



Destructive Leadership And Subordinates intention To Leave: An Empirical Study

V.Gowtham Raaj

Doctoral Research scholar, BSMED, Bharathiar university -Coimbatore

*** Dr.Rupa Gunaseelan**

Professor, BSMED, Bharathiar university-Coimbatore
* Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT

The leadership is like two sided coin: the constructive side and the destructive side. Both are obvious in organizations, but only constructive seems to get all the attention. Hence the study is concentrated on the other side of leadership. Destructive leadership is defined as: ‘the systematic and repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor or manager that violates the legitimate interests of the organisation by undermining and / or sabotaging the organization’s goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and / or motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of subordinates’ Einarsen et al. (2007). An ineffectual leader has the potential to influence the course of an organization. The traits that they identify as causing follower distress are hostility and neuroticism. Such leaders are unwilling to communicate effectively with subordinates and are likely to limit subordinates’ ability to cope with day-to-day problems. The composite effect of leader behavior towards subordinate’s intention to quit organization has been studied in this paper. Sample of subordinates (n= 214) has been taken, data collection was done through structured questionnaire .The findings of this study is that the Destructive leadership has a moderate effect on subordinates intention towards leaving the organization. Also this paper highlights the progress and limitations of prior research, suggest directions for further research.

KEYWORDS

Destructive, leader, constructive, wellbeing , subordinate, distress.

INTRODUCTION

The leadership is like two sided coin : the constructive side and the destructive side. Both are evident in organizations, but only one seems to get all the attention. Also some researchers had put forward that it is possible for the same leaders to be constructive and destructive in different situations (Einarsen, Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007). Such actions are the loss of leader credibility and increased anger, cynicism, and resistance to change by those implementing the change. Ironically, the resistance to change leaders complain about may well be the product of their own destructive actions.

Einarsen et al. (2007) studied destructive leadership and defined it as: **‘the systematic and repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor or manager that violates the legitimate interests of the organisation by undermining and / or sabotaging the organization’s goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and / or motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of subordinates’ (p. 208).**

In this research how the destructive behavior of a leader impacts on turnover intention among subordinates. To fully understand destructive leadership, we consider both sides of leadership and how they impact each other. Idiosyncratic credit theory suggests that typically constructive leaders are likely to be forgiven for “destructive mistakes” that damage trust, particularly if they use closure conversations to acknowledge and apologize for the mistakes. However, there may be a limit to how many destructive actions a constructive leader can take before it begins undermining their leadership.

RESEARCH QUESTION

Does destructive leadership influences intention to quit among subordinates?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Mumford et al. (2007) studied the destructive behavior of leaders and concluded that they can broadly categorize destructive leaders by their selective interpretation of information and reality distortion. This broad dimension suggests that

biased self-serving appraisals of others and their intentions, especially the projection of negative intentions, may play an important role in destructive behavior of leaders in general.

(Schaubroeck, Walumbwa, Ganster, & Kepes, 2007) the study was examined that two dispositional constructs, hostility and trait negative affectivity (NA), that have been the focus of much epidemiological research. The study concentrated on Job scope which moderate the effects of supervisor hostility on somatic complaints, depression, and experienced anxiety on the job, overall job satisfaction, workload satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions. Data were obtained from employees of a large contracting firm by issuing questionnaire .Data were provided by 203 direct reports; 154 of the direct reports provided both complete questionnaire data and interview data about the hostility of their supervisor. It was found that among individuals who reported having more enriched jobs, supervisor traits of expressive hostility and generally negative emotionality were more strongly associated with symptoms of psychological strain, dissatisfaction, and a desire to leave the organization.

(Schyns & Schilling, 2013)The impact of destructive leadership on the individual employee is alarming, with a high negative correlation between destructive leadership and stress. The loss of control among subordinates of destructive leaders has been found to be a cause of stress (Ferris et al., 2007). The presence of destructive leadership is negatively related to employee well-being and commitment to the organisation, and is also negatively related to individual performance (Schyns & Schilling, 2013).

(Shaw, Erickson, & Harvey, 2011) This study describes the measure the nature of destructive leadership in organizations. They used DLQ by Erickson et al. (2007) scales from that measure , in a cluster analysis to empirically derive a behavior-based taxonomy of destructive leaders. Data were obtained through a web-based survey that generated 707 respondents. Based on follower perceptions, the results identified seven types of destructive leaders using behavior-focused scales. An

interesting discovery was that most of the types of destructive leaders identified were not “all destructive” but rather perceived as extreme on just one or two characteristics.

Schyns and Schilling (2013) in his study he states that there is a high correlation between a leader’s destructive behavior and attitudes towards the leader. They then directly correlate negative attitudes towards a leader with subordinates’ counterproductive work behavior. Ambition can drive a leader to excel, but may become a dangerous attribute if it negatively influences how he or she interacts with others. The effectiveness of leaders depends on their relationships with others, as well as their ability to conceive a vision of the future, communicate it and through inspiring and motivating others.

(Padilla, et al., 2007) The study provides an enhanced understanding of destructive leadership, its antecedent, personality factors (leadership narcissism and hubris (Hayward & Hambrick, 1997; Kroll et al., 2000)) and contextual reinforcement and extends their underlying theories. Within the context of the model that we presented in this paper, leaders exhibiting deluded behavior have low capability and are self-oriented. The result is a fragmented approach to leadership in general and organisational change specifically. Organisational damage occurs as those within the organisation are set against each other as they attempt to implement conflicting initiatives.

(Glasø, Einarsen, Matthesen, S. B., & Skogstad, 2008) The study has demonstrated that one third of a representative sample of the Norwegian work force may experience severe interpersonal problems at work resembling patients who attend psychotherapeutic day hospitals for their corresponding problems. The present study shows that thirty per cent of the leaders exhibit elevated profiles of personality characteristics regarding interpersonal problems, on a level comparable to that of a sample with psychiatric patients, thus, indicating that severe problems may arise in social interactions between leaders with personnel responsibilities and their subordinates. These results are compatible with recent studies documenting relatively high prevalence of destructive leadership behavior in organizations (e.g., Einarsen et al, 2007; Hogan & Hogan, 2001).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study is designed as an exploratory one based on survey method. Two main variables i.e. destructive Leadership, independent variable and dependent variable , Intention to Quit are considered to analyze. By using the structured questionnaire the total number of sales and marketing executives of Banks who are working in Coimbatore was consider for this study. Among a total, convenience sampling method was used to derive the sample of 217 form the population.

HYPOTHESIS OF STUDY

The following Hypothesis is suggested as a statistical statement.

H1A: Destructive leadership positively correlated to intention to quit

H1B: Destructive leadership influences intention to quit

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table No 1: shows the correlation relation between destructive leadership and turnover intention

H1A: Destructive leadership positively correlated to intention to quit

Correlations					
	Abusive supervision	Authoritarian Leadership	Narcissism	Self-Promotion	Unpredictability

Intention to quit	Pearson Correlation	.293**	.144*	.138*	.059	.216**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.034	.043	.390	.001
	N	217	217	217	217	217
** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).						
* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).						

INTERPRETATION

The above table shows the positive statistical relationships (with sig<0.05) among the variables of destructive leadership and intention to quit. Were Abusive supervision has positive relation of .293, Authoritarian Leadership.144, Narcissism .138, and unpredictability.216. Comparing with other variables the abusive supervision which has high relationship with turnover intention of 0.293. Hence the hypothesis H1A is accepted that there is a positive relationship among the Destructive Leadership and turnover Intention.

Table 2:shows Influence of Destructive leadership on turnover intention

H1B:Destructive leadership influences intention to quit

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.357 ^a	.127	.107	2.71128

a. Predictors: (Constant), Unpredictability, Abusive supervision, Narcissism, Authoritarian Leadership, Self-Promotion

INTREPRETATION:

The table 2 shows the *R* and *R*² values. The *R* value represents the simple correlation and is 0.357 (the “*R*” Column), which indicates a high degree of positive correlation. The *R*² value (the “*R Square*” column) indicates how much of the total variation in the dependent variable, Turnover intention is influenced by the independent variable Unpredictability, Abusive supervision, Narcissism, Authoritarian Leadership, Self-Promotion. In this case, .12.7% can be explained, which is satisfied.

Table 2a : Regression model prediction

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	226.210	5	45.242	6.155	.000 ^b
	Residual	1551.071	211	7.351		
	Total	1777.281	216			

a. Dependent Variable: Intention to quit

b. Predictors: (Constant), Unpredictability, Abusive supervision, Narcissism, Authoritarian Leadership, Self-Promotion

This table indicates that the regression model predicts the dependent variable significantly well. “**Sig.**” column. That indicates the statistical significance of the regression model that was run. Here, *p* < 0.0005, which is less than 0.05, and indicates that, overall, the regression model statistically significantly predicts the outcome variable (i.e., it is a good fit for the data). Hence the hypothesis H1B is accepted that the Destructive Leadership influence turnover Intention among the subordinates.

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Destructive leadership in organization contribute to the de-

veloping research stream that examine the both theoretical and practical implications. The conceptual framework indicates that it is possible to empirically identify different types of Destructive leadership and the negative outcome towards subordinates and the organization. The empirical results tended to be destructive based on the high score on few negative behaviors. Some destructive behavior that there are very specific behavior that followers identify which rates highly on their turnover intention. One reason for this finding may be that subordinates define destructiveness by their personal experience and outcomes. The main implication is that the top management need to be monitored effectively by the extend of destructive leadership in the organization. If that makes a major issues by legitimating interest of organization or undermining the subordinates wellbeing the management has to provide possible training or counseling to the leader. If many of the leader a predominant in such behavior the selection of leaders should be made warranted.

REFERENCE

- Bano, S., Khan, M. A., Afzal, H., & Akhtar, M. N. (2012). Bio Diversity Effect of diverse workforce and conducive work environment on organizational loyalty : study of the factors those impacts on organizational loyalty in the corporate sector of Islamabad , Pakistan, *53*, 11769–11773.
- Burchard, M. (2011). Ethical Dissonance and Response to Destructive Leadership: A Proposed Model. *Leadership*. Retrieved from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/elj/vol4iss1/Buchard_V4I1_pp154-176.pdf
- Craig, S. B., & Kaiser, R. B. (2008). Destructive Leadership, 1996.
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behavior: A definition and conceptual model. *Leadership Quarterly*, *18*, 207–216. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002>
- Engin Karada destructive leadership , psychological capital and organizational citizenship behavior : a structural equation modelling abstract : (2014), (september), 117–118.
- Ferris, G. R., Zinko, R., Brouer, R. L., Buckley, M. R., & Harvey, M. G. (2007). Strategic bullying as a supplementary, balanced perspective on destructive leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *18*, 195–206. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.004>
- Glassø, L., Einarsen, S., Matthiesen, S. B., & Skogstad, a. (2008). The dark side of leaders : A representative study of interpersonal problems among leaders. *Scandinavian Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 3–14.
- Good, L., & Robin, M. (2014). Workplace leadership a review of prior research, (july).
- Hayward, M., & Hambrick, D. (1997). Explaining the premiums paid for large acquisitions: Evidence of CEO hubris. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *42*, 103–128.
- Kelloway, E., Sivanathan, N., Francis, L., & J., B. (2005). Poor leadership. *Handbook of Work Stress*, 89–112. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=YLu7yN4g84C&oi=fnd&pg=PA89&dq=Poor+Leadership&ots=vfSGaabHM8&sig=kru9l6AzLwCN2cezycGHLHuMt0oInhttp://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=YLu7yN4g84C&oi=fnd&pg=PA89&dq=Poor+leadership&ots=vfSGb35FQ9&sig=jjb5qaMI>
- Krasikova, D. V., Green, S. G., & LeBreton, J. M. (2013). Destructive Leadership: A Theoretical Review, Integration, and Future Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, *39*(5), 1308–1338. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312471388>
- Leadership, A., Division, D., & Leavenworth, F. (2011). UNCLASSIFIED LIMITATION CHANGES TO : FROM : Antecedents and consequences of toxic leadership in the U . S . Army : A two year review and recommended solutions, (June).
- Leonard, J. B. (2014). The Dissolution of Effective Leadership : A Multiple-Case Study Analysis of Destructive Leadership.
- Morse, C. B., Westring, A. F., Mph, R. M. S., Conant, E. F., Abbuhl, S. B., & Pi, J. (n.d.). Variation across departments and divisions at one academic institution.
- Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. *Leadership Quarterly*, *18*, 176–194. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.001>
- Schaubroeck, J., Walumbwa, F. O., Ganster, D. C., & Kepes, S. (2007). Destructive leader traits and the neutralizing influence of an “enriched” job. *Leadership Quarterly*, *18*, 236–251. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.006>
- Schmidt, A. A. (2008). Development and Validation of the Toxic Leadership Scale, *58*, 569–579.
- Shaw, J. B., Erickson, A., & Harvey, M. (2011). A method for measuring destructive leadership and identifying types of destructive leaders in organizations. *Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(4), 575–590. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.05.001>
- Sheard, A. G., Kakabadse, N., & Kakabadse, A. (2013). Destructive behaviors and leadership: The source of the shift from a functional to dysfunctional workplace? *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, *1*(1), 73–89. <http://doi.org/10.11114/ijss.v1i1.31>
- Thoroughgood, C. N. (2010). by, (May).
- Thoroughgood, C. N., Padilla, A., Hunter, S. T., & Tate, B. W. (2012). The susceptible circle: A taxonomy of followers associated with destructive leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *23*, 897–917. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.05.007>
- Thoroughgood, C. N., Tate, B. W., Sawyer, K. B., & Jacobs, R. (2012). Bad to the Bone: Empirically Defining and Measuring Destructive Leader Behavior. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *19*, 230–255. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1548051811436327>
- Tran, Q., Tian, Y., & Sankoh, F. P. (2013). The Impact of Prevalent Destructive Leadership Behavior on Subordinate Employees in a Firm, *2013*(November), 595–600.