STUDY ON SUPPORTIVE DISLOYAL, DESTRUCTIVE LEADERSHIP AND ITS IMPACT ON THE SUSCEPTIBLE FOLLOWERS AND ORGANIZATION.

AREEB MASOOD
PhD Scholar, National Defence University, Islamabad, Pakistan
Email: talk2areeb@yahoo.com

Beena khurshid
Ms Scholar, National Defence University, Islamabad, Pakistan
Email: beenakhurshid@yahoo.com
ABSTRACT

In this article, we propose actions for elimination of destructive leadership behavior by identifying the anti-organization and pro-subordinate behavior of leader. Besides we summarize the existing destructive leadership research and encompass it in new directions. By studying the current literature on destructive leadership and general research on different behaviors in organizations, we tried to explore the basic features and mechanisms that define destructive leadership. Identifying that each type of destructive leadership currently studied (e.g. supportive disloyal, constructive, derailed and tyrannical leadership) shows different aspects of destructive leadership but there is a need to find out the complete picture of each type of destructive leadership style, we studied supportive disloyal, and tried to address some issues of this type of destructive leadership. We tried to explain some characteristics of pro-subordinate destructive leadership that set it apart from other forms of leading, and consolidate this thinking into a theoretical model that supports us to understand the indicators of destructive leadership, and their backgrounds and impact on followers and organization.
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INTRODUCTION:
We can describe destructive leaders by personalized needs for power, charisma, narcissism, negative life history, and an ideology of hate. In many circumstances, in combination with particular followers, potentially destructive leaders can achieve power and can achieve their destructive objectives by being kind and with pro subordinate behavior. A single component is possibly in adequate to explain this phenomenon: destructive nature individuals driven by a selfish need for power but missing oratorical skills and strengths might not achieve substantial power. Similarly, skilled public speakers with a compassionate image and mixed motives are less likely to be destructive. Although these features might be necessary for destructive leadership, but they are not enough alone, combination of wickedness and destructiveness make the toxic leaders powerful.

This paper is based on descriptive study on how Destructive leadership encourages the followers to pursue their destructive goals and how followers responses towards the manifestation of destructive leadership. This study will also explain how the business environment is getting contaminated by Destructive leadership as once destructive behavior occurs in the company, the entire system becomes “alienated” and starts destabilizing. The best way to erase destructive behavior within the organization is to be first aware of its root.

Statement of the Problem

Destructive leadership is often destroying many organizations’ in the form of immense economic and social losses and these losses have a tendency to spread outside the boundaries of those affected organizations. It has been observed that for their own destructive anti organization goals the destructive leadership is exploiting the susceptible followers through influencing them by pro subordinate behavior.

The objectives and purposes:

1. To study and explain how Destructive leadership through pro subordinate behavior encourages the followers to pursue their destructive goals.
2. To observe the followers responses towards this manifestation and anti-organization behavior of destructive leadership

3. To propose the measures to erase destructive behavior within the organization

**Significance of Study:**

This study will propose the actions to erase destructive behavior within the organization which will contribute in several ways to destructive leadership theory and research. We elucidate the definition and the associated models which will support the understanding of destructive leadership by presenting a broad and comprehensive concept of destructive leadership behavior, including behaviors focused towards exploitation of followers for the achievements of their personal goals. Our study is suggesting the course actions through which organizations can detect and eliminate the destructive behavior within the organization and it will also stimulate further research and theory development in the area of destructive leadership.

**Literature Review:**

The focus of most of the researches is on positives and constructive side of leadership, whereas darker sides of leadership are most of the time overlooked (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Destructive leadership defines as hostile actions of a leader (Schaubroeck, Walumbwa, Ganster & Kepes, 2007), and destructive leadership behavior can be defined as the organized and recurrent behavior of a leader, supervisor or manager, which spoil the working of the organization by damaging /or impairing the organization’s ultimate objectives, everyday jobs , resources, and work efficiency, these destructive objectives can be achieved by minimizing the motivational and job satisfaction level or welfare of his/her followers. Besides, some researchers have also been described leaders' behaviours in two ways one is constructive (pro-behaviours) and other is destructive (anti-behaviours) on each of the two dimensions. By further classifying the two dimensions, the model offered four categories of leadership behaviors, three of which are destructive: (1) Tyrannical Leadership Behavior (pro-organizational oriented behaviour coupled with anti-subordinate behavior), (2) Derailed Leadership Behavior (anti organizational behaviour as well as anti-subordinate behavior), (3) Supportive–Disloyal Leadership Behavior (pro-subordinate behavior, which at the same time displaying anti-organizational behavior) and (4) loyal and constructive leadership (Einarsen et al., 2007).
Many Researchers have suggested destructive leadership concepts which are mainly targeted at followers e.g. “abusive supervisors” (Hornstein, 1996; Tepper, 2000), “health endangering leaders” (Kile, 1990), “trivial dictators” (Ashforth, 1994), “oppressors” (Namie & Namie, 2000), “disrupted leaders” (Schackleton, 1995), “unbearable managers” (Lombardo & McCall, 1984), “psychopaths” (Furnham & Taylor, 2004), and “irritating leaders”(Brodsky, 1976). Although resemblances among these concepts are evident, but there is need for researchers to agree on a common definition or conceptual framework of destructive leadership. Though “abusive supervision” can be defined as the extent to which supervisor shows the hostility towards the followers through his verbal and nonverbal behaviors (Tepper, 2000), p.178, Hornstein (1996) has also described an abusive or insulting leader as the leader whose main objective is to get control over others, and he try to achieve such control by applying different techniques and methods, which generate anxiety and extortion among followers (Hornstein, 1996). Ashforth (1994) has also explained a trivial dictator as a leader who uses his supremacy and authority tyrannically and maliciously (p.126). Kile (1990) defines these leaders as someone whose tyrannical behavior destroy both mental and physical health of followers. Destructive leaders acts deceitfully (Lipman-Blumen, 2005) which is always reflected through their destructive behaviours such as “corruption, hypocrisy, interference and manipulation, and some other varied immoral, unlawful, and illegitimate acts. Kellerman (2004)

Destructive leadership can also be referred as substantial negative but organized and recurrent set of behaviors of a leader which have negative impact on employee’s performance and organizational outcome (Erickson and Harvey, 2011). Sometimes the destructive behavior within leaders can be undetectable for both leaders and followers, the deviant behaviour might in this way incorporate behaviors that were not planned to cause loss, yet as an aftereffect of neglectfulness, harshness, or absence of ability, undermines the subordinates or the organization. (Rayner, Hoel, &Cooper , 2002) these leader often want to get success by letting other people down (Kusy&Halloway 2009, p. 129; Gangel 2007, p.3, p.6). These leaders may also considered as having “psychological disorders” (Kusy&Halloway 2009, p. 131) Padilla, Hogan and Kaiser (2007), explain the relationship among destructive leaders, vulnerable followers and conducive environments .They designed a system to explain the impact of destructive leaders on vulnerable followers, this mechanism has three major components which include destructive leaders,
vulnerable followers and favorable environments. And there is link among all these three. In the first component, the authors have pointed out that some characteristics such as charisma can also lead towards destructivity. The second component explains the relationship between a destructive leader and his followers and impact of this relationship on both of them. The third part of system explains the environmental factors which influence the behavior of destructive leader. However the important point is that: even if a leader has some of these traits it does not mean he or she will surely become a destructive leader (Padilla, Hogan & Kaiser 2007). We will see that sometimes leaders can be charismatic or narcissistic and yet be “good” leaders. Sometimes any action of a leader in a particular situation may be considered as destructive but in some other situation it can be qualified as an action of “good” leader, even the most destructive leaders are not destructive all the time (Lipman-Blumen, 2005).

Supportive–disloyal leaders are the leaders who for the sake of accomplishment of their personal goal show concerns for the well being of their followers and along with welfare of followers these leaders are violating the real interest of the organization. Such leaders may exploit the resources, material, time, or financial resources of the organization (Altheide et al., 1978; Ditton, 1977). Supportive–disloyal leaders may exploit their followers by conceding them more benefits at the cost of the organization. These leaders may also appreciate the negativity in followers by overlooking their negligence or misconduct (Einarsen et al., 2002)

Destructive behaviours other than theft can also be called as Supportive–disloyal leadership behaviour. Some Leaders are continuously engaging in damaging the organization by creating hurdles in the achievement of its ultimate goal. Sometimes the main objective of the supportive–disloyal leader may not necessarily to destroy the organization; rather destructive leader may has a different vision or strategy to support some other goals of organization, and in his mind he is believing that he or she is acting for his own the organization’s best interest. Some Leaders whose strategic competence are not so good may be able to maintain friendly relationships with their followers; but if their behaviour is not in the interest of the organization then despite having good relations with their followers, these leaders will also be as considered destructive leader.((Einarsen et al., 2007)

Though Followers have not been studied so often than leaders, but still one cannot deny their pivotal role in the leadership process (Boccialetti, 1995; Hollander, 1992; Hollander & Offermann, 1990; Lord & Brown, 2004; Yukl, 2005). Barnard (1938) explains that why some
followers need to accept a leader's authority because some followers are actually getting benefits from destructive activities and therefore they contribute and follow the destructive vision of their leader. At the group level these needs can be linked as the desire to get identity, social status cohesion, and the coordination of collective activity. People have natural tendency to obey one who has power (Milgram, 1974).

The strangeness in the bond of leadership and followers depends on the more similarity between the leader’s and follower’s self-concept, stronger bond bring the greater the motivation to follow. Completion of this cycle is dependent on the leader's vision and the follower's self-concept and how its lifts self-esteem and self-efficacy (Shamir et al., 1993; Weierter, 1997). Followers 'values and beliefs are also contribute towards the extent which followers follow the destructive leaders, those individuals who are by nature greedy and selfish, they are more likely to follow destructive leaders and can easily be engaged in destructive activities (Hogan, 2006). Determined but less-socialized followers are susceptible and whenever they are authorized or appreciate by a leader they can easily engage themselves in destructive actions (McClelland, 1975).

There are two types of followers who support destructive leadership. one is Conformers who submissively and blindly follow their leaders because of their own unsatisfied needs and immaturity make them vulnerable to such influences destructive leaders. The other one is Colluders who support destructive leaders just for the sake of promoting themselves in organization (Padilla, et al 2007)

Combinations of low ethical and moral value of leaders and followers nurture the concept of leader-centric (Kellerman, 2004, Yukl, 2005), and accentuate the dynamic relationship between the leader’s destructive nature, the followers’ level of vulnerability, and the ethical environment. This combination generates a collective unethical, destructive behavior in the whole organization (Brewer, 2007; Zimbardo, 2007, Zyglidopoulos & Fleming, 2008), and members of organization will continue to participate in this cycle until either the organization itself finally collapses, or the individual starts re-evaluating his or her values and decided to exit (Brewer, 2007).

In extreme cases, leaders place the organization at risk and can align the organization with unethical or illegal objectives and activities by influencing their followers to pursue destructive goals, (Kayes, Stirling, & Nielsen, 2007).On the other hand, sometimes it happens that followers are unaware of their leader’s vision, and cannot properly judge the actual intention of their leaders in asking them to pursue destructive goals and suffer no harm from that goal pursuit or
even benefit by pursuing destructive goals. Those followers who are loyal to their leader and ambitiously follow their leader in pursuing his or her destructive goals may get the substantial rewards or the favor from their leader (Anand, Ashforth, & Joshi, 2005).

**Work & Methodology:**

**Sources of data:** (Secondary) Survey, Interviews, observation, case-studies, books, journals, periodicals, abstracts, indexes, research reports, Internet,

**Findings:**

We studied that leader is converted in the destructive leader when he starts:

- Feeling that his organization is not valuing him.
- Feeling that his efforts are not recognized or appreciated by the organization.
- Feeling that his employer doesn't pay him enough.
- Feeling like there is not enough career advancement opportunities in the organization.
- Identifying his destructive goals and in the pursuit of those goals he start encouraging his followers.
- Tactfully utilizing his destructive thinking to motivate followers to accomplish his destructive goals. These two signs jointly can create a big disaster in any organization.

First manifestation of destructive leader starts occurring when a leader become supportive disloyal destructive leadership when he starts encouraging his followers to pursue destructive goals which are against the organizational interests (Einarsen et al., 2007) For example, if an organization main objective is to provide customer with high levels of product safety, and if a leader in that organization start encouraging his or her subordinates or followers to distribute unsafe products to increase the sale, he in this way is nurturing his followers towards the pursuit of a destructive goal. The second manifestation of destructive leader happens, when a leader starts behaving or acting in negative way just to influence followers to follow him in the pursuit of organizational goals, these actions are not only harmful for the followers but for the organization as well (i.e., uses a DL style). For example, if a leader threatens his followers to comply the procedure strictly for ensuring a greater product safety, this is also considered as destructive leadership style, despite of the fact that this leader was working to pursue the organizational goal. (Krasikova, Dina et al, 2013)
How to prevent disloyal destructive leadership in organizations?

1. Organizations should explain their values and goals to all employees. Organizations must determine how they value their employees.

2. Organizations must create a work environment that encourages honesty and loyalty, it will attract employees’ attention and they will work and follow with loyalty and respect.

3. Create a dialogue with your employee about what loyalty means to him or her. This confirms that everyone is on the same page.

4. Clear and Ethical culture must be developed in organizations. Organizations can't expect their employees to be devoted to them if organizations are not following the ethical code of conduct. Be truthful with your employees even if it hurts. Give respect and get respect. When employees know that it cost you something to be honest with them, they will definitely try to be as honest and loyal as they can.

5. Organizations must show care for employees. They must try to be connected with employees on a personal level. All employees must be treated with the respect and care, what they deserve.

6. Culture of mutual trust must be developed in organizations. Crucial information or responsibilities should not be withheld or hide from employees, by these employees will feel like that they are being valued. And in case there is absence of mutual trust vulture in organization, that creates a destructive environment for all involved. To get trust and loyalty from employees, organizations must first give it to them.

7. Employees should be encouraged to question organization. Questioning or challenging organization is not an indication of betrayal. Rather it is an indication that employee cares enough about organizations and that is why he is/ she is showing his or her concerns honestly. It will give a chance to create a dialogue with employee so that both organization and employee can discover solutions and answers for the problems.

8. Organizations must encourage employees to seek out advice and assistance from other experts; it will enhance employee’s professional growth because they get someone else's perspective. It will improve employee’s confidence and perceptions in a positive and constructive direction.
9. All organizations must reward loyalty. There must be a reward or incentive program in all organizations. Honesty and sincerity of employee cannot be earned by giving big raises and incentives on an annual basis, in fact there must be something that is unique and special just for employees. Organizations must try to create a relationship with employee so it shouldn't be too hard to get the positive results.

10. Organizations must show their concerns to work/life conflicts. Faithful employers will create an environment where employees are free to come to them with their work/life problems so that they can work together for solutions. Employees are more loyal to empathetic employers especially when they know that their employer is showing real concern. So organizations must take care to treat their employees as such and they will reward them with their loyalty.

Conclusion
In the past few years significant researches have been made on the diversity of concepts and behavioral descriptions of destructive leadership. But still there is a need of further extensive research in this area. Our study is descriptive in nature and we tried to discuss and highlight the indicators of destructive leader and how a destructive leader influences his followers to achieve his destructive goals. In addition, we discussed that these indicators of destructive leader are possibly to happen through distinct means and bring different consequences for the organization, followers, and destructive leader. Then, we discussed that how destructive leader act in the pursuit of destructive goals, and why leadership Loyalty and commitment toward organization convert in to destructive leadership. This study fills in an area of lack in research by extending the ways to prevent disloyal destructive leadership in organizations exploration, by emphasizing on ethical culture development in the organizational. We hope that the proposed actions will stimulate further research and theory development in the area of destructive leadership.
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