark Leadership on Organizational Commitment and Turnover. *Leadership Review*, Vol. 10, Summer 2010, pp. 104 – 124.
- [78] Kim, W. G., and Brymer, R. A. (2011). The effects of ethical leadership on manager job satisfaction, commitment, behavioral outcomes, and firm performance. *International Journal of Hospital Management* 30, 1020–1026.
- [79] Chughtai, A., Byrne, M., and Flood, B. (2015). Linking ethical leadership to employee well-being: The role of trust in supervisor. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128, 653–663.
- [80] Brown, D. J., and Keeping, L. M. (2005). Elaborating the construct of transformational leadership: The role of affect. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 245–272.
- [81] Kanwal, I., Lodhi, R. N., and Kashif, M. (2019). Leadership styles and workplace ostracism among frontline employees. *Management Research Review*.
- [82] Kolzow, H. (2014). Leading from within: Building Organizational Leadership Capacity.
- [83] Ball G. A., Trevino L. K., and Sims H. P. (1994). Just and unjust punishment: Influences on subordinate performance and citizenship. *Academic Management Journal*. 37 299–322.
- [84] Yun S., Cox J., Sims H. P., Jr., and Salam S. (2007). Leadership and teamwork: the effects of leadership and job satisfaction on team citizenship. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2 171–193.
- [85] Richman, J. A., Flaherty, J. A., and Rospenda, M. (1992). Mental health consequences. *JAMA* 267, 692–694.
- [86] Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Petty tyranny in organizations: a preliminary examination of antecedents and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 14, 126–140.
- [87] Aasland, M. S., Skogstad, A., Notelaers, G., Nielsen, M. B., and Einarsen, S. (2010). The prevalence of destructive leadership behaviour. *British Journal of Management*. 21, 438–452.
- [88] Hershcovis, M. S., and Rafferty, A. E. (2012). Predicting abusive supervision. *Health Psychology: Global Perspectives on Research Practices*, 2, 92–108.
- [89] Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18, 19–31.
- [90] Howell, J. M., and Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: submission or liberation? *Executive* 6, 43–54.
- [91] Aronson, E. (2001). Integrating leadership styles and ethical perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 18, 244–256.
- [92] Naseer, S., Raja, U., Syed, F., Donia, M.B., and Darr, W. (2016). Perils of being close to a bad leader in a bad environment: exploring the combined effects of despotic leadership, leader member exchange, and perceived organizational politics on behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*. 27, 14–33.
- [93] Harvey, P., Stoner, J., Hochwarter, W., and Kacmar, C. (2007). Coping with abusive supervision: the neutralizing effects of ingratiation and positive affect on negative employee outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 264–280.
- [94] Aryee, S., Sun, L. Y., Chen, Z. X. G., and Debrah, Y. A. (2008). Abusive supervision and contextual performance: the mediating role of emotional exhaustion and the moderating role of work unit structure. *Management Organization Review*, 4, 393–411.
- [95] Fontaine, P., Ross, S. E., Zink, T., and Schilling, L. M. (2010). Systematic review of health information exchange in primary care practices. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*, 23, 655–670.

- [96] Schmid, E.A., Pircher, Verdorfer A and Peus, C.V. (2018). Different Shades—Different Effects Consequences of? Different Types of Destructive Leadership. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9:1289.
- [97] Gastil, J. (1994). A meta-analytic review of the productivity and satisfaction of democratic and autocratic leadership. *Small Group Res.* 25, 384–410.
- [98] Jiang, H., Chen, Y., Sun, P., and Yang, J. (2017). The relationship between authoritarian leadership and employees' deviant workplace behaviors: the mediating effects of psychological contract violation and organizational cynicism. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 8:732.
- [99] Zhang, Y., and Xie, Y.-H. (2017). Authoritarian leadership and extra-role behaviors: A role-perception perspective. *Management Organization Review*, 13, 147–166.
- [100] Drescher, G. and Drescher, G. (2017). Delegation outcomes: perceptions of leaders and follower's satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 2-15.
- [101] Crossan, M., Vera, D. and Nanjad, L. (2008). Transcendent leadership: strategic leadership in dynamic environments. *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 19 No. 5, pp. 569-581.
- [102] Wegge, J., Shemla, M. and Haslam, S.A. (2014). Leader behavior as a determinant of health at work: specification and evidence of five key pathways. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 28 Nos 1/2, pp. 6-23.
- [103] Van Vugt, M., Jepson, S.F., Hart, C.M. and De Cremer, D. (2004). Autocratic leadership in social dilemmas: a threat to group stability. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 1-13.
- [104] Mihai, L., Schiopoiu, A.B. and Mihai, M. (2017). Comparison of the leadership styles practiced by Romanian and Dutch SME owners. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, Vol. 6 No. 1, p. 4.
- [105] Afsar, B., Badir, Y.F., Saeed, B.B. and Hafeez, S. (2017). Transformational and transactional leadership and employee's entrepreneurial behavior in knowledge-intensive industries. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 307-332.
- [106] Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2007). Leadership style, organizational politics, and employees' performance: An empirical examination of two competing models. *Personnel Review*, Vol. 36, pp. 661-683.
- [107] Raziq, M.M., Borini, F.M., Malik, O.F., Ahmad, M. and Shabaz, M. (2018). Leadership styles, goal clarity, and project success: evidence from project-based organizations in Pakistan. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 39, pp. 309-323.
- [108] Zettler, I., and Hilbig, B. E. (2010). Honesty-humility and a person-situation interaction at work. *European Journal of Personality*, 24, 569–582.
- [109] Wiltshire, J., Bourdage, J.S., and Lee, K. (2014). Honesty-Humility and perceptions of organizational politics in predicting workplace outcomes. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 29, 235–251.
- [110] Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., and de Vries, R. E. (2005). Predicting workplace delinquency and integrity with the HEXACO and Five Factor Models of personality structure. *Human Performance*, 18, 179–197.
- [111] De Vries, R. E., and Van Gelder, J. L. (2015). Explaining workplace delinquency: the role of Honesty-Humility, ethical culture, and employee surveillance. *Personality of Individual Differences*, 86, 112–116.
- [112] Ashton, M. C., and Lee, K. (2008). The prediction of Honesty-Humility-related criteria by the HEXACO and Five-Factor Models of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42, 1216–1228.
- [113] De Vries, R. E., Pathak, R. D., Van Gelder, J.-L., and Singh, G. (2017). Explaining Unethical Business Decisions: the role of personality, environment, and states. *Personality of Individual Differences*, 117, 188–197.
- [114] Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M., and Salvador, R. B. (2009). How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108, 1–13.
- [115] Yukl, G. (2012). Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention. *Academic Management Perspective*, 26, 66–85.