



Journal of Applied Sciences

ISSN 1812-5654

science
alert

ANSI*net*
an open access publisher
<http://ansinet.com>

Impact of Destructive Leadership on Subordinate Behavior via Voice Behavior, Loyalty and Neglect in Hanoi, Vietnam

^{1,2}Quangyen Tran, ¹Yezhuang Tian, ¹Chengfeng Li and ^{1,3}Foday Pinka Sankoh

¹School of Management, Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China

²National Economics University, Hanoi, Vietnam

³Portloko Teachers' College, Portloko, Sierra Leone

Abstract: Scholars' examination of antecedents in organizations revealed that destructive leadership behaviors of managers have a strong influence on their employees' behaviors due to their physical and psychological proximity to employees and their ability to administer rewards and punishments as well as performance ratings. Drawing from the destructive leadership, social learning and empirical evidence, this study examined the impact of how destructive leadership differentially affect (that is, promote or inhibit) the occurrence of subordinate behavior mechanism via loyalty, voice behavior and neglect in the context of business enterprises in Hanoi, Vietnam. Data collected from 323 employees and statistically analyzed using Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) software provided support for the hypothesized relationships. Results showed that destructive leadership behavior is an important antecedent of workplace loyalty, voice behavior and neglect which provides a strategic focus that enables organizations to effectively guide managers' behavior to create a civil work environment. Therefore, organizations should be aware of the salience of managers as role model of setting the tone for the interpersonal treatment among employees as well as working environment. This, in turn, will relate to positive employee attitudes and behaviors, reducing dissatisfaction and voluntary turnover rates in enterprises.

Key words: Destructive leadership, enterprise, subordinates behavior, voice behavior, loyalty

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, many enterprises throughout Vietnam have seen successes and failures in their businesses. The enterprises which have seen failures due to management inadequacies experienced difficulties and decline after a period of promising growth. The management of any business enterprise is supposed to be the most professional element of a business. As such, managers are directly responsible for the conduct and success of an enterprise, subordinate employees and outside interests. It is the vital role of management to guarantee all components of a business can run effectively and efficiently by communicating across all interests found within the enterprise. Executives and upper management are responsible for making decisions that affect the operations of an enterprise particularly with regards the behaviors of some superiors in the enterprise. At the same time, managers must convey the need and rationale of changes to subordinates. This is necessary to help ensure workers do their best to support versus hinder reforms in the workplace. Meanwhile, managers should also be tasked with aiding workers in

accomplishing their roles in the enterprise. As a consequence, managers must be knowledgeable on all fronts. In fact, workers can be a key source of information when considering ways of improving operations, thus wise and talented management will be certain to transmit employee ideas to executives. In all, management truly serves as a bridge between all members of a business community, thus the role of management is pivotal for all enterprises.

However, in pursuing these roles, superiors were seen to engage in behaviors that may affect subordinate employees. When subordinate employees feel aggrieved and there is no mediator to their grievances, they resort to certain behaviors that may affect the enterprise. Behaviors such as bullying, harassment, oppressive, vindictive, arbitrary use of rights and powers, verbal and non-verbal behavior, corruption, hypocrisy by superiors may seriously undermine the progress of the enterprise. These behaviors, called destructive leadership behavior have been seen to invariably undermine or sabotage the well-being, motivation and satisfaction of subordinates, as well as the effectiveness of the organization by targeting tasks, resources and goals.

This is the first empirical research paradigm to investigate the destructive leadership content and structure in the context of Vietnam culture and related issues. It will provide a more in-depth and comprehensive understanding of the nature of the leadership process, rich and localized systems that were not recognized by destructive leaders in order to prevent the adverse consequences of destructive leadership as an important practical value. It is against this backdrop that this thesis sought to investigate the impact of destructive leadership on subordinate behavior mechanism via voice behavior, loyalty and neglect in Vietnamese enterprises with applicable recommendations.

CONCEPTS OF DESTRUCTIVE LEADERSHIP

Classics in the field of organization theory put forth many concepts which fall within the domain of destructive leadership that is aimed at subordinates. These include, abusive supervisors (Hornstein, 1996; Tepper, 2000), health endangering leaders (Einarsen *et al.*, 2010), petty tyrants (Ashforth, 1994), bullies (Namie *et al.*, 2010), derailed leaders (Shackleton, 1995), intolerable bosses (Lombardo and McCall, 1984), psychopaths (Furnham and Taylor, 2004) and harassing leaders (Brodsky, 1976). Similarly, destructive actions directed against the organization have also been identified (example, working towards goals other than those defined by the organization), examples, Lipman-Blumen (2005) concept of toxic leaders and Lombardo and McCall (1984) concept of leader derailment. Since, these concepts have obvious similarities among them, researchers have yet to adopt a common definition or conceptual framework of destructive leadership. While abusive supervision is defined as subordinates' perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile, verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact (Hornstein, 1996; Tepper and Henle, 2011) described an abusive leader as one whose primary objective is the control of others and such control is achieved through methods that create fear and intimidation. Ashforth (1994) described a petty tyrant as someone who uses his/her power and authority oppressively, capriciously and perhaps vindictively against subordinates. Kile (1990) using the term health endangering leaders, defined a destructive leader as someone who behaves in such a manner towards subordinates that the subordinates develop poor health and attribute these health problems to the leader's behaviors. Lipman-Blumen (2010) described toxic leaders as leaders who act without integrity by dissembling and engaging in various other dishonourable behaviors,

include behaviors such as corruption, hypocrisy, sabotage and manipulation, as well as other assorted unethical, illegal and criminal acts. Kellerman (2004) also pointed out that leaders may involve themselves in corruption, by lying, cheating and stealing or otherwise putting their self-interest ahead of the organization's legitimate interest. Therefore, the concept of destructive leadership should account for destructive behavior aimed at both subordinates and at the organization. Hence, destructive leadership can be defined as: The systematic and repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor or manager that violates the legitimate interest of the organization by undermining and/or sabotaging the organization's goals, tasks, resources and effectiveness and/or the motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of subordinates. This definition includes behaviors that are directed toward both the subordinates and the organization itself. Vredenburg and Brender (1998) noted that managers have the opportunity to abuse both organizational members and/or the organization through their use and misuse of power. Hence, destructive leadership may undermine or sabotage the well-being, motivation and satisfaction of subordinates, as well as the effectiveness of the organization by targeting tasks, resources and goals. Second, unlike Tepper (2000) definition of abusive supervision, all physical and verbal behaviors were included in the definition of destructive leadership. In explaining the different behaviors that were included in the above definition, it is necessary to apply Buss (1961) classification of aggressive behaviors which distinguishes among three dimensions: Physical versus verbal aggression, active versus passive aggression and direct versus indirect aggression. Therefore an all-inclusive concept of destructive leadership must include behavior from each domain. As a result, destructive leadership behaviors are not necessarily active and manifested but may also constitute passive and indirect behaviors. An example of passive-physical-indirect behavior may be a leader who fails to protect a subordinate's welfare, for example in a working environment with potential safety risks (Neuman and Baron, 2005). An example of passive-verbal-indirect behavior may be a leader failing to provide a subordinate with important information or feedback on important issues of the organization. Any behavior to be defined as destructive according to the above definition, the leader must (a) Perform the behavior systematically and repeatedly and (b) Violating the legitimate interest of the organization. Similarly, the above definition does not include any intent to harm as a qualifying element highlighting those instances of thoughtlessness as well as ignorance and incompetence may be included in the

concept. The definition of destructive leadership behavior focuses on repeated and systematic behaviors. Hence, the definition excludes isolated misbehavior such as an uncharacteristic outburst of unjustified anger. Such an issue could be viewed from the European research tradition on bullying in the workplace which emphasizes that in order for the label, bullying, to be applied to a particular activity, interaction or process it has to occur repeatedly and regularly (example, weekly) and over a period of time (example, about six months) (Hoel *et al.*, 2010). The focus on systematic and repeated behaviors has important implications. One must accept that leaders occasionally make poor decisions or otherwise have a bad day at work. It is only when this behavior becomes systematic and repeated that it can be classified as destructive behavior. Hence, it is only when leaders make mistakes repeated or repeatedly act aggressively towards subordinates that they may be characterized as being destructive. Tepper (2000) also supported this criterion and focused on sustained displays of hostile behaviors in his definition of abusive supervision.

Many researchers do not make explicit whether their definition of destructive leadership includes the intention to cause harm (Ashforth, 1994; Ma *et al.*, 2004; Vredenburg and Brender, 1998), whereas others explicitly exclude unintentional behavior from their definition (Bies and Tripp, 1998; Kile, 1990). However, the definition should not include intent because what makes leadership destructive has less to do with the leaders' intentions than with the outcomes of the leaders' behavior. In addition, all isolated and potentially accidental behaviors were already excluded in the definition through the focus on systematic and repeated behavior. Destructive leadership behavior may therefore include behaviors that were not intended to cause harm but as a result of thoughtlessness, insensitivity or lack of competence, undermines subordinates and/or the organization. Hoel *et al.* (1999) also argued that intent may create an artificial barrier for an operational definition of hostile behaviors at work, as it is difficult to verify an actor's intentions. In the case of organizational theft which may be seen as one example of destructive behavior in organizations, Pyszczynski *et al.* (1999) argued that there are distinct differences based on whether the intent of the theft is of an antisocial or a pro-social nature. Parallel to this, Altheide *et al.* (1978) found that theft in organizations may be considered ritualistically and symbolically tied to becoming a successful employee, one who gets along well. Based on this assumption Greenberg *et al.* (1997) distinguish between the actor's intentions, whether they are pro-social or antisocial and

between the targets of this behavior being either the employer or co-workers. By crosscutting these two dimensions, he identifies four distinct social motives for a theft: Approvals, support, even the score and thwart (Pyszczynski *et al.*, 1999). In the case of the approval motive, the theft is motivated by a pro-social intent directed toward the organization. Leaders, for instance, may then participate in stealing from the organization because they wish to behave in accordance with norms expressed or supported by their own superiors. Hence, their behaviors may be a result of observational learning more than an explicit intent to harm. A support motive which is based on a pro-social intent in order to support colleagues, means that the thief, in our case a leader, may only behave in accordance with group norms condoning the behavior. When behaving in accordance with an even score motive, the theft is considered an antisocial intent as opposed to the previous two motives and the target of this intention is the employer. In this situation, the thief wishes to harm or strike back at the employer. For instance, as revenge from a perceived injustice by the employer, a leader may take part in stealing. In the last scenario, the thwart motive, the intent of the thief is again antisocial but the target is one's colleagues. In all these cases, the leader's theft behavior arguably has the effect of sabotaging and undermining the organization, irrespective of the actor's intentions. Thus one can argue that the same is true for other kinds of destructive behaviors. Nevertheless, although the intent or motive behind the leader's behavior is not included in the proposed definition, it is important not to underestimate the significant part intent may play in subjective judgments made by subordinates and superiors when labeling a leader as destructive (Tepper, 2000).

EFFECTS OF DESTRUCTIVE LEADERSHIP

Many empirical studies have investigated and analyzed the impact of destructive leadership on subordinate behavior mechanism (Ashforth, 1994; Einarsen *et al.*, 2010; Erickson *et al.*, 2007; Hornstein, 1996; Kellerman, 2004; Lipman-Blumen, 2010; Lombardo and McCall, 1984; Namie *et al.*, 2010; Reed and Bullis, 2009; Tepper, 2000). The results of these studies revealed that destructive leadership is negatively associated with subordinate employee behavior mechanism because the subordinates are likely to experience a low level of mediation by organizational justice and psychological contract violation. Comparatively, more research has investigated constructive, effective or successful leadership (Kelloway *et al.*, 2006). Traditionally, leadership research

focuses on factors associated with effective leadership, often with an implicit assumption that ineffective leadership simply reflects the absence of leadership (Ashforth, 1994). However, research on destructive aspects of leadership clearly documented that this phenomenon includes a variety of different behaviors that are not limited to the mere absence of effective leadership behavior (Ashforth, 1994; Bies and Tripp, 1998; Brown and Mitchell, 2010; Einarsen *et al.*, 2010; Mullen *et al.*, 2011). Recent prior study on bullying at work in the U.S has documented that some 5-10% of employees are subjected to bullying at any one time, where as much as 80% of the cases involve a superior in the role as an alleged bully (Einarsen *et al.*, 2010). In an English study some 40% of the participants reported that they had experienced bullying from a leader during their working career (Rainbird *et al.*, 2011). Namie *et al.* (2010) found that 89% of those experiencing bullying at work perceived leaders as the main bully. These studies clearly documented that leaders may actively behave in a destructive manner towards subordinates. In addition, sabotage, theft and corruption among managers have been documented (Altheide *et al.*, 1978; Kellerman, 2004; Lipman-Blumen, 2010) although existing empirical research in this domain is limited. Researchers on economic management have therefore recently called for a closer examination of the characteristics and outcomes associated with destructive leadership (Kellerman, 2004; Kelloway *et al.*, 2006). Burke *et al.* (2006) pointed out that by exploring the dark side of leadership, a more accurate view of leadership may emerge which again may contribute to the general understanding of leadership effectiveness and leadership development. Based on results findings, Zapf and Einarsen (2011) concluded that there is overwhelming support to the notion that negative events in social interactions have a stronger effect than do positive events. Hence, understanding and preventing destructive leadership may be as important or even more important, than understanding and enhancing positive aspects of leadership.

Systematic studies on tyrannical supervision conducted by Ashforth (1994) found that elements like belittling subordinates, oppressive, vindictive, display of little consideration and using non-contingent punishment were associated with frustration, helplessness and alienation from work. Keashly and Nowell (2011) in support of Ashforth (1994) highlighted that in destructive leadership, nonphysical abuse occurred more frequently than physical abuse like throwing things, punching or threatening with weapons and those individuals who experience more destructive leadership behaviors were less satisfied with their jobs. Tyrannical behaviors by

leaders in organizations undermine the motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of subordinates, without necessarily being clearly destructive as regards to the organization's goals. Tyrannical leaders may behave in accordance with the goals, tasks, missions and strategies of the organization but they typically obtain results not through but at the cost of subordinates (Ashforth, 1994; Tepper, 2000). They humiliate, belittle and manipulate subordinates in order to get the job done. Tyrannical leadership behavior has some features in common with the leadership style that Blake and Mouton (1985) termed authority-obedience in which the leader places emphasis on task completion. However, where the authority-obedience leader takes little interest in subordinates and wishes to spend as little time as possible interacting with them, tyrannical leaders act aggressively towards subordinates, possibly out of the belief that doing so will engender increased work effort.

Harassment is thought to be associated with destructive leadership in organizations. Brodsky (1976) argued that leaders who harass their subordinates may nevertheless perform well on other work related assignments. Parallel to this, Skogstad *et al.* (2007) pointed out that leaders who behave destructively towards subordinates may not necessarily be destructive in other interpersonal relationships, be it with customers or business partners or towards upper management. They may also have strong technical skills described as the paradox of managerial tyranny, arguing that tyrannical leadership may lead to extraordinary performance even when subordinates suffer. Furthermore, they argued that the tyrants' prime hold on subordinates lies in the ability to create an elaborate justification for their tyrannical methods. Examples of such tyrannical methods include creating groups of insiders and outsiders, fermenting distrust within the group, using propaganda and creating scapegoats who they punish harshly to serve as a warning to others. Despite a general penchant to think of positive outcomes associated with leadership, those in positions of authority sometimes not only fail to meet high expectations but actually misuse their over subordinates. This led Conger and Kanungo (1990) to refer to such problematic aspects of supervisory behavior as the dark side of leadership.

Psychologically, destructive leadership affects not only the subordinate work attitudes and behaviors but gives employees a lot of negative psychological reactions. For example, studies by Burton and Hoobler (2006) have shown that abusive supervision and subordinates anxiety, depression, fatigue, emotional exhaustion, low self-esteem and work stress were significantly correlated and a sense of

injustice or emotional labor on most of these relations play an intermediary role (Tepper, 2000). In addition studies on destructive leadership conducted by Erickson *et al.* (2007) found out that bad leadership that is closely affiliated to psychological reactions are negative reactions with common psychological feelings such as: Anger, self-insight, self-esteem and frustration. Anger is related to angry, tiredness, irritated and painful or revenge. Self-insight or decreased self-esteem is the lack of a sense of value or sense of questioning their ability. At the same time there will be some psychological reactions which include voluntary quitting, confused, defensive or sense of threat, distress or sense of betrayal, helplessness, a sense of ill-treatment and lower motivation. Also, Skogstad *et al.* (2007) pointed out that the laissez-faire leadership in a leadership vacuum state is not equal to zero leadership but a destructive leadership behavior. The absence of constructive leadership means legitimate expectations cannot be achieved which may bring subordinate role stress, lack of communication and leadership will increase employees' fuzzy cognitive tasks, objectives, responsibilities and the cause of tension between colleagues resulting to a job increase in bullying in the workplace and the impact on the mental health of employees. In fact, empirical results show that, laissez-faire leadership and role conflict, role fuzzy, colleagues conflict are related and laissez-faire leadership through role conflict, role ambiguity, colleagues conflict, in particular the work of bullying behavior and other intermediary variables affect employees mental illness.

IMPACT OF DESTRUCTIVE LEADERSHIP ON SUBORDINATE BEHAVIOR

The subordinate dimension in leadership describes leadership behavior ranging from anti-subordinate behavior to pro-subordinate behavior. Anti-subordinate behavior illegitimately undermines or sabotages the motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of subordinates, involving behavior such as harassment and mistreatment of subordinates (Einarsen *et al.*, 2010). Pro-subordinate behavior fosters the motivation, well-being and job satisfaction of subordinates, including taking care of and supporting them in accordance with organizational policies. The key leadership theory study aims to explore different leadership styles on employee attitudes, behavior and performance in order to improve leadership effectiveness. Similarly, the main content of destructive leadership necessarily involves destructive leadership of the employees affected. In this study, the influence of variables involved include: The loyalty of subordinates,

voice behavior, subordinate neglect, turnover intention and job satisfaction. These variables are related to subordinate and leaders, colleagues, work, organization of attitudes, behavior and psychological reactions. Literature review of national and international research shows that destructive leadership on subordinates' attitudes, behaviors and psychological reactions have an impact of different nature and extent. For example, Tepper (2000) pointed out that improper supervision of employees and organizations have a negative impact. Existing research results show that abusive supervision on the performance of subordinates have a negative impact. For example, studies by Harris *et al.* (2007) found out that there was a significant negative correlation between abusive supervision and subordinates formal performance evaluation results. In addition, Erickson *et al.* (2007) highlighted that bad leadership will have a negative impact on individual job performance of subordinates. The most common reaction is a decline in motivation to work which will render a negative impact on the performance of the organization. Therefore, this study proposed the following hypotheses:

Destructive leadership relate to subordinates' voice behavior negatively:

- H_{1.1a}**: An increased level of contact with corruption behaviors will negatively affect subordinates' voice behavior
- H_{1.1b}**: An increased level of contact with abusive subordinate will negatively affect subordinates' voice behavior
- H_{1.1c}**: An increased level of contact with blame subordinate will negatively affect subordinates' voice behavior
- H_{1.1d}**: An increased level of contact with moral loss will negatively affect subordinates' voice behavior

Destructive leadership relate to subordinates' loyalty negatively:

- H_{1.2a}**: An increased level of contact with corruption behaviors will negatively affect subordinates' loyalty
- H_{1.2b}**: An increased level of contact with abusive behaviors will negatively affect subordinates' loyalty
- H_{1.2c}**: An increased level of contact with blame will negatively affect subordinates' loyalty
- H_{1.2d}**: An increased level of contact with moral loss will negatively affect subordinates' loyalty

Destructive leadership relate to subordinates' neglect negatively:

- H_{1.3a}:** An increased level of contact with corruption behaviors will negatively affect subordinates' neglect
- H_{1.3b}:** An increased level of contact with abusive behaviors will negatively affect subordinates' neglect
- H_{1.3c}:** An increased level of contact with blame will negatively affect subordinates' neglect
- H_{1.3d}:** An increased level of contact with moral loss will negatively affect subordinates' neglect

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sample: Structured questionnaires, developed from a sample size of 400 employees and 243 enterprises in Hanoi, Vietnam were used in the survey. Out of this sample, only 323 (80.8%) actively participated in the research. 80.8% sample size was the representative population that was used to come with good results. The 243 enterprises were the most developed enterprises with many employees in Hanoi. Employees with potential for greater levels of responsibility and thought that they were treated fairly or unfairly by their management were selected for the survey.

Survey instrument: The questionnaire for this study addressed demographics (age, gender, education and years of service), voice behavior, loyalty, neglect, turnover, organizational justice (interpersonal justice, distributive justice and procedural justice) and psychological contract violation (psychological contract breach) with various aspects of the job and relationships with others. Furthermore the questionnaires were designed to explore aspects of destructive leadership along laissez-faire leadership, blame subordinate, abusive subordinates, moral missing, corruption (arbitrariness and self-aggrandizement) and non-contingent punishment. Participants were asked to indicate frequency of experience by selecting from five options ranging from strongly disagree 1 to strongly agree 5. A number of questions were reverse-coded to express positive leadership behaviors such as, encouraged subordinates to speak up when they disagreed with a decision. The use of this scale resulted in a measure of destructive leadership that provided a continuous variable that ranged from 50-400, suitable for a variety of common statistical analyses. Demographics were included to determine whether the phenomenon of destructive leadership varies by group membership. Of particular

interest was the degree to which experience with destructive leadership varies by age, gender and years of service. As another form of impact variable, participants were asked to suppose that they needed to decide whether to remain in the service or not. Assuming that they could remain and they were under no service obligation and eligible for retirement, they were asked to indicate their desire to quit the service on a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from strongly disagree 1 to strongly agree 5. Respondents were also asked to indicate whether they seriously considered leaving their jobs because of the way they were treated by a supervisor. A series of follow-up questions about the supervisor and situation were included in an effort to identify particularly problematic or frequent behaviors that caused the respondent to consider leaving the job.

Pilot study: To provide a basis for the validation of the main survey, it was necessary to carry out a pilot survey prior to the commencement of the actual survey. Population sample for the pilot survey was drawn from 25 employees in the case study area. A total of eighteen responses were returned equivalent to 72% response rate. This was a satisfactory response rate in order to check the clarity of the questions, to eliminate difficulties or ambiguities and to estimate the length of time a respondent would take to complete the questionnaires (Ott and Longnecker, 2010). The results obtained provided an opportunity for a revision of the questions in designing the questionnaires for the main survey and validation of the final outcomes of this research. The length of time invested in the pilot study was valuable and enriching for later phases of the research. The questionnaires took approximately 20 min to be completed. Some revisions to the scales were made to take account of the level of education of the respondents.

Data analysis: In this study, SPSS software was used to analyze the data and test hypotheses. Correlations were used to determine the significance of associations between destructive leadership and voice behavior, loyalty and neglect.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographics: Demographic data of respondents that are related to this study included gender, age, education, length of service and nature of enterprise. Table 1 is an SPSS analysis output showing five key descriptive statistical parameters: Frequency, mean, standard deviation, percentage and cumulative percentage for the identified demographics of respondents.

Table 1: Statistical analysis of demographic data of respondents

Demographic data	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative (%)
Gender			
Female	169	52.3	52.3
Male	154	47.7	100
Total	323	100	
Education			
Junior secondary	26	8	8
High school	58	18	26
University of specialist	90	28	54
Undergraduate	84	26	80
Master	49	15	95
Doctor	16	5	100
Total	323	100	
Age (years)			
<21	29	9	9
21-30	90	28	37
31-40	145	45	82
41-50	26	8	90
51-60	23	7	97
>60	10	3	100
Total	323	100	
Mean = 37.1			
Standard deviation = 7.4			
Nature of enterprise			
Private holding company	113	35	35
State-owned enterprise	181	56	91
Foreign investment/joint ventures	10	3	94
Administrative and professional	19	6	100
Total	323	100	

As shown in Table 1, the final sample of 323 employees consisted of 154 male respondents (47.7%) and 169 female respondents (52.3%) and 117 male subordinates (36.4%) and 206 female subordinates (63.6%). Approximately 46% of the respondents had at least a college degree. On average, subordinate employees were 37.1 years old with 5 years of service. Subordinate employees assessed their leaders' destructive leadership behaviors and also provided demographic information; 35.2% of the leaders were male, 64.8% of them were females and their mean age was 42.2 years old. In terms of the nature of the enterprises, 56% state-owned enterprises, 35% private holding companies, 6% administrative and professional and 3% foreign investment/joint ventures.

Experiences with destructive leadership: The results displayed in Table 2 indicated that experiences with destructive leadership were a significant predictor of disloyalty, aggressiveness and negligence.

Hypothesis testing: The final step in the data analysis was to test the hypotheses. The hypotheses are tested by assessing the impact of destructive leadership on subordinate behavior using regression analysis. The results of the hypotheses tested were presented in Table 3. The results indicated that the 12 hypotheses

Table 2: Regression indicating the relationship of destructive leadership experience (corruption, abusive, blame and moral loss) to effective variable

Variables	RC	SE	SC	p-value
Voice behavior				
Corruption	-0.040	0.701	-0.611	0.000
Abusive behavior	-0.036	0.792	-0.536	0.000
Blame	-0.045	0.893	-0.632	0.000
Moral loss	-0.050	0.706	-0.523	0.000
Constant	34.490			
Loyalty				
Corruption	-0.044	0.682	-0.409	0.000
Abusive behavior	-0.038	0.708	-0.527	0.000
Blame	-0.043	0.803	-0.433	0.000
Moral loss	-0.031	0.473	-0.521	0.000
Constant	35.420			
Neglect				
Corruption	-0.032	0.791	-0.502	0.000
Abusive behavior	-0.041	0.872	-0.332	0.000
Blame	-0.037	0.828	-0.553	0.000
Moral loss	-0.047	0.608	-0.437	0.000
Constant	36.110			

N: 323, SC: Standard coefficient, SE: Standard error, RC: Regression coefficient (not standardized)

tested were statistically significant and supported. These variable pairs were: Corruption behaviors and subordinates' voice behavior, abusive subordinate and subordinates' voice behavior, blame subordinate and their voice behavior, moral loss and subordinates' voice behavior, corruption behaviors and subordinates' loyalty, abusive behaviors and subordinates' loyalty, blame subordinates and their loyalty, moral loss and subordinates' loyalty, corruption behaviors and subordinates' neglect, abusive behaviors and subordinates' neglect, blame subordinates and their neglect, moral loss will negatively affect subordinates' neglect.

Measurement scale and model validation

Measurement scale validation: In order to determine the validity and reliability of the scales measuring the impact of destructive leadership on subordinate behavior, a series of Exploratory Factor Analyses (EFA) was conducted. In this study, the EFA was used as a data reduction technique by making fewer variables (Factors) out of more variables. The SPSS output of factor loadings based on the correlation matrices and variants are shown in Table 4. According to Hair *et al.* (1995), the threshold value of Chronbach's alpha of individual variables is 0.60. If Chronbach's alpha is 0.60 or greater (for exploratory research) there is a support on the internal consistency of the observed variables justifying their use in a summated scale. Since, the overall Chronbach's alpha is 0.725 and varies between 0.711 and 0.752 (Table 4), therefore the data of the individual construct variables are reliable and valid.

Table 3: Summary of hypotheses testing results

Hypothesis	p-value	Results
H _{1.1a} : An increased level of contact with corruption behaviors will negatively affect subordinates' voice behavior	0.000	Supported
H _{1.1b} : An increased level of contact with abusive subordinate will negatively affect subordinates' voice behavior	0.000	Supported
H _{1.1c} : An increased level of contact with blame subordinate will negatively affect subordinates' voice behavior	0.000	Supported
H _{1.1d} : An increased level of contact with moral loss will negatively affect subordinates' voice behavior	0.000	Supported
H _{1.2a} : An increased level of contact with corruption behaviors will negatively affect subordinates' loyalty	0.000	Supported
H _{1.2b} : An increased level of contact with abusive behaviors will negatively affect subordinates' loyalty	0.000	Supported
H _{1.2c} : An increased level of contact with blame will negatively affect subordinates' loyalty	0.000	Supported
H _{1.2d} : An increased level of contact with moral loss will negatively affect subordinates' loyalty	0.000	Supported
H _{1.3a} : An increased level of contact with corruption behaviors will negatively affect subordinates' neglect	0.000	Supported
H _{1.3b} : An increased level of contact with abusive behaviors will negatively affect subordinates' neglect	0.000	Supported
H _{1.3c} : An increased level of contact with blame will negatively affect subordinates' neglect	0.000	Supported
H _{1.3d} : An increased level of contact with moral loss will negatively affect subordinates' neglect	0.000	Supported

Table 4: Matrices of factor loadings for EFA

Variables	1	2	3
Voice behavior (1)	0.711	0.712	0.532
Loyalty (2)	0.432	0.752	0.532
Neglect (3)	0.235	0.567	0.713

Table 5: Fit statistics for the factor analysis solutions

Model	Satorra-bentler scaled χ^2	df	RMSEA	CFI	GFI	CAIC
One factor: Voice behavior	772.4	203	0.040	0.89	0.82	1003.80
Two factor: Loyalty	667.4	199	0.036	0.90	0.84	973.01
Three factor: Subordinate neglect	467.1	191	0.026	0.95	0.88	933.32

Model validation: This study used goodness-of-fit measures to fit the proposed model beginning with a model with zero factors and gradually increase the number of factors to seven. The aim is to ultimately choose a model that explains the data significantly better than with fewer factors. The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) fit index was used to test the fitness of the model proposed (Table 5). The RMSEA is an estimate of the discrepancy between the model and the data per degree of freedom for the model. Values less than 0.05 constitute good fit (Browne and Cudeck, 1992). An advantage of the RMSEA fit index is that it provides confidence intervals which allow the comparison of a series of models with varying numbers of factors. As shown in Table 5, the model that yielded the best fit to the data was a three-factor solution: $\chi^2 = 467.10$; $df = 191$; Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.95; Good of Fit Index (GFI) = 0.88; Consistent Akaike Information Criterion (CAIC) = 933.32; Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.026 supporting the internal validity of the scale which measures three subordinate behavior due to destructive leadership.

DISCUSSION

Destructive leadership is defined as the systematic and repeated behavior by a supervisor or manager that undermines the effectiveness, well-being, or job satisfaction of subordinates (Einarsen *et al.*, 2010). This type of negative leadership has been steadily researched under different labels such as abusive supervision

(Tepper, 2000) and petty tyranny (Ashforth, 1994). The results of the data analysis has revealed clear indications that destructive leadership is associated with the incidence of subordinate loyalty, voice behavior and neglect in the organization. For example, abusive supervision where subordinates perceived leaders to exhibit blame subordinates, moral loss, corruption and abusive behaviors (verbal and non-verbal behavior) but does not include physical contact; petty tyrant-oppressive, vindictive, arbitrary use of the rights and powers of leadership.

Destructive leadership is a volitional behavior by a leader that can harm or intends to harm a leader's organization and/or followers by (a) Encouraging followers to pursue goals that contravene the legitimate interests of the organization and/or (b) Employing a leadership style that involves the use of harmful methods of influence with followers, regardless of justifications for such behavior. This assertion builds on the study of Aasland *et al.* (2010) by viewing destructive leadership as a leader's behavior that violates the legitimate interests of the organization. However, the construct of destructive leadership overlaps with other harmful constructs (example, counterproductive workplace behavior, workplace aggression), it also represents a specific form of leadership. Thus destructive leadership should be viewed as harmful behavior imbedded in the process of leading. By doing so, behaviors falling under the rubric of counterproductive workplace behaviors (example, stealing organizational property, gossiping about coworkers are eliminated from the construct space of destructive

leadership and thereby depart from the study by Aasland and colleagues who consider such behavior manifestations of destructive leadership. Also, although there is an agreement with Aasland *et al.* (2010) in that destructive leadership harms organizations and/or leaders' followers, it is more accurate and more theoretically meaningful to distinguish between two manifestations of destructive leadership-encouraging followers to pursue destructive goals and using destructive methods of influence with followers-than simply drawing a surface distinction between the two targets of such leadership. These two manifestations of destructive leadership reflect different processes-setting goals for followers and acting to influence followers to achieve these goals and are likely to have different predictors and consequences. In addition, destructive leadership as volitional behavior that can harm or is intended to harm the organization or a leader's followers, a boundary should be drawn between destructive leadership and acts of ineffective leadership (example, incompetence) that represent a leader's inability to achieve goals valued by the organization or mobilize followers to achieve such goals.

With regard to leadership, previous research has focused mainly on top management or senior managers, under the assumption that they play a powerful role in shaping the norms of the organization: These managers send a message to individuals in the organization regarding appropriate behaviors, attitudes and beliefs. Thus, employees' perceptions of management's behaviors and concern for creating a workplace free from destructive leadership affect their judgments about the appropriateness of behaviors at work. According to social information processing theory, people's perceptions of organizational phenomena are influenced by the opinion and information of salient others such as supervisors. Managers' social influence may be facilitated by their organizational power or status which endows them with the ability to administer rewards and punishments to employees. This, in turn, results in employees' tendency to evaluate the appropriateness of their behavior by comparing themselves to standards provided by their managers. Further, managers have been known to serve as a key role model to employees which suggest that leadership behaviors displayed by immediate managers would influence employees' experience of destructive leadership in the organization.

The pivotal characteristic of destructive leadership behavior is interpersonal mistreatment towards employees (example, bullying, yelling and screaming, humiliating, corruption, blame, moral loss) that results in diminished employee well-being. However, perceived mistreatment by

managers will lead victimized employees to experience feelings of anger and frustration which may involve interpersonal injustice and threat to self/social identity. This in turn may produce unfavorable employee attitudes, including poor job satisfaction, reduced organizational commitment and increased subordinates' turnover. Consequently, in some cases, retaliation will result as a predominant response to abusive supervisory acts. Retaliation can take the form of any aggressive behavior, ranging from homicide, heated verbal confrontations and acting rudely toward others or gossiping about the supervisor in the workplace. These may confirm a tit-for-tat argument that suggests spiral or vicious cycle of revenge and counter-revenge. In addition to retaliatory reactions, targets of destructive leadership behavior may engage in offensive and hostile behavior towards their coworkers or subordinates which may lead to elevated levels of bad behaviors in the organization. For example, a displaced aggression that occurs when victimized employees cannot retaliate directly against the source of provocation (example, supervisor) or when they are fearful of the consequences of revenge and express their hostility against less powerful or more available individuals. It is imperative that senior managers, as change agents, have a good understanding of the psychological contract and how it influences employee behavior and attitudes towards their job and their organization.

CONCLUSION

A unique contribution provided was that most of the behaviours of a destructive leader evident in this study are also present in one way or another in the current literature on destructive leadership. Therefore, drawing from the leadership, social learning and empirical evidence the results of the analyzed data show that destructive leadership and subordinate behavior mechanism have differential relationships with incidents of loyalty, voice behavior and neglect, in Hanoi's enterprises. Subordinates reported their immediate managers as showing some kind of consistent and frequent destructive leadership during the last five years. Thus, organizations should be aware of the significant relationship between the impact of destructive leadership behaviors and subordinates' behavior mechanism and strive to create a pleasant and productive work environment where employees feel they are treated with dignity and respect by others. This, in turn, will relate to positive employee attitudes and behaviors, reducing the subordinates' turnover rates in Vietnam's enterprises. The recruited enterprises in this study are all located in Hanoi with a

small sample size as compared to the existing enterprises in Hanoi not to mention of Vietnam. This may have biased the data as it has been very difficult to get access to the type of data presented in this study, as some private work agencies guard their professional knowledge in a strict way and are very reluctant to be interviewed. Most of the studies dealt with in the literature review are cross-sectional and mono-method. Future research should, therefore, try to collect longitudinal data to determine the direction of the relationship. In conclusion, considering the negative effects of destructive leadership for both subordinates and the organization documented in several studies, destructive leadership constitutes a serious problem in contemporary working life in Vietnam.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We wish to thank all the firms in Hanoi, Vietnam that collaborated in the study.

REFERENCES

- Aasland, M.S., A. Skogstad, G. Notelaers, M.B. Nielsen and S. Einarsen, 2010. The prevalence of destructive leadership behaviour. *Br. J. Manage.*, 21: 438-452.
- Altheide, D.L., P.A. Adler, P. Adler and D.A. Altheide, 1978. The Social Meanings of Employee Theft. In: *Crime at the Top*, Johnson, J. and J. Douglas (Eds.). Lippincott, Baumhart, RC., Philadelphia, PA., pp: 90-124.
- Ashforth, B., 1994. Petty tyranny in organizations. *Hum. Rela.*, 47: 755-778.
- Bies, R.J. and T.M. Tripp, 1998. Revenge in Organizations: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly. In: *Dysfunctional Behavior in Organizations: Violent and Deviant Behavior*, Griffin, R.W., A. O'Leary-Kelly and J.M. Collins (Eds.). JAI Press, Stanford, CT., pp: 49-67.
- Blake, R.R. and J.S. Mouton, 1985. The Managerial Grid III: A New Look at the Classic that has Boosted Productivity and Profits for Thousands of Corporations Worldwide. Gulf Publishing Company, Houston, TX., Pages: 224.
- Brodsky, C.M., 1976. *The Harassed Worker*. D.C. Heath and Co., Oxford, England.
- Brown, M.E. and M.S. Mitchell, 2010. Ethical and unethical leadership. *Bus. Ethics Q.*, 20: 583-616.
- Browne, M.W. and R. Cudeck, 1992. Alternative ways of assessing model fit. *Soc. Meth. Res.*, 21: 230-258.
- Burke, C.S., K.C. Stagl, E. Salas, L. Pierce and D. Kendall, 2006. Understanding team adaptation: a conceptual analysis and model. *J. Applied Psych.*, 91: 1189-1207.
- Burton, J.P. and J.M. Hoobler, 2006. Subordinate self-esteem and abusive supervision. *J. Manage. Issues*, 18: 340-355.
- Buss, A.H., 1961. *The Psychology of Aggression*. John Wiley and Sons Inc., Hoboken, NJ., USA., Pages: 307.
- Conger, J.A. and R. Kanungo, 1990. A behavioral attribute measure of charismatic leadership in organizations. *Proceedings of the 50th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*, August, 1990, San Francisco, CA., USA.
- Einarsen, S., A. Skogstad and M.S. Aasland, 2010. The Nature, Prevalence and Outcomes of Destructive Leadership. In: *When Leadership Goes Wrong Destructive Leadership, Mistakes and Ethical Failures*, Schyns, B. and T. Hansbrough (Eds.). Information Age Publishing, Inc., Charlotte, NC., pp: 145-171.
- Erickson, A., J.B. Shaw and Z. Agabe, 2007. An empirical investigation of the antecedents, behaviors and outcomes of bad leadership. *J. Leader. Stud.*, 1: 26-43.
- Furnham, A. and J. Taylor, 2004. *The Dark Side of Behaviour at Work*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Greenberg, J., S. Solomon and T. Pyszczynski, 1997. Terror Management Theory of Self-Esteem and Cultural Worldviews: Empirical Assessments and Conceptual Refinements. In: *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Zanna, M.P. (Ed.). Academic Press, San Diego, CA., USA., pp: 61-139.
- Hair, J.F., R.E. Anderson, R.L. Tatham and W.C. Black, 1995. *Multivariate Data Analysis with Reading*. MacMillian Publishing Co., New York.
- Harris, K.J., K.M. Kacmar and S. Zivnuska, 2007. An investigation of abusive supervision as a predictor of performance and the meaning of work as a moderator of the relationship. *Leadership Quart.*, 18: 252-263.
- Hoel, H., C. Rayner and C. Cooper, 1999. Workplace bullying. *Int. Rev. Ind. Organ. Psychol.*, 14: 195-230.
- Hoel, H., L. Glaso, J. Hetland, C.L. Cooper and S. Einarsen, 2010. Leadership styles as predictors of self-reported and observed workplace bullying. *Br. J. Manage.*, 21: 453-468.
- Hornstein, H.A., 1996. *Brutal Bosses and their Prey*. Riverhead Books, New York.
- Keashly, L. and B.L. Nowell, 2011. Conflict, Conflict Resolution and Bullying. In: *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace: Developments in Theory, Research and Practice*, Einarsen, S., H. Hoel, D. Zapf and C.L. Cooper (Eds.). 2nd Edn., CRC Press, Boca Raton, London, pp: 423-445.
- Kellerman, B., 2004. *Bad Leadership*. Harvard Business Press, Boston, MA.

- Kelloway, E.K., J. Mullen and L. Francis, 2006. Divergent effects of transformational and passive leadership on employee safety. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.*, 11: 76-86.
- Kile, S., 1990. *Helsefarleg Leierskap (Health Endangering Leadership)*. Universitetet I Bergen, Bergen, Norway.
- Lipman-Blumen, J., 2005. Toxic leadership: When grand illusions masquerade as noble visions. *Leader to Leader*, 36: 29-36.
- Lipman-Blumen, J., 2010. Toxic leadership. http://achievingstyles.com/articles/toxic_leadership_career_development.pdf
- Lombardo, M.M. and M.W. McCall Jr., 1984. Coping with an intolerable boss. Center for Creative Leadership Special Report, Greensboro, NC.
- Ma, H., R. Karri and K. Chittipeddi, 2004. The paradox of managerial tyranny. *Bus. Horizons*, 47: 33-40.
- Mullen, J., E.K. Kelloway and M. Teed, 2011. Inconsistent style of leadership as a predictor of safety behaviour. *Work Stress: Int. J. Work Health Organ.*, 25: 41-54.
- Namie, G., R. Namie and P. Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010. Challenging Workplace Bullying in the United States: An Activist and Public Communication Approach. In: *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace: Developments in Theory, Research and Practice*, Einarsen, S., H. Hoel, D. Zapf and C.L. Cooper (Eds.). 2nd Edn., CRC Press, Boca Raton, London, pp: 447-467.
- Neuman, J.H. and R.A. Baron, 2005. Aggression in the Workplace: A Social-Psychological Perspective. In: *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets*, Fox, S. and P.E. Spector (Eds.). American Psychological Association, Washington, DC., USA, pp: 13-40.
- Ott, L.R. and M. Longnecker, 2010. *An Introduction to Statistical Methods and Data Analysis*. Cengage Learning, Belmont CA.
- Pyszczyński, T., J. Greenberg and S. Solomon, 1999. A dual-process model of defense against conscious and unconscious death-related thoughts: An extension of terror management theory. *Psychol. Rev.*, 106: 835-845.
- Rainbird, H., E. Leeson and A. Munro, 2011. Is regulation good for skill development? Mediating actors and workplace practice in adult social care in England. *Int. J. Hum. Res. Manage.*, 22: 3727-3741.
- Reed, G.E. and R.C. Bullis, 2009. The impact of destructive leadership on senior military officers and civilian employees. *Armed For. Soc.*, 36: 5-18.
- Shackleton, V., 1995. Leaders Who Derail. In: *Business Leadership*, Shackleton, V. (Ed.). Thompson, London, pp: 89-100.
- Skogstad, A., S. Einarsen, T. Torsheim, M. Schanke and H. Hetland, 2007. The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.*, 12: 80-92.
- Tepper, B.J., 2000. Consequences of abusive supervision. *Acad. Manage. J.*, 43: 178-190.
- Tepper, B.J. and C.A. Henle, 2011. A case for recognizing distinctions among constructs that capture interpersonal mistreatment in work organizations. *J. Organiz. Behav.*, 32: 487-498.
- Vredenburg, D. and Y. Brender, 1998. The hierarchical abuse of power in work organizations. *J. Bus. Ethics*, 17: 1337-1347.
- Zapf, D. and S. Einarsen, 2011. Individual Antecedents of Bullying: Victims and Perpetrators. In: *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace: Developments in Theory, Research and Practice*, Einarsen, S., H. Hoel, D. Zapf and C.L. Cooper (Eds.). 2nd Edn., CRC Press, Boca Raton, London, pp: 177-200.