DESTRUCTIVE LEADER EVALUATIONS AND THEIR NOMOLOGICAL NETWORK: A SECOND ORDER META-ANALYTIC REVIEW

by

Corey Matthew Shores

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Business Administration

Charlotte

2024

Approved by:

_____

Dr. George Banks

_____

Dr. David Woehr

_____

Dr. Eric Heggestad

_____

Dr. SungJune Park

ABSTRACT

COREY MATTHEW SHORES. Destructive Leader Evaluations and Their Nomological Network: A Second Order Meta-Analytic Review (Under the direction of DR. GEORGE BANKS)

Over the past half-century, leadership paradigms have evolved from transactional dynamics between leaders and followers to a transformative, authentic exploration of individual and organizational outcomes. Recent scholarly attention has turned towards evaluations of harmful or "dark" leadership traits and behaviors. However, prevailing literature on destructive leaders primarily delves into leader-centric evaluations of traits, antecedents, and consequences, leaving a significant gap in understanding follower-driven perspectives on evaluations of destructive leaders.

This study advocates for a second-order meta-analysis (SOMA) to scrutinize the interplay between evaluations of destructive leaders, the nomological network of concepts surrounding followers' evaluations, and the relative importance of potential predictors of such evaluations. The existing body of research predominantly concentrates on the potential correlates of evaluations of destructive leader behavior (DLB), encompassing concepts such as counterproductive work behavior, turnover intention, burnout, commitment, and job performance, with limited clarity on what might proceed or derive from such evaluations of DLBs. Additionally, a noteworthy portion of scholarly discourse revolves around abusive supervision, creating a conspicuous void regarding other forms of evaluations of DLBs.

Finally, while primary meta-analytic inquiries abound in the field, their findings sometimes present conflicting results, necessitating a secondary meta-analytic exploration encompassing diverse variables, including follower traits and various manifestations of destructive leadership behaviors. This dissertation takes stock of the limitations and opportunities

in the extant literature. It presents a roadmap for a cleaned-up concept space, which will allow more robust future research by systematically searching through 256 articles and retaining 30 articles for the initial inclusion of the SOMA effect size estimates in the correlation matrices for follower and leader individual differences, leadership construct correlates, and potential outcomes of DLB.

Although I successfully coded over 37 follower differences, 68 DLB outcomes, and five destructive leadership constructs as correlates, many missing correlates were primarily tied to outcome relationships, demographics, and personality measures. These missing correlates were initially substantial, with over 70% of the meta-analytic correlation matrices bank. Moreover, the selection process prioritized meta-analytic estimates with the largest sample sizes to mitigate random sampling errors, resulting in comprehensive matrices comprising ***184 meta-analytic estimates (total k = 10,818 & total n = 2,384,935)***, not including Metabus.org derived meta-analytic estimates, that were coded from the initial systematic search yield of 256 articles, plus a total of 10 additional first-order and second-order meta-analyses to complete the missing correlates in the matrices for leader and follower individual differences.

These initially blank correlation matrix correlates were between personality factors, demographics, and attitudes. I largely mitigated the missing correlates with the ten additional articles. I utilized MetaBus.org derived meta-analytic effect size estimates for the remainder, thus ***generating additional second-order meta-analytic effect sizes outside of the destructive leadership literature on individual differences***. A few added relationships include FFM to gender, narcissism to affect, psychological capital to CSE, and much more essential to the organizational behavior and applied psychology literature, thus ***significantly adding to the***

contributions of this dissertation beyond the destructive leadership literature to differential and applied psychology in management.

Some key statistically significant results include a robust model using thirteen follower individual differences (i.e., gender, age, race, five-factor personality traits, positive affect, negative, narcissism, trait anger, and self-esteem) with $R^2 = 0.233$, and all incremental correlate additions measured by ΔR^2 with $p < 0.000$ for all predictor variable additions excluding age and emotional stability. Also, the relative weights and regression coefficients supported these findings with further analysis of collinearity (VIF), covariance, and sample size to assess for predictive validity limitations. Such limitation for emotional stability included a weak partial correlation to the followers' evaluations of destructive leadership of $r_{partial} = 0.019$ and the Variance Inflation Factor of $VIF_{emotional\ stability} = 3.8$. These statistics limit the predictive validity strength of the emotional stability measure compared to the other 12 factors, thus potentially explaining the statistically insignificant emotional stability predictor when modeled with the other individual follower differences in the ΔR^2 analysis.

In summary, the RWA and predictive incremental validity results suggest that negative affect ($\beta = 0.637$, $p < 0.001^{***}$ with RW% of 0.39, $R^2 = 0.233$) and positive affect ($\beta = -0.541$, $p < 0.001^{***}$ with RW% of 0.10, $R^2 = 0.233$) are the most important or influential predictors. Moreover, demographics are the least significant predictors largely due to the low magnitude of the second-order meta-analytic effect sizes, thus suggesting no statistically significant predictive power or relationship between leader and follower demographics in the individual followers' evaluation of destructive leadership. Additionally, when reviewing the destructive leadership nomological networks to include individual outcomes and positively and negatively valenced leadership constructs, this dissertation notes some strong correlations with individual behaviors,

attitudes, other outcomes, and other leadership types. For example, the most negatively associated are attitude toward leader ρ = -0.57 (k = 7; n = 1,582), leader effectiveness ρ = -0.45 (k = 4; n = 809), psychological functioning ρ = -0.49 (k = 8; n = 3,355), trust in leader, ρ = -0.51 (k = 11; n = 3,560), turnover intention p = 0.40 (k = 54; n = 18,868), and job satisfaction p = -0.41 (k = 52; n = 17,717). Inversely, the most positively associated are ostracism ρ = 0.63 (k = 5; n = 2,678), depersonalization ρ = 0.55 (k = 4; n = 1,222), and fear of leader ρ = 0.52 (k = 5; n = 1,427).

Lastly, an exciting finding suggests that the following positively valenced leadership constructs are positively associated with destructive leadership: Transactional ρ = 0.12 (k = 7; n = 2,156), Authentic Leadership ρ = 0.40 (k = 1; n = 594), and Management by Exception (passive) ρ = 0.24 (k = 3; n = 690). The most substantial leadership effect size was the correlation between Ethical Leadership and Abusive Supervision with ρ = -0.63 (k = 18; n = 8,186). Interestingly, Unethical Leadership ρ = 0.58 (k = 10, n = 2,702) has the most significant magnitude of its effect size measurement to Abusive Supervision, much like what was noted for Ethical Leadership but with a reversed relationship.

This dissertation accomplishes many further, yet similar analyses used to evaluate additional leader individual differences as correlates and their relative importance to followers' evaluations of destructive leadership and individual outcomes. Furthermore, this study delves deeper into other potential DLB outcomes as I correlate destructive leadership, with numerous meaningful results for the leadership and applied psychology literature while highlighting various gaps and limitations for opportunities for future research.

DEDICATION

To my beloved wife Taylor and son Heath, whose presence elevates me daily by enriching my essence and imparting the profound meaning of genuine love.

Heath, as you encounter these words in the years ahead, may you understand the journey intertwined within these pages. From the moment of your birth until your tender age of 18 months, this dissertation evolved alongside you, mirroring my transformation into not just a father, but ***your father***. You, my cherished child, have illuminated my life with unparalleled wonder. In April 2024, as you reach this milestone of 18 months, I commit this manuscript, envisioning the remarkable man you will become, journeying far beyond infancy, embracing the complexities of adulthood, perhaps even to the threshold of fatherhood yourself. As you traverse life's terrain, I impart these fragments of wisdom: embrace the harmony of opposites, cultivate kindness alongside intensity, logic intertwined with imagination, intelligence coupled with humility, and determination balanced with cunning. Remember to reciprocate love, nurture alliances, extend kindness, and defend fiercely those you hold dear. In moments of adversity, internal or external, cling to clarity of mind, anchoring yourself on the bedrock of your principles, infusing optimism to vanquish negativity. Your foundation, forged through relationships, daily actions, and cherished bonds, will sustain you through life's trials. Above all, discern your path guided by the eternal truths of your faith, grounded not merely in words but in the spiritual resonance echoing within your soul. Seek God's unwavering love, trusting in His guidance amidst life's ebb and flow. ***Heath****, may you never cease to ascend, propelled by boundless growth, with the sky as your canvas and no limit to your aspirations.*

Lastly, to all of the readers of this dissertation, it serves as a testament to our attitudes, actions, and character in shaping our reality and achievements.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I extend my deepest appreciation to the esteemed faculty of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte DBA Program for their invaluable contributions to my academic journey. Their collective knowledge and expertise have been instrumental in shaping my dissertation and overall DBA experience. Through countless lectures, papers, and assignments, they have provided unwavering support and guidance, making this challenging process both manageable and rewarding.

I am particularly grateful to my Dissertation Chair, Dr. George C. Banks, and my esteemed committee members, Dr. David Woehr, Dr. Eric Heggestad, and Dr. Sungjune Park, for their exceptional mentorship and scholarly insights. Dr. Banks's rigorous challenges and recommendation of a Second Order Meta-analysis have elevated the depth and scope of my dissertation, allowing for a comprehensive examination of destructive leadership from a follower-centric and reversing-the-lens perspective. Additionally, I extend special thanks to Dr. David Woehr for his critical review of my statistical methods, which has resulted in a more robust and rigorous final product.

Their dedication, guidance, and expertise have been invaluable throughout this journey, and I am truly grateful for their time and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES ..... **xi**
LIST OF FIGURES ..... **xii**
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION **1**
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW **7**
Theoretical Frameworks **7**
Destructive Leadership Theoretical Frameworks **26**
Conservation of Resource (COR) Approach *26*
Cognitive Theory Approach *27*
Identity (Trait Theory) Approach *27*
Exchange Theory Approach *28*
Reversing-the-Lens-Theory *29*
Correlates of Evaluations of DLBs **30**
Leader Individual Differences *30*
Follower's Big Five Personality Factors *31*
Core Self-evaluation (CSE) *32*
Dark Triad Traits *33*
Moral Identity Theory *33*
Psychological Differences *34*
Follower Demographic Information *35*
Follower's Attitudes and Perceptions *35*
The Role of Follower Traits in Evaluations of Destructive Leadership **38**
Destructive Leadership and Positively Valenced Leadership **40**
Summary **41**
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY **42**
Systematic Search Strategy **42**
Inclusion Criteria **44**
Coding Procedure **45**
Data Analysis **45**
Bivariate Correlations *45*
Relative Weights Analysis *46*
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS **47**
Meta-Analytic Procedures **47**
Test of Research Question 1 - Individual Leadership Differences **50**
Leader Individual Differences as Correlates Generating Effect Sizes with Correlation Matrix Analysis (RQ1a) *50*
Individual Leadership Differences & Relative Weights (RQ1b) *51*
Individual Leaders' Differences & Relative Weights (RQ1c) *52*
Test of Research Question 2 – Individual Follower Differences **55**
Leader Individual Differences as Correlates Generating Effect Sizes with Correlation Matrix Analysis (RQ2a) *55*
Follower Individual Differences with Relative Weights Analysis (RQ2b) *57*
Follower Individual Differences with Incremental Predictive Validity (RQ2c) *59*

Test of Research Question 3 – Nomological Networks of DLBs 64
DLBs and Outcomes as Correlates Generating Effect Sizes with Correlation Matrix Analysis 64
DLBs and Positively Valenced Leadership as Correlates 66
Evaluations of DLBs and other Correlates 66
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION 68
Theoretical Contributions 68
Research Question 1: Leader Differences 69
Research Question 2: Follower Differences 71
Research Question 3: Nomological Networks 76
Future Research Potential 78
Practical Implications 79
Study Limitations and Future Research Directions 81
Roadmap for Future Research 85
Recommendation #1: Additional study of DLBs and their practical implications at an aggregated or organizational level of analysis for advances in strategic human resource management 85
Recommendation #2: Build more on the limited theoretical framework associated with destructive leadership and its correlates. 86
Recommendation #3: Investigate the impact of leader individual differences on evaluations of destructive leadership via its mechanisms of influence. 88
Recommendation #4: Continued exploration of the role of followers' individual differences in evaluations of destructive leadership to include mechanisms of influence. 88
Recommendation #5: Examine the moderating role of contextual factors in destructive leadership evaluations. 90
Conclusion 91
REFERENCES 93
APPENDIX A: PRIMARY META-ANALYSIS ARTICLES 106
Individual Differences 106
Nomological Networks 107
APPENDIX B: SECOND ORDER META-ANALYSIS REFERENCES 109
APPENDIX C: OTHER TABLES & FIGURES 110

LIST OF TABLES

Table #	Table Title	Page
1A	Type of Destructive Leadership Construct or Phenomena and Article	10
1B	Destructive Leadership Constructs and Definitions	11
2	Destructive Leadership Theoretical Frameworks, Constructs, Phenomena, and Prevalent Correlates	16
3	Destructive Leadership Research Methods and Theoretical Framework by Focus	19
4	Destructive Leadership Research and Correlate Foci	21
5	Effect Sizes Between Leaders' Individual Differences and the Followers' Destructive Leadership Evaluations	51
6	Individual Leaders' Differences with Raw & Rescaled Relative Weights	52
7	Change in Adjusted R Square & Model Summary for Incremental Predictive Validity for Individual Leader Differences	53
8	Regression Coefficients & Model Summary for Incremental Predictive Validity of the Leaders' Individual Differences	54
9	Second Order Meta-Analytic Effect Sizes Between the Followers' Individual Differences and their Evaluations of DLB	56
10	Followers' Individual Differences with Raw & Rescaled Relative Weights	58
11	Change in Adjusted R Square & Model Summary for Incremental Predictive Validity for Individual Followers' Differences & Their Destructive Leadership evaluations	60
12	Regression Coefficients with VIF & Partial Correlations for Followers' Individual Differences for Incremental Predictive Validity	62
13	Second Order Meta-Analytic Effect Size Estimates for Individual Outcomes of DLB	65
14	Second Order Meta-Analytic Effect Size Estimates for Traditional & Values Based Leadership Constructs as Correlates to DLBs	66
15	Second Order Meta-Analytic Effect Size Estimates Between Destructive Leadership Correlates	67
16	Agenda for Future Research on Destructive Leadership Behaviors & Perceptions	83
A1	Abusive and Destructive Leadership Focus and Journal	110
A2	Research Question 1c: Individual Leader Differences Analysis of Variance	111
A3	Research Question 2c: individual Follower Differences Analysis of Variance	112

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure #	Figure Title	Page
N/A	N/A	N/A

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In the last two decades, a novel leadership phenomenon has emerged that delves into the darker facets of leadership, encompassing evaluations of traits, intentions, behaviors, and resultant outcomes (Tepper et al., 2017; Gardner et al., 2020). This phenomenon, termed "destructive leadership," has garnered considerable scholarly attention (Fischer et al., 2021). Furthermore, there has been a notable surge of 30% in publications specifically focused on evaluations of destructive leader behaviors (DLBs) over the past five years (Tepper, Simon et al., 2017; Gardner, Lowe et al., 2020). The detrimental impact of DLBs underscores the importance of studying it. For instance, empirical investigations illuminate the link between evaluations of DLBs and attrition, revealing that turnover costs can escalate from 90 to 200% of an employee's base salary, thereby highlighting the significance of this research domain (Reina et al., 2018).

The destructive leadership literature proposes the mechanisms contributing to these adverse consequences. One notable avenue is the capacity of destructive leaders to erode employee morale through fear-based tactics and intimidation, resulting in a hostile work environment characterized by feelings of devaluation, unappreciation, and inadequate support (Krasikova et al., 2013; Mackey et al., 2021). This deterioration in morale can lead to reduced motivation and productivity, fostering elevated turnover rates (Tepper et al., 2017). Additionally, the rigidity and inflexibility inherent in the mindset of destructive leaders hinder organizational creativity and innovation, impeding growth (De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2008; Mackey et al., 2021). Such leadership approaches suppress sharing ideas and perspectives, potentially inducing disengagement and reluctance to contribute to the organization's advancement (Wang et al., 2021). The repercussions extend to cultivating a negative organizational culture characterized by conflict, mistrust, and hostility, which consequently obstruct effective collaboration, communication, and teamwork, undermining organizational performance (Schyns & Schilling,

2013). Over time, this negative culture may tarnish the organization's reputation and compromise its ability to attract and retain top-tier talent (Mackey et al., 2013).

A pivotal advancement in destructive leadership occurred in 2000 when Tepper introduced the concept of evaluations of abusive supervision and its ramifications (Tepper, 2000). Tepper (2000) defined evaluations of abusive supervision in his seminal publication as "Subordinates' perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact" (p. 178). Research on abusive leadership has recently surged, capturing a prominent position within the expansive landscape of destructive leadership inquiry (Tepper et al., 2017; Gardner et al., 2020). Consequently, much of the existing literature in this area focuses on outcomes, accentuating its significance (Mackey et al., 2021). This burgeoning field extends its reach into applied psychological and organizational behavior studies, making a compelling case for the continued exploration of DLBs as a concept. The practical implications of this research are particularly relevant to strategic human resource management and applied psychology.

The literature review on destructive leadership reveals several potential opportunities for research. Primarily, while some previous studies have investigated the potential precursors and consequences of evaluations of DLBs, a void exists in understanding how leader and follower traits and attributes might influence the evaluations of DLBs (Zhang & Bednall, 2016; Wang et al., 2019; Mackey et al., 2021). Despite exploring individual differences such as personality traits and other demographic factors, there still needs to be a better understanding of these variables' relative importance and magnitude in predicting evaluations of DLBs (Mackey et al., 2017). This notion applies to follower and leader distinctions. It presents an avenue for potential studies investigating the nomological network around these individual differences and how they contribute to improved predictive accuracy in evaluations of DLBs.

Furthermore, the literature underscores disparities, highlighting a need for more diverse sample populations in the studied region (Gardner et al., 2020). Despite Tepper's original positioning of abusive supervision as an evaluation, the vast majority of abusive supervision research and destructive leadership, more broadly, conflate leader behaviors with evaluations of destructive leadership (Fischer et al., 2021). Consequently, there is a severe need for further work in this literature to provide greater theoretical specificity.

Secondly, most research emphasizes the *consequences* of evaluations of DLBs (although the literature suggest a reciprocal relationship where such variables may predict followers' evaluations of DLBs), including variables like counterproductive work behavior (CWB), turnover intention, burnout, commitment variations, and job performance. For example, a leader may target followers and use destructive behaviors against them. This action would then cause an evaluation of the leader as high on destructive leadership, and such a perspective may lead to the individual intending to turn from the organization. Conversely, an individual may engage in CWBs, drawing the leader's anger, who then uses DLBs. One's desire to leave the organization may increase the likelihood that one gives poor ratings to a leader. Regardless, there are several ways these concepts may influence each other simultaneously.

Generally speaking, the literature has dedicated scant attention to investigating other theoretical predictors, which is necessary to form a comprehensive nomological network of correlates that may play varying roles in the leadership process (Cheng & McCarthy, 2018; Mao, Chiang et al., 2019; Gardner et al., 2020; Mackey et al., 2021). Presently, the understanding stands that evaluations of DLBs intricately connect to adverse outcomes encompassing emotional labor, stress, exhaustion, attrition, engagement, and job satisfaction. Furthermore, a multitude of studies suggests from correlation evidence that these outcomes are influenced by individual traits like grit, job mobility, and quality of life (Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al., 2001;

Tepper, 2007; Starratt & Grandy, 2010; Mackey et al., 2013; Kim et al., 2016; Choi et al., 2019; Kabat-Farr et al., 2019).

Third, a sizable portion of scholarly articles predominantly revolves around abusive supervision, resulting in a gap within the literature concerning other subcategories of DLBs, such as toxic, unethical, despotic, and dysfunctional (Rose et al., 2015; Kabat-Farr et al., 2019; Mao et al., 2019; Nauman et al., 2020). This gap presents a distinct avenue for delving into the correlations and distinct constructs of destructive leadership (e.g., unethical leadership, abusive supervision, authoritarianism) concerning the broader nomological network.

Fourth, extending on the third gap, additional reviews need to clarify the extent to which forms of destructive leadership have been studied in connection with positively valenced forms of leadership. Regarding the current state of the literature, more future studies need to investigate positively or negatively valenced leader behavior. Instead, more so evaluations and outcomes of leader behavior are being researched (Banks et al., 2021). Furthermore, it is necessary to understand how followers experience and evaluate leader behaviors fully.

Finally, the literature boasts a plethora of primary meta-analytic investigations concerning the multifaceted domain of destructive leadership. Over the past decade, these studies have organically expanded to incorporate the viewpoint of followers and their assessments of leaders. Nonetheless, the findings from these primary studies, which underpin the abovementioned primary meta-analytic syntheses, might exhibit conflicting results. Consequently, there arises an increasing necessity for a secondary meta-analytic examination that spans a diverse spectrum of correlates, including leader and follower traits and various distinctive conceptualizations of destructive leadership. This examination also extends to well-established outcomes tied to destructive leadership; specifically negative behaviors exhibited by followers. Again, the existing theoretical literature fails to acknowledge that many of these

"outcomes" can be used to evaluate leader behavior for various reasons. This simultaneity problem was highlighted in one recent review of the leadership literature (Güntner et al., 2020).

The primary objective of this study is to enhance our comprehension of evaluations of DLBs and their implications for both organizations and their leaders. In their work, Tuncdogan et al. (2017) underscored the necessity of investigating a wide array of leader traits and behaviors within relatively unexplored domains, including background traits, goal orientation, neurological attributes, and leader behaviors beyond conventional leadership styles (Tuncdogan et al., 2017). Therefore, the subsequent sections of my dissertation trace the evolution of destructive leadership since the 1970s, examine its repercussions on followers, and illuminate the increasing interest surrounding this topic in contemporary research.

I emphasize trait theory and the reversing-the-lens theory to identify leader (and follower) traits that might contribute to evaluations of DLBs. Furthermore, this dissertation scrutinized the research that has probed into the role of follower traits in shaping evaluations of DLBs. Ultimately, this study seeks to analyze and address gaps in the literature on destructive leadership's correlates. This study of correlates considers the relationship between leader and follower individual differences as well as attitudes, along with their respective magnitudes, relative to evaluations of DLBs. In doing so, it aims to elucidate some potential mechanisms through which these concepts contribute to destructive leadership for future research.

This study employs a Second-Order Meta-Analysis (SOMA) as its chosen methodology to address the identified gaps outlined in the preceding section. Initially, the SOMA delves into the variance linked to individual differences in followers' and leaders' perceptions and assessments of DLBs. The results from primary meta-analyses will be analyzed to accomplish this.

In this investigation, a diverse range of variables will be considered, encompassing contributions from the Big Five Personality Model, the Dark Triad Model, affect, gender, and various other correlates of evaluations of DLBs. I will develop a conceptual model to build upon this, and consistent with other SOMA studies (e.g., Banks et al., 2018; Woznjy et al., 2022), the SOMA methodology was applied to explore the research inquiries. The SOMA approach, known for its pragmatic nature in synthesizing and amalgamating outcomes from multiple studies, is anticipated to yield a more robust and reliable estimation of the effect size of specific variables (Oh, 2020). Subsequently, the expected findings will be examined and discussed. Methodologically, the study will systematically comb through previous primary meta-analytic studies and employ the SOMA framework for both data extraction and analysis. The research will also acknowledge and discuss its limitations, including methodological diversity, while making a concerted effort to address these constraints.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review provides a new perspective on evaluations of DLBs and associated correlates within the nomological network by factoring in all theoretical perspectives used in the last decade to formulate a model (Tepper, 2007; Zhang & Bednall, 2016). The primary focus of the review is on "un-conflating" several concepts and documenting the overlooked potential for simultaneity in the relationships. Some of the theories utilized for analysis include reversing-the-lens (follower-centric leadership), conservation of resource (COR), leader-member-exchange (LMX), cognitive, motivation, self-concept based, person-job-fit, identity, justice, and workplace anxiety (TWA). Also, this literature review analyzes all used correlates, including proposed outcomes, antecedents, moderators, and mediators, to assess for gaps in empirical research for an all-encompassing view of the studied variable relationships.

Theoretical Frameworks

Leadership, a social influence process (Day & Antonakis, 2014), is vital to any organization and its stakeholders. Leader behaviors that are charismatic and visionary can motivate followers to transcend their self-interest to pursue collective and social goals (Shamir et al., 1993). Charismatic and transformational leadership theories emerged as a highly studied topic in the 1970s. The proposed outcomes include but are not limited to emotional attachment, motivational arousal, rallying followers to the mission, self-esteem, trust, and confidence (Shamir et al., 1993; Tourish, 2013).

Leadership has fascinated human imagination for millennia with references to leadership and its various forms (e.g., constitutionality elected, divine right monarchy, philosopher kings), responsibilities, and constraints mentioned and described in biblical settings, classical and modern philosophy, and ultimately 20th century academia. For example, at the turn of the 20th century, Mumford (1906) rooted the origins of leadership in sociology about associations and

processes to include "innate and acquired modal societary tendency or force" (Mumford, 1906, p. 222). Murphy (1941) continued this social process-driven leadership perspective but added a substantial breakthrough by eliminating the leader's isolation as an individual and proposing that the individual is a factor in the social situation (Murphy, 1941). Stogdill (1948) also pioneered the psychological factors of leadership, greatly paving the way for individual perspectives in the current literature (Stogdill, 1948). These perspectives prior to 1970 were accumulated in a contemporary scene review by Hollander and Julian (1969), which included influence, participants' processes, transactions between leaders and followers, function of leaders, and effectiveness (Hollander & Julian, 1969).

Ultimately, the 1970s emerged as a renaissance for theoretical contributions regarding leadership. Much of the early leadership theory utilized direct or two-way relationships between leaders and followers via the exchange, reinforcement, and cognitive lenses (Shamir et al., 1993). For example, the LMX concept from 1975 postulated that supervisor and their subordinates form relationships via expectations like trust, competence, and influence (Graen & Cashman, 1975; Choi et al., 2019). Moreover, Burns (1978) compared leaders to visionaries and motivators who achieve higher-level outcomes, such as collectivism and goal sharing (Burns, 1978). These early ideologies and theoretical constructs fall into the constructive view of leadership, with many empirical studies measuring the influence between the level of constructive leadership and positive outcomes like well-being, job satisfaction, commitment, and individual performance (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Other constructive theoretical contributions to leadership have emerged in the last decade, such as ethical and authentic leadership.

In 1990, Conger introduced a spin on the previously existing constructive view of leadership. Conger’s article was instrumental because it focused on “dark” leadership due to traits associated with transformational leadership that could cause harm to the organization and

its followers. For example, Conger stated that leaders' qualities, such as strategic vision, communication, and management skills, can replace organizational objectives with personal objectives, unrealistic expectations, and aggressive work practices that harm their organization and alienate employees (Conger, 1990). Therefore, Conger is one of the nucleation sites of the destructive leadership phenomenon. Conger based his theoretical framework on potential adverse outcomes of previously existing transformational leadership and trait theories. Almost in parallel, Robinson and Bennett (1995) introduced workplace deviance. They defined workplace deviance as violating the organizational norms and causing harm to the organization or employees, thus making it an excellent variable for destructive leadership empirical studies (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007).

In 2000, as previously mentioned, Tepper made an incremental advancement in destructive leadership by introducing abusive supervision and its consequences (Tepper, 2000). Abusive leadership articles have taken the forefront of the destructive leadership phenomenon, with the subject matter growing exponentially over the last five years (Tepper, Simon, et al. 2017; Gardner, Lowe et al. 2020). However, abusive leadership is lacking from a theoretical perspective, and many studies analyze it as a phenomenon that needs to be theory-driven (Tepper, 2007; Zhang & Bednall, 2016). The result is that most abusive leadership studies focus exclusively on outcomes. In 2007, Shamir (2007) made a significant incremental theoretical contribution by proposing the reverse-of-the-lens theory of leadership, which theorizes that followership and follow-centric leadership are equally, if not more significant than purely leader-centric theories and analysis (Shamir, 2007).

Various other destructive leadership constructs have been introduced, with evaluations of abusive supervision being the primary or most common subcategory. Other phenomenon-based destructive leadership types include evaluations of laissez-faire behavior, management by

exception, personalized leadership, supervisor undermining, petty tyranny, and toxic leadership (Thoroughgood et al., 2012). Furthermore, Nauman et al. (2020) decomposed destructive leadership further with the concept of despotic leadership related to emotional labor, withdrawal of employees, and performance (Nauman et al., 2020). Table 1A summarizes these basic destructive leadership constructs by scholar and publication date. Schyns and Schilling's (2013) meta-analysis provided an updated summary of the destructive leadership literature. Additionally, I revised Schyns and Schilling's (2013) summary table to add the theoretical contribution of additional aspects of destructive leadership from the 1990s to the present day.

Table 1A: Type of Destructive Leadership Construct or Phenomena and Article (Schyns & Schilling, 2013)

Type of Destructive Leadership	Original Articles
"Dark" Leadership	Conger (1990)
Petty tyranny	Ashforth (1997)
Abusive supervision	Tepper (2000)
Coercive power	Elangovan and Xie (2000)
Abusive supervisory behaviors	Yagil (2005)
Social undermining	Duffy et al. (2002)
Supervisor verbal abuse	Grandey et al. (2007)
Unsupportive managerial behaviors	Rooney and Gottlieb (2007)
Aversive leadership	Bligh et al. (2007)
Destructive leadership	Einarsen et al. (2002)
Tyrannical leadership	Hauge et al. (2007)
Despotic leadership	De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2008)
"Dark" transformational leadership	Tourish (2013)
Dysfunctional Leadership	Rose et al. (2015)
Supervisor Incivility	Arasli et al. (2018)
Unethical Leadership	Kabat-Farr et al. (2019)
Incompetent Leadership	Mao et al. (2019)

Similar to Table 1A in generation techniques, Table 1B integrates the destructive leadership constructs found in Table 1A with the destructive leadership review and meta-analysis by Mackey et al. (2021) for a more complete review.

Table 1B: Destructive Leadership Constructs and Definitions
(Schyns, 2009; Schyns Schilling, 2013; Mackey et al., 2021)

Destructive Leadership Constructs	Definitions
Abusive supervision[1]	"Subordinates' perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact" (Tepper, 2000, p. 178)
Abusive supervisory behaviors[1]	None provided
Aversive leadership[4]	"Leadership behaviors that emphasize the use of threats, intimidation, and punishment" (Bligh et al., 2007, p. 530)
Coercive power[4]	None provided
Corrupt Leadership	"The leader and at least some followers lie, cheat, or steal to a degree that exceeds the norm; they put self-interest ahead of the public interest" (Kellerman, 2004, p. 44)
"Dark" Leadership[3]	"Volitional behavior by a leader that can harm or intends to harm a leader's organization and followers by (a) encouraging followers to pursue goals that contravene the legitimate interests of the organization and (b) employing a leadership style that involves the use of harmful methods of influence with followers, regardless of justifications for such behavior" (Krasikova et al., 2013, p. 1310)
"Dark" transformational leadership[3]	None provided
Derailed Leadership	"Leaders may display anti-subordinate behaviors like bullying, humiliation, manipulation, deception or harassment, while simultaneously performing anti-organizational behaviors like absenteeism, shirking, fraud, or theft" (Einarsen et al., 2007, pp. 212-213)

Table 1B: Destructive Leadership Constructs and Definitions (Continued)

Despotic leadership	“Leadership that is “self-aggrandizing and exploitative of others” because it “is based on personal dominance and authoritarian behavior that serves the self-interest of the leader” (De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2008, p. 298)" (Mackey et al., 2021, p. 707)
Destructive leadership[3]	"Volitional behavior by a leader that can harm or intends to harm a leader's organization and followers by (a) encouraging followers to pursue goals that contravene the legitimate interests of the organization and (b) employing a leadership style that involves the use of harmful methods of influence with followers, regardless of justifications for such behavior" (Krasikova et al., 2013, p. 1310)
Dysfunctional Leadership[3]	None provided
Evil Leadership	“The leader and at least some followers commit atrocities. They use pain as an instrument of power. The harm done to men, women, and children is severe rather than slight. The harm can be physical, psychological, or both” (Kellerman, 2004, p. 46)
Exploitative Leadership	"Leadership with the primary intention to further the leader's self-interest. Such leaders exploit others by (1) acting egoistically, (2) exerting pressure and manipulating followers, (3) overburdening followers, or, on the other hand, (4) consistently under-challenging followers, allowing no development" (Schmid et al., 2019, p. 1404)
Incompetent Leadership[3]	None provided
Insincere Leadership	"A diverse set of leadership behaviors to achieve personal goals at the expense of others without confrontation but rather in the form of clandestine and deceitful tactics and strategies" (Schilling, 2009, p. 114)

Table 1B: Destructive Leadership Constructs and Definitions (Continued)

Insular Leadership	"The leader and at least some followers minimize or disregard the health and welfare of the 'other' – that is, those outside the group or organization for which they are directly responsible" (Kellerman, 2004, p. 45)
Leader Bullying	Behavior that occurs "repeatedly over some time, and the person confronted has to have difficulties defending himself/herself" (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996, p. 191)
Leader Exclusion	"Leaders deny followers "acceptance into meaningful workplace relationships, activities or events" (Scott, 2007, p. 15)" (Mackey et al., 2021, p. 707)
Leader Incivility[2]	"Low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target violates workplace norms for mutual respect. Uncivil behaviors are characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others" (Andersson & Pearson, 1999, p. 457)
Leader Narcissism	Leaders' behaviors are "principally motivated by their own egomaniacal needs and beliefs, superseding the needs and interests of the constituents and institutions they lead" (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006, p. 631)
Negative Leadership[3]	"Commonly disliked and denounced behaviors ranging from ineffective to destructive aspects" (Schilling, 2009, p. 103)
Personalized Charismatic Leadership	"Leaders emphasize their self-interest and purposefully create unbalanced relationships with their followers by manipulating and disempowering them" (Mackey et al., 2021, p. 707)
Petty tyranny	"Someone who uses their power and authority oppressively, capriciously, and perhaps vindictively. It suggests, in short, someone who lords their power over others" (Ashforth, 1997, p. 126)

Table 1B: Destructive Leadership Constructs and Definitions (Continued)

Pseudo-Transformational Leadership	"Occurs when "leaders advance their self-interested agendas by dominating and controlling their followers. In focusing on self-interest, pseudo-transformational leaders are more interested in becoming personal idols than in the collective ideals that might benefit their followers (Barling et al., 2008, p. 852)" (Mackey et al., 2021, p. 707)
Social (leader) Undermining	Leaders' "behavior intended to hinder, over time, the ability to establish and maintain positive interpersonal relationships, work-related success, and favorable reputation" (Duffy et al., 2002, p. 332)
Supervisor Incivility[2]	None provided
Supervisor verbal abuse[1]	None provided
Toxic Leadership	"Individuals, who by dint of their destructive behaviors and dysfunctional personal qualities generate a serious and enduring poisonous effect on the individuals, families, organizations, communities, and even societies they lead" (Lipman-Blumen, 2005, p. 30)
Tyrannical leadership	"Tyrannical leaders may behave by the goals, tasks, missions, and strategies of the organization, but they typically obtain results not through, but at the cost of subordinates" (Einarsen et al., 2007, p. 212)
Unethical Leadership[3]	None provided
Unsupportive managerial behaviors[3]	None provided

Notes:

1. These destructive leadership constructs all fall under the Abusive Leadership construct definition.
2. Supervisor incivility is assumed to be the same as Leader incivility.
3. Numerous other destructive leadership constructs are in the literature and summarized in Tables 1A and 1B. In my review, a referenceable consensus construct definition needs to be identified. Therefore, these constructs are assumed to fall under the Destructive Leadership construct definition due to their ambiguity and denotations in their literature.
4. Coercive power is assumed to be the same as Aversive Leadership.

The allocation of destruction leadership into specific subunits linked by traits, behaviors, and outcomes by Tepper (2000), Thoroughgood et al. (2012), and Nauman et al. (2020) allowed the introduction of specific and existing theoretical perspectives on destructive leadership constructs. For example, I see the application of COR, LMX, TWA, justice theory, identity theory, cognitive theories, reinforcement theory, self-concept-based theory, and person-job-fit-theory to destructive leadership types to explain relationships between the various correlates (Shamir et al., 1993; Tepper, 2000; Mitchell and Ambrose, 2007, Mackey et al., 2013; Dionne et al., 2014; Kim et al., 2016, Harms et al., 2017; Pradhan & Jena, 2017, Tepper et al., 2017; Shareef & Atan, 2019, Gardner et al., 2020). Table 2 summarizes the theoretical framework of recent literature associated with destructive leadership constructs.

Table 2: Destructive Leadership Theoretical Frameworks, Constructs, Phenomena, and Prevalent Correlates[5]

Theory	Type of Destructive Leadership	Correlates	Article
Leader-Member-Exchange (LXM)[1]	Abusive Supervision	Emotional Intelligence Employee Creativity Intension to Quit Emotional Exhaustion	Pradhan and Jena (2016) Harms et al. (2017) Han et al. (2017) Choi et al. (2019)
Conservation of Resource (COR)	Abusive Supervision Supervisor Incivility Bullying	Resistance Behavior Job Satisfaction Exhaustion Performance Social Learning Knowledge Sharing Intention to Quit Level of Commitment CWB Polychronicity Defensive Silence Innovation Neglect Stress	Mackey et al. (2013) Kim et al. (2016) Tepper et al. (2017) Han et al. (2017) Arasli et al. (2018) Rai and Agarwal (2018) Peltokorpi and Ramaswami (2021)
Theory of Work Place Anxiety (TWA)	Abusive Supervision	Emotional Exhaustion Stress Resistance Behavior	Cheng and McCarthy (2018)
Identity Theory[2]	Abusive Supervision Supervisor Uncivility Unethical Leadership	Emotional Exhaustion Resistance Behavior Harassment Grit Perceived Work Ability (PWA) CWB	Conger (1990) Harvey et al. (2007) Nielsen et al. (2017) Tuncdogan et al. (2017) Cheng and McCarthy (2018) Kabat-Farr et al. (2019) Brender-Ilan and Sheaffer (2019)
Cognitive Theory[3]	Unethical Leadership	Intention to Quit	Shareef and Atan (2019)
Reinforcement Theory	Despotic Leadership	Emotional Exhaustion Quality of Work life (QWL) Performance Resistance Behavior	Nauman, Zheng et al. 2020
Self-concept-based Theory[4]	Abusive Supervision	Performance Emotional Exhaustion	Mackey et al. (2013) Tepper et al. (2017) Cheng and McCarthy (2018)
Motivation Theory	Abusive Supervision	Resistance Behavior Intention to Quit	Pradhan and Jena (2017) Cheng and McCarthy (2018) Choi, Kim et al. (2019)
Justice Theory	Abusive Supervision Laissez-faire leadership	Family Well-being Emotional Exhaustion Intention to Quit Job Satisfaction Cost Resistance Behavior CWB	Tepper (2000) Thoroughgood et al. (2012)
Person-job-fit Theory	Supervisor Incivility	Emotional Exhaustion Performance Polychronicity	Arasli et al. (2018)

[1] Includes Social Exchange Theory
[2] Includes Social Identity and Trait Theories
[3] Includes Social Cognitive and Cognitive Evaluation (CET) Theories
[4] Includes Self Regulation Theory
[5] Notes 1-4 display combined theories for simplification purposes due to same theoretical definition, similar outcomes, and Correlates

Table 2 displays the abundance of destructive leadership phenomenon studies, with most research targeting performance, emotional labor, and behavioral psychology-related correlates. Moreover, the most common theoretical frameworks used are COR and identity theories.

Evaluations of DLBs and a Nomological Network

Scholars have increasingly studied evaluations of DLBs, such as abusive supervision, over the last decade but still lack a common theoretical framework linking correlates to DLB evaluations (Tepper, 2007; Zhang & Bednall, 2016; Tepper et al., 2017; Gardner et al., 2020). First, many themes emerged on specific outcomes regarding emotional labor in stress, exhaustion, commitment, and performance (Tepper et al., 2001, Tepper 2007; Tepper et al., 2017). Second, studies suggest emotional labor moderates, meditates, or directly affects deviant work practices like abuse and CWB (Ng & Feldman, 2014). Third, there are emotional labor-related outcomes involving strategic human resource management, like the intent of quitting, social learning, and training (Rose et al., 2015; Reina et al., 2018; Choi et al., 2019). Therefore, I take an approach to address the gap in theoretical perspectives on evaluations of DLBs and the correlates in the nomological network.

This review considers evaluations of DLBs, such as abusive supervision and other "dark" manifestations of leadership, because they address the same phenomena with similarly proposed antecedents and outcomes. For example, individual traits of the follower and leader may result in particular destructive behaviors (Conger, 1990; Tepper, 2000; Tepper, 2007; Tourish, 2013). Additionally, many factors could mediate such relationships and depend on organizational characteristics (Tepper et al. 2001; Pradhan & Jena, 2016; Tuncdogan et al., 2017). I rely on these basic ideas to organize the review.

Table 3 presents the characteristics of critical destructive leadership articles organized by leadership theory (e.g., destructive, abusive, unethical), a theoretical framework if applicable

(e.g., COR, TWA, trait theory), methodology (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, or mixed), level of analysis, journal, year, and the number of citations in Google Scholar. Furthermore, Table 4 presents additional vital findings, article focus (e.g., emotional labor and stress), geographical region of study, and empirical characteristics such as sample size and variables (e.g., independent, dependent, mediators, and moderators).

Table 3: Destructive Leadership Research Methods and Theoretical Framework by Focus

				Research Method			Theoretical Framework	COR			Self-concept			Cognitive			Identity Theory			LXM			Justice			TWA			Person-job Fit			Re-enforcement			Agency		
Author	Year	Journal	Citations	Quantitative	Qualitative	Mixed	Unit of Analysis (O, G, I):	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I
B Shamir, RJ House, MB Arthur	1993	Organization science	5733	X (META)							X		X																								
A Starratt, G Grandy	2010	Leadership & organization development journal	74		X																																
C Peus, JS Wesche, B Streicher, S Braun	2012	Journal of Business Ethics	534	X																																	
B Schyns, J Schilling	2013	The Leadership Quarterly	1135	X (META)																																	
D Tourish	2013	The Dark Side of Leadership (Book)	475		X																																X
JD Mackey, BP Ellen III, WA Hochwarter	2013	The Leadership Quarterly	82	X						X			X																								
SD Dionne, A Gupta, KL Sotak, KA Shirreffs	2014	The Leadership Quarterly	218			X (META)													X						X												
TWH Ng, DC Feldman	2015	Journal of Applied Psychology	261			X (META)																															
K Rose, B Shuck, D Twyford	2015	Human Resource Development Review	75		Conceptual																																
Y Zhang, TC Bednall	2016	Journal of Business Ethics	209	X (META)																																	
SL Kim, S Lee, S Yun	2016	Journal of Managerial Psychology	41	X						X																											
S Pradhan, LK Jena	2016	Journal of Human Values	29	X																		X															
S Pradhan, LK Jena	2017	Journal of Organizational Analysis	46	X																																	
BJ Tepper, L Simon, HM Park	2017	Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior	337			X (META)				X			X																								
PD Harms, M Credé, M Tynan, M Leon, W Jeung	2017	The leadership quarterly	273	X (META)																		X															
MB Nielsen, L Glasø, S Einarsen	2017	Personality and individual differences	137	X															X																		
GH Han, PD Harms, Y Bai	2017	Journal of Business Ethics	83	X						X												X															
A Tuncdogan, OA Acar, D Stam	2017	The Leadership Quarterly	73		Conceptual														X																		

Table 3: Destructive Leadership Research Methods and Theoretical Framework by Focus (Continued)

				Research Method			Theoretical Framework	COR			Self-concept			Cognitive			Identity Theory			LXM			Justice			TWA			Person-job Fit			Re-enforcement			Agency		
Author	Year	Journal	Citations	Quantitative	Qualitative	Mixed	Unit of Analysis (O, G, I):	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I	O	G	I
J Conger	1990	Organization Dynamics	1061	X																		X															
BJ Tepper	2000	Journal of Applied Psychology	4274			X (META)																															
BJ Tepper, MK Duffy, JD Shaw	2001	Journal of Applied Psychology	635			X (META)							X						X									X									
P Harvey, J Stoner, W Hochwarter, C Kacmar	2007	The Leadership Quarterly	548	X										X		X																					
M Mitchell, M Ambrose	2007	Journal of Applied Psychology	1566	X						X																							X				
C Thoroughgood, B Tate, K Sawyer	2012	Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies	168	X						X																											
CS Reina, KM Rogers, SJ Peterson	2018	Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies	160	X																		X															
S Sonnentag	2018	Research in Organizational Behavior	110	X															X																		
BH Cheng, JM McCarthy	2018	Journal of Applied Psychology	78	X															X																		
RA Shareef, T Atan	2018	Management Decision	70	X																																	
H Arasli, BH Namin, AM Abubakar	2018	International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management	30	X																																	
A Rai, U Agarwal	2018	International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management	8	X																																	
W Choi, SL Kim, S Yun	2019	Journal of Business and Psychology	50			X (META)																															
D Kabat-Farr, BM Walsh, AK McGonagle	2019	Journal of Business Ethics	34	X																														X			
Y Brender-Ilan, Z Sheaffer	2019	Asia Pacific Management Review	23							X																											
T Watkins, R Fehr, W He	2019	The Leadership Quarterly	20		Conceptual														X																		
JY Mao, JTJ Chiang, L Chen, Y Wu	2019	Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology	11	X															X																		
NZA Khan, A Imran, A Anwar	2019	International Journal of information, business, and management	0	X																																	
WL Gardner, KB Lowe, JD Meuser, F Noghani	2020	The Leadership Quarterly	28	X																				X		X											
S Nauman, C Zheng, A Basit	2020	Leadership & Organization Development Journal	8	X																																	
V Peltokorpi, A Ramaswami	2021	The International Journal of Human Resource Management	23	X																						X											

Table 4: Destructive Leadership Research and Correlate Foci

Source	Year	Focus	Main Effect (Independent Variables)	Moderators	Mediators	Dependent Variables	Sample size	Key findings	Location
J Conger	1990	Dark side of transformational leadership					Conceptual	Leadership qualities and behaviors like strategic vision, communication skills, and general management skills can adversely affect their organizations.	US
B Shamir, RJ House, MB Arthur	1993	Self enhancement motives	Leader Behavior, motivational mechanisms, Self-concept	Organizational conditions, follower attributes		Further effects (general outcomes)	Conceptual	Derivation of theory testable propositions about leaders, followers, values, and orientation. Also, the organizational conditions that favor charismatic leadership emergence and effectiveness.	US
BJ Tepper	2000	Abusive supervision	Abusive supervision perceived mobility			Voluntary turnover	712, 362 (2 studies)	Abusive supervision (b= -0.37), perceived mobility (b= -0.22)	US
BJ Tepper, MK Duffy, JD Shaw	2001	Abusive supervision moderators, follower personality	Abusive supervision	Follwer personality		Resistance behaviors	712, 388 (2 studies)	Follower personality moderates the effect of abusive supervision. Abusive supervision is positively correlated to resistance behavios.	US
P Harvey, J Stoner, W Hochwarter, C Kacmar	2007		Abusive supervision	ingratiation (dependent on PA amount)		job tension emotional exhaustion turnover intent	715 completed surveys	Partial support was found for each hypothesis, with results indicating that low PA individuals who refrained from ingratiation experienced more strain and turnover intentions than other individuals. Implications of these results as well as strengths, limitations, and avenues for future research are discussed.	US
M Mitchell, M Ambrose	2007	Abusive supervision, negative reciprocity, deviant behavior	Abusive leadership	Negative reciprocity		Deviance to supervisor, organizational deviance, and interpersonal deviances	427	The relationship between abusive supervision and supervisor-directed deviance is stronger when individuals hold higher negative reciprocity.	US
A Starratt, G Grandy	2010	Emotional exhaustion, resistance behaviors	Abusive Leadership behaviors	Financial incentives		Physical and emotional outcomes, intension to quit, destructive culture	30 Interviews	Creation of definition and model of abusive leadership as experienced by young workers. The model details 11 behaviors, five moderators and six individual and two organizational outcomes of abusive leadership.	CANADA
C. Peus, JS Wesche, B Streicher, S Braun	2012	Authentic leadership	Self knowledge, self consistency		Predictability	Employee satisfaction, active commitment, extra effort	306, 105 (2 studies)	Strong positive correlation data on all variable relationships within model. The strongest relationship between self-knowledge and authentic leadership, and AL with constructive outcomes (e.g satisfaction, extra effort).	US

Table 4: Destructive Leadership Research and Correlate Foci (Continued)

Source	Year	Focus	Main Effect (Independent Variables)	Moderators	Mediators	Dependent Variables	Sample size	Key findings	Location
C Thoroughgood, B Tate, K Sawyer	2012	Relevant predictors of destructive leadership, CWB	Destructive leadership behaviors (all)	Unique antecedents		CWB	3 major studies (conceptual)	More research is needed for unique antecedents and outcomes for each form of destructive leadership. Existing constructs yield little data on relevant predictors but studies of CWB suggest distinct predictors of behaviors.	US
B Schyns, J Schilling	2013	Destructive leadership	Destructive leadership			Leader related concepts, job related concepts, organization related concepts, individual follower related concepts	200	The highest correlation arises between destructive leadership and attitudes towards the leader; The data suggests a clear negative impact from destructive leadership but more knowledge is needed on what triggers destructive leadership.	US
D Tourish	2013	Destructive leadership					Conceptual (Book)	There is a potential dark side to Transformational leadership because TL approaches can encourage narcissism, megalomania and poor decision making.	International Case-study
JD Mackey, BP Ellen III, WA Hochwarter	2013	Abusive leadership, performance, emotional exhaustion, job satisfaction	Abusive leadership	Social adaptability		Abusive leadership outcomes (e.g. performance, emotional exhaustion, job satisfaction)	254, 275 (used repeated measure over 60 days)	Adaptability moderates the negative relationship of emotional labor outcomes.	US
SD Dionne, A Gupta, KL Sotak, KA Shirreffs	2014	Trait theory, ethical leadership					800 (conceptual)	In conceptual articles for trait theory only 16% used levels of analysis. In empirical, only explicitly stated a level of analysis. It is determined that multilevel of analysis is low at 18%.	US
TWH Ng, DC Feldman	2015	Ethical leadership, destructive leadership outcomes	Ethical leadership			Deviant work behavior, emotional exhaustion, resistance behavior (destructive & (constructive outcomes)	101 articles published over the last 15 years (N=29,620)	Ethical leadership predicted task performance, citizenship behavior, and counterproductive work behavior after controlling for destructive and transformational leadership as well as contingent rewards. EL to job satisfaction (r=0.42), affective commitment (r=0.40), normative commitment (r=0.52), and organizational identification	US
K Rose, B Shuck, D Twyford	2015	Dysfunctional leadership	Low supervision, centralized decision making			Dysfunctional leadership	Conceptual	Defines dysfunctional leadership as placing burdensome structures in the path of progress, violating psychological contracts, and treat their employees with disrespectful.	US
Y Zhang, TC Bednall	2016	Abusive supervision anteceedents and moderators	Abusive supervision antecedents for supervisor, organizational, subordinate, and demographic.			Abusive supervision	74 articles (N=30,063)	Results yield predictable relationships across the four categories of abusive anteceedents: supervisor related organization relate, subordinate related, and demographic characteristics of supervisors and subordinates.	US

Table 4: Destructive Leadership Research and Correlate Foci (Continued)

Source	Year	Focus	Main Effect (Independent Variables)	Moderators	Mediators	Dependent Variables	Sample size	Key findings	Location
SL Kim, S Lee, S Yun	2016	COR, Abusive leadership	Abusive leadership	Learning goal orientation, self-enhancement motives		Knowledge sharing	245	Abused employees with depleted resources are likely to reduce their knowledge sharing. Low internal motivation and/or low resources for knowledge sharing will increase the negative effects of abusive supervision.	South Korea
S Pradhan, LK Jena	2016	Justice theory, social exchange theory, intension to quit	Abusive supervision	Neutralizers (e.g. positive affect, meaningful work, perceived co-worker support, emotional intelligence)		Intention to quit	Conceptual	Conceptually derives moderators for the relationship between abusive supervision and intention to quit.	India
S Pradhan, LK Jena	2017	Abusive supervision, intention to quit	Abusive supervision	meaningful work		Intention to quit	227	The result confirms that abusive supervision is strongly related to subordinates' intention to quit. Also, the study finds meaningful work to have a significant moderating effect on the relationship between abusive supervision and intention to quit.	India
BJ Tepper, L Simon, HM Park	2017	Antecedent based focus on causes of abusive supervision	Antecedents of abusive supervision (i.g social learning, identity threat, self regulation impairment)		Performance enhancing undermining pathways	Abusive supervision, performance	238 empirical studies, 59 antecedent papers, over last 15 years	Antecedents are a largely overlooked research agenda of abusive supervision. Identifies the need for theory-based study of traits as control variables prior to further studies of abusive supervision. Little research has examined abusive supervision within larger models of leadership behavior.	US
PD Harms, M Credé, M Tynan, M Leon, W Jeung	2017	Burnout, emotional exhaustion, abusive supervision	Type of leadership (i.g. LXM, AS, TL)			Emotional labor factors (e.g. stress, burnout, depression, emotional exhaustion, and PA)	12	Leader stress influences leader behavior, leadership behaviors and leader-follower relationships are predictors of stress and burnout for followers.	US
MB Nielsen, L Glasø, S Einarsen	2017	Region as a moderator, traits of individuals influencing harassment, workplace harassment	Five factor model of personality (FFM)	Geographic region, type of harassment		Harassment	101 cross-sectional effect sizes from 36 independent sample (N=13,896)	Harassment exposure's relationship to neuroticism (r=0.25), extraversion (r=—0.10), agreeableness (r=—0.17), and conscientiousness (r=—0.10. Harassment did not yield any statistically significant results related to openness.	Norway
GH Han, PD Harms, Y Bai	2017	Abusive supervision, sleep, exhaustion	Abusive supervision		emotional labor related outcomes (i.g. sleep, emotional exhaustion)	Employee creativity	222	Abusive supervision has a negative correlation to creativity due to sleep and emotional factors.	US
A Tuncdogan, OA Acar, D Stam	2017	Trait theory, multilevel outcomes, relationships	Leader and follower traits	trait activation, situation, situational strength, follower traits		leader behaviors, multilevel outcomes, follower effects	Conceptual	Outcomes must be added to research models. Moderators must be selected that emphasize follower traits relating to the leader traits and behaviors. effects of leader traits. Recommend investigating various leader traits and behaviors in under researched areas like background traits, goal orientation, and neurological characteristics, and leader behaviors other than just leadership styles.	UK

Table 4: Destructive Leadership Research and Correlate Foci (Continued)

Source	Year	Focus	Main Effect (Independent Variables)	Moderators	Mediators	Dependent Variables	Sample size	Key findings	Location
RA Shareef, T Atan	2018	Ethical leadership, turnover, motivation	Ethical leadership		Intrinsic motivation	OCBI/OCBO, intension to quit	351	Ethical leadership is positively correlated to OCB and negatively correlated to turnover intentions. Intrinsic motivation mediates the relationship between ethical leadership, OCB, and intention to quit.	IRAQ
H Arasli, BH Namin, AM Abubakar	2018	Employee performance, supervisor incivility	Polychronicity	Supervisor incivility		Job performance	262	The results suggest that polychronicity refers to employees' performance. Supervisor incivilities do not negatively and significantly influences job performance. Supervisor incivilities moderate the relationship between polychronicity and job performance.	Cyprus
A Rai, U Agarwal	2018	Abusive leadership, workplace bullying	Workplace bullying	Friendship	Defensive silence	Innovative work behavior, neglect	835	Workplace bullying is negatively related to innovation and positively related to neglect. Defensive silence mediates bullying outcomes and relationships are weaker with friendship as moderator.	India
W Choi, SL Kim, S Yun	2019	Abusive leadership, LXM, psychological fulfillment	Abusive supervision	psychological contract fulfillment, self enhancement motive		LXM, knowledge sharing	184	LXM mediates the abusive supervision and knowledge sharing relationship. This is contingent on the psychological contract fulfillment and self-enhancement motive.	South Korea
D Kobat-Farr, BM Walsh, AK McConagle	2019	Unethical leadership, uncivility, perceived work ability (PWA)	Abusive supervision	Grit		PWA	60, 218 (2 studies)	Hypothesis 1 (sample one) regarding main effect of supervisor incivility on PWA ($b=-0.23$, $p=0.001$). Hypothesis 2 (sample two) regarding moderating effects of grit job involvement yield no statistically significant results.	US
Y Brender-Ilan, Z Sheaffer	2019	Counterproductive work behavior (CWB), destructive leadership	Destructive leadership		Self-efficacy, autonomy, CWB	CWB	845	Autonomy and self-efficacy moderate and mediate the effect of destructive leadership on CWB. Narcissism strengthens efficacy's impact on CWB.	Israel

Table 4: Destructive Leadership Research and Correlate Foci (Continued)

Source	Year	Focus	Main Effect (Independent Variables)	Moderators	Mediators	Dependent Variables	Sample size	Key findings	Location
T Watkins, R Fehr, W He	2019	Abusive supervision	Instrumentality of beliefs	Empathetic concern	Abusive leadership	Abusive leadership, CWB	European (N=100), China (N=218)	Study's data suggest that abusive leaders sometimes abuse their employees for pro-organizational goals vice aggressing.	Europe, China
JY Mao, JTJ Chiang, L Chen, Y Wu	2019	Psychological safety, team performance, self-serving leadership	Leader competence	Leader's self serving behavior	Leader's self serving behavior	Team psychological safety, team performance	166 leaders, 514 followers	Leader self-serving behavior was an important factor in how subordinates perceive their leader. Leader competence and non self-serving behavior is positivity related to psychological safety and team performance.	China
NZA Khan, A Imran, A Anwar	2019	Destructive leadership, emotional exhaustion, job satisfaction	Destructive leadership		Emotional exhaustion, Stress	Job satisfaction	250	Destructive leadership to job satisfaction (r= -0.66), emotional exhaustion (r=0.509).	Pakistan
WL Gardner, KB Lowe, JD Meuser, F Noghani	2020	Leadership, theories, outcomes, future research	Destructive leadership				META (last 30 years of Leadership Quarterly)	Other approaches or new directions gained increased attention in the Leadership Quarterly's third decade (i.g. diversity (4.9%), emotions (4.7%), strategic (4.5%), and destructive leadership (4.1%), includes a including abusive supervision.	International, review of Leadership Quarterly
S Nauman, C Zheng, A Basit	2020	Despotic leadership, work withdraw	Despotic Leadership	QWL	Work withdraw	Job performance	195	Mediating effect between despotic leadership and performance is enhanced by the level of withdrawal behavior. Despotic leadership to job performance relationship via work withdrawal behavior is with a higher level of QWL.	Pakistan
V Peltokorpi, A Ramaswami	2021	COR theory, stressor-strain model, work and health-related outcomes, abusive supervision	Abusive supervision	Power distance orientation	Job satisfaction	Mental health, physical health	603	Indirect effect of abusive supervision on physical health via job satisfaction was weaker (b=0.09) when power distance orientation was lower. The effect was stronger (b=0.16) at 95% confidence interval when power distance orientation is high. Also, the indirect effect of abusive supervision on mental health via job satisfaction was weak (b=0.29). When power distance orientation was low, the indirect effect was strong (b=0.49).	Japan

Destructive Leadership Theoretical Frameworks

This literature review expands upon the fact that the study of destructive leadership phenomena is developing in contemporary journals and still needs unified and unique theoretical constructs and models. Many destructive leadership researchers study "alleged" outcomes of evaluations of DLBs without an established theoretical framework (Tepper, 2007) and without acknowledging the previously mentioned simultaneity problem. Alternatively, researchers focus on the *'what'* instead of the *'why'* and *'how.'* In recently published literature, I have found some preexisting and established theoretical perspectives used to link evaluations of DLBs with correlates.

Conservation of Resource (COR) Approach

A firm's growth and success are related to effectively disseminating information and educating its employees. Knowledge sharing is vital to a constructive relationship between employees, colleagues, and supervisors. In their article, Kim et al. (2016) stated that abused employees with depleted resources (e.g., emotional, informational) will likely reduce their knowledge sharing. Moreover, low internal motivation and knowledge-sharing resources will increase the adverse effects of abusive supervision (Kim et al. 2016).

Peltokorpi and Ramaswami's (2021) empirical study on abusive supervision and physical and mental health demonstrated similar findings. Their article used abusive supervision, COR, and stressor-strain models of work and health-related outcomes of abusive supervision. The article theorized that job satisfaction mediated abusive supervision and the subordinates' physical and mental health. The results are that job satisfaction was weaker (b=0.09) when power distance orientation was lower. The effect was substantial (b=0.16) when the power distance orientation was high. Also, the indirect effect of abusive supervision on mental health via job

satisfaction was weak (b=0.29). Lastly, the indirect effect was strong when power distance orientation was low (b=0.49) (Peltokorpi & Ramaswami, 2021).

Cognitive Theory Approach

Shareef and Atan's (2019) article analyzed the gap in existing literature between intrinsic motivation mediators, leadership, and intent to quit using cognitive evaluation theory (CET). They studied the relationships between the levels of ethical leadership, subordinate organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and intention to quit. The study investigated the mediating role of intrinsic motivation on leadership and OCB (Shareef & Atan, 2019). Shareef and Atan (2019) determined that ethical leadership level positively correlates to OCB and negatively correlates to the intention to quit (Shareef & Atan, 2019).

Identity (Trait Theory) Approach

Dionne et al. (2014) reviewed 800 articles relating to abusive supervision, trait theories, and their level of analysis—only 16% used levels of analysis in conceptual articles for trait theory. Empirical articles comprised 63% of the review, with only 18% explicitly stating a level of analysis. Therefore, the literature review suggested that multilevel analysis is low regarding abusive supervision and trait theory (Dionne et al., 2014). In the literature review, trait theory pertained more to the *'why'* and *'how'* of destructive leadership. For example, traits can be more helpful in explaining what psychological motivators like threat identification, social learning, and self-regulation impairment are responsible for the antecedents of destructive leadership (Tepper et al., 2017). Moreover, theoretical antecedents are primarily overlooked in research on abusive supervision. Tepper et al. (2017) identified the need for a theory-based study of traits as control variables prior to further studies of abusive supervision and that little research has

examined abusive supervision within larger models of leadership behavior (Tepper, Simon, et al. 2017).

For example, Tuncdogan et al. (2017) recommend investigating various leader traits and behaviors in under-researched areas like background traits, goal orientation, neurological characteristics, and leader behaviors other than just leadership styles (Tuncdogan et al., 2017). Similarly, Tuncdogan et al. (2017) recommended adding new measurement outcomes to the research models. Moderators should be selected to emphasize follower traits relating to the abusive leader's traits and behaviors. Lastly, Nielsen et al. (2017) built off the Tuncdogan et al. (2017) article with empirical studies on the relationship of harassment exposure to neuroticism. The study results yielded the following significant relationship of harassment exposure to neuroticism ($r=0.25$), extraversion ($r= -0.10$), agreeableness ($r= -0.17$), and conscientiousness ($r= -0.10$). Moreover, harassment yielded no statistically significant results related to openness (Nielsen et al., 2017). Nielsen et al. (2017) reported these smaller effect sizes as significant, likely due to the large sample size of 13,896.

Exchange Theory Approach

Han et al. (2017) stated that many articles on abusive supervision use reactance or social exchange theory to link abuse to outcomes (Han et al., 2017). Pradhan and Jena (2016) conceptually derived new moderators for the relationship between abusive supervision and intention to quit via social exchange theory. They conceptually suggested a correlation between abusive supervision and a follower's intention to quit. Also, the article suggested that meaningful work may moderate the relationship between abusive supervision and the intention to quit (Pradhan & Jena, 2016; Pradhan & Jena, 2017). Importantly, these methods suggested some significant limitations from the standard method since finding our job meaningful or liking the

leader implies some correlation. Regardless, the intention to quit is a common destructive leadership outcome studied, also labeled as voluntary turnover, attrition, and leaving the job (Tepper et al., 2001; Reina et al., 2018).

Harms et al. (2017) suggested that leader stress influences their behavior. Moreover, leadership behaviors and leader-follower relationships predict stress and burnout for followers. Harms et al. (2017) set a leader-centered perspective on the antecedents of destructive leadership (Harms et al., 2017). Lastly, according to Choi et al. (2019), LMX mediates abusive supervision and knowledge-sharing relationships. This relationship is contingent on fulfilling the psychological contract and the motive for self-enhancement (Choi et al., 2019).

Reversing-the-Lens-Theory

A majority of the destructive leadership literature is leader-centric. In other words, the research has gravitated more toward how destructive leaders impact their followers, teams, and organizations. However, the measures and mechanisms in which followers drive leader behavior, perceptions, and leadership evaluations account for much less available literature (Shamir, 2007; Zhang & Bednall, 2016; Wang et al., 2019; Mackey et al., 2021). This potential gap was a noted research limitation for Shamir (2007), who highlighted existing leadership theory with his seminal work that rebranded followers from passive recipients to active co-producers (Shamir, 2007).

Moreover, Shamir's research helped pave the way for more recent follower-centric research that incorporates follower differences (e.g., demographic, psychological, tenure) as antecedents and to destructive leadership and its constructs (Zhang & Bednall, 2016; Wang et al., 2019; Mackey et al., 2021). Lastly, it is essential to note that many destructive leadership constructs like abusive supervision are well-established measures that are scoped based on the

follower's ratings of the leader (Tepper, 2000). Therefore, it logically follows that measuring outcomes based on the level of abusive supervision must consider follower differences in these destructive leadership ratings.

Shamir pointed to many potential mechanisms for reversing the lens theory, all based on different leader-follower perspectives versus a unified model. Firstly, followers are recipients of leadership, considering that a leader's behavior affects follower attitudes and behaviors. Second, followers are moderators of leadership, which considers follower traits. Third, followers are substitutes for leadership, which considers conditions that lower the need for leadership based on follower development (i.e., training, knowledge, job tenure). Fourth, followers are constructors of leadership, which considers leadership constructed by followers via CET or LMX. Lastly, followers as leaders consider shared leadership (Shamir, 2007).

Correlates of Evaluations of DLBs

Leader Individual Differences

For clarification, potential correlates in this context are leader and follower individual differences related to evaluations of DLBs. These could include perceptions, psychological differences, certain behaviors, and demographic variables. For example, several correlates of DLB evaluations have been identified, including leader narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Furthermore, one of the critical characteristics of destructive leadership is that it involves a power imbalance between the leader and followers. Leaders who engage in destructive behavior abuse their power to control and manipulate others.

Moreover, they may be motivated by personal gains such as financial or status benefits. Another characteristic is that destructive leaders often have a narcissistic personality associated with grandiosity, entitlement, and a lack of empathy. These characteristics enable destructive

leaders to justify their harmful behaviors and deflect blame onto others. Other correlates include organizational factors such as toxic work environments and poor leadership culture (Einarsen & Nielsen, 2015). However, my review suggests a gap regarding how leader traits and characteristics can influence the perception and emergence of destructive leadership behavior.

Tepper et al. (2017) discussed some correlates as overlooked and identified the need for a theory-based study of leader traits as control variables. Moreover, Tepper et al. (2017) recommended completing this before additional research into abusive supervision. Lastly, Tepper et al. (2017) stated that little research has examined abusive supervision within larger models of leadership behavior (Tepper et al., 2017). This article is comparable to the Thoroughgood et al. (2012) article, which stated the need for more research on unique antecedents and outcomes for each form of destructive leadership. (Thoroughgood et al., 2012).

RQ1a: What is the magnitude of relationship between a leader's individual differences (e.g., personality, attitudes, gender, age) and the followers' evaluations of destructive leadership?

RQ1b: Which leader's individual differences are more important in predicting the followers' evaluations of destructive leadership?

RQ1c: To what extent do various leaders' individual differences add incremental predictive validity in the followers' evaluations of destructive leadership?

Follower's Big Five Personality Factors

McCrae and Costa (1999) authored the Five-Factor Theory of Personality (FFM), which compartmentalizes an individual's personality into agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, and openness to experience (McCrae & Costa, 1999). The applied psychology literature applies the FFM to countless practical areas and academic disciplines. For

example, Judge and Bono (2000) hypothesized and tested that the FFM is a predictor of transformational leadership, with the results suggesting that Extraversion and Agreeableness positively predicted transformational leadership (Judge & Bono, 2000). Similarly, this methodology and empirical research applies to other forms of both constructive and destructive leadership (Wang et al., 2019). For example, Nielsen et al. (2017) published a primary meta-analysis, one level of analysis higher than pure leadership, to better understand the exposure to workplace harassment and the Five-Factor Model of personality (Nielsen et al., 2017). From the literature review, I have seen that neuroticism is a crucial area of research, with the literature suggesting that followers with high neuroticism were more likely to perceive their leaders' behaviors as negative and harmful, while those with high agreeableness were more likely to overlook negative behaviors in favor of maintaining positive relationships (Tepper, 2009: Nielsen et al., 2017; Schyns & Schilling, 2013).

Core Self-evaluation (CSE)

CSE is a theory that differs from the personality dimensions of FFM and includes self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional Stability. Moreover, Judge et al. (1997) suggested that these CSE measures are central, foundational evaluations that individuals believe about themselves and those external to themselves. One of the vital theoretical beliefs is that CSE subconsciously influences an individual's assessment of themselves and those around them (Judge et al., 1997). Moreover, the data suggested that CSE is a significant predictor of cognitive and emotionally driven behaviors across stimuli in the workplace (Mackey et al., 2017). Therefore, CSE may be an essential correlate of evaluations of DLBs.

Dark Triad Traits

Machiavellianism, subclinical narcissism, and subclinical psychopathy encompass the three negatively connotated non-pathological personalities (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Paulhus and Williams (2002) examined the contention that this "Dark Triad" is highly correlated with one another, whereby their data suggested that these factors were inter-correlated but not equal (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Also necessary for this study are Paulhus and Williams (2002), who studied the Dark Triad and their relationship to the FFM. Of significance, their study suggested that the most common correlate is disagreeableness with other distinct relationships between each Dark Triad personality. For example, subclinical psychopaths demonstrated low neuroticism. Machiavellians and psychopaths demonstrated low conscientiousness. Narcissism positively correlated with cognitive ability (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Furnham et al. (2013) built on the Dark Triad body of knowledge with their review encompassing ten years of research post the Paulhus and Williams (2002) article whereby they dedicated substantial review building on their relationship to both the FFM and Six Factor Models (Furnham et al., 2013).

In the destructive leadership literature context, a few studies measured follower and leader Dark Triad personalities against outcomes and follower evaluations of DLBs. Mackey et al. (2021) measured the followers' personalities against their perceptions of destructive leadership behaviors like abusive supervision in their primary meta-analysis. The results suggested that follower Narcissism was positively correlated with increased evaluations of DLBs (Mackey et al., 2021).

Moral Identity Theory

Moral Identity theory significantly advanced with Blasi's (1984) research regarding moral identity and its role in moral functioning (Blasi, 1984; Blasi, 1985). Therefore, this

follower difference will profoundly affect how followers perceive and rate their leaders and, ultimately, the scope of the destructive leadership construct in question. From Blasi's (1984) exemplar work on moral identity, we learned of the proposed self-model of moral functioning that seeks to explain the effects of an individual's judgment of their obligation to perform a moral action and their desire for self-consistency on moral action (Blasi, 1984; Blasi, 1985). Additionally, Blasi proposed that two aspects construct an individual identity - objective identity content and subjective identity experience (Blasi, 1984; Blasi, 1985). Ultimately, Blasi's (1984) moral identity as a follower difference is an interesting follower-centric antecedent whereby the literature suggested that the follower's subjective identity yearns for more self-consistency with time.

Psychological Differences

Psychological capital (PsyCap) and positive and negative affect are additional follower individual differences that need special consideration. Luthans and Youssef (2004) made their contribution to the psychological capital literature by viewing it through the lens of human and social capital in order to understand better the theory and its associated measure in the framework of individual development and a business's sustained competitive advantage (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). Psychological capital is further decomposed into four perceptions or distinct differences: optimism, self-efficacy, hope, and resilience (Luthans & Youssef, 2004; Wang et al., 2019; Mackey et al., 2021). Therefore, it is clear to see the relationship between PsyCap and positive affect via hope and optimism. Moreover, the literature suggested that PsyCap and positive affect are inversely correlated with destructive leadership constructs like evaluations of abusive supervision, while there is a correlation between negative affect and these same constructs (Zhang & Bednall, 2016; Mackey et al., 2017).

Follower Demographic Information

Demographic information in the destructive leadership literature includes age, education, tenure, gender (or sex), position, and marital status. Moreover, these variables are typically control variables more frequently than main effects. Wang et al. (2019) fostered a clever means to take these demographic measures and correlate them to followers' evaluations of abusive supervision with a primary meta-analysis (Wang et al., 2019). McCord et al. (2018) took Wang et al.'s approach a step further by focusing exclusively on gender and adding race, as well as broadening out the scope of the resource to include all workplace mistreatment, including supervisor-lead abusive supervision (McCord et al., 2018).

As discussed previously, any follower difference is a potential source of variance. Therefore, future research should further study demographics due to potential variance from stereotypes, subordinate gender roles, and bias or subjective evaluations of follower work tasks (Banks et al., 2021). The same thoughts apply to race, age, and other stereotypes. Moreover, these demographic differences could manifest as FFM-contributed variance due to gender. All possibilities are essential to consider for the scope of this review.

Follower's Attitudes and Perceptions

Mackey et al. (2021) compiled the most extensive list of attitudes and perceptions in a meta-analysis that included a broad scope of measures. The literature suggested that burnout, psychologically driven emotions (i.e., anger, anxiety, depression, frustration), job perceptions (i.e., insecurity, satisfaction, tension), and justice have the highest main effect correlations to destructive leadership scales, perceptions, and leader evaluations (Schyns & Schilling, 2013; Mackey et al., 2021).

Fear. Mackey et al. (2021) found that fear was a prominent follower attitude associated with evaluations of DLBs. Other studies also discovered that employees who experienced abusive supervision or destructive leadership exhibited higher fear toward their leaders. Followers reported reacting in various ways, including heightened anxiety, reluctance to voice concerns, and a general sense of unease in the work environment. This finding underscores the detrimental impact of destructive leadership on followers' psychological well-being and workplace morale (Mackey et al., 2013; Mackey et al., 2017; Mackey et al., 2019; Ng & Feldman, 2015).

Intent to Quit. Voluntary turnover intention is one of the most prevalent correlates of this literature review. This variable practically provides the abusive leadership phenomenon with immediate implications for human resource management practices and policies (Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al., 2001; Schyns & Schilling, 2013; Pradhan & Jena, 2017; Tepper et al., 2017; Reina et al., 2018). Reina et al. (2018) measured one of the most significant relationships relating to supervisor behavior, stress, and emotional engagement. However, this can only link abusive leadership indirectly as the measurement is for the direct relationship between emotional job engagement and voluntary turnover (Reina et al., 2018). Additionally, I note additional research limitations with this study as it measured a follower's attitude to their leader and their stress, which suggests a level of redundancy or a global construct.

Commitment. Additionally, Schyns and Schillings (2013) highlighted the significant relation of DLB evaluations with reported follower commitment. Their research demonstrated that employees who reported higher evaluations of DLBs were likelier to report lower organizational commitment. Furthermore, their research characterized decreased commitment by

a diminished sense of loyalty, a reduced willingness to go above and beyond their job requirements, and a higher likelihood of considering alternative employment options.

They perceived Organizational Support. Moreover, perceived organizational support emerged as another crucial follower attitude correlated with evaluations of DLBs (Tepper et al., 2001; Mackey et al., 2021). The study revealed that employees who experienced abusive supervision or destructive leadership reported lower perceived support from their organizations. This lack of perceived support was associated with feelings of isolation, a diminished sense of belonging, and a decreased belief that the organization valued their contributions. These findings emphasized the need for organizations to address DLBs to maintain a supportive work environment that nurtures employee well-being and engagement (Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al., 2001).

Work-Family Conflict. Work-family conflict was also identified as a significant follower attitude correlated with evaluations of DLBs (Mackey et al., 2021). The research indicated that employees subjected to abusive supervision or destructive leadership were more likely to experience higher levels of conflict between their work and family responsibilities. This conflict manifested in challenges such as difficulty balancing work and family commitments, increased stress levels, and a sense of neglect towards personal life. These findings underscore the broader impact of destructive leadership on followers' overall quality of life and highlight the need for organizations to promote leadership practices that facilitate work-life integration.

Trust. Lastly, trust in the leader was identified as a critical follower attitude correlated with evaluations of DLBs (Mackey et al., 2021). It could serve as an antecedent to such evaluations or an outcome of enacted DLBs. Research has suggested that employees who reported experiencing DLBs exhibited lower trust in their leaders. The literature characterizes

diminished trust as skepticism, reluctance to rely on leader guidance, and heightened uncertainty regarding leadership decisions. These findings highlight the pivotal role of trust in leader-follower relationships and underscore the importance of cultivating positive leadership behaviors to foster trust and confidence among followers (Mackey et al., 2019; Tepper, 2007; Mao et al., 2019).

Counterproductive Work Behavior. Thoroughgood et al. (2012) also discussed that existing destructive leadership constructs yield little data on relevant predictors. However, the article stated that CWB studies suggest distinct behavior predictors (Thoroughgood et al., 2012). Therefore, CWB may be an excellent place to look for measurable antecedents and outcome behaviors of DLBs when formulating a model.

Brender-Ilan and Sheaffer (2019) discussed in their study that autonomy and self-efficacy moderate and mediate the effect of destructive leadership on CWB. Moreover, narcissism strengthens efficacy's impact on CWB. (Brender-Ilan & Sheaffer, 2019). This idea allows studying several psychological traits or behavior moderators to study destructive leadership emergence.

The Role of Follower Traits in Evaluations of Destructive Leadership

Many studies investigated the relationship between follower traits and evaluations of DLBs, suggesting that followers' traits and characteristics affect reactions to DLBs or may result in being the target of destructive leaders, as previously discussed. Additional research shows that neuroticism, emotional Stability, and self-esteem affect followers' evaluations of abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000). Moreover, neurotic followers are more likely to evaluate abusive supervision, while emotionally stable followers are less likely to evaluate a leader as abusive. A critical caveat here is that it is unclear if those less emotionally stable individuals are more likely

to be the target of destructive leaders. In addition, followers with high self-esteem are less likely to evaluate abusive supervision as threatening. Conversely, those with low self-esteem are more likely to evaluate abusive supervision as threatening (Tepper, 2000). The same caveats apply here regarding followers being targeted by leaders.

Furthermore, Tepper et al. (2009) found that followers with high neuroticism were more likely to evaluate their leaders' behaviors as negative and harmful, while those with high agreeableness were more likely to overlook negative behaviors in favor of maintaining positive relationships. Similarly, Spector et al. (2001) found that followers with an internal locus of control were less likely to experience adverse outcomes from abusive supervision than those with an external locus of control (Spector et al., 2001). Additionally, Petrides (2011) found that followers with high emotional intelligence were likelier to evaluate their leaders' behaviors as positive and supportive (Petrides, 2011). Schyns and Schilling (2013) found that employees with low emotional Stability and high neuroticism were likelier to evaluate their leaders as abusive.

Schaubroeck et al.'s (2018) study found that followers' self-efficacy and proactive personality traits moderated the relationship between abusive supervision and followers' well-being. Specifically, followers with elevated levels of self-efficacy and proactive personality traits were less likely to experience adverse outcomes when working under an abusive leader than those with low levels of these traits (Schaubroeck et al., 2018). Lastly, Wu et al. (2018) found that followers' social support and coping strategies could buffer the harmful effects of destructive leadership. Followers with high social support and effective coping strategies were less likely to experience job strain and lower job satisfaction when working under a destructive leader.

RQ 2a: To what extent are followers' individual differences associated with their evaluations of destructive leadership?

RQ 2b: Which followers' individual differences are more important in predicting their evaluations of destructive leadership?

RQ2c: To what extent do various followers' individual differences add incremental predictive validity in understanding evaluations of destructive leadership?

Destructive Leadership and Positively Valenced Leadership

In my review of the destructive leadership literature, I found limited direct studies linking destructive leadership constructs (e.g., abusive supervision, despotic leadership, dysfunctional leadership) to existing constructive leadership theories (e.g., ethical leadership, transformational leadership, authentic leadership). Value could be gained in a nomological model using the various leadership constructs as correlates. This construct development is similar to the development of the ethical, transformational, and authentic leadership theories, whereby researchers have highly studied in terms of one another and their outcomes (Zhang & Bednall, 2016; Mackey et al., 2017).

For example, many leadership scholars have developed and tested several antecedents and outcomes of constructive leadership theories since the 1970s, looking at the same questions as destructive leadership scholars, like predictability, satisfaction, active commitment, and extra effort (Peus et al., 2012). Moreover, Shamir et al. have already formed a valuable model for hypothesis testing motivational antecedents and the direct relationship between self-concepts and effects (e.g., burnout, stress, and intention to quit). (Shamir et al., 1993). Leadership theorists should study destructive leadership models in the context of preexisting constructive models to determine if the phenomenon is a different theory or a lower (or opposite) magnitude of measurement on the continuum of ethical, authentic, and transformational leadership.

RQ3: What is the nomological network of correlates with evaluations of destructive

leadership?

Summary

The literature on destructive leadership is replete with primary meta-analytic investigations, delving into the multifaceted dimensions of this critical domain. Over the past decade, these primary studies have naturally evolved to encompass followers' perspectives, considering their assessments of leaders. However, it is worth acknowledging that the findings arising from these primary studies, which serve as the foundation for those mentioned primary meta-analytic syntheses, may occasionally present conflicting results. Consequently, an increasing need arises for a secondary meta-analytic exploration that spans various antecedents, including follower traits and distinctive conceptualizations of destructive leadership. This exploration also extends into the realm of well-established outcomes associated with destructive leadership, explicitly focusing on negative behaviors displayed by followers.

Numerous scholars have emphasized the pervasive nature of destructive leadership, contending that it is as prevalent in the workplace as constructive leadership (Starratt & Grandy, 2010). The prevalence of this pressing issue, coupled with the insights gleaned from this comprehensive literature review, underscores the imperative need to explore this phenomenon and its underlying causes to devise potential strategies to address potential DLBs in the workplace (Tepper et al., 2017). Furthermore, future scholars are encouraged to focus on emerging traits and behaviors of leaders *and* followers as precursors, laying the groundwork for theoretical advancement.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Second-order meta-analysis (SOMA) is a statistical methodology that leverages prior meta-analytical findings as data to conduct a higher-level analysis, amalgamating results from primary meta-analyses (Hedges & Olkin, 1985). This approach seeks to comprehensively understand a specific phenomenon's impacts by synthesizing and scrutinizing outcomes from multiple primary meta-analyses. SOMA facilitates the identification of prevailing themes and patterns in the literature and allows for examining the moderating effects of various factors. Additionally, SOMA enables a comprehensive investigation of the variance attributed to follower traits or characteristics in their perceptions of destructive leadership and the outcomes of DLBs.

Systematic Search Strategy

The foundation of this meta-analytic approach lies in a meticulously conducted systematic search. This initial phase is crucial for identifying pertinent articles and data, forming the basis for subsequent analyses. Adhering to established standards in meta-analytical research (Hedges & Olkin, 1985; Banks et al., 2018; Woznyj et al., 2022), I meticulously comb through several electronic databases: Web of Science, PsycINFO, Google Scholar, ABI/INFORM, and the UNC Library, aided by Harzing's Publish or Parish software. My search terms encompass "destructive leadership," "follower perceptions," "follower traits," "follower characteristics," and "meta-analysis." Additionally, I diligently scrutinized the reference lists of identified studies for relevant supplementary sources. For example, to name a few, I examine Schyns & Schilling (2013), Mackey et al. (2017), Mackey et al. (2019), Mackey et al. (2021), Fosse et al. (2019), Palmer et al. (2021), Zhang & Liao (2015), Zhang & Bednall (2016), Zhang et al. (2019), Eagly

et al. (2003), Park et al. (2015), Liu et al. (2023), Lai et al. (2020), Wang et al. (2012), Wang et al. (2019), Hongqing & Jisheng (2018), and Taylor et al. (2019).

I embarked on a comprehensive literature search focusing on destructive leadership to refine my selection of primary meta-analyses. Firstly, a meticulous Google Scholar Advanced Search is performed with the criteria "Meta-analysis" OR "Meta-analytic" in all titles related to "destructive leadership" without imposing any temporal constraints. This specific criterion holds significance, aligning with the American Psychological Association's (APA) stipulation that articles in the social and natural sciences must include "meta-analysis" or "meta-analytic" in their title and abstract. This criterion ensures inclusivity, assuming articles in reputable journals comply with this APA requirement. This initial search yielded five articles, all of which I retained following a thorough review of titles and abstracts based on follower perceptions aligned with the Reversing-the-Lens Theory approach for follower perceptions of DLBs.

Subsequently, I broadened the search criteria to include other significant constructs associated with destructive leadership, as identified in my literature review. This expanded search encompasses the terms "Abusive Supervision," "Unethical leadership," "Tyrannical leadership," "Coercive power," "Unsupportive Managerial Behaviors," "Despotic leadership," and "Laissez Faire Leadership." As anticipated, this broadened search yielded 12 articles retained after a detailed review of titles and abstracts.

Finally, I extend the search to encompass the remaining extensively researched constructs within destructive leadership, maximizing the available search text characters. This additional Google Scholar search included the terms "Dysfunctional Leadership," "Supervisor Incivility," and "Incompetent Leadership." However, this additional search yields no additional articles. I

conducted forward and backward reference searches in Google Scholar to ensure thoroughness, yet I unearthed no further articles.

I then replicate the previously employed search criteria across alternate databases alongside Google Scholar: ABI/INFORM, ProQuest, and PsycINFO. The search in PsycINFO returned 215 articles, each meticulously reviewed and narrowed down based on title and article description. Regrettably, no additional new articles were deemed relevant. In Web of Science, I retrieved nine articles, each subject to rigorous scrutiny based on title and description, yielding no additional inclusions. However, a reverse citation search in Web of Science reveals seven supplementary articles. Lastly, in ABI/INFORM, eight articles are obtained, each carefully reviewed and narrowed down based on title and description, with no further inclusions. I conduct these additional searches to comprehensively populate the second-order meta-analytic correlation matrix. In total, 256 articles were screened, and 30 were retained for inclusion.

Inclusion Criteria

For inclusion in this second-order meta-analysis (SOMA), studies must meet several criteria. Firstly, the article had to address one of the constructs of destructive leadership (Mackey et al., 2021). I emphasized locating articles focusing on followers' perceptions of destructive leadership as antecedents to address the nomological network. Secondly, I considered only primary meta-analyses published in peer-reviewed journals, regardless of publication date. Third, each article had to employ quantitative measures for assessing follower traits or characteristics, outcomes, and correlates. Fourth, primary meta-analysis, involving multilevel modeling for data analysis, had to be the chosen research method. Finally, each article was required to furnish effect sizes, confidence intervals, and sample sizes.

Coding Procedure

I categorized primary meta-analyses investigating destructive leadership into follower perspectives, correlates, outcomes, and destructive leadership constructs. I extract the following information from each of the identified primary meta-analyses: author(s), publication year, journal, sample size, sample type, research methodology, measures utilized to assess follower traits or characteristics, type of destructive leadership behavior, effect sizes, confidence intervals, and statistical significance. All extracted data is subjected to SOMA analysis to estimate the overall effect size of the relationship between follower traits and perceptions of destructive leadership, correlations between DLBs, and outcomes.

Data Analysis

Bivariate Correlations

I constructed a meta-analytic correlation matrix to compare each coded bivariate correlation. I generate these matrices based on estimates from the largest sample sizes, leveraging SOMA's capacity to reduce random sampling error. I repeat this process for antecedents, correlates, outcomes, and destructive leadership constructs.

The goal is to establish a comprehensive meta-analytic correlation matrix encompassing every antecedent (e.g., stable traits, demographics, behaviors), correlates (e.g., constructive leadership, destructive leadership), and outcomes (e.g., behaviors, psychological), with a specific focus on followers' perceptions or evaluations of destructive leadership and its constructs. When a variable estimate is available from more than one study ($k > 1$), the primary meta-analysis with the larger sample size is selected to minimize potential overlapping samples and mitigate potential study limitations. In order to support the additional analyses (i.e., relative weights, predictive incremental validity) and for the completion of holistic data collection, values are

determined via additional systematic searches for those correlates (e.g., demographics, FFM, other personality traits). Lastly, any additional blanks for correlation matrix gaps are completed with the MetaBus.org tool (Bosco, 2024) via the taxonomy function, which specifies specific numerical codes for that correlation. This MetaBus.org tool is primarily used with demographics (e.g., gender, race, age, tenure).

Relative Weights Analysis

I conduct additional SOMA analyses to assess the relative importance of various identified antecedents of destructive leadership. This analysis will determine which traits, such as those within the Five-Factor Model (FFM) and demographic variables, hold greater predictive significance regarding followers' perceptions of destructive leadership. This technique, well-established in the meta-analytic methodology literature (Banks et al., 2016), utilizes the Tonidandel & LeBreton (2011) epsilon weight technique, with weights cross-verified using ratio calculations (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011). Additionally, I use the statistical software IBM SPSS Statistics (SPSS) Version 28.0.1.1 to run various regression analyses on selected correlates for follower individual differences as specified in Research Questions 1 & 2. This regression analysis in SPSS aims to analyze the Adjusted R Square values, coefficients, and their significance to perform incremental predictive validity across each correlate or model.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

This chapter delves into the comprehensive analysis of the study's findings. Firstly, I elucidate the meticulous meta-analytic procedures employed to construct the correlation matrix, facilitating the examination of the interplay between critical demographics (i.e., gender, race, age), personality traits, and various dimensions of leadership, including destructive and positively valenced leadership forms. Secondly, I thoroughly evaluate each research question posited in Chapter Two, offering insights into their implications and significance within the broader context of the study.

Thirdly, I undertake a comparative analysis, juxtaposing these findings with the established relationships among the Big Five personality traits—openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability, Dark Triad (e.g., narcissism), and other critical individual follower differences (e.g., affect, anger, psychological capital, CSE, self-esteem), and critical DLB outcomes (e.g., work engagement, performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and more). Next, I employ a relative weights analysis to discern the varying degrees of importance attributed to critical demographics and personality factors in predicting their associations with distinct destructive leadership constructs. Lastly, I use incremental predictive validity for the leader and follower individual differences to analyze for improvements in the model's adjusted R squared and Beta coefficients for eleven unique variables of follower differences.

Meta-Analytic Procedures

I create numerous second-order meta-analytic correlation matrices generated from meta-analytic estimates described in Chapter Three from prior primary meta-analyses to evaluate research questions 1 - 3 and their subparts (Landis, 2013). Of the 256 articles from the systematic

search, I retained 30 articles for the initial inclusion of the SOMA effect size estimates in the correlation matrices for follower and leader individual differences and leadership construct correlates and potential outcomes of DLB. Although I successfully coded over 37 follower differences, 68 DLB outcomes, and five destructive leadership constructs as correlates, many missing correlates were primarily tied to outcome relationships, demographics, and personality measures. These missing correlates were initially substantial, with over 70% of the meta-analytic correlation matrices bank. Moreover, the selection process prioritized meta-analytic estimates with the largest sample sizes to mitigate random sampling errors.

A primary study exploration addressed gaps in existing research, particularly individual follower and leader differences and their relationship with evaluations of DLBs. This analysis combined systematic searches with examining primary study findings, enhancing our analysis's robustness. In order to accommodate these missing values or gaps associated with the correlation matrices, I started with the relationship between the personality traits, diving straight into the Five Factor Model measures and demographics (e.g., gender, race, age, tenure) of both the leader and follower (Zhang & Bednall, 2016). I emphasized these gaps in an incrementally strategic manner to add to my initial systematic search finding some essential literature on the relationships between personality, demographic, and behavioral individual differences, including Anglim et al. (2020), O'Boyle et al. (2015), Park et al. (2020), Parks-Leduc et al. (2015), and Schmitt et al. (19932008). Moreover, I took a similar approach to the leadership and outcome meta-analytic matrices, incorporating Banks et al. (2018) on the leadership gaps and Harrison et al. (2006) on job attitudes and other DLB outcomes. The methodological description is a slight oversimplification of the work that undertakes the process; for example, over 30 additional primary meta-analyses were searched with ten additional meta-analyses retained, selected, and

then reviewed for applicability to solve for the gaps in the second-order meta-analytic correlation matrices, which, in essence, was equivalent of undertaking an additional systematic search per research question. These initially blank correlation matrix correlates were between personality factors, demographics, and attitudes. I largely mitigated the missing correlates with the ten additional articles. I utilized MetaBus.org-derived meta-analytic effect size estimates for the remainder, thus generating additional second-order meta-analytic effect sizes outside of the destructive leadership literature on individual differences.

After the initial coding and systematic search, a few completed matrix correlations include FFM to gender, narcissism to affect, Psychological Capital to CSE, and others essential to the organizational behavior and applied psychology literature, thus greatly adding to this dissertation's contributions beyond destructive leadership literature. Of note, the relationship between those correlates, such as individual differences or outcomes, is a different area of study in the literature to include applied psychology and areas of organizational behaviors outside the scope of the leadership literature (e.g., FFM, CSE, demographics). Therefore, the blanks in the meta-analytic correlation matrices between follower and leader differences logically follow given the breadth of the research questions and particular focus on destructive leadership vice personality, demographic, behavioral, and follower and organization outcomes interdependencies or correlations (Mackey et al., 2021). Furthermore, the gap between outcomes and other individual behavior correlates to DLBs was also an expected result due to the destructive leadership literature treating DLBs as a dependent variable with specific outcomes (e.g., Job Performance) as the independent variable or, conversely and less studied, treating follower and leader differences as the dependent variable with DLBs as the independent variable (Tepper, 2000; Wang et al., 2019)

However, the relationship between DLBs needs to be studied more, as reflected in the substantial number of blanks in the correlation matrices of the leadership constructures. Moreover, this is compound by the literature using mainly abusive supervision measures when describing DLBs in the primary meta-analyses leading to a relative abundance of AS versus other DLBs (Zhang & Bednall, 2016; Wang et al., 2019; Mackey et al., 2021). Ultimately, I use this discovery in Chapter 5 to highlight opportunities for future research.

In summary, the results of the systematic search iteration resulted in comprehensive matrices comprising ***184 meta-analytic estimates (total k = 10,818 & total sample size n = 2,384,935)***, not including any Metabus.org derived meta-analytic estimates, that were coded from the initial systematic search yield of 256 articles, plus a total of 10 additional first-order and second-order meta-analyses to complete the missing correlates in the matrices for leader and follower individual differences with the majority of blanks mitigated allowing for a 13-factor model for individual follower differences in RQ2.

Test of Research Question 1 - Individual Leadership Differences

Leader Individual Differences as Correlates Generating Effect Sizes with Correlation Matrix Analysis (RQ1a)

A second-order meta-analytic correlation matrix was used to answer RQ1a. Interestingly, individual leader differences were the fewest in the total SOMA correlate estimates revealed due to a lack of data from the list of the associated references populated by the systematic search. Moreover, most information focused on demographic characteristics (Mackey et al., 2017; Mackey et al., 2021). The data suggest that Leader Gender has the highest main effect or correlation to destructive leadership with r = - 0.06 (k = 35; n = 7,561). However, we cannot underscore the importance of Leader Age and Leader Tenure in the Organization with weaker

correlation values but a decently sized sample size (n), increasing the measures' power. These effect sizes are low enough to suggest no significance in their relationship to the followers' evaluation of destructive leadership due to the confidence interval. Table 5 summarizes our findings in support of RQ1a.

Table 5: Effect Sizes Between Leaders' Individual Differences and the Followers' Destructive Leadership Evaluations

	Leader Differences	1	2	3	4
1	Destructive Leadership[2]	1			
2	Leader Gender	ρ = -0.06 (k =35; n = 7,561)[k]	1		
3	Leader Age	ρ = -0.04 (k =21; n = 5,356)[k]	r = -0.022 (k = 824, n = 639,843)[m]	1	
4	Leader Tenure in Organization	ρ = 0.01 (k =9; n = 2,056)[k]	r = -0.008 (k =785; n = 684,421)[m]	r = 0.524 (k =769; n = 876,609)[m]	1

Note 1: Alphabetical letters after the effect sizes denote the source of the data listed in Appendix B
Note 2: Abusive Supervison or Follower Perceptions of Destructive Leadership

Individual Leadership Differences & Relative Weights (RQ1b)

Conducting a relative weights analysis enabled a nuanced understanding of the relative contributions of each individual difference from the leader's perspective (e.g., key demographics, tenure) attributed to the variance in the follower's evaluations of DLB (Tepper, 2000; Wang et al., 2019). In order to perform this RWA, I made use of the web tool located at https://www.scotttonidandel.com/rwa-web in parallel with referencing Tonidandel & LeBreton's (2011) associated article supporting the theoretical and statistical methods (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011).

Table 6 summarizes the RWA analysis from the leader's perspective. The data suggest that Leader Gender makes the most significant contribution at 55.0% with r = - 0.06, followed closely by Leader Age at 34.2%. Lastly, The Leader's Tenure in the Organization is the lowest RW% = 10.79%, supported by the lowest magnitude SOMA meta-analytic correlation matrix at r = - 0.01 (k =9; n = 2,056). Of note, as discussed in the results of RQ1a, these effect sizes are too

low to suggest any meaningful relationship between these leader demographics and the follower's evaluations of destructive leadership. In conclusion of RQ1, the analysis presented herein sheds light on the intricate dynamics between key leader demographics (i.e., gender, age, tenure), enriching our understanding of the multifaceted nature of leadership phenomena.

Table 6: Individual Leaders' Differences with Raw & Rescaled Relative Weights

Variables	Raw Relative Weight	Rescaled Relative Weight
Leader Gender	0.0037	55.01
Leader Age	0.0023	34.2
Leader Tenure in Organization	0.0007	10.79
	R^2 = 0.0066	

Individual Leaders' Differences & Relative Weights (RQ1c)

To further analyze the correlation and RWA analysis, I tested for incremental predictive validity of these measures. This enabled an additional nuanced understanding of the individual contributions of each measure to the model's potentially predictive relationships of each individual difference from the leader's demographic perspective (e.g., key demographics, tenure) attributed to the variance in the follower's evaluations of DLB (Tepper, 2000; Wang et al., 2019; Mackey et al., 2021). This analysis allows for a better understanding of the improvements in R2 by adding each measure and their regression coefficients (β).

In order to answer RQ1c, incremental predictive validity was employed using SPSS statistical software. The first step was to arrange the correlates in Table 5 to mirror the values on either side of the diagonal line referencing 1.00 or a measure correlated with itself. This correlation data generation could be done in Microsoft Excel or the Syntax of SPSS. I elected to use the Syntax to build out the mirrored correlation matrix. Next, to determine the sample size of

the matrix, the harmonic mean of the sample sizes was calculated and applied across each measure (Landis, 2013). The harmonic mean was used instead of the arithmetic mean to avoid overrepresenting the mean sample size due to significant outliers in the sample sizes. Lastly, the regression analysis was run in SPSS to generate the output tables for review. Both Table 7 and Table 8 are used in tandem for the data interpretation. Additionally, I include other useful tables (e.g., ANOVA) in Appendix C.

It is important to note that the change in the adjusted R squared is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) for models 2 and 3. Model 1 includes age, which suggests that age alone does not add incremental predictive validity to our model or increase the total model variance, contributing to a change in evaluations of DLBs. Lastly, regarding Table 7, it is essential to note that Model 3 has the highest Adjusted R Square value of $R^2 = 0.116$ ($p < 0.000^{***}$), which suggests that each correlate or predictor variable adds a statistically significant contribution to the total variance to explained in evaluations of DLBs.

Table 7: Change in Adjusted R Square & Model Summary for Incremental Predictive Validity for Individual Leader Differences

					Change Statistics				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.020[a]	0.000	0.000	0.9998674	0.000	2.965	1	7409	0.085
2	.036[b]	0.001	0.001	0.9994711	0.001	6.877	1	7408	**0.009****
3	.116[c]	0.013	0.013	0.9934780	0.012	90.646	1	7407	**0.000*****

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age

b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender

c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Leader Tenure in Organization

d. **p < 0.05*, p < 0.01**, p < 0.001*****

Reviewing the regression coefficients of the 3-factor model in Table 8 provides an additional understanding of the RWA (RQ1b) and the Adjusted R Square results of Table 7. The incremental predictive validity analysis and regression model suggest *that Leader Tenure in Organization ($\beta = 0.110$, $p < 0.001^{***}$) and Leader Gender ($\beta = -0.312$, $p < 0.01^{**}$)* have

statistically significant regression coefficients and display significant improvements in the 3-factor model's variances in predicting followers' evaluations of destructive leadership. However, we cannot imply any predictive power in their measures, as discussed in the analysis of the correlation effective sizes of RQ1a. These meta-analytic effect size estimates were used to generate Tables 7 & 8. Regardless, the results are interesting to note as gender and leader tenure in an organization yield the highest statistical regression coefficients and meta-analytic effect size estimates.

Table 8: Regression Coefficients & Model Summary for Incremental Predictive Validity of the Leaders' Individual Differences

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	0.000	0.012		0.000	1.000
	Age	-0.020	0.012	-0.020	-1.722	0.085
2	(Constant)	0.000	0.012		0.000	1.000
	Age	-0.021	0.012	-0.021	-1.780	0.075
	Gender	-0.030	0.012	**-0.030**	-2.622	**0.008****
3	(Constant)	0.000	0.012		0.000	1.000
	Age	-0.018	0.012	-0.018	-1.583	0.114
	Gender	**-0.032**	0.012	**-0.032**	-2.729	**0.006****
	Leader Tenure in Organization	**0.110**	0.012	**0.110**	9.521	**0.000*****

a. Dependent Variable: Followers' Destructive Leadership Evaluations

b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Leader Tenure in Organization

c. **p < 0.05*, p < 0.01**, p < 0.001*****

In conclusion of RQ1, the analysis presented herein sheds light on the intricate dynamics between key leader demographics (i.e., gender, age, tenure), enriching our understanding of the multifaceted nature of leadership phenomena.

Test of Research Question 2 – Individual Follower Differences

Leader Individual Differences as Correlates Generating Effect Sizes with Correlation Matrix Analysis (RQ2a)

Like the methodology of the leader individual differences discussed in RQ1, follower individual differences were also examined. More data were collected from this case's systematic search and subsequent coding. As expected from the literature review, key personality differences and their correlates for SOMA estimates were uncovered, including FFM, CSE, Affect, Demographics, and other key differences. Table 9 provides a detailed account of the SOMA correlate estimations and their source article.

The strongest or top five of the effect sizes measuring these follower difference of RQ2a and destructive leadership included Negative Affectivity: $\rho = 0.36$ ($k = 45$; $n = 14{,}754$), Emotional Stability (Inverse Neuroticism): $\rho = -0.29$ ($k = 51$; $n = 16{,}398$), Psychological capital: $\rho = -0.29$ ($k = 7$; $n = 3{,}212$), CSE: $\rho = -0.22$ ($k = 27$, $n = 6{,}082$), Positive Affectivity: $\rho = -0.19$ ($k = 16$; $n = 3{,}544$). Conversely, the weakest SOMA estimate was gender: $\rho = -0.03$ ($k = 206$; $n = 64{,}712$). Of note, all second-order meta-analytic estimates of follower differences and their evaluations of destructive leadership are derived from first-order meta-analyses with their estimate source noted by the reference superscript in Table 9. MetaBus.org was not used for any second-order meta-analytic estimates supporting RQ2a for the correlations between follower differences and their evaluations of destructive leadership. Moreover, these estimate sources are found in Appendix A & B. MetaBus.org derived estimates annotated by the superscript "[m]" were mainly used to complete Table 9 for the correlations between demographics and follower differences. Lastly, these MetaBus.org estimates are denoted with the correlation coefficient r vice rho (ρ).

Table 9: Second Order Meta-analytic Effect Sizes Between the Followers' Individual Differences and their Evaluations of DLB

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1	**Destructive Leadership**[2]	1																
2	**Agreeableness**	ρ = - 0.17 (k = 20; n = 6,933)[a]	1															
3	**Conscientiousness**	ρ = - 0.18 (k = 27; n = 7,779)[k]	ρ = 0.40 (k = 155; n = 80,305)[q]	1														
4	**Extraversion**	ρ = - 0.09 (k = 28; n = 9,673)[a]	ρ = 0.28 (k = 122; n = 70,551)[q]	ρ = 0.24 (k = 129; n = 96,442)[q]	1													
5	**Emotional Stability (Inverse Neuroticism)**[3]	ρ = - 0.29 (k = 51; n = 16,398)[a]	ρ = 0.22 (k = 144; n = 76,406)[q]	ρ = 0.29 (k = 163; n = 106,149)[q]	ρ = 0.34 (k = 138; n = 100,801)[q]	1												
6	**Openness to Experience**	ρ = 0.08 (k = 12; n = 4,150)[k]	ρ = 0.28 (k = 111; n = 67,389)[q]	ρ = 0.20 (k = 121; n = 69,753)[q]	ρ = 0.38 (k = 114; n = 68,152)[q]	ρ = 0.09 (k = 114; n = 68,068)[q]	1											
7	**Trait Anger**	ρ = - 0.13 (k = 5; n = 1,391)[k]	ρ = - 0.41 (k = 21; n = 9,939)[x]	ρ = - 0.17 (k = 21; n = 9,939)[x]	ρ = - 0.05 (k = 21; n = 9,939)[x]	ρ = - 0.46 (k = 21; n = 9,939)[x]	ρ = - 0.05 (k = 21; n = 9,939)[x]	1										
8	**Gender**	ρ = - 0.03 (k = 206; n = 64,712)[k]	ρ = - 0.09 (k = 55; n =17,637)[xee]	ρ = - 0.07 (k = 55; n =17,637)[xee]	ρ = - 0.06 (k = 55; n =17,637)[xe]	ρ = 0.22 (k =55; n=17,637)[xe]	ρ = 0.03 (k=55; n = 17,637)[xee]	ρ = - 0.037 (k = 31; n = 8,569)[m]	1									
9	**Traditionality**	ρ = - 0.14 (k = 4; n = 1,222)[x]	ρ = 0.22 (k = 51; n = 53,692)[r]	ρ = 0.10 (k =51; n = 53,692)[r]	ρ = - 0.25 (k =51; n = 53,692)[r]	ρ = - 0.03 (k =51; n = 53,692)[r]	ρ = - 0.24 (k =51; n = 53,692)[r]		r = 0.034 (k = 14; n = 4,717)[m]	1								
10	**Narcissism**	ρ = 0.08 (k = 6; n = 1,238)[k]	ρ = - 0.36 (k = 84; n = 44,480)[o]	ρ = 0.11 (k = 79; n = 43,707)[o]	ρ = 0.49 (k =85; n = 44,237)[o]	ρ = 0.20 (k =93; n = 45,885)[o]	ρ = 0.25 (k =82; n = 42,936)[o]	r = 0.124 (k = 2; n = 559)[m]	r = 0.044 (k = 21; n = 5,761)[m]	r = - 0.14 (k =1; n = 385)[m]	1							
11	**Positive Affectivity**	ρ = - 0.19 (k = 16; n = 3,544)[k]	ρ = 0.22 (k =122; n = 40,714)[x]	ρ = 0.40 (k =128; n = 43,497)[x]	ρ = 0.51 (k =157; n = 51,731)[x]	ρ = 0.39 (k =167; n = 54,816)[x]	ρ = 0.28 (k =123; n = 41,406)[x]	r = - 0.108 (k = 3; n = 546)[m]	r = 0.022 (k = 138; n = 44,568)[m]	r = 0.19 (k = 1; n = 283)[m]	r = - 0.01 (k = 1; n = 204)[m]	1						
12	**Negative Affectivity**	ρ = 0.36 (k = 45; n = 14,754)[k]	ρ = - 0.30 (k =120; n = 39,023)[x]	ρ = - 0.29 (k =128; n = 42,358)[x]	ρ = - 0.06 (k =121; n = 49,212)[x]	ρ = - 0.65 (k =172; n = 55,495)[x]	ρ = - 0.06 (k =121; n = 39,538)[x]	r = 0.242 (k=5; n = 790)[m]	r = 0.016 (k = 170; n = 52,801)[m]	r = -0.1 (k = 2; n = 467)[m]	r = 0.144 (k = 2; n = 653)[m]	r = - 0.234 (k = 253; n = 80,271)[m]	1					
13	**Psychological Capital**[4]	ρ = - 0.29 (k = 7; n = 3,212)[k]	ρ = 0.24 (k = 196; n =145,623)[x]	ρ = 0.38 (k = 219; n =149,681)[x]	ρ = 0.38 (k =219; n =158,905)[x]	ρ = 0.46 (k =224; n =158,934)[x]	ρ = 0.10 (k =194; n =146,668)[x]	r = -0.59 (k = 1; n = 288)[m]	r = -0.003 (k = 46; n = 24,686)[m]	r = 0.16 (k = 1; n = 195)[m]		r = 0.473 (k = 12; n = 3,223)[m]	r = - 0.423 (k = 9; n = 2,823)[m]	1				
14	**Self-Esteem**	ρ = - 0.17 (k = 15; n = 7,431)[k]	r = 0.177 (k = 24; n = 10,340)[m]	r= 0.296 (k = 35; n = 14,191)[m]	r = 0.285 (k = 37; n = 17,220)[m]	r= 0.436 (k= 56; n = 19,374)[m]	r = 0.176 (k = 24; n = 22,785)[m]	r = 0.191 (k = 30; n = 13,166)[m]	r= 0.011 (k = 101; n = 70,748)[m]	r= 0.334 (k = 4; n = 7,118)[m]	r= 0.114 (k = 14; n = 4,160)[m]	ρ = 0.63 (k = 5; n = 903)[y]	ρ = - 0.58 (k = 5; n = 903)[y]	r = 0.438 (k = 12; n = 4,729)[m]	1			
15	**Age**	r = - 0.02 (k = 190; n = 63,879)[k]	r = 0.056 (k = 206; n = 2,140,075)[m]	r = - 0.034 (k = 265 ,n = 2,187,506)[m]	r = 0.023 (k = 273, n = 2,171,977)[m]	r = 0.058 (k = 65, n = 2,069,355)m	r = 0.018 (k = 211, n = 2,177,057)[m]	r = - 0.065 (k = 34; n = 17,823)[m]	r = - 0.022 (k = 936; n = 639,843)[m]	r = 0.011 (k =27; n = 16,625)[m]	r = - 0.047 (k = 25; n = 7,246)[m]	r = 0.028 (k = 110; 34,406)[m]	r = - 0.081 (k = 164; n = 65,851)[m]	r = 0.041 (k = 55; n = 42,844)[m]	r = 0.042 (k = 90; n = 53,810)[m]	1		
16	**Race**	ρ = 0.11 (k = 3, n = 2,285)[y]	r = - 0.001 (k = 18; n = 8,313)[m]	r = - 0.019 (k = 22, n= 11,456)[m]	r = - 0.038 (k = 23, n = 11,407)[m]	r = - 0.013 (k = 14, n = 5,678)[m]	r = -0.004 (k = 14, n = 6,047)[m]	r = 0.032 (k = 4, n = 2,908)[m]	r = 0.01 (k = 261; n = 351,820)[m]	r = 0.11 (k = 1; n = 870)[m]	r = -0.01 (k = 1; n = 229)[m]	r = -0.089 (k = 2; n = 270)[m]	r = -0.121 (k = 2; n = 270)[m]		r = 0.072 (k = 8; n = 6,081)[m]	r = - 0.022 (k = 170; n = 262,094)[m]	1	
17	**CSE**	ρ = - 0.22 (k = 27, n = 6,082)[a]	r = 0.2 (k = 22; n = 7,354)[m]	r= 0.359 (k = 24; 8,823)[m]	r = 0.333 (k = 22; n = 8,232)[m]	r = 0.445 (k = 11; n = 3,684)[m]	r = 0.209 (k = 4; n = 3,279)[m]	r = - 0.27 (k = 1; n = 77)[m]	r = - 0.034 (k= 53; n = 37,166)[m]		r = 0.043 (k = 4; n = 1,164)[m]	r = 0.516 (k = 3; n = 972)[m]	r = -0.428 (k = 5; n = 1183)[m]	r = 0.414 (k = 2; n = 583)[m]	r = 0.687 (k = 10; n 4,307)[m]	r = 0.053 (k = 48; n = 60,250)[m]	r = 0.014 (k = 6; n = 10,128)[m]	1

Note 1: Alphabetical letters after the effect sizes denote the source of the data listed in Appendix B

Note 2: Abusive Supervision or Follower Perceptions of Destructive Leadership

Note 3: FFM variables are measured directly against Emotional Stability. The Neuroticism effect size is reversed for Follower Perceptions of Destructive Leadership only.

Note 4: Psychological Capital implied from similar measures (e.g., Psychological well-being, Hope, Efficacy, Resilience, and Optimism Measures)

Follower Individual Differences with Relative Weights Analysis (RQ2b)

Similar to the RWA methodology previously discussed under RQ1b, I achieved another nuanced understanding of the relative contributions of each difference (e.g., key demographics, FFM for personality, positive affectivity, CSE, trait anger) and how these individual differences contribute to the variance in follower evaluations of DLB. Table 10 provides an RWA summary for selecting follower individual differences.

The first step was to eliminate measures with missing correlates after a rigorous additional systematic search, and MetaBus.org was used to complete the missing second-order meta-analytic estimates in Table 9. Psychological capital and traditionality were eliminated, reducing the available measures to a 13-factor model. Additionally, the 13-factor model using the R-derived code from https://www.scotttonidandel.com/rwa-web relating to Tonidandel & LeBreton's (2011) associated statistical methods yielded an $R^2 = 0.2332$. This variance value suggests a potentially significant variance of these followers' individual differences and their perceptions of destructive leadership for later analysis in RQ2c with incremental predictive validity.

Next, each factor was analyzed for relative weight strength. For example, negative affect emerged as a dominant predictor across followers' personality and demographic traits at 39%, underscoring its pivotal role in shaping leadership perceptions. Emotional stability and positive affect are the second and third most relatively important factors at 12% and 10%, respectively. Moreover, all the other measures of the 13-factor model resulted in an RWA of less than 10% each.

In summary, the RWA presented herein, RQ2b, sheds light on the intricate dynamics between critical demographics (i.e., gender, age, race), FFM, and other key personality traits

such as affectivity, narcissism, and anger. These results lead to a much more robust analysis of this RWA over the leader differences RQ1b, mainly due to more correlated data available from the primary meta-analyses and stronger correlations for the second-order meta-analytic effective sizes.

Table 10: Followers' Individual Differences with Raw & Rescaled Relative Weights

Variables	Raw Relative Weight	Rescaled Relative Weight
Age	0.0002	0.07
Gender	0.0017	0.72
Race	0.0145	6.2
Openness to Experience	0.0184	7.88
Concienstiouness	0.0099	4.26
Extraversion	0.0042	1.81
Agreeablness	0.0153	6.55
Emotional Stability	0.0299	12.8
Trait Anger	0.0035	1.51
Narcissim	0.0034	1.44
Self Esteem	0.0159	6.82
Postive Affect	0.0234	10.05
Negative Affect	0.093	39.88
$R^2 = 0.2332$		

Follower Individual Differences with Incremental Predictive Validity (RQ2c)

In order to answer RQ2c, incremental predictive validity was employed using SPSS statistical software similar to RQ1c. The first step was to arrange the correlates in Table 9 to mirror the values on either side of the diagonal line referencing 1.00 or a measure correlated with itself. This correlation data generation could be done in Microsoft Excel or the Syntax of SPSS. I elected to use the Syntax to build out the mirrored correlation matrix. Next, to determine the sample size of the matrix, the harmonic mean of the sample sizes was calculated and applied across each measure (Landis, 2013). The harmonic mean of n = 2793 was used instead of the arithmetic mean to avoid overrepresenting the mean sample size due to significant outliers in the sample sizes. Lastly, the regression analysis was run in SPSS to generate the output tables for review. Both Table 11 and Table 12 are used in tandem for the data interpretation.

It is important to note that the change in the adjusted R squared is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) for models 3 to 13, except for model 11. Models 1 and 2 include Age and Age with Gender, which suggests that age and gender alone do not add incremental predictive validity to our model or increase the total model variance contributed to a change in evaluations of DLBs, thus supporting RQ1 & RQ2. Model 11 includes the first addition of positive affectivity as a predictor variable. Statistically, this is important to discuss further and analyze because positive affect had one of the highest second-order meta-analytic estimates $\rho = -0.19$ ($k = 16$; $n = 3{,}544$) and the third highest RWA result (RW% = 0.105, R2 = 0.233).

Another consideration that could explain this limitation is that positive affect had a smaller sample size than the other measures. Moreover, this is exacerbated by the substantial degree of correlation (covariance) with emotional stability $\rho = -0.65$ ($k = 172$; $n = 55{,}495$) and self-esteem $\rho = 0.63$ ($k = 5$; $n = 903$). These two covariance correlates of Table 9 are the highest

degree of covariance noted in the 13-factor model, thus lowering positive affect's contribution as a predictive factor in the followers' evaluation of destructive leadership. This is further analyzed with covariance in Table 12, along with the regression coefficient and model summary results.

Table 11: Change in Adjusted R Square & Model Summary for Incremental Predictive Validity for Followers' Individual Differences

					Change Statistics				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.020[a]	0.000	0.000	0.9999791	0.000	1.117	1	2791	0.291
2	.036[b]	0.001	0.001	0.9997139	0.001	2.481	1	2790	0.115
3	.116[c]	**0.013**	0.012	0.9938250	**0.012**	34.162	1	2789	**0.000*** **
4	.141[d]	**0.020**	0.019	0.9906656	**0.007**	18.818	1	2788	**0.000*** **
5	.246[e]	**0.061**	0.059	0.9700353	**0.041**	120.849	1	2787	**0.000*** **
6	.264[f]	**0.070**	0.068	0.9656158	**0.009**	26.570	1	2786	**0.000*** **
7	.294[g]	**0.086**	0.084	0.9571460	**0.017**	50.525	1	2785	**0.000*** **
8	.365[h]	**0.133**	0.131	0.9323213	**0.047**	151.285	1	2784	**0.000*** **
9	.369[i]	**0.136**	0.134	0.9307685	**0.003**	10.297	1	2783	**0.000*** **
10	.380[j]	**0.144**	0.141	0.9267413	**0.008**	25.240	1	2782	**0.000*** **
11	.381[k]	0.145	0.142	0.9263302	0.001	3.470	1	2781	0.063
12	.439[l]	**0.192**	0.189	0.9005832	**0.047**	162.287	1	2780	**0.000*** **
13	.483[m]	**0.233**	0.230	0.8777044	**0.041**	147.819	1	2779	**0.000*** **

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age
b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender
c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race
d. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness to Experience
m. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness
m. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion
m. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness
m. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability
m. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability, Trait Anger
m. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability, Trait Anger, Narcissim
m. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability, Trait Anger, Narcissim, Postive Affectivity
m. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability, Trait Anger, Narcissim, Postive Affectivity, Negative Affectivity
m. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability, Trait Anger, Narcissim, Postive Affectivity, Negative Affectivity, Self Esteem
c. **p < 0.05*, p < 0.01**, p < 0.001*****

Lastly, it is essential to note that Model 13 has the highest Adjusted R Square value of R2 = 0.233 ($p < 0.000^{***}$), which suggests that each correlate or predictor variable other than positive affect adds a significant contribution to the total variance in the followers' evaluations of DLBs.

In order to complete the incremental predictive validity analysis and answer RQ2c, I use the Model 13 Adjusted R Square improvements R2 = 0.233 ($p < 0.000^{***}$) to review the Standardized Regression Coefficients for this model as well as look for collinearity and covariance limitations between predictors as suggested in Table 11 for positive affectivity.

In Table 12, all measures for Model 13 are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) except for emotional stability. However, the other twelve predictors' standardized regression coefficients are statistically significant ($p < 0.001^{***}$). Of the statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) predictors in the 13-factor model with the most significant and lowest magnitude of regression coefficients, the results from SPSS demonstrate that negative affect ($\beta = 0.637$, $p < 0.001^{***}$) and positive affect ($\beta = -0.541$, $p < 0.001^{***}$) have the greatest positive and negative magnitudes, respectively. The predictor with the lowest magnitude standardized regression coefficient is gender ($\beta = -0.064$, $p < 0.001^{***}$).

The partial correlation column of Table 12 provides the independent correlations of each predictor variable to the followers' evaluation of destructive leadership behaviors in the model. The emotional stability partial correlation value of $r_{partial} = 0.019$ suggests that emotional stability, compared to the other individual follower predictors, is not a strong individual predictor in the 13-factor model. This assumption is further explained with the variance inflation factor (VIF) < 5 ($VIF_{emotional\ stability} = 3.8$). Overall, no VIF > 10 was observed when checking for collinearity across all 13 models and individual follower individual difference additions, suggesting no substantial problems with collinearity.

Table 12: Regression Coefficients with VIF & Partial Correlations for Followers' Individual Differences for Incremental Predictive Validity

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized			Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	0.000	0.019		0.000	1.000					
	Age	-0.020	0.019	-0.020	-1.057	0.291	-0.020	-0.020	-0.020	1.000	1.000
2	(Constant)	0.000	0.019		0.000	1.000					
	Age	-0.020	0.019	-0.020	-1.041	0.298	-0.020	-0.020	-0.020	1.000	1.000
	Gender	-0.030	0.019	-0.030	-1.575	0.115	-0.030	-0.030	-0.030	1.000	1.000
3	(Constant)	0.000	0.019		0.000	1.000					
	Age	-0.017	0.019	-0.017	-0.930	0.353	-0.020	-0.018	-0.017	0.999	1.001
	Gender	-0.031	0.019	-0.031	-1.644	0.100	-0.030	-0.031	-0.031	1.000	1.000
	Race	0.110	0.019	**0.110**	5.845	**0.000*** **	0.110	0.110	0.110	0.999	1.001
4	(Constant)	0.000	0.019		0.000	1.000					
	Age	-0.019	0.019	-0.019	-1.018	0.309	-0.020	-0.019	-0.019	0.999	1.001
	Gender	-0.033	0.019	-0.033	-1.778	0.076	-0.030	-0.034	-0.033	0.999	1.001
	Race	0.110	0.019	**0.110**	5.863	**0.000*** **	0.110	0.110	0.110	0.999	1.001
	Openness to Experience	0.081	0.019	**0.081**	4.338	**0.000*** **	0.080	0.082	0.081	0.999	1.001
5	(Constant)	0.000	0.018		0.000	1.000					
	Age	-0.026	0.018	-0.026	-1.418	0.156	-0.020	-0.027	-0.026	0.998	1.002
	Gender	-0.049	0.018	**-0.049**	-2.658	**0.008****	-0.030	-0.050	-0.049	0.993	1.007
	Race	0.106	0.018	**0.106**	5.762	**0.000*** **	0.110	0.109	0.106	0.999	1.001
	Openness to Experience	0.123	0.019	**0.123**	6.574	**0.000*** **	0.080	0.124	0.121	0.957	1.045
	Conscientiousness	-0.207	0.019	**-0.207**	-10.993	**0.000*** **	-0.180	-0.204	-0.202	0.953	1.050
6	(Constant)	0.000	0.018		0.000	1.000					
	Age	-0.024	0.018	-0.024	-1.323	0.186	-0.020	-0.025	-0.024	0.998	1.002
	Gender	-0.055	0.018	**-0.055**	-2.996	**0.003****	-0.030	-0.057	-0.055	0.989	1.011
	Race	0.102	0.018	**0.102**	5.581	**0.000*** **	0.110	0.105	0.102	0.998	1.002
	Openness to Experience	0.160	0.020	**0.160**	7.995	**0.000*** **	0.080	0.150	0.146	0.839	1.192
	Conscientiousness	-0.190	0.019	**-0.190**	-9.964	**0.000*** **	-0.180	-0.186	-0.182	0.923	1.083
	Extraversion	-0.104	0.020	**-0.104**	-5.155	**0.000*** **	-0.090	-0.097	-0.094	0.823	1.216
7	(Constant)	0.000	0.018		0.000	1.000					
	Age	-0.015	0.018	-0.015	-0.808	0.419	-0.020	-0.015	-0.015	0.992	1.008
	Gender	-0.064	0.018	**-0.064**	-3.531	**0.000*** **	-0.030	-0.067	-0.064	0.984	1.017
	Race	0.104	0.018	**0.104**	5.742	**0.000*** **	0.110	0.108	0.104	0.997	1.003
	Openness to Experience	0.183	0.020	**0.183**	9.143	**0.000*** **	0.080	0.171	0.166	0.815	1.226
	Conscientiousness	-0.141	0.020	**-0.141**	-7.017	**0.000*** **	-0.180	-0.132	-0.127	0.815	1.226
	Extraversion	-0.084	0.020	**-0.084**	-4.183	**0.000*** **	-0.090	-0.079	-0.076	0.807	1.239
	Agreeableness	-0.146	0.021	**-0.146**	-7.108	**0.000*** **	-0.170	-0.133	-0.129	0.774	1.292
8	(Constant)	0.000	0.018		0.000	1.000					
	Age	-0.001	0.018	-0.001	-0.067	0.947	-0.020	-0.001	-0.001	0.988	1.012
	Gender	0.002	0.019	0.002	0.098	0.922	-0.030	0.002	0.002	0.901	1.110
	Race	0.106	0.018	**0.106**	5.973	**0.000*** **	0.110	0.112	0.105	0.997	1.003
	Openness to Experience	0.156	0.020	**0.156**	7.928	**0.000*** **	0.080	0.149	0.140	0.805	1.242
	Conscientiousness	-0.086	0.020	**-0.086**	-4.311	**0.000*** **	-0.180	-0.081	-0.076	0.776	1.289
	Extraversion	-0.005	0.021	**-0.005**	-0.241	**0.000*** **	-0.090	-0.005	-0.004	0.729	1.372
	Agreeableness	-0.123	0.020	**-0.123**	-6.083	**0.000*** **	-0.170	-0.115	-0.107	0.767	1.304
	Emotional Stability	-0.250	0.020	**-0.250**	-12.300	**0.000*** **	-0.290	-0.227	-0.217	0.756	1.323
9	(Constant)	0.000	0.018		0.000	1.000					
	Age	-0.003	0.018	-0.003	-0.146	0.884	-0.020	-0.003	-0.003	0.988	1.012
	Gender	0.005	0.019	0.005	0.274	0.784	-0.030	0.005	0.005	0.898	1.113
	Race	0.108	0.018	**0.108**	6.113	**0.000*** **	0.110	0.115	0.108	0.995	1.005
	Emotional Stability	0.156	0.020	**0.156**	7.970	**0.000*** **	0.080	0.149	0.140	0.805	1.243
	Trait Anger	-0.081	0.020	**-0.081**	-4.035	**0.000*** **	-0.180	-0.076	-0.071	0.770	1.298
	Extraversion	0.009	0.021	0.009	0.444	0.657	-0.090	0.008	0.008	0.696	1.437
	Agreeableness	-0.150	0.022	**-0.150**	-6.863	**0.000*** **	-0.170	-0.129	-0.121	0.649	1.540
	Emotional Stability	-0.283	0.023	**-0.283**	-12.423	**0.000*** **	-0.290	-0.229	-0.219	0.598	1.673
	Trait Anger	-0.070	0.022	**-0.070**	-3.209	**0.001****	0.130	-0.061	-0.057	0.645	1.551
10	(Constant)	0.000	0.018		0.000	1.000					
	Age	0.001	0.018	0.001	0.059	0.953	-0.020	0.001	0.001	0.986	1.014
	Gender	0.005	0.019	0.005	0.268	0.788	-0.030	0.005	0.005	0.898	1.113
	Race	0.106	0.018	**0.106**	6.005	**0.000*** **	0.110	0.113	0.105	0.995	1.005
	Openness to Experience	0.131	0.020	**0.131**	6.466	**0.000*** **	0.080	0.122	0.113	0.753	1.328
	Conscientiousness	-0.106	0.021	**-0.106**	-5.139	**0.000*** **	-0.180	-0.097	-0.090	0.726	1.378
	Extraversion	-0.064	0.026	-0.064	-2.497	0.013	-0.090	-0.047	-0.044	0.470	2.128
	Agreeableness	-0.058	0.028	-0.058	-2.045	0.041	-0.170	-0.039	-0.036	0.381	2.628
	Emotional Stability	-0.293	0.023	**-0.293**	-12.852	**0.000*** **	-0.290	-0.237	-0.225	0.594	1.685
	Trait Anger	-0.062	0.022	**-0.062**	-2.845	**0.004****	0.130	-0.054	-0.050	0.641	1.560
	Narcissim	0.136	0.027	**0.136**	5.024	**0.000*** **	0.080	0.095	0.088	0.418	2.391

a. Dependent Variable: Follower Evaluations of Destructive Leadership

b. $p < 0.05$*, $p < 0.01$**, $p < 0.001$***

Table 12: Regression Coefficients with VIF & Partial Correlations for Followers' Individual Differences for Incremental Predictive Validity (Continued)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized			Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
11	(Constant)	0.000	0.018		0.000	1.000					
	Age	0.001	0.018	0.001	0.063	0.950	-0.020	0.001	0.001	0.986	1.014
	Gender	0.005	0.018	0.005	0.296	0.767	-0.030	0.006	0.005	0.898	1.114
	Race	0.103	0.018	**0.103**	5.818	**0.000*** **	0.110	0.110	0.102	0.987	1.013
	Openness to Experience	0.142	0.021	**0.142**	6.732	**0.000*** **	0.080	0.127	0.118	0.692	1.446
	Conscientiousness	-0.086	0.023	**-0.086**	-3.723	**0.000*** **	-0.180	-0.070	-0.065	0.575	1.741
	Extraversion	-0.027	0.032	-0.027	-0.822	0.411	-0.090	-0.016	-0.014	0.292	3.427
	Agreeableness	-0.084	0.032	**-0.084**	-2.657	**0.008****	-0.170	-0.050	-0.047	0.307	3.259
	Emotional Stability	-0.279	0.024	**-0.279**	-11.719	**0.000*** **	-0.290	-0.217	-0.205	0.541	1.849
	Trait Anger	-0.062	0.022	**-0.062**	-2.846	**0.004****	0.130	-0.054	-0.050	0.641	1.560
	Narcissim	0.101	0.033	**0.101**	3.026	**0.002****	0.080	0.057	0.053	0.279	3.589
	Postive Affectivity	-0.051	0.027	-0.051	-1.863	0.063	-0.190	-0.035	-0.033	0.410	2.438
12	(Constant)	0.000	0.017		0.000	1.000					
	Age	0.014	0.017	0.014	0.795	0.427	-0.020	0.015	0.014	0.983	1.017
	Gender	-0.060	0.019	**-0.060**	-3.188	**0.001****	-0.030	-0.060	-0.054	0.831	1.203
	Race	0.141	0.017	**0.141**	8.071	**0.000*** **	0.110	0.151	0.138	0.958	1.044
	Openness to Experience	0.180	0.021	**0.180**	8.678	**0.000*** **	0.080	0.162	0.148	0.678	1.476
	Conscientiousness	-0.041	0.023	-0.041	-1.821	0.069	-0.180	-0.035	-0.031	0.561	1.783
	Extraversion	-0.066	0.032	**-0.066**	-2.083	**0.04***	-0.090	-0.039	-0.036	0.289	3.460
	Agreeableness	-0.069	0.031	-0.069	-2.253	0.024	-0.170	-0.043	-0.038	0.306	3.263
	Emotional Stability	0.023	0.033	0.023	0.705	0.481	-0.290	0.013	0.012	0.264	3.793
	Trait Anger	0.013	0.022	0.013	0.593	0.553	0.130	0.011	0.010	0.595	1.680
	Narcissim	-0.004	0.033	-0.004	-0.119	0.905	0.080	-0.002	-0.002	0.262	3.820
	Postive Affectivity	-0.090	0.027	**-0.090**	-3.349	**0.001*** **	-0.190	-0.063	-0.057	0.405	2.469
	Negative Affectivity	0.345	0.027	**0.345**	12.739	**0.000*** **	0.360	0.235	0.217	0.396	2.527
13	(Constant)	0.000	0.017		0.000	1.000					
	Age	0.008	0.017	0.008	0.452	0.651	-0.020	0.009	0.008	0.982	1.018
	Gender	-0.064	0.018	**-0.064**	-3.490	**0.000*** **	-0.030	-0.066	-0.058	0.831	1.204
	Race	0.115	0.017	**0.115**	6.712	**0.000*** **	0.110	0.126	0.111	0.943	1.060
	Openness to Experience	0.253	0.021	**0.253**	12.005	**0.000*** **	0.080	0.222	0.199	0.622	1.607
	Conscientiousness	0.090	0.025	**0.090**	3.630	**0.000*** **	-0.180	0.069	0.060	0.454	2.203
	Extraversion	0.196	0.038	**0.196**	5.193	**0.000*** **	-0.090	0.098	0.086	0.195	5.137
	Agreeableness	-0.353	0.038	**-0.353**	-9.290	**0.000*** **	-0.170	-0.174	-0.154	0.191	5.238
	Emotional Stability	0.036	0.032	0.036	1.115	0.265	-0.290	0.021	0.019	0.263	3.797
	Trait Anger	-0.239	0.030	**-0.239**	-7.991	**0.000*** **	0.130	-0.150	-0.133	0.309	3.236
	Narcissim	-0.344	0.043	**-0.344**	-8.027	**0.000*** **	0.080	-0.151	-0.133	0.150	6.654
	Postive Affectivity	-0.541	0.045	**-0.541**	-11.923	**0.000*** **	-0.190	-0.221	-0.198	0.134	7.470
	Negative Affectivity	0.637	0.036	**0.637**	17.850	**0.000*** **	0.360	0.321	0.297	0.217	4.617
	Self Esteem	0.535	0.044	**0.535**	12.158	**0.000*** **	-0.170	0.225	0.202	0.143	7.009

a. Dependent Variable: Follower Evaluations of Destructive Leadership
b. p < 0.05*, p < 0.01**, p < 0.001***

Reflecting on the RWA of RQ2b, I cross-check the incremental predictive validity. For example, the RWA shows that negative affect emerged as a dominant predictor compared to the other follower personality (FFM), demographic, and attitude traits at 39%. Emotional stability and positive affect are the second and third most relatively important, at 12% and 10%, respectively. However, the incremental predictive validity analysis demonstrates a few limitations in the RWA results of RQ2b.

Recapitulating the adjusted R2 results of Table 11, emotional stability's addition into the model did not yield a statistically significant improvement in the 13-factor model or

incrementally improved variance in the relationship of the 13 individual follower differences and their evaluation of destructive leadership. Additionally, analyzing the standardized regression coefficients, collinearity statistics (e.g., VIF), and partial correlation of Table 12 demonstrate further limitations about emotional stability with a statistically insignificant standardized regression coefficient (β), weak $r_{partial} = 0.019$, and the $VIF_{emotional\ stability} = 3.8$. This limits the predictive validity strength of the emotional stability measure compared to the other 12 factors. The follower demographic of age also yielded statistically insignificant results and low RWA percentages, thus supporting the findings in RQ1b and RQ1c. However, all other predictors of the FFM, attitudes, and specific demographics, including gender and race, demonstrated statistically significant coefficients in Table 12.

Therefore, the RWA and predictive incremental validity results suggest that negative affect ($\beta = 0.637$, $p < 0.001^{***}$ with RW% of 0.39, $R^2 = 0.233$) and positive affect ($\beta = -0.541$, $p < 0.001^{***}$ with RW% of 0.10, $R^2 = 0.233$) are the most important or influential predictors. Moreover, demographics are the least significant predictors primarily due to the low magnitude of the second-order meta-analytic effect sizes, thus suggesting no statistically significant relationship between these demographic traits and follower evaluations of destructive leadership. Furthermore, these findings are supported by RWA (RQ2b) and incremental predictive validity (RQ2c) analyses.

Test of Research Question 3 – Nomological Networks of DLBs

DLBs and Outcomes as Correlates Generating Effect Sizes with Correlation Matrix Analysis

RQ3 shifts its focus away from the individual differences of the leaders and followers and their role in DLB and their evaluations to more all-encompassing measures to achieve a

nomological network. For example, DLB outcomes are a key focus area. Table 13 summarizes my correlate coding findings with another SOMA correlation estimate matrix. The available data on the correlation between outcomes was sparse, although this logically makes sense given that these measures are usually dependent variables in the leadership literature (Banks et al., 2016; Banks et al., 2018). Given their dependent nature in the literature, primary meta-analytic matrices did not yield a large sum of data to incorporate into the SOMA correlation estimate matrix in Table 13. However, I do note some strong correlations with evaluations of DLBs. For example, the most negatively associated are attitude toward leader ρ = -0.57 (k = 7; n = 1,582), leader effectiveness ρ = -0.45 (k = 4; n = 809), psychological functioning ρ = -0.49 (k = 8; n = 3,355), trust in leader, ρ = -0.51 (k = 11; n = 3,560), turnover intention p = 0.40 (k = 54; n = 18,868), and job satisfaction p = -0.41 (k = 52; n = 17,717). Inversely, the most positively associated are ostracism ρ = 0.63 (k = 5; n = 2,678), depersonalization ρ = 0.55 (k = 4; n = 1,222), fear of leader ρ = 0.52 (k = 5; n = 1,427), and supervisor deviance ρ = 0.51 (k = 14; n = 8,447). These correlations result from the SOMA estimations reaffirm much of the original articles on Abusive Supervision and other DLBs associated consequences (Tepper, 2000; Tepper, 2007).

Table 13: Second Order Meta-Analytic Effect Size Estimates for Individual Outcomes of DLB

	Work Engagement	Job Performance	Task Performance	Job Satisfaction	Organizational Commitment	Turnover Intention	Work-to-Family Conflict	Attitude Toward Leader	Leader Effectiveness	Psychological Functioning (health)	Trust in Leader	Ostracism	Depersonalization	Fear of Leader	Supervisor Deviance
Destructive Leadership[2]	ρ = -0.24 (k = 15; n = 3,608)[k]	ρ = -0.161 (k = 12; n = 3,653)[h]	ρ = -0.20 (k = 60; n = 16,379)[k]	ρ = -0.41 (k = 52; n = 17,717)[k]	ρ = -0.31 (k = 10; n = 2,859)[k]	ρ = 0.40 (k = 54; n = 18,868)[k]	ρ = 0.33 (k = 17; n = 3,608)[k]	ρ = - 0. 57 (k = 7; n = 1,582)[t]	ρ = -0.45 (k = 4; n = 809)[d]	ρ = -0.49 (k = 8; n = 3,355)[n]	ρ = -0.51 (k = 11; n = 3,560)[k]	ρ = 0.63 (k = 5; n = 2,678)[k]	ρ = 0.55 (k = 4; n = 1,222)[e]	ρ = 0.52 (k = 5; n = 1,427)[k]	ρ = 0.51 (k = 14; n = 8,447)[j]

Note 1: Alphabetical letters after the effect sizes denote the source of the data listed in Appendix B
Note 2: Abusive Supervision or Follower Perceptions of Destructive Leadership

DLBs and Positively Valenced Leadership as Correlates

The nomological network in RQ3 also has to incorporate leadership correlates. After a careful, systematic search and review of the associated articles, the correlates of evaluations of DLBs (e.g., abusive supervision, unethical leadership) still need to be discovered, as noted by the gaps or blanks in Tables 14 and 15. A vigilant review of the primary meta-analyses in the leadership literature was performed for the SOMA meta-analytical estimates of Table 14 to check for counterintuitive relationship magnitudes and directions. Of note, the following positively valenced leadership correlates are positively associated with Abusive Supervision via the effect size estimates: Transactional ρ = 0.12 (k = 7; n = 2,156), Authentic Leadership ρ = 0.40 (k = 1; n = 594) and Management by Exception (passive) ρ = 0.24 (k = 3; n = 690). Although these results are counterintuitive, we cannot eliminate the effect of random sampling error and smaller k values resulting in smaller sample sizes as a potential cause of the findings. As expected, all other positively balanced leadership correlates are negatively associated with DLBs. The strongest correlation is between Ethical Leadership and Abusive Supervision with ρ = -0.63 (k = 18; n = 8,186).

Table 14: Second Order Meta-Analytic Effect Size Estimates for Traditional & Values Based Leadership Constructs as Correlates to DLBs

		Initiating Structure	Management by Exception-Active	Contingent Rewards	Consideration	Management by Exception Passive	Transformational	Authentic Leadership	Ethical Leadership	Servant Leadership	Supportive	Transactional	LMX
1	**Abusive Supervison**[2]						ρ = −0.34 (k = 15; n = 3,922)[k]		ρ = −0.63 (k = 18; n = 8,186)[k]		ρ = -0.53 (k = 6; n = 1,230)w	ρ = 0.12 (k = 7; n = 2,156)[k]	ρ = −0.52 (k = 32; n = 9,077)[k]
2	**Authoritarian**												
3	**Unethical**												
4	**Laissez-fairre**	ρ = −0.48 (k = 13; n = 2,975)[b]	ρ = −0.51 (k = 5; n = 1,075)[b]	ρ = −0.38 (k = 6; n = 1,293)[b]	ρ = −0.48 (k = 13; n = 2,975)[b]	ρ = 0.24 (k = 3; n = 690)[b]	ρ = −0.50 (k = 85; n = 38,489)[b]	r = 0.40 (k = 1; n = 594)[b]	r = −0.27 (k = 1; n = 62)[b]	r = −0.40 (k = 1; n = 207)[b]			

Note 1: Alphabetical letters after the effect sizes denote the source of the data listed in Appendix B
Note 2: Abusive Supervison or Follower Perceptions of Destructive Leadership

Evaluations of DLBs and other Correlates

Lastly, Table 15 further builds on Table 14 by focusing only on Destructive Leadership behaviors and their correlates. Of note, only a few additional measures for the DLBs were found

through the systematic review and subsequent coding. Interestingly, Unethical Leadership ρ = 0.58 (k = 10, n = 2,702) is the strongest correlation to Abusive Supervision, much like Ethical Leadership, which was the strongest negative correlation with ρ = -0.63 (k = 18; n = 8,186) in Table 14. The only other measure is Authoritarian Leadership with ρ = 0.47 (k = 8; n = 1190), which suggests a potentially positive relationship.

Table 15: Second Order Meta-Analytic Effect Size Estimates Between Destructive Leadership Correlates

		Abusive Supervison[2]	Authoritarian	Unethical
1	**Abusive Supervison[2]**	1		
2	**Authoritarian**	ρ = 0.47 (k = 8; n =1,190)[j]	1	
3	**Unethical**	ρ = 0.58 (k = 10; n =2,702)[w]		1

Note 1: Alphabetical letters after the effect sizes denote the source of the data listed in Appendix B
Note 2: Abusive Supervison or Follower Perceptions of Destructive Leadership

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Theoretical Contributions

In addressing the specific research questions concerning the evaluation of DLBs concerning leader and follower individual differences, this discussion section aims to provide theoretical contributions that offer a roadmap for future research and practical improvements. Moreover, this chapter synthesizes the study's findings on destructive leadership, addressing the research questions and examining the implications of the results. This discussion continues to be structured around the leader's individual differences, follower differences, and nomological networks of destructive leadership behaviors, drawing upon correlation matrices, relative weights analysis, and incremental predictive validity tests conducted during the research and specified in Chapter Four.

This research has significantly advanced our theoretical understanding of destructive leadership behaviors and abusive supervision in isolation. By investigating the intricate interplay between follower and leader characteristics, this research has expanded existing knowledge regarding the factors influencing the perception and evaluations of DLBs. Notably, identifying specific follower attributes, such as emotional stability and anger, as well as specific measures of organizational identification, contribute valuable insights into how individuals interpret and respond to their perceptions of DLBs (Carmeli et al., 2010; Tepper, 2007). Similarly, the exploration of typically measured leader traits through the lens of follower traits such as narcissism, anger, and affect enrich our understanding of the personality factors predisposing individuals to engage in abusive leadership behaviors (Babić et al., 2021; Schyns & Schilling, 2013).

Research Question 1: Leader Differences

First, the study introduces a comprehensive framework integrating individual differences such as personality, intelligence, age, and gender with leadership evaluation processes through the Reversing-the-lens framework. This framework delineates the intricate process leading to leadership emergence and subsequent follower evaluation, emphasizing the role of individual characteristics in shaping leadership perceptions (Shamir, 2007). By highlighting how these individual differences influence leader behavior and follower evaluation, the study provides a nuanced understanding of the dynamics in destructive leadership assessments.

This study also explored leaders' individual differences in isolation that influence the potential relationship to evaluations of DLBs. The literature suggested several leader traits could be identified as significant predictors of DLBs. These included traits such as narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and authoritarianism which the literature suggests are associated with negative leadership behaviors as the literature (Schyns & Schilling, 2013; Mackey et al., 2017; Mackey et al., 2021). Moreover, the research suggests that these individuals engage in abusive supervision as they prioritize their own needs and goals over the well-being of their subordinates through some phenomenon (Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Furnham et al., 2013; Mackey et al., 2021). However, the systematic search and coding for leader differences only resulted in demographic or stable individual differences between leaders as a correlation to the followers' evaluation of DLBs. This lack of correlational evidence suggests a potential gap in the primary meta-analytic studies involving leader differences and evaluations of DLBs.

Therefore, this study analyzed leader demographics due to potential variance from stereotypes, subordinate gender roles, and bias or subjective evaluations of follower work tasks (Banks et al., 2021). Scholarly investigations have revealed the inherent volatility, where actual

leader behaviors can often be conflated with subjective perceptions, leading to divergent evaluations concerning leaders' gender. For example, research conducted by Banks et al. (2021) and earlier studies by Butterfield and Bartol (1977) underscore the dynamic nature of follower evaluations, demonstrating how they are subject to fluctuation depending on the gender of the leader (Butterfield & Bartol, 1977; Wang et al., 2019; Bank et al., 2021; Santos, 2023). This variability is attributed to several critical factors, including the activation of gender stereotypes, the gender identity of the evaluator, and the gendered context within which evaluations are made. Moreover, Deaux and Major's (1987) seminal work proposed a foundational model elucidating the influence of gender stereotypes on behavior. Their findings suggest that individuals tend to align their evaluations with prevailing gender stereotypes, mainly when these stereotypes are activated (Deaux & Major, 1987; Santos, 2023).

All of these theories and associated studies are accumulated in my results of the relationship between leader gender and perceptions of DLB, suggesting that leader gender is the more meaningful correlate of the available demographic traits with RW% = 0.55 at $R^2 = 0.0066$. Moreover, leader gender's SOMA main effect or correlation estimate is the highest at $\rho = -0.06$ ($k = 5$; $n = 7{,}561$). However, from the data of second order meta-analytic effect sizes, RWA, and incremental predictive validity suggests that there is no statistically significant inference that female leaders may less likely result in followers perceiving their DLBs as abusive. Moreover, given the weak effect sizes amongst the leaders' differences, the results of this study suggest that the estimated demographic correlates do not predict the evaluations of DLBs in a meaningful way which is evident by the near zero effect sizes and associated confidence intervals.

In summary, the findings on the relationships of leader tenure in organization, age, and gender suggest these stable characteristics or demographic traits are not significant enough in

terms of effect size to draw any meaningful predictive validity to evaluations of DLBs. Furthermore, the RWA demonstrated that these leader traits contribute unique contributions with gender as the highest RW%, although the total effect of the combined measures is likely practically insignificant. Theoretically this is interesting to note that some of the most common characteristics are not practically significant in predicting evaluations of DLBs.

Research Question 2: Follower Differences

Second, this study serves as a primer for research on evaluations of DLBs, offering a synthesized overview of relevant theoretical definitions and constructs. The study bridges the gap between leadership research and personality psychology by examining the correlates and outcomes of evaluations of DLBs through the lens of individual differences. Meta-analytic findings underscore the nuanced interplay between individual differences and destructive leadership assessments, underscoring the need for a holistic understanding of evaluative processes.

The study investigated various follower characteristics that influence perceptions of DLBs. The correlation matrices revealed significant associations between specific follower attributes and their perceptions of abusive supervision. For instance, followers' levels of FFM traits, narcissism, affect, anger, and demographics emerged as critical factors affecting how they perceive and interpret leadership behaviors. The strongest or greatest magnitude of the second order meta-analytic effect sizes measuring these follower differences of RQ2a and their relationship to destructive leadership evaluations included Negative Affectivity: $\rho = 0.36$ ($k = 45$; $n = 14,754$), Emotional Stability (Inverse Neuroticism): $\rho = -0.29$ ($k = 51$; $n = 16,398$), Psychological capital: $\rho = -0.29$ ($k = 7$; $n = 3,212$), CSE: $\rho = -0.22$ ($k = 27$, $n = 6,082$), Positive Affectivity: $\rho = -0.19$ ($k = 16$; $n = 3,544$). Conversely, the weakest SOMA estimate was gender:

ρ = -0.03 (k = 206; n = 64,712). These findings suggest that followers with a higher measure of negative affectivity are more likely to report higher evaluations of a leader's DLB. Conversely, the higher the positive personality measures such as emotional stability, positive affectivity, psychological capital, and CSE are, the less likely they are to report evaluations of DLB, thereby signaling some potential coping mechanism or similar phenomena. While the total number of articles (k) are relatively small in this case, the large sample sizes (n) suggest that the effects are relatively robust and minimize random-sampling error which is the largest contributing factor to variance in effect sizes (Schmidt & Hunter, 2016).

Similar to the leaders' gender, followers' gender also resulted in weak effect sizes, suggesting little to no relationship or predictive ability between gender and evaluations of DLBs. This result and its interpretation may be explained by Powell et al.'s (2021) analysis that gender stereotypes have evolved from being predominantly masculine to a more androgynous conception. Although gender's impact on follower evaluations has remained a consistent focus in research for decades, recent studies have indicated a shift in the perception of the "ideal manager" stereotype. This evolving stereotype potentially signals a decreasing barrier for women in receiving positive evaluations from followers, reflecting evolving attitudes within organizational environments (Powell et al., 2021; Santos, 2023). This shift in the gender perceptions and stereotyping paradigm may be an example of the weak yet still negative relationship between both genders and evaluations of DLBs.

The relative weights analysis also highlighted the importance of different follower characteristics in predicting evaluations of DLBs. Negative affectivity emerged as a potentially powerful predictor, indicating its potential role in shaping followers' interpretations of leadership interactions. For example, the RWA and predictive incremental validity results suggest that

negative affect ($\beta = 0.637$, $p < 0.001^{***}$ with RW% of 0.39, $R^2 = 0.233$) and positive affect ($\beta = -0.541$, $p < 0.001^{***}$ with RW% of 0.10, $R^2 = 0.233$) are the most important or influential predictors in the 13-factor regression model of follower differences. This study further examined the incremental predictive validity by analyzing the 13-factor model of follower differences in SPSS with individual variable or predictor contributions. The 13-factor model yielded significant $R^2 = 0.233$ ($p < 0.001^{***}$) as determined by the R derived RWA analysis and SPSS multiple regression.

Additionally, analyzing correlated regression coefficients as part of the test suggested continued improvement in the Adjusted R in Table 12 ***with the exception of the emotional stability.*** All regression coefficients (β) except for emotional stability and age are statistically insignificant in the 13-factor model. However, the other 11 measures are statistically significant, with many values of $p < 0.001$. The coefficients (β) with the statistically significant highest magnitude are negative affect $\beta = 0.637$, $p < 0.001^{***}$ and positive affect $\beta = -0.541$, $p < 0.001^{***}$. The measure with the coefficient with the lowest magnitude is follower gender $\beta = -0.064$, $p = 0.001^{***}$. The regression coefficients (β) are pronounced effect sizes to determine the relative change in that predictor variable compared to the associated change in the evaluation of the DLB. These coefficients verify the meta-analytic estimates of those correlates (ρ) in the correlation matrices. Interestingly, emotional stability's regression coefficient (β) is statistically insignificant in the RQ2c regression model. This is potentially explained by the review of the partial correlations and the predictor's collinearity (VIF) and covariance limitations as well as a relatively small sample size. The incremental predictive validity results, therefore, support the finding of my SOMA meta-analytic correlation matrices and the RWA with positive and negative affect as the correlates contributing to the most variance attributing to the follower

perceptions of DLB in the 13-factor follower individual differences selected for my regression model.

While this study's results demonstrate statistically significant relationships between follower individual differences and perceptions of DLB, it is crucial to delve deeper into the meaningfulness of these effect sizes. Examining effect sizes provides insights into the practical significance of the findings. For instance, the significant magnitude coefficients for negative and positive affect suggest that these factors may substantially influence follower perceptions of DLB. Conversely, the smaller effect sizes for extraversion, openness to experience, narcissism, and demographic traits raises questions about their relative importance in this context.

Building on these results, we must consider the conceptual confusion and measurement issues associated with the source data found in the destructive leadership and abusive supervision literature used to generate the primary meta-analytic studies and, therefore, used to yield this study's SOMA results. For example, Fischer et al. (2021) highlighted the confusion in conceptualizing abusive supervision and the conflation between followers' subjective evaluations and leaders' behaviors. Similarly, in the context of this study's results, there may be a need to critically assess how perceptions of DLB are measured and whether they accurately capture followers' experiences of abusive leadership. This need could involve discussing the potential limitations of existing measurement tools and the implications for interpreting the study's findings (Fischer et al., 2021). For example, Fischer et al. (2021) underlined that abusive supervision is a low base rate phenomenon, posing challenges for empirical research and potential endogeneity in my second-order meta-analytic results for research questions 1, 2, and 3. This low base rate phenomenon, characterized by the survey results of Tepper's (2000) fifteen-question AS score, may raise questions about the prevalence and reporting of DLB within

organizational contexts. Therefore, further exploring the implications of DLB being a relatively rare occurrence could shed light on the generalizability of the study's findings and the extent to which they can be applied across different organizational settings (Tepper, 2000; Fischer et al., 2021).

Considering the results of this study, the limitations mentioned above, and research gaps, I raise additional thoughts regarding methodological considerations used to generate the primary meta-analytic studies used to populate SOMA correlates and subsequent RWA and incremental predictive validity analyses. For example, Fischer et al. (2021) critiqued the overreliance on cross-sectional survey-based studies and vignette experiments in abusive supervision research. Similarly, this dissertation's results may prompt a reflection on the methodological approaches used to investigate follower perceptions of DLB. Considering the challenges identified by Fischer et al., such as the inability of some studies to establish causal effects due to their methodological limitations, the discussion could explore alternative research designs that could address these issues, such as longitudinal studies or experimental approaches such as simulation (Fischer et al., 2021).

Lastly, regardless of the methodological limitations, these results support the Reversing-the-lens theoretical perspective given the statistically significant and power of the effective sizes, such as the regression coefficient for negative affect, the change in R^2, and the correlation estimate with their RWA (Wang et al., 2019). Therefore, these findings contribute to our understanding of the complex interplay between follower characteristics and perceptions of abusive supervision, emphasizing the importance of considering individual differences when examining leadership dynamics. Notably, the recent destructive leadership literature points to many gaps relating to these results from both a methodological and conceptual framework.

Research Question 3: Nomological Networks

Through second-order meta-analysis and relative weights analysis, the study elucidates the differential impacts of leader and follower individual differences on evaluations of destructive leadership. By exploring the predictive power of individual characteristics, such as personality traits, intelligence, gender, and many other correlates, including 184 SOMA meta-analytic correlation estimates, the research offers insights into the complex interrelationships between these factors and leadership evaluations. Notably, while specific individual differences emerge as potential predictors, like leader gender and follower emotional stability, their interaction underscores the nuanced nature of destructive leadership assessments.

For example, this study examined the nomological networks surrounding evaluations of DLBs to understand their relationships with other relevant constructs. The correlation matrices revealed significant associations between evaluations of DLBs and various outcomes, including follower job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions. Furthermore, I note some strong correlations with evaluations of DLBs based on ρ and the robustness of the meta-analytic estimate due to the highest number of articles (k) included and sample size (n). For example, Turnover Intention $\rho = 0.40$ *(k = 54; n = 18,868)* and Job Satisfaction $\rho = -0.41$ *(k = 52; n = 17,717)* are the most robust correlates related to the evaluations of DLBs based on sample size but I cannot discredit the variance contributed to individual performance, work-family-conflict, and other performance measures (Schyns & Schilling, 2013; Mackey et al., 2021; Zhang & Bednall, 2016).

Furthermore, examining the nomological networks surrounding abusive supervision sheds light on its broader impact on organizational outcomes. The significant associations identified with variables such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover

intentions underscore the detrimental effects of evaluations of DLBs on individual well-being and organizational effectiveness (Tepper, 2000; Zhang & Bednall, 2016). This comprehensive approach to understanding evaluations of DLBs contributes to developing more nuanced theories of leadership dynamics, enhancing our ability to predict, prevent, and address destructive behavior in organizational settings.

Additionally, to complete the nomological network around evaluations of DLBs, I focused on positive and negatively valenced leadership constructs for a complete perspective. The finds suggest that most positively valenced leadership constructs (e.g., transformational, charismatic, LMX, ethical, servant, supportive, management by exception (active)) are negatively correlated with evaluations of DLBs except for Transactional $\rho = 0.12$ ($k = 7$; $n = 2{,}156$), Authentic Leadership $\rho = 0.40$ ($k = 1$; $n = 594$) and Management by Exception (passive) $\rho = 0.24$ ($k = 3$; $n = 690$). The strongest correlation is between Ethical Leadership and Abusive Supervision with $\rho = -0.63$ ($k = 18$; $n = 8{,}186$). Interestingly, Unethical Leadership $\rho = 0.58$ ($k = 10$, $n = 2{,}702$) is the strongest correlation to Abusive Supervision, much like Ethical Leadership, which was the strongest negative correlation with $\rho = -0.63$ ($k = 18$; $n = 8{,}186$) in Table 14. The only other measure is Authoritarian Leadership with $\rho = 0.47$ ($k = 8$; $n = 1190$), which suggests a potentially positive relationship.

These findings, the destructive leadership literature, and associated theories suggest gaps in the relationship between leadership correlates. Although positively valenced leadership has been well studied, the relationship between these measures and destructive leadership needs to be better understood quantitatively (Banks et al., 2016; Banks et al., 2018; Banks et al., 2021). This interpretation is even more true for the DLBs and their correlates, especially outside of abusive supervision, as the effect sizes in the primary meta-analysis literature resulted in many blanks in

our SOMA analysis (Mackey et al., 2021). Moreover, to build on this observation, many destructive leadership articles use Tepper's (2000) abusive leadership measure but use the term destructive leadership to describe quantitative relationships such as correlations between follower and leader differences (Tepper, 2000). Therefore, I find that term destructive leadership in terms of a measurable correlate must be used with caution because the actual DLB used to draw empirical relationships is abusive supervision in most cases (Zhang & Bednall, 2016; Mackey et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2019).

Future Research Potential

First, this study synthesizes existing literature to propose a future research agenda to advance the understanding of destructive leadership evaluations. The study paves the way for empirical investigations into specific individual differences, contextual moderators, and theoretical frameworks by identifying critical gaps and recommending avenues for further inquiry. Moreover, the research underscores the importance of informed decision-making in organizational contexts by advocating for a deeper understanding of evaluative processes.

Secondly, my findings and their methodological limitations extend Fischer et al.'s (2021) recommendations for rethinking the conceptualization, measurement, and empirical study of abusive supervision. Drawing on these recommendations and discussing the dissertation results could propose avenues for future research to address the identified challenges and advance knowledge in the abusive leadership field. These avenues include suggestions for refining conceptualizations and measurement tools, adopting more rigorous research designs, and exploring novel approaches to studying DLB. All with the hope of minimizing errors such as standard method basis exacerbating any endogeneity problems and better understanding the relationships between correlates and evaluations of DLBs from a predictive power perspective.

Lastly, the findings of this study have several important implications for theory, research, and practice in the field of leadership. By identifying the follower and leader characteristics that influence perceptions of DLBs, this research enhances our understanding of the factors contributing to their occurrence. Additionally, examining the nomological network provides valuable insights into the broader potential impact of DLBs on organizational outcomes. For future research, it would be valuable to explore further the mechanisms underlying the relationships identified in this study, particularly the mediating and moderating factors that influence the effects of DLBs. Additionally, longitudinal studies could help elucidate the long-term consequences of destructive leadership behavior and its impact on organizational effectiveness.

Practical Implications

In addition to its theoretical contributions, this dissertation offers practical implications for practitioners seeking to improve leadership evaluation processes. By delineating the influence of individual differences on destructive leadership assessments, the study provides insights into factors that may affect leadership effectiveness. Moreover, by highlighting the need for nuanced evaluation criteria, the research prompts reevaluating existing assessment practices and developing more tailored evaluation strategies.

From a practical standpoint, organizations can use the findings of this research to develop targeted interventions to mitigate the adverse effects of DLBs. By fostering emotional intelligence among leaders and promoting a culture of organizational justice and support, organizations can create environments that discourage evaluations of DLBs and promote positive outcomes for leaders and followers. Furthermore, the study underscores the broader organizational implications of destructive leadership evaluations. The research highlights the

importance of considering multiple factors in evaluative processes by elucidating how individual differences shape leadership perceptions. From a practical standpoint, this entails addressing individual biases and designing evaluation systems that account for diverse characteristics and perspectives.

The findings of this study hold crucial practical implications for organizations seeking to address and mitigate DLBs. By understanding the follower and leader characteristics associated with destructive behavior, organizations can tailor interventions and strategies to prevent or reduce its occurrence. For instance, incorporating modules focused on enhancing emotional intelligence and promoting a culture of fairness and support within leadership development programs can equip leaders with the skills and awareness necessary to recognize and mitigate abusive behaviors (Barling et al., 2009; Petrou et al., 2012).

Additionally, interventions to improve organizational justice and social support can protect against the adverse effects of DLBs. Organizations can mitigate the impact of DLBs on individual and organizational outcomes by implementing policies and practices that promote fairness, transparency, and employee well-being (Colquitt et al., 2007; Schaubroeck et al., 2018). This proactive approach not only helps prevent the occurrence of abusive supervision but also fosters a positive organizational climate that supports employee engagement, satisfaction, and retention.

In summary, this dissertation contributes significantly to leadership studies, providing valuable insights into the complex phenomenon of DLBs. By elucidating the interplay between follower and leader characteristics and exploring its nomological networks, the study advances our understanding of the factors contributing to abusive supervision and its impact on organizational outcomes. Furthermore, the practical implications of this research offer actionable

strategies for organizations to address and mitigate abusive leadership behaviors, ultimately fostering healthier and more effective workplaces.

Study Limitations and Future Research Directions

Leadership scholars have long explored the intricate dynamics of destructive leadership behaviors (DLBs), recognizing their detrimental effects on organizational outcomes and individual well-being. However, while extant literature has provided valuable insights into the role of individual differences in shaping perceptions and experiences of DLBs, there still needs to be a notable gap regarding the comprehensive understanding of these phenomena. This dissertation addresses this gap by examining the influence of individual differences on the occurrence and perception of DLBs within organizational contexts. Nonetheless, this research primarily concentrates on individual-level factors, thus overlooking the potential impact of broader organizational and situational determinants on DLBs. Furthermore, as highlighted, the existing literature often conflates evaluations with behaviors, necessitating a more nuanced examination of the relationships between individual differences, behaviors, and perceptions of DLBs (Fischer et al., 2021).

Expanding the scope of inquiry beyond individual differences is imperative to encompass a broader array of factors influencing DLBs, which builds upon Fischer et al.'s (2021) insightful critique. Organizational culture, for instance, plays a pivotal role in shaping leadership behaviors and the tolerance for destructive practices within a given context (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012). Similarly, situational factors such as power dynamics and environmental stressors can significantly impact the prevalence and manifestations of DLBs (Tepper et al., 2017). Thus, future research endeavors should adopt a multi-level approach, integrating organizational, situational, and individual factors to understand DLBs comprehensively.

Additionally, it is essential to disentangle the complexities surrounding the evaluation of DLBs. Evaluations are not synonymous with behaviors; instead, they represent subjective appraisals influenced by many factors, including individual predispositions and contextual cues (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). Therefore, future studies should strive to differentiate between perceptions of DLBs and actual behavioral manifestations, elucidating whether individual differences predispose individuals to engage in or perceive such behaviors.

Furthermore, while this study illuminates the predictive power of individual differences in destructive leadership evaluations, it must fully elucidate the mechanisms underlying these relationships. The ambiguity regarding the mechanisms underlying the relationship between individual differences and DLBs warrants more attention. It remains unclear whether specific individuals are more susceptible to being targeted by DLBs or are more prone to perceiving such behaviors in their interactions with leaders. Moreover, the role of leaders' characteristics in either perpetrating or being perceived as engaging in DLBs warrants closer examination (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). By disentangling these reciprocal influences, future research can provide valuable insights into the dynamics of DLBs and inform interventions to mitigate their detrimental impact. Therefore, future research should delve deeper into the interplay between individual characteristics and evaluative processes to provide a more nuanced understanding of leadership assessments.

Lastly, while meta-analytic approaches offer valuable insights, they are constrained by the limitations of existing data and methodologies. Future research should address these limitations by incorporating more diverse samples, utilizing standardized measurement tools, and exploring additional moderating variables and work to address endogeneity issues, standard method basis, and low base rate phenomenon in abusive supervision (Fischer et al., 2021). Also,

contextual factors such as organizational culture or situational contexts still need to be explored in the current research. Future studies should contextualize individual differences within broader organizational frameworks, considering factors such as industry norms or leadership styles.

Table 16: Agenda for Future Research on DL Behaviors & Perceptions

Key Finding	Sample Research Question	Theoretical Consequence
Recommendation #1: Additional studies of DLBs and their practical implications at an aggregated or organizational level of analysis for advances in strategic human resource management.		
The outcomes of DLBs are well studied; however, the measurable cost impact at an aggregated scale needs to be identified in the research. This would open the door for destructive leadership research integration with economics or organizational-level quantitative performance measures.	What is the aggregated economic impact of firm attrition due to DLBs, including lost productivity, decreased learning, and increased requirement costs?	It bridges the gap between academia and practitioner-focused studies while reinforcing the measurable cost impacts of quantitative measures outside of applied psychology and follower well-being.
Recommendation #2: Build more on the limited theoretical framework associated with destructive leadership and its correlates.		
This study's theoretical framework for individual differences and DLB perceptions is the Reversing-the-lens Theory. Continued examination of supporting and alternative theoretical perspectives will better ground destructive leadership in theory rather than phenomena-driven perspectives.	Given the positive correlation between Transactional Leadership, LMX, and DL, what is the relationship between Agency Theory and the Behavioral Agent Model (BAM) in explaining the transaction or information asymmetry perspectives on follower perceptions of DL?	This study's findings will strengthen the theoretical framework of such observations and the leadership field.
Recommendation #3: Investigate the impact of leader individual differences on evaluations of destructive leadership via its mechanisms of influence.		
This study only included leader demographic differences and tenure, paving the way for many	How does a leader's personality trait, such as narcissism or Machiavellianism, affect their	Longitudinal studies could elucidate how individual leader differences correspond to shifts in DLB evaluations

Table 16: Agenda for Future Research on DL Behaviors & Perceptions (Continued)		
Key Finding	**Sample Research Question**	**Theoretical Consequence**
personality traits, attitudes, and behaviors as characterized by the leader.	propensity for engaging in destructive behaviors, and how do followers with different personality profiles interpret these behaviors?	over time. Researchers can inform interventions to mitigate destructive leadership tendencies and foster more positive leader-follower relationships by gaining a deeper understanding of these dynamics.
Recommendation #4: Continue the exploration of the role of followers' individual differences in evaluations of destructive leadership.		
Although this study area was successfully reviewed via SOMA techniques following individual differences in RQ2, more work is needed outside of the SOMA methodology to target some of the identified research gaps, such as the **impact of the follower's geographical region of study** on DLB evaluations. Also, more primary studies are needed on **the Dark Triad and other excluded or missing individual traits** in this study's SOMA meta-analytic correlation estimates.	How does the follower's geographic region affect the relationship between other individual differences and evaluations of DLBs? Also, how strong is the relationship between a follower's Dark Triad trait (excluding narcissism) and evaluations of DLBs?	This question aims to continue to fill the research and available data gaps on critical measures and follower differences for a more holistic understanding of the relationships between measures. Of note is that this study measured the relationship between follower narcissism and evaluations of DLBs but not Machiavellianism and psychopathy.
Recommendation #5: Examine the moderating role of contextual factors in the followers' destructive leadership evaluations.		
Research should explore how organizational culture, industry norms, and situational contexts shape perceptions of destructive leadership behaviors.	How do cultural differences in leadership expectations influence the interpretation of destructive leadership behaviors across diverse organizational contexts?	Examining how contextual factors interact with leader and follower individual differences to influence evaluations of destructive leadership can provide a more comprehensive understanding of this phenomenon.

Roadmap for Future Research

This section offers a roadmap for future research to advance an understanding of evaluations of DLBs. The study lays the foundation for empirical inquiries into the complexities of leadership assessment processes by identifying key research questions and theoretical implications. Through a multifaceted approach encompassing theoretical refinement, methodological innovation, and practical application, future research endeavors can contribute to developing more informed and effective evaluation strategies in organizational contexts.

Moreover, from a practical perspective, employee retention and the cost of Turnover are some of the biggest business problems in contemporary research. Retaining valued employees remains one of the most urgent managerial challenges today. Estimates imply that an employee's total replacement cost is 90% to 200% of the annual salary. The operational factors driving costs include recruitment, selection, and training (Reina, Rogers et al., 2018). Moreover, evaluations of DLBs directly correlate with turnover intentions (Reina, Rogers, et al., 2018; Shareef & Atan, 2019). Therefore, many practical studies of attrition could bring value to studying destructive leadership. Moreover, the literature suggests the need for a consistent, theoretically driven framework linking behaviors, traits, and organizational characteristics as antecedents to emotional, labor, performance, and attrition outcomes in future research. (Harvey, Stoner et al. 2007, Tepper 2007, Nauman, Zheng et al. 2020, Peltokorpi and Ramaswami 2021).

Recommendation #1: Additional study of DLBs and their practical implications at an aggregated or organizational level of analysis for advances in strategic human resource management

The high cost of Turnover is 90 to 200% of the employee's base salary. This cost results in a research area of high value (Reina et al., 2018). Moreover, the literature on destructive

leadership's relationship to attrition has grown 30% in the last five years (Tepper et al., 2017; Gardner et al., 2020). Starratt and Grandy (2010) suggested two reasons for the growing interest in the dark side of leadership. The first is the prevalence and costs of destructive leadership in the workplace, and the second is the effect of creating a destructive organizational culture (Starratt & Grandy, 2010). Moreover, although an older statistic, Tepper et al. (2007) estimated a cost of $23.8 billion annually for US companies due to abusive supervision (Tepper, 2007; Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Therefore, research is needed to address the gap in the literature regarding practical implications such as economics and firm-level mitigation policies for strategic human resources management.

Recommendation #2: Build more on the limited theoretical framework associated with destructive leadership and its correlates.

Additional study is needed to address the gap found in the literature that abusive supervision is phenomenon-based versus theory-driven research. Moreover, many scholars stated that an integrative theoretical framework for abusive supervision and other forms of DLBs is still needed (Tepper, 2007; Zhang & Bednall, 2016). Choi et al. (2019) successfully linked LMX to address the gap in knowledge-sharing outcomes or behaviors related to abusive supervision. Their article proposes a theoretical model that links abusive supervision to employee knowledge sharing mediated by leader-member exchange (LMX) from a social exchange perspective (Choi, et al., 2019). Their success demonstrates that it is crucial to continue linking destructive leadership constructs to existing theoretical frameworks to yield external validity. My literature review determined that only 20 of 43 articles initially reviewed from the last 20 years in top journals, not including the meta-analytic systematic search articles (see Table A1, Appendix C), are theoretical, while the others use abusive supervision or destructive leadership constructs as a

phenomenon-driven approach based on outcomes. For example, Agency Theory is a specific theoretical framework missing in the literature for destructive leadership. Moreover, scholars only mention agency theory in the Tourish et al. (2013) article on dark transformational leadership (Tourish, 2013). Lastly, the destructive leadership literature has gravitated toward follower-centric research; therefore, the literature would benefit by utilizing the reversing-the-lens-theory (Wang et al., 2019).

Furthermore, the literature review finds that most contemporary research on abusive supervision utilizes reactance theory, social exchange theory, CET, or COR to explain the connection between abusive supervision and employee outcomes (Han, Harms, et al. 2017). New theoretical frameworks like reversing-the-lens-theory linking antecedents to outcomes should be employed to bring value and external validity to destructive leadership research (Wang et al., 2019). For example, Tourish (2013) pulled from Sutton's (2010) literature and discussed the agency theory perspective and moral hazards of power and leadership, "When people (regardless of personality) wield power, their ability to lord it over others causes them to (1) become more focused on their own needs and wants; (2) become less focused on others' needs, wants, and actions; and (3) act as if written and unwritten rules others are expected to follow, do not apply to them" (Tourish, 2013, p. 10).

Moreover, self-interest-seeking behavior is a notable antecedent and measured outcome in the destructive leadership literature (Kim et al., 2016; Tepper et al., 2017; Mao et al., 2019). Therefore, building on the mosaic of the destructive leadership supported theories, I suggest future research in additional theoretical frameworks like resource-based view (RBV) to address emotional resource predictors and agency theory for self-interest, moral hazards, and leadership self-serving behavior antecedents.

Recommendation #3: Investigate the impact of leader individual differences on evaluations of destructive leadership via its mechanisms of influence.

In-depth exploration of how leader individual differences impact evaluations of destructive leadership is imperative. Future research should continue to investigate how these follower and leader individual differences influence perceptions of destructive leadership behaviors. For instance, consider the questions: how does a leader's personality trait, such as narcissism or Machiavellianism, affect their propensity for engaging in destructive behaviors, and how do followers with different personality profiles interpret these behaviors?

Moreover, through the lens of longitudinal studies, leadership researchers could elucidate how individual leader differences over time changes correspond to shifts in destructive leadership evaluations, examining for causal mechanisms and mediation paths. Leadership and applied psychology researchers can inform interventions to mitigate destructive leadership tendencies and foster more positive leader-follower relationships by gaining a deeper understanding of these dynamics.

Recommendation #4: Continued exploration of the role of followers' individual differences in evaluations of destructive leadership to include mechanisms of influence.

Understanding how followers' differences contribute to evaluations of destructive leadership is essential for comprehensively addressing this phenomenon. Research should investigate how follower personality traits, cognitive abilities, and demographic characteristics influence perceptions of DLBs. Additionally, exploring the role of follower characteristics in shaping responses to destructive leadership, such as resistance or compliance, can provide valuable insights into follower reactions. By incorporating follower perspectives into the

evaluation process, researchers can develop more nuanced models of destructive leadership and inform strategies for empowering followers to mitigate its adverse effects.

The geographic region of study. This literature review also identifies a gap in the study region or sample population. For example, 20 of 43 articles initially reviewed in the literature review from the last 20 years in top journals, not including the meta-analytic systematic search articles (see Table A1, Appendix C), involve sample sizes from Western culture (e.g., Europe, the US, and Canada). In comparison, only the other 13 articles represent the entire global population (e.g., Asia, India, Middle East). Moreover, no scholars in my literature review used sample populations from Latin America. Rai and Agarwal (2018) also noted this gap in the literature by extending their study of workplace bullying to India's underrepresented developing Asian country (Rai & Agarwal, 2018). This gap is essential to note and evaluate because Arasli et al.'s (2018) study in North Cyprus suggested other abusive supervision and performance results. For example, the Arasli et al. (2018) article measuring un-civility in North Cyprus suggested a weakened or less direct relationship between polychronicity and employee performance as un-civility increased as a moderator (Arasli et al., 2018). This confounding suggests the need for further empirical research studies of destructive leadership in diverse cultures. Significantly, scholars have increased the number of studies outside the US in the last five years.

Other Antecedent-focused Studies. Antecedents are essential for developing a working nomological model. While previous studies have extensively examined the antecedents and outcomes of destructive leadership on followers, there exists a noticeable gap in our comprehension of how follower traits and characteristics may influence the emergence or perception of destructive leadership behavior (Zhang & Bednall, 2016; Wang et al., 2019;

Mackey et al., 2021).

For example, Zhang and Bednall's (2016) article discussed that the outcomes of abusive supervision are well studied, and continued focus on outcomes is unlikely to yield solid theoretical contributions. Therefore, their review sees an increase in scholars shifting their attention from the consequences of destructive leadership to its antecedents (Zhang & Bednall, 2016). My initial literature review yielded similar results, with only 8 of 43 articles studying theoretically positioned correlates as traits, behaviors, or organizational characteristics. Given the causal implications of the term antecedents, this study focused on correlates versus antecedents. Also, it is essential to note the limitation of conflating and low base rate phenomena in the predictive power of abusive supervision correlates (Fischer et al., 2021). Thoroughgood et al. (2012) also discussed the need for antecedent-based studies from the dark triad personality framework, which discusses many under-explored paths in this field of research.

Furthermore, we know little about the interaction between the dark-triad personality traits of leaders and followers and which external factors (e.g., organizational structures) moderate this interaction (Thoroughgood et al., 2012). Moreover, despite investigating various individual dissimilarities such as personality traits, affect, demographic factors, and tenure, there still needs to be more knowledge regarding these variables' relative significance and magnitude in forecasting assessments of destructive leadership (Mackey et al., 2017).

Recommendation #5: Examine the moderating role of contextual factors in destructive leadership evaluations.

Investigating the moderating role of contextual factors in evaluations of destructive leadership is crucial for understanding the situational nuances that influence these assessments. Research should explore how organizational culture, industry norms, and situational contexts

shape perceptions of destructive leadership behaviors. For instance, consider the question: how do cultural differences in leadership expectations influence the interpretation of destructive leadership behaviors across diverse organizational contexts? Future research examining how contextual factors interact with leader and follower individual differences to influence evaluations of destructive leadership can provide a more comprehensive understanding of this phenomenon. Through this lens, researchers can develop targeted interventions to address destructive leadership behaviors and promote more positive organizational outcomes by considering the broader organizational and environmental context.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this dissertation lays the groundwork for future research to advance our understanding of destructive leadership evaluations in the context of individual differences between leaders and followers. By providing actionable recommendations for research inquiry, the study paves the way for empirical investigations that can inform organizational practices and interventions. Through interdisciplinary collaboration and methodological innovation involving SOMA, researchers can continue to deepen our understanding of destructive leadership's complex dynamics and contribute to developing strategies for fostering healthier leader-follower relationships and promoting positive organizational outcomes.

Of note is the importance of both positive and negative affect as potential predictors of destructive leadership evaluations, which tells the story and allows for personal reflection through the lens of the other attitude and personality differences outside of the FFM. Moreover, the findings of this SOMA related to personality differences suggest individual uniqueness in our perceptions of interactions between peers and managers. Lastly, ethical and destructive leadership have the most inversed relationship among all the positive and negatively valenced

leadership types. This result may imply that ethical-focused characterizations of leadership styles are highly differentiated from destructive leadership definitions in both a conceptual and quantitative perspective. However, more research will be required to understand these mechanisms of influence in leadership correlates.

Additionally, this study targeted an all-encompassing view of destructive leadership by collecting and measuring data associated with its nomological networks to include other leadership correlates and various DLB outcomes. These research agenda items, and methodology allowed significant contributions to the literature and uncovered numerous gaps, paving the way for future research.

REFERENCES

***References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the review Tables 3 to 5**

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, Jobs and Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender & Society, 4*(2), 139-158. doi:10.1177/089124390004002002.

*Albashiti, B., et al. (2021). "Fire in the belly: the impact of despotic leadership on employees work-related outcomes in the hospitality setting." International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management **33**(10): 3564-3584.

Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for Tat? The Spiraling Effect of Incivility in the Workplace. The Academy of Management Review, 24(3), 452–471. https://doi.org/10.2307/259136.

Anglim, J., Horwood, S., Smillie, L. D., Marrero, R. J., & Wood, J. K. (2020). Predicting Psychological and Subjective Well-Being From Personality: A Meta-Analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 146(4), 279–323. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000226

Antonakis, J., & Day, D. V. (2018). Leadership: Past, present, and future. In J. Antonakis & D. V. Day (Eds.), The nature of leadership (3rd ed., pp. 3–26). Sage Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506395029.n1

*Arasli, H., et al. (2018). "Workplace incivility as a moderator of the relationships between polychronicity and job outcomes." International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management **30**(3): 1245-1272.

Ashforth, B.E. (1997), Petty Tyranny in Organizations: A Preliminary Examination of Antecedents and Consequences. Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences / Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 14: 126-140. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-4490.1997.tb00124.x.

Babić, L., Mihić, M., & Gligorijević, M. (2021). Dark triad of personality and abusive supervision: The mediating role of organizational politics. Current Psychology, 40(2), 923-934.

Banks, G. C., Gooty, J., Ross, R. L., Williams, C. E., & Harrington, N. T. (2018). Construct redundancy in leader behaviors: A review and agenda for the future. The Leadership Quarterly, 29(1), 236-251.

Banks, G. C., McCauley, K. D., Gardner, W. L., & Guler, C. E. (2016). A meta-analytic review of authentic and transformational leadership: A test for redundancy. The Leadership Quarterly, 27(4), 634-652.

Banks, G. C., Woznyj, H. M., & Mansfield, C. A. (2021). Where is "behavior" in organizational behavior? A call for a revolution in leadership research and beyond. The Leadership Quarterly, 101581.

Barling, J., Dupré, K. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2009). Predicting workplace aggression and violence. Annual Review of Psychology, 60, 671-692

Blasi, A. (1984). Moral identity: Its role in moral functioning. In W.M. Kurtines & J.J. Gewirtz Eds.), Morality, moral behavior and moral development (pp. 128–139). New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Blasi, A. (1985). The moral personality: Reflections for social science and education. In MW. Berkowitz & F. Oser (Eds.), Moral education: Theory and application (pp. 433–443). New York, NY: Wiley.

Bligh, Michelle & Kohles, Jeffrey & Pearce, Craig & Justin, Joseph & Stovall, John. (2007). When the Romance is Over: Follower Perspectives of Aversive Leadership. Applied Psychology. 56. 528 - 557. 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00303.x.

*Brender-Ilan, Y. and Z. Sheaffer (2019). "How do self-efficacy, narcissism, and autonomy mediate the link between destructive leadership and counterproductive work behavior." Asia Pacific Management Review **24**(3): 212-222.

Butterfield, D., & Bartol, K. (1977). Evaluators of leader behavior: A missing element in leadership theory. In JG Hunt & LL Larson (Eds.), Leadership: The cutting edge.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York, Harper & Row.

Carmeli, A., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Ziv, E. (2010). Inclusive leadership and employee involvement in creative tasks in the workplace: The mediating role of psychological safety. Creativity Research Journal, 22(3), 250-260.

*Cheng, B. H. and J. M. McCarthy (2018). "Understanding the Dark and Bright Sides of Anxiety: A Theory of Workplace Anxiety." Journal of Applied Psychology **103**: 537–560.

*Choi, W., et al. (2019). "A Social Exchange Perspective of Abusive Supervision and Knowledge Sharing: Investigating the Moderating Effects of Psychological Contract Fulfillment and Self-Enhancement Motive." Journal of Business and Psychology **34**(3): 305-319.

Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk-taking and job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(4), 909-927.

*Conger, J. A. (1990). "The Dark Side of Leadership." Organizational Dynamics **19**(2): 44.

De Hoogh, A. H., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates optimism: A multi-method study. The leadership quarterly, 19(3), 297-311.

Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender related behavior. *Psychological review, 94*(3), 369.

Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2012). Work engagement and Machiavellianism in the ethical leadership process. Journal of business ethics, 107, 35-47.

*Dionne, S. D., et al. (2014). "A 25-year perspective on levels of analysis in leadership research.EIN" The Leadership Quarterly **25**(1): 6-35.

Duffy, M.K., Ganster, D.C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. Academy of Management Journal, 45, 331–351.

Einarsen, S., & Skogstad, A. (1996). Bullying at work: Epidemiological findings in public and private organizations. European journal of work and organizational psychology, 5(2), 185-201.

Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. The leadership quarterly, 18(3), 207-216.

Fischer, T., Tian, A. W., Lee, A., & Hughes, D. J. (2021). Abusive supervision: A systematic review and fundamental rethink. The Leadership Quarterly, 32(6), 101540.

Furnham, A., Richards, S. C., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). The Dark Triad of Personality: A 10 Year Review. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 7, 199-216.

*Gardner, W. L., et al. (2020). "The Leadership Trilogy: A review of the third Decade of The Leadership Quarterly." The Leadership Quarterly **31**(1): 101379.

Graen, G. & J. F. Cashman (1975). "A ROLE-MAKING MODEL OF LEADERSHIP IN FORMAL ORGANIZATIONS - A DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH." Organization and administrative sciences **6**(2-3): p. 143.

Güntner, A. V., Klasmeier, K. N., Klonek, F. E., & Kauffeld, S. (2021). The power of followers

that do not follow: Investigating the effects of follower resistance, leader implicit followership theories and leader negative affect on the emergence of destructive leader behavior. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 28(3), 349–365. https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518211012408

*Han, G. H., et al. (2017). "Nightmare Bosses: The Impact of Abusive Supervision on Employees' Sleep, Emotions, and Creativity." Journal of Business Ethics **145**(1): 21-31.

*Harms, P. D., et al. (2017). "Leadership and stress: A meta-analytic review." The Leadership Quarterly **28**(1): 178-194.

*Harvey, P., et al. (2007). "Coping with abusive supervision: The neutralizing effects of ingratiation and positive effect on negative employee outcomes." The Leadership Quarterly **18**(3): 264-

Hedges, L. V., & Olkin, I. (2014). Statistical methods for meta-analysis. Academic press.280.

Hollander, E. P., & Julian, J. W. (1969). Contemporary trends in the analysis of leadership processes. Psychological Bulletin, 71(5), 387–397. https://doi.org/10.1037/h002734

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational Leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(5), 751–765. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.751.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. Research in Organizational Behavior, 19, 151-188.

*Kabat-Farr, D., et al. (2019). "Uncivil Supervisors and Perceived Work Ability: The Joint Moderating Roles of Job Involvement and Grit." Journal of Business Ethics **156**(4): 971-985.

*Khan, N. Z. A., et al. (2019). "Destructive Leadership And Job Stress: Causal Effect of

Emotional Exhaustion on Job Satisfaction of Employees In Call Centers." International Journal of Information, Business and Management **11**(1): 135.

*Kim, S. L., et al. (2016). "Abusive supervision, knowledge sharing, and individual factors." Journal of Managerial Psychology **31**(6): 1106-1120.

Kellerman, Barbara (2004). Bad Leadership: What It Is, How It Happens, Why It Matters. Boston, Harvard Business Publishing, 2004, p. 44.

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.

Landis, R. S. (2013). Successfully combining meta-analysis and structural equation modeling: Recommendations and strategies. Journal of business and psychology, 28(3), 251-261.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). Toxic leadership: When grand illusions masquerade as noble visions. Leader to Leader, 2005(36), 29-36.

Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M. (2004). Human, Social, and Now Positive Psychological Capital Management: Investing in people for competitive advantage. Organizational Dynamics, 33(2), 143–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.01.003

*Mackey, J. D., et al. (2013). "Subordinate social adaptability and the consequences of abusive supervision perceptions in two samples." The Leadership Quarterly **24**(5): 732-746.

Mackey, J. D., Frieder, R. E., Brees, J. R., et al. (2017). Abusive supervision: A meta-analysis and empirical review. Journal of Management, 43(6), 1940–1965. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316635056

Mackey, J. (2021). The dark side of leadership: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis

of destructive leadership research. Journal of Business Research, 134, 514–529. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.05.047

Madison, K., Holt, D.T., Kellermanns, F.W., Ranft, A.L., 2016. Viewing Family Firm Behavior and Governance Through the Lens of Agency and Stewardship Theories. Family Business Review 29, 65–93.

*Mao, J.-Y., et al. (2019). "Feeling safe? Conservation of resources perspective examining the interactive effect of leader competence and leader self-serving behavior on team performance." Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology **92**(1): 52-73.

Marengo, D., Davis, K.L., Gradwohl, G.Ö. et al. A meta-analysis on individual differences in primary emotional systems and Big Five personality traits. Sci Rep 11, 7453 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-84366-8

McCord, M. A., Joseph, D. L., Dhanani, L. Y., & Beus, J. M. (2018). A meta-analysis of sex and race differences in perceived workplace mistreatment. Journal of applied psychology, 103(2), 137.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1999). A Five-Factor theory of personality. In L. A. Pervin &O. P. John (Eds.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (pp. 139–153). Guilford Press.

*Mitchell, M. S. and M. L. Ambrose (2007). "Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs." Journal of Applied Psychology **92**(4): 1159.

Murphy, A. J. (1941). A study of the leadership process. American Sociological Review, 6, 674–687. https://doi.org/10.2307/2085506

Murphy, K.R. and Cleveland, J.N. (1995) Understanding Performance Appraisal. Social,

Organizational and Goal Setting, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

*Nauman, S., et al. (2020). "How despotic leadership jeopardizes employees' performance: the roles of quality of work-life and work withdrawal." Leadership & Organization Development Journal **42**(1): 1-16.

O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., Story, P. A., & White, C. D. (2015). A meta-analytic test of redundancy and relative importance of the dark triad and five-factor model of personality. Journal of Personality, 83(6), 644–664.

Oh, I. (2020). Beyond Meta-Analysis: Secondary Uses of Meta-Analytic Data. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 7, 125-153. doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-045006.

*Ng, T. W. H. and D. C. Feldman (2014). "Ethical leadership: Meta-analytic evidence of criterion-related and incremental validity." Journal of Applied Psychology **100**: 948–965.

*Nielsen, M. B., et al. (2017). "Exposure to workplace harassment and the Five-Factor Model of personality: A meta-analysis." Personality and Individual Differences **104**: 195-206.

Park, H. (H.), Wiernik, B. M., Oh, I.-S., Gonzalez-Mulé, E., Ones, D. S., & Lee, Y. (2020). Meta-analytic five-factor model personality intercorrelations: Eeny, meeny, miney, moe, how, which, why, and where to go. Journal of Applied Psychology, 105(12), 1490–1529. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000476

Parks-Leduc, L., Feldman, G., & Bardi, A. (2015). Personality Traits and Personal Values: A Meta-Analysis. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 19(1), 3–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868314538548

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism,

Machiavellianism and psychopathy. Journal of Research in Personality, 36(6), 556–563. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6

*Peltokorpi, V. and A. Ramaswami (2021). "Abusive supervision and subordinates' physical and mental health: the effects of job satisfaction and power distance orientation." The International Journal of Human Resource Management **32**(4): 893-919.

*Peus, C., et al. (2012). "Authentic Leadership: An Empirical Test of Its Antecedents, Consequences, and Mediating Mechanisms." Journal of Business Ethics **107**(3): 331-348.

Petrides, K. V. (2011). Ability and trait emotional intelligence. In T. Chamorro-Premuzic, S. von Stumm, & A. Furnham (Eds.), The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of individual differences (pp. 656–678). Wiley Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444343120.ch25

Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., Peeters, M. C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Hetland, J. (2012). Crafting a job on a daily basis: Contextual correlates and the link to work engagement. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33(8), 1120-1141.

Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A., & Jiang, X. (2021). The "good manager" over five decades: towards an androgynous profile? *Gender in Management: An International Journal*.

*Pradhan, S. and L. K. Jena (2016). "The Moderating Role of Neutralizers on the Relationship between Abusive Supervision and Intention to Quit: A Proposed Model." Journal of Human Values **22**(3): 238-248.

*Pradhan, S. and L. K. Jena (2017). "Effect of abusive supervision on employee's intention to quit and the neutralizing role of meaningful work in Indian IT organizations." International Journal of Organizational Analysis **25**(5): 825-838.

*Rai, A. and U. Agarwal (2018). "Impact of workplace bullying on employee outcomes: a study of Indian managerial employees." International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management **67**(7): 1147-1170.

*Reina, C. S., et al. (2018). "Quitting the Boss? The Role of Manager Influence Tactics and Employee Emotional Engagement in Voluntary Turnover." Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies **25**(1): 5-18.

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. Academy of Management Journal, 38(2), 555–572. https://doi.org/10.2307/256693

*Rose, K., et al. (2015). "Skunked." Human Resource Development Review **14**(1): 64-90.

Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. The leadership quarterly, 17(6), 617-633.

Santos, K. L. (2013). Gender and Leadership: A Second-Order Meta-Analytic Review

Schaubroeck, J. M., Lam, L. W., Lai, J. Y., Lennard, A. C., Peng, A. C., & Chan, K. W. (2018). Changing experiences of work dirtiness, occupational disidentification, and employee withdrawal. Journal of Applied Psychology, 103(10), 1086.

Schilling, J. (2009). From ineffectiveness to destruction: A qualitative study on the meaning of negative leadership. Leadership, 5(1), 102-128.

Schmid, E. A., Pircher Verdorfer, A., & Peus, C. (2019). Shedding light on leaders' self-interest: Theory and measurement of exploitative leadership. Journal of Management, 45(4), 1401-1433.

*Schyns, B. and J. Schilling (2013). "How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes." The Leadership Quarterly **24**(1): 138-158.

*Shamir, B., et al. (1993). "The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-Concept Based Theory." Organization Science **4**(4): 577-594.

Shamir, B. (2007). From Passive Recipients to Active Co-Producers: The Roles of Followers in The Leadership Process. Follower-Centered Perspectives on Leadership: A Tribute to JR Meindl. Stamford, CT: Information Age Publishing.

*Shareef, R. A. and T. Atan (2019). "The influence of ethical leadership on academic employees' organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention." Management Decision **57**(3): 583-605.

*Sonnentag, S. (2018). "The recovery paradox: Portraying the complex interplay between job stressors, lack of recovery, and poor well-being." Research in Organizational Behavior **38**: 169-185.

Spector, P. E., Cooper, C. L, Sanchez, J. I., O'Driscoll, M., Sparks, K., Bernin, P., Büssing, A., Dewe, P., Hart, P., Lu, L., Miller, K., De Morales, L. R., Ostrognay, G. M., Pagon, M., Pitariu, H. D., Poelmans, S. A., Radhakrishnan, P., Russinova, V., Salamatov, V., . . . Yu, S. (2002). Locus of control and well-being at work: How generalizable are Western findings? Academy of Management Journal, 45(2), 453–466. https://doi.org/10.2307/3069359

*Starratt, A. and G. Grandy (2010). "Young workers' experiences of abusive leadership." Leadership & Organization Development Journal **31**(2): 136-158.

Stogdill, R. (1948). Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. Journal of Psychology, 25, 35-71.https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1948.9917362

Strong, A. L. (1907). Review of Origin of Leadership [Review of the book Origin of leadership, by E. Mumford]. Psychological Bulletin, 4(12), 390. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0069268

*Tepper, B. J. (2000). "Consequences of abusive supervision." Academy of Management Journal **43**(2): 178-190.

*Tepper, B. J. (2007). "Abusive Supervision in Work Organizations: Review, Synthesis, and Research Agenda." Journal of Management **33**(3): 261-289.

*Tepper, B. J., et al. (2001). "Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive

*Tepper, B. J., et al. (2017). "Abusive Supervision." Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior **4**(1): 123-152.

*Thoroughgood, C. N., et al. (2012). "Bad to the Bone." Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies **19**(2): 230-255.

Tonidandel, S., & LeBreton, J. M. (2011). Relative importance analysis: A useful supplement to regression analysis. Journal of Business and Psychology, 26, 1-9.

*Tourish, D. (2013). "The Dark Side of Transformational Leadership."

*Tuncdogan, A., et al. (2017). "Individual differences as antecedents of leader behavior: Towards an understanding of multilevel outcomes." The Leadership Quarterly **28**(1): 40-64.

*Watkins, T. et al. (2019). "Whatever it takes: Leaders' perceptions of abusive supervision instrumentality." The Leadership Quarterly **30**(2): 260-272.

Wang, G., Van Iddekinge, C. H., Zhang, L., & Bishoff, J. (2019). Meta-analytic and primary investigations of the role of followers in ratings of leadership behavior in organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 104(1), 70.

Wang, H., Han, X., & Li, J. (2021). Supervisor narcissism and employee performance: A moderated mediation model of affective organizational commitment and power distance orientation. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 43(1), 14-29.

Woznyj, H., et al. (2022). "Job Attitudes: A Meta-Analytic Review and Agenda for Future Research." Journal of Organizational Behavior **43**(9).

Wu, M., Peng, Z., & Estay, C. (2018). How destructive leadership influences compulsory organizational citizenship behavior. Chinese Management Studies, 12(2), 453-468.

*Zhang, Y. and T. C. Bednall (2016). "Antecedents of Abusive Supervision: A Meta-analytic Review." Journal of Business Ethics **139**(3): 455-471.

Zhang, Y., Liu, X., Xu, S., Yang, L. Q., & Bednall, T. C. (2019). Why abusive supervision impacts employee OCB and CWB: A meta-analytic review of competing mediating mechanisms. Journal of Management, 45(6), 2474–2497

APPENDIX A: PRIMARY META-ANALYSIS ARTICLES

Individual Differences

[a] Anglim, J., Horwood, S., Smillie, L. D., Marrero, R. J., & Wood, J. K. (2020). Predicting Psychological and Subjective Well-Being From Personality: A Meta-Analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 146(4), 279–323. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000226

[j] Mackey, J. D., Frieder, R. E., Brees, J. R., et al. (2017). Abusive supervision: A meta-analysis and empirical review. Journal of Management, 43(6), 1940–1965. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316635056

[k] Mackey, J. (2021). The dark side of leadership: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis of destructive leadership research. Journal of Business Research, 134, 514–529. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.05.047

[x] Marengo, D., Davis, K.L., Gradwohl, G.Ö. et al. A meta-analysis on individual differences in primary emotional systems and Big Five personality traits. Sci Rep 11, 7453 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-84366-8

[l] McCord, M. A., Joseph, D. L., Dhanani, L. Y., & Beus, J. M. (2018). A meta-analysis of sex and race differences in perceived workplace mistreatment. Journal of applied psychology, 103(2), 137.

[m] MetaBus. Bosco, Frank. (2024). metaBUS – explore science.

[o] O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., Story, P. A., & White, C. D. (2015). A meta-analytic test of redundancy and relative importance of the dark triad and five-factor model of personality. Journal of Personality, 83(6), 644–664.

[q] Park, H. (H.), Wiernik, B. M., Oh, I.-S., Gonzalez-Mulé, E., Ones, D. S., & Lee, Y. (2020). Meta-analytic five-factor model personality intercorrelations: Eeny, meeny, miney, moe, how, which, why, and where to go. Journal of Applied Psychology, 105(12), 1490–1529. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000476

[r] Parks-Leduc, L., Feldman, G., & Bardi, A. (2015). Personality Traits and Personal Values: A Meta-Analysis. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 19(1), 3–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868314538548

[s] Schmitt, D. P., Realo, A., Voracek, M., & Allik, J. (2008). Why can't a man be more like a woman? Sex differences in Big Five personality traits across 55 cultures. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94(1), 168.

[u] Wang, G., Van Iddekinge, C. H., Zhang, L., & Bishoff, J. (2019). Meta-analytic and primary investigations of the role of followers in ratings of leadership behavior in organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 104(1), 70.

[w] Zhang, Y. and T. C. Bednall (2016). "Antecedents of Abusive Supervision: A Meta-analytic Review." Journal of Business Ethics **139**(3): 455-471.

Nomological Networks

[a] Anglim, J., Horwood, S., Smillie, L. D., Marrero, R. J., & Wood, J. K. (2020). Predicting Psychological and Subjective Well-Being From Personality: A Meta-Analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 146(4), 279–323. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000226

[b] Banks, G. C., Gooty, J., Ross, R. L., Williams, C. E., & Harrington, N. T. (2018). Construct redundancy in leader behaviors: A review and agenda for the future. The Leadership Quarterly, 29(1), 236–251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.005

[c] Cao, W., Li, P., van der Wal, R. C., & Taris, T. W. (2022). Leadership and workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. Journal of Business Ethics, 175(3), 551–569. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04612-2

[d] Fosse, T. H., Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S. V., et al. (2019). Active and passive forms of destructive leadership in a military context: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 35(1), 11–24.

[e] Harms, P. D., et al. (2017). Leadership and stress: A meta-analytic review. The Leadership Quarterly, 28(1), 178–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.10.006

[f] Harrison, David A., et al. (2006). "How Important Are Job Attitudes? Meta-Analytic Comparisons of Integrative Behavioral Outcomes and Time Sequences." *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 49, no. 2, 2006, pp. 305–25, https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2006.20786077.

[g] Kaluza, A. J., Boer, D., Buengeler, C., & van Dick, R. (2020). Leadership behaviour and leader self-reported well-being: A review, integration and meta-analytic examination. Work & Stress, 34(4), 388–412. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2020.1799135

[h] Li, P., Yin, K., Shi, J., Taris, T., & Damen, T. (2022). Are Bad Leaders indeed Bad for Employees? A Meta-Analysis and Review of Longitudinal Studies. Academy of Management Proceedings, 2022(1), 16057. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2022.16057abstract

[i] Lyubykh, Z., Turner, N., Hershcovis, M. S., et al. (2022). A meta-analysis of leadership and workplace safety: Examining relative importance, contextual contingencies, and methodological moderators. Journal of Applied Psychology, 107(2), 184–218. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000897

[j] Mackey, J. D., Frieder, R. E., Brees, J. R., et al. (2017). Abusive supervision: A meta-analysis and empirical review. Journal of Management, 43(6), 1940–1965. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316635056

[k] Mackey, J. (2021). The dark side of leadership: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis of destructive leadership research. Journal of Business Research, 134, 514–529. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.05.047

[m] MetaBus. Bosco, Frank. (2024). metaBUS – explore science.

[n] Montano, D., Schleu, J. E., et al. (2023). A Meta-Analysis of the Relative Contribution of Leadership Styles to Followers' Mental Health. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 30(2), 229–247. https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518211006561

[o] O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., Story, P. A., & White, C. D. (2015). A meta-analytic test of redundancy and relative importance of the dark triad and five-factor model of personality. Journal of Personality, 83(6), 644–664.

[p] Pajic, S., Buengeler, C., Den Hartog, D. N., et al. (2021). The moderating role of employee socioeconomic status in the relationship between leadership and well-being: A meta-analysis and representative survey. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 94(3), 637–664. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12343

[t] Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. The Leadership Quarterly, 24(1), 138–158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.001

[u] Wang, G., Van Iddekinge, C. H., Zhang, L., & Bishoff, J. (2019). Meta-analytic and primary investigations of the role of followers in ratings of leadership behavior in organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 104(1), 70.

[v] Zhang, Y., & Liao, Z. (2015). Consequences of abusive supervision: A meta-analytic review. Asia Pacific journal of management, 32, 959-987.

[w] Zhang, Y., & Bednall, T. (2016). Antecedents of Abusive Supervision: A Meta-analytic Review. Journal of Business Ethics **139**(3): 455-471.

APPENDIX B: SECOND ORDER META-ANALYSIS REFERENCES

[aa] Banks, G. C., Engemann, K. N., Williams, C. E., Gooty, J., McCauley, K. D., & Medaugh, M. R. (2017). A meta-analytic review and future research agenda of charismatic leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, 28(4), 508-529.

[bb] Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analysis. Journal of applied psychology, 89(5), 901.

[cc] Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: a qualitative and quantitative review. Journal of applied psychology, 87(4), 765.

[dd] Original Meta-Analysis.

[ee] Santos, K. L. (2013). Gender and Leadership: A Second-Order Meta-Analytic Review

APPENDIX C: OTHER TABLES & FIGURES

Table A1: Abusive Supervision and Destructive Leadership Focus and Journal

Discipline and Journal	Number of Articles	Abusive Supervision (AS)	Destructive Leadership (DL)	Other
Applied Psychology	**10**	**6**	**1**	**3**
Journal of Applied Psychology	5	3	1	1
Journal of Managerial Psychology	1	1	0	0
Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior	1	1	0	0
Personality and Individual Differences	1	0	0	1
Journal of Business and Psychology	1	1	0	0
Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology	1	0	0	1
Human Resources	**2**	**1**	**0**	**1**
Human Resource Development Review	1	0	0	1
The International Journal of Human Resource Management	1	1	0	0
Management	**20**	**8**	**7**	**5**
Leadership & Organizational Development Journal	2	1	0	1
The Leadership Quarterly	9	5	3	1
Asia Pacific Journal of Management	1	0	1	0
International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management	1	0	1	0
Organization Dynamics	1	0	0	1
Research in Organizational Behavior	1	0	1	0
Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies	2	0	1	1
Journal of Human Values	2	2	0	0
International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management	1	0	0	1
Business	**4**	**1**	**2**	**1**
International Journal of Information, Business, and Management	1	0	1	0
Journal of Business Ethics	3	1	1	1
TOTAL	**36**	**16**	**10**	**10**

Table A2: ANOVA for Research Question One (RQ1c) of Leaders' Individual Differences

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.964	1	2.964	2.965	.085[b]
	Residual	7407.036	7409	1.000		
	Total	7410.000	7410			
2	Regression	9.833	2	4.917	4.922	**.007**[c]
	Residual	7400.167	7408	0.999		
	Total	7410.000	7410			
3	Regression	99.301	3	33.100	33.536	**<.001**[d]
	Residual	7310.699	7407	0.987		
	Total	7410.000	7410			

a. Dependent Variable: Individual Follower Evaluation of Destructive Leadership

b. Predictors: (Constant), Age

c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender

d. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Leader Tenure in Organization

Table A3: ANOVA for Research Question One (RQ2c) of Followers' Individual Differences

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.117	1	1.117	1.117	.291[b]
	Residual	2790.883	2791	1.000		
	Total	2792.000	2792			
2	Regression	3.596	2	1.798	1.799	.166[c]
	Residual	2788.404	2790	0.999		
	Total	2792.000	2792			
3	Regression	37.338	3	12.446	12.601	**<.001**[d]
	Residual	2754.662	2789	0.988		
	Total	2792.000	2792			
4	Regression	55.806	4	13.951	14.216	**<.001**[e]
	Residual	2736.194	2788	0.981		
	Total	2792.000	2792			
5	Regression	169.521	5	33.904	36.031	**<.001**[f]
	Residual	2622.479	2787	0.941		
	Total	2792.000	2792			
6	Regression	194.295	6	32.382	34.730	**<.001**[g]
	Residual	2597.705	2786	0.932		
	Total	2792.000	2792			
7	Regression	240.582	7	34.369	37.515	**<.001**[h]
	Residual	2551.418	2785	0.916		
	Total	2792.000	2792			
8	Regression	372.083	8	46.510	53.508	**<.001**[i]
	Residual	2419.917	2784	0.869		
	Total	2792.000	2792			
9	Regression	381.003	9	42.334	48.866	**<.001**[j]
	Residual	2410.997	2783	0.866		
	Total	2792.000	2792			
10	Regression	402.681	10	40.268	46.886	**<.001**[k]
	Residual	2389.319	2782	0.859		
	Total	2792.000	2792			
11	Regression	405.658	11	36.878	42.977	**<.001**[l]
	Residual	2386.342	2781	0.858		
	Total	2792.000	2792			
12	Regression	537.281	12	44.773	55.204	**<.001**[m]
	Residual	2254.719	2780	0.811		
	Total	2792.000	2792			
13	Regression	651.156	13	50.089	65.020	**<.001**[n]
	Residual	2140.844	2779	0.770		
	Total	2792.000	2792			

a. Dependent Variable: Individual Follower Evaluation of Destructive Leadership
b. Predictors: (Constant), Age
c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender
d. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race
e. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness_to_Experience
f. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness_to_Experience, Conscientiousness
g. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness_to_Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion
h. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness_to_Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness
i. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness_to_Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional_Stability
j. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness_to_Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional_Stability, Trait_Anger
k. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness_to_Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional_Stability, Trait_Anger, Narcissim
l. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness_to_Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional_Stability, Trait_Anger, Narcissim, Postive_Affectivity
m. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness_to_Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional_Stability, Trait_Anger, Narcissim, Postive_Affectivity, Negative_Affectivity
n. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Race, Openness_to_Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional_Stability, Trait_Anger, Narcissim, Postive_Affectivity, Negative_Affectivity, Self_Esteem