




September 2021

The effect of destructive leadership on self-efficacy and counterproductive work behaviors: A research on service sector employees in Mersin, Turkey

Murat Aydinay
Conectys, murataydinay@gmail.com

Aysehan Cakici
Mersin University, aysehancakici@mersin.edu.tr

A. Celil Cakici
Mersin University, celilcakici@mersin.edu.tr
Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/globe>

 Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), [Leadership Studies Commons](#), and the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#)

This Refereed Article is brought to you for free and open access by the M3 Center at the University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Global Business Insights by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Aydinay, M., Cakici, A., & Cakici, A. (2021). The effect of destructive leadership on self-efficacy and counterproductive work behaviors: A research on service sector employees in Mersin, Turkey. *Journal of Global Business Insights*, 6(2), 186-206. <https://www.doi.org/10.5038/2640-6489.6.2.1166>

Corresponding Author

Murat Aydinay, Fatih Mah. 30004 Sok., Bilgenler Apt. No: 9/2 Mezitli, Mersin, Tukey

Revisions

Submission date: Dec. 6, 2020; 1st Revision: Feb. 6, 2021; 2nd Revision: Apr. 17, 2021; 3rd Revision: Jul. 5, 2021; 4th Revision: August 31, 2021; Acceptance: Sep. 17, 2021

The Effect of Destructive Leadership on Self-Efficacy and Counterproductive Work Behaviors: A Research on Service Sector Employees in Mersin, Turkey

Murat Aydinay¹, Aysehan Cakici², and A. Celil Cakici³

Conectys, Poland

¹murataydinay@gmail.com

Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences

Mersin University, Turkey

²aysehancakici@mersin.edu.tr

Faculty of Tourism

Mersin University, Turkey

³celilcakici@mersin.edu.tr

Abstract

The aim of this study was to find out the effect of destructive leadership on employees' self-efficacy and counterproductive work behaviors. The data was collected from a convenience sample of 486 service sector employees in Mersin, Turkey. Descriptive statistics, explanatory factor analysis, and regression analysis were conducted to analyze the data. The results showed that lack of competence in leadership, excessive authoritarianism, and favoritism dimensions increased the organization-oriented counterproductive work behaviors while resistance to technology and change dimension decreased these behaviors. In contrast, insensitivity to subordinates had no effect on counterproductive work behaviors. Furthermore, destructive leadership had no effect on employees' self-efficacy, but self-efficacy affected counterproductive work behaviors. This study provides theoretical and practical implications for understanding the effect of destructive leadership behaviors on the employees' self-efficacy and counterproductive work behaviors in the context of the service sector.

Keywords: negative leadership, confidence in competencies, organizational deviance, labor force, service

Introduction

Leadership is defined as the ability and power to direct people towards certain tasks in line with the desired goals (Davis, 1977). This definition supports the idea that it would be significant to examine the effects of the leaders' behavior and leadership styles at any time. Leadership styles can be investigated in terms of positive and negative leader behaviors. destructive leadership is accepted as a negative aspect of the leader behavior. Destructive leadership behaviors are directly related to how followers feel and think about their leaders (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Hence,

employees exposed to negative leader behaviors react negatively. Accordingly, negative leader behaviors represent potential reasons that lead employees to react negatively towards the organization and individuals within the organization. Elimination of these reactions from employees is crucial for the future of the organization and the well-being of other members. Destructive leadership has an effect on followers' attitudes and employees' work-related behaviors are affected by destructive leader behaviors (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). In this context, examining the relationship between destructive leadership and counterproductive work behaviors will reveal the effect of negative leader behaviors on employees' reactions. Counterproductive work behavior is a kind of harmful behavior developed by employees towards the organization or other members of the organization for a specific reason (Spector & Fox, 2002). Explaining which harmful behaviors are developed by the employees as a reaction to managers' destructive behaviors makes a contribution to the related literature. While destructive leadership negatively affects employees' psychology and well-being (Johansen & Platek, 2017; Spradbrow, 2016), it also causes the employees to cope with negative emotions and perceptions. Employees working in the presence of negative emotions and perceptions cause them to fail to transfer confidently their competencies to their duties. In this case, organizations will not be able to obtain the productivity and the efficiency expected from human resources. For this reason, the concept of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994), the subjective perception of the individuals' success in the activities they carry out, shaped by their beliefs in their own skills or abilities, comes to the fore. In this context, examining the relationship between self-efficacy and destructive leadership to clarify the effect of negative leadership on employees' confidence in their skills through a scientific approach provides theoretical contributions to the related literature and practical information to the organizational life.

Based on the notion that leadership perception contains mostly positive attributes, current studies mostly focus on the idealized side of leadership or aim to unearth the characteristics that consider leaders successful (Torregiante, 2005). Therefore, one of the original aspects of this study was to address destructive leadership style to reveal the negative side of leaders. Current studies on this type of leadership have not thoroughly addressed the consequences of destructive leadership behavior and have instead focused on partial effects (Aasland et al., 2010). Furthermore, the suggestion that destructive leadership style should be addressed due to the lack of theoretical and practical implications about this leadership style (Featherston, 2012) reveals the importance of this leadership style. Thus, there are many potential negative consequences of this leadership that have not yet been the subject of any research, even though destructive leadership has some negative consequences that are supported by different research. From this point of view, associating destructive leadership with self-efficacy and counterproductive work behaviors in the context of the service sector in the current study revealed new consequences of destructive leadership. These results draw attention to the new consequences of destructive leadership and support the development of new research proposals. Hence, while *destructive leadership* supports the importance of this study, the relationship between this variable and *self-efficacy and counterproductive work behaviors* reveals the original aspect of the current study. This study clarified whether individuals turned to themselves and questioned their self-efficacy or tended to harm it by developing counterproductive work behaviors when being subjected to behaviors described as destructive or that contain negativity.

Conceptual Framework and the Hypotheses

Destructive Leadership (DL)

Destructive Leadership (DL) is defined as the attitudes and behaviors of leaders that repeatedly and systematically damage organizational processes, goals, resources, and tasks (Einarsen et al., 2007). Thus, it is a type of leadership that negatively affects the organization overall, and the subordinates' rights, interests, effectiveness, motivation, well-being, and self-esteem (Brandebo et al., 2016; Einarsen et al., 2007; Krasikova et al., 2013; Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Most employees (59%) are exposed to DL behaviors at their organizations (Shishigu et al., 2015). One may witness DL attitudes, high or low, at all levels of management, and these attitudes have negative effects on the organization itself and the subordinates (Woestman, 2014). In the context of a destructive leader, strong charisma, holding power in their own hands, narcissistic tendency, perceived threat, cultural values or economic situation, and scarcity of resources are seen as the triggers of DL (Padilla et al., 2007). Hence, different studies address the effect of such situations on employees from a DL perspective; for instance, job stress, workplace deviant behaviors, silence, performance, voice, satisfaction, well-being, and crisis (Brandebo, 2020; Carnevale et al., 2018; Haider et al., 2018; Khan et al., 2019; Reed & Bullis, 2009; Tepper et al., 2011; Vogel & Mitchell, 2017; Wu et al., 2018). Therefore, examining DL through CWBs and SE in the context of the service sector contributes to the theoretical background of DL while also providing practical implications. In the literature, DL has six dimensions: (a) excessive authoritarianism, (b) lack of competence in leadership, (c) unethical behavior, (d) resistance to technology and change, (e) insensitivity to subordinates, and (f) favoritism (Uymaz, 2013).

Counterproductive Work Behaviors (CWBs)

Counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) are negative attitudes and behaviors developed willingly and systematically by employees to harm the organization or its members (Kozako et al., 2013; Neuman & Baron, 2005; Spector & Fox, 2002). These behaviors appear in the form of negative behaviors as working with less effort, making conscious mistakes, showing violent tendencies, not following workplace rules, taking more breaks than usual, deliberately damaging fixtures, or stealing (Spector et al., 2006). CWBs have two dimensions: organization-oriented CWBs (CWB-O) and individual-oriented CWBs (CWB-I). Based on these dimensions, finding out the effect of DL on employees would be easier by making a distinction between employees' reactions towards the organization itself or its members. Different studies associate CWBs with personality (Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Salgado, 2002) and with organizational variables such as job characteristics, organizational justice, organizational culture, management styles, social norms, satisfaction, work ethic, job stressors, organizational structure, and many more (Dischner, 2015; Marcus & Schuler, 2004; Meriac, 2012; Robbins & Timothy, 2013; Spector & Fox, 2005; Yu et al., 2019; Zhang, et al., 2020). As a result of this study, understanding the relationship between CWBs and DL in the context of the service sector provided a new perspective to the relevant literature and practices in organizational life.

The Effect of DL on CWBs

This research data was collected in 2018. According to the Turkish Statistical Institute (2018), Turkey had an unemployment rate of 11%, and the ratio was 20.9% in the age group of 15-24,

meaning the unemployment rate was higher among the younger generation. According to a TUIK report in 2018, Gini coefficient, one of the income inequality criteria was .408, the relative poverty rate was 13.9%, the permanent poverty rate was 12.7%, the rate of those with installment payments or debts was 70.4%, and the financial deprivation rate was 26.5%. Data was collected in Mersin city where there was no exception on the unemployment rate and general economic circumstances valid in Turkey. In those conditions, employees who were exposed to DL behaviors might not show CWBs because of the fear of being fired or unemployed. Additionally, Roux (2010) and Mehmood (2017) reported both significant and non-significant relationships between leadership styles and SE. Therefore, stating the direction of the effect was deliberately avoided in all hypotheses.

In case of being exposed to negative leadership behaviors, one of the common coping strategies for employees is to challenge the leader (Webster et al., 2014). Thus, the employees tend to harm the organization itself or its members as they cannot harm the leaders when they face negative leader behaviors. Based on this perspective, the relationships between DL and CWBs come to the fore (Einarsen et al., 2016; Schyns & Schilling, 2013). While DL traits or the causes of DL can be related to the leaders' characteristics (Viktorovich, 2013), CWBs are associated with dark triad personality traits: Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy (O'Boyle et al., 2012). This relationship reveals how important the role of leaders is in the DL style and the potential negative effects of this leadership. Therefore, the following hypothesis H_1 was developed.

- **H_1 :** DL affects the tendency to develop counterproductive work behavior.

Constructive leaders develop both pro-organizational and pro-subordinate behaviors for the legitimate interests of their organizations by developing new strategies, and motivating and supporting their subordinates (Einarsen et al., 2017). Contrary to constructive leaders, destructive leaders theoretically affect motivation negatively on the basis of performance (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Moreover, destructive leaders generally have poor skills of communication and strategy (Aravena, 2017) that can cause some negative effects on employees due to the lack of competence in leadership. Therefore, the negative aspect of leaders might direct employees to react negatively. The leaders may lead employees to develop CWBs depending on this assumption that underlines the effect of a leader's lack of competence. In other words, a leader's lack of competence about their responsibilities or abilities will enhance an employee's tendency to develop CWBs. Accordingly, the hypotheses H_{1a} and H_{1b} were developed.

- **H_{1a} :** A leader's lack of competence affects the tendency to develop organization oriented CWBs.
- **H_{1b} :** A leader's lack of competence affects the tendency to develop individual oriented CWBs.

Direct resistance to the leader poses a great risk of being punished by the leader. Thus, instead of taking such risk, developing a counterproductive work behavior is seen as a safer way to retaliate against DL (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Similarly, a greater than normal workload, being forced to work harder than usual, not being appreciated by managers or employers, poor communication, unfair performance evaluation system, salary, and rewards cause job stress; and job stress directs employees to CWBs (Aftab & Javeed, 2012; Aravena, 2017). When possible similar relationships are considered, the dominance of leaders are assumed to create a perception of authority in such situations, and this perception leads the employees to negative reactions to harm the organization itself or the members of the organization. Based on this assumption, the hypotheses H_{1c} and H_{1d}

were developed.

- ***H_{1c}***: Excessive authoritarianism affects the tendency to develop organization oriented CWBs.
- ***H_{1d}***: Excessive authoritarianism affects the tendency to develop individual oriented CWBs.

Narcissistic tendencies that cause DL direct leaders to resist basic change (Sheard et al., 2013). In other words, leaders who tend to develop negative behaviors and attitudes are likely to resist change and this resistance is likely to have a negative effect on employees since change-oriented leadership behaviors have a positive effect on employees (Ergun & Yalcinkaya, 2018). Thus, leaders who show resistance in the opposite direction can lead employees to act negatively. Considering that technology is a significant component of the change (Attaran et al., 2019), leaders are expected to have the same effect on technology. Based on this assumption and that CWBs are a preferred reaction by employees to negativity, the hypotheses H_{1e} and H_{1f} were developed.

- ***H_{1e}***: Leader's resistance to technology and change affects the tendency to develop organization oriented CWBs.
- ***H_{1f}***: Leader's resistance to technology and change affects the tendency to develop individual oriented CWBs.

Some leaders discriminate between employees and violate equality (Keashly et al., 1994). Due to this discrimination, employees may also tend to react by harming the organization. For example, there is a positive relationship between perceived gender discrimination and CWBs (Rachel, 2017) and between favoritism and organizational opposition. In this direction, the hypotheses H_{1g} and H_{1h} were developed based on the idea that some employees will target the organization and its members in response to leaders' discriminatory behaviors.

- ***H_{1g}***: Favoritism by leaders affects the tendency to develop organization oriented CWBs.
- ***H_{1h}***: Favoritism by leaders affects the tendency to develop individual oriented CWBs.

Employees are exposed to the negative behaviors of their leaders at least once throughout their working life (Keashly et al., 1994). Insensitivity and unkindness of leaders toward their followers, ignoring subordinates' opinions and views, indifference to subordinates' demands, poor communication between managers and employees, lack of organizational support, and other leader attitudes such as these negatively affect employees. Another examples is organizational and supervisors' support affecting job satisfaction, commitment, turnover intentions, and well-being of employees (Caesens et al., 2016; Osca et al., 2005). The hypotheses H_{1i} and H_{1j} were developed based on the notion that the employees will harm the organization and its members when leaders ignore and do not support their employees.

- ***H_{1i}***: Insensitivity of a leader to subordinates affects the tendency to develop organization oriented CWBs.
- ***H_{1j}***: Insensitivity of a leader to subordinates affects the tendency to develop individual oriented CWBs.

A leader's unethical behavior may direct followers to behave unethically or to harm the organization (Unal et al., 2012). In this regard, the leader's unethical behaviors correspond to violations of moral standards and behaviors, and they encourage followers to act negatively and unethically (Brown & Mitchell, 2010). Assuming that destructive leader behaviors are also

unethical, DL also has an effect on followers' tendencies toward destructive goals that could adversely affect the organization or its members (Lasakova & Remisova, 2015). In other words, leaders sometimes do not respect ethical values and might cause employees to prefer CWBs towards the organization itself or its members. However, ethical leadership might have an adverse effect on CWBs. Depending on such situations, leaders' unethical behaviors will enhance the employees' tendencies to develop CWBs. Accordingly, the hypotheses H_{1k} and H_{1l} were developed.

- H_{1k} : A leader's unethical behavior affects the tendency to develop organization oriented CWBs.
- H_{1l} : A leader's unethical behavior affects the tendency to develop individual oriented CWBs.

Self-Efficacy (SE)

Self-efficacy (SE) is the subjective perception of an individual on the activities carried out to achieve the objectives (Bandura, 1997). For this reason, the concept of SE, which is used to express individuals' belief in themselves, not only refers to the abilities of individuals but also refers to their confidence in the resources they have and self-assessments about their own performance (Brophy, 1998; Tian & Huang, 2013). Individuals with a high level of SE address problems from a broad perspective, show determination in achieving goals, cope with difficult situations, tend to seek the cause of failure in themselves, and have more self-confidence (Bandura, 1994). Thus, SE is a concept that affects many situations and factors; for example, perceived SE has a positive effect on the proactive behaviors of employees (Parker, 1998). Also, there is a significant relationship between SE and job satisfaction, emotional exhaustion, and well-being (Seggelen-Damen & Dam, 2016). However, there are both significant and non-significant relationships between leadership styles and SE (Mehmood, 2017; Roux, 2010). For this reason, examining the relationship between one of the leadership types and SE corresponds to a valuable contribution that clarifies the ambiguous results of previous studies.

The Effect of DL on SE

DL has an effect on organizational life and the employees are negatively affected by DL even when they have a high level of psychological resilience (Johansen & Platek, 2017). DL also negatively affects employees and employees with high endurance levels are less affected by DL than those with low levels of resilience (Spradbrow, 2016). Moreover, the continuity of DL may cause subordinates to perceive themselves as inadequate to fulfill their duties (Woestman, 2014). In this direction, hypothesis H_2 was developed based on the leaders' negative behaviors affect the employees' confidence in their skills and abilities.

- H_2 : DL affects SE.

The damaging effect of leader behavior has a negative effect on employee SE, satisfaction, or general well-being (Duffy et al., 2006). Considering that leaders who have leadership competencies take initiatives that will have a positive effect on employees (Kiyikci, 2016), leaders who do not have these competencies are likely to develop behaviors and attitudes that have negative effects on employees' performance, motivation, satisfaction, and SE. SE is associated with employee performance and motivation, and employee SE perception increases directly and positively when the managers adopt motivating attitudes (Cherian & Jacob, 2013). In this

direction, the hypothesis H_{2a} was developed based on the assumption that a leader's lack of competence will have an effect on the employee SE.

- H_{2a} : A leader's lack of competence affects the SE perception.

Authoritarian behaviors of leaders have a negative effect on employee organization-based self-esteem and task performance (Chan et al., 2012), which can be associated with employee SE. Based on this relationship, it is possible to assume that the authoritarian attitudes and negativity-based behaviors adopted by managers in organizational life will have negative effects on employee SE. For example, negativity-based behaviors, attitudes, and speeches of managers affect SE perception (Baron, 1988; Duffy et al., 2002). Thus, hypothesis H_{2b} was developed depending on the assumption that the employee SE will be affected in the case of exposing authoritarian or dominance-oriented leader behaviors.

- H_{2b} : Excessive authoritarianism affects the SE perception.

As a reality of organizational life, all organizations are in a continuous cycle of change and these changes affect business methods and practices. Depending on this situation, employees should be more open to renewal and change to feel more competent in this process of change. Organizational support should be one of the fundamentals needed for employees to get a leader's support in this change or renewal process. Organizational support has an effect on employee attempts to be more innovative and creative. Therefore, employees with the potential of innovation and creativity show more intention to be more effective when receiving strong organizational support (Diliello & Houghton, 2006). In this direction, hypothesis H_{2c} was developed based on the idea that leader behaviors that create the perception of support and encourage openness to change will have an effect on employee confidence in their competencies and belief in their skills.

- H_{2c} : Leader's resistance to technology and change affects the SE perception.

While a leader's discriminatory behaviors reduce employee motivation and job satisfaction (Denissen & Saguy, 2014), these behaviors also have an effect on organizational commitment, depressive symptoms, and stress (Ensher et al., 2001; Hammond et al., 2010; Pascoe & Richman, 2009; Raver & Nishii, 2010). In this regard, discrimination affects employee well-being in general. Thus, hypothesis H_{2d} was developed based on the assumption that employee well-being through organizational life and employee confidence in their own competencies will be affected negatively by leaders' discriminatory behaviors.

- H_{2d} : Favoritism by leaders affects the SE perception.

While perceived manager sensitivity has an influence on the relationship between managerial behaviors and job satisfaction, job strain, and turnover intentions; SE is associated with supportive and non-supportive managerial behaviors (Rooney et al., 2009). In this case, a logical implication would expect a relationship between perceived organizational support and employee SE. Accordingly, the insensitive behavior of managers to employees should have an adverse effect on the employees and hypothesis H_{2e} was developed.

- H_{2e} : Insensitivity of a leader to subordinates affects the SE perception.

A leader's ethical behavior has an indirect effect on employee SE. Depending on this effect, employee SE levels are affected by the situations such as leader ethical values, trust, honesty, integrity, and commitment to goals. Employee SE increases as leaders show these characteristics (Mansouri & Arani, 2015). The unethical behavior of leaders, one of the dimensions of DL, should be associated with similar situations and should affect employee SE. In this direction, the hypothesis H_{2f} is as follows.

- **H_{2f}:** A leader's unethical behavior affects the SE perception.

The Effect of SE on CWBs

While a high level of SE reduces CWBs, a low level of SE has an enhancing effect (Pal, 2015; Stremic et al., 2017). Based on this relationship, SE is a significant variable in the prediction of CWBs (Cretu & Burcas, 2014). The SE of employees who develop relatively more CWBs is lower than others and the employees who are blocked or under stress may tend to develop CWBs as a way to deal with problems (Rhodes, 2013). In this direction, the level of employee SE should cause employees to react to harming the organization itself or its members. Therefore, the hypotheses H₃, H_{3a} and H_{3b} were developed.

- **H₃:** SE affects the tendency to CWBs.
- **H_{3a}:** SE affects the tendency to organization oriented CWBs.
- **H_{3b}:** SE affects the tendency to individual oriented CWBs.

Method

Instruments

Data was collected via a questionnaire developed based on the literature. While the first part of the questionnaire includes demographic information, the other three parts consist of DL, SE, and CWBs scales.

DL Scale

Participant DL perception was measured by a 28-item scale. This scale consists of six dimensions: excessive authoritarianism, lack of competence in leadership, unethical behavior, resistance to technology and change, insensitivity to subordinates, and favoritism. The Cronbach's alpha value was calculated as .96 for the reliability of the whole scale (Uymaz, 2013). Based on the results of the pilot study and expert recommendations, one item (*My manager likes specific people more.*) was added to the dimension of *favoritism* to enhance its clarity. In this case, the number of items in this dimension was increased to three, and the total number of items in the scale was increased to 29. The response categories of the items in this scale were subjected to a 5-point Likert rating ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree).

CWBs Scale

The tendency to develop CWBs was measured by a short form of 10-item scale by Spector et al., (2010). The Turkish form of this scale was obtained from the research conducted by Arkan (2016). Cronbach's alpha value of the 10-item scale was calculated as .83, and there were two dimensions

in this scale: CWB-O (Cronbach's alpha of organization-oriented CWB is .66) and CWB-I (Cronbach's alpha of individual-oriented CWB is .80). The response categories of the items in this scale were subjected to a 5-point Likert rating (1 = Never; 2 = Very rare; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Often; and 5 = Always).

SE Scale

Participants' SE was measured by a 17-item scale developed by Sherer et al. (1982) and the internal consistency analysis of the Turkish form was performed by Yildirim & Ilhan (2010). Cronbach's alpha value of this scale was .80 and the items 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, and 17 were reversed (Yildirim & Ilhan, 2010). The response categories of the items in this scale were subjected to a 5-point Likert rating (1 = Does not represent me at all; 2 = Represents me very little; 3 = Represents me a little; 4 = It represents me a lot; and 5 = It represents me very well).

Sampling

The four-part questionnaire was administered to service sector employees (full-time employees from education, health, informatics, retail, and hotel businesses) in Mersin, Turkey with a convenience sampling method. These employees were preferred because the service sector is more open to manager-employee relationships or communication compared to other sectors. In other words, the assumption that employees in this sector can express more opinion about their leaders' attitudes and behaviors has been decisive. Based on this assumption, participants from the service sector were selected on the condition that operating in organizations that belong to the service sector in Mersin with five or more employees and working connected to at least one manager. A pilot study was conducted with 100 participants to test the reliability, understandability, and clarity of the questions and items on the scale. Based on feedback from participants in the pilot study, a few modifications were made, and one item was added. After administering the finalized questionnaire between June to September 2018, 510 surveys were obtained through face-to-face data collection and web-questionnaire.

Data Analysis

First, multivariate outliers were detected by calculating the Mahalanobis distances (D^2). These distances transformed into D^2/df , and then the questionnaires exceeding the theoretical t -value at $\alpha = .001$ were deleted (Hair et al., 2014). After deleting 15 questionnaires, 486 questionnaires were ready for multivariate normality test.

For this purpose, the correlations between Mahalanobis and chi-square inverse values were compared with theoretical values based on five per thousand significant levels, taking into account the number of items in the scale as the degree of freedom. When the correlation coefficient is greater than the theoretical value, multivariate normality is provided (Kalayci, 2006). The analysis resulted in all three scales having multivariate normality (for DL scale $r_c = .978 > t_{29} = 0.937$; SE scale $r_c = .960 > t_{17} = 0.903$; CWBs scale $r_c = .960 > t_{10} = 0.860$). After these detections, while frequency analysis, factor analysis, and reliability analysis were used for data analysis, the simple and multiple linear regression analyzes were used to test hypotheses via SPSS 20.0.

Reliability Analysis

In a research study, data reliability should be examined. Reliability has been defined as the extent to which a variable or set of variables was consistent in what it was intended to measure (Hair et al., 2014). Table 1 summarizes all reliability statistics of the three scales' dimensions. In the DL scale, the item-total correlation with no negative sign ranged from .445 to .854, and alpha was .968. One item in the SE scale was removed since it had an item-total correlation of .227, which was lower than the cut-off points of .300. For the SE scale with 16-items, item-total correlations ranged from .336 to .632 with no negative sign, and alpha was .856. The CWBs scale had the item-total correlations ranging from .402 to .486 with no negative sign and alpha was .677. The items of the organizational-oriented CWBs had an alpha coefficient of .660, while the items of individual-oriented CWBs had an alpha coefficient of .673. Based on this evaluation, the collected data from three scales are reliable (Hair et al., 2014; Ho, 2006).

Table 1. Reliability Statistics of the Scales

Coefficients	Scale							
	LOC	EA	DL		SE		CWBs	
			RTC	F	IS	SE	CWB-O	CWB-I
Number of items	8	8	3	3	3	16	3	3
Alpha coefficient	.963	.922	.888	.942	.849	.856	.633	.650
Min. & max. corrected item-total correlations	.803-.903	.588-.826	.696-.853	.837-.906	.665-.763	.336-.632	.449-.477	.459-.573
Negative sign on corrected item-total correlations	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Min. & max. Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted	.955-.961	.905-.924	.778-.915	.896-.949	.749-.842	.841-.857	.499-.578	.439-.669

Note. DL = Destructive Leadership; SE = Self-Efficacy; CWBs = Counterproductive Work Behaviors; LOC = Lack of Competence in Leadership; EA = Excessive Authoritarianism; RTC = Resistance to Technology and Change; F = Favoritism; IS = Insensitivity to Subordinates; CWB-O = Organization-Oriented Counterproductive Work Behavior; CWB-I = Individual-Oriented Counterproductive Work Behavior

Validity Analysis

Reliability of the data is necessary but insufficient in research. Therefore, validity discussion should follow reliability or vice versa. Validity differs from reliability and has been defined as the extent to which a measure or set of measures correctly represented the concept of the study. It was also explained as the degree to which the data was free from any systematic or nonrandom error. Reliability relates to the consistency of the measure(s) whereas validity relates to how well the concept is defined by them (Hair et al., 2014). Explanatory factor analysis with varimax rotation was used to determine the construct validity of the scales. Overall data fitting to factor analysis was determined by Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sampling adequacy and Bartlett sphericity test (Hair et al., 2014; Ho, 2006). The number of factors was detected based on eigenvalues greater than 1 and communality values greater than .500; and minimum loading for any item to one factor were determined to be .500 (Hair et al., 2014).

DL Scale

The original DL scale had six factors. The first analysis showed that four items related to unethical behaviors were loaded on three different factors. Excluding these items, factor analysis yielded five factors (see Table 2) with eigenvalues greater than 1 (KMO = 95.6%; Bartlett Sphericity Test: $\chi^2 = 11,770$; $df = 300$; $p < .001$; total variance explained = 77.726%). There were eight items in the factor of *lack of competence*, explaining 26.590% of the total variance. Excessive authoritarian dimension with eight items explained 19.824% of the total variance. Three items in the favoritism

dimension explained 10.761%, while resistance to technology and change explained 10.421% of the total variance. The last factor with three items of insensitivity to subordinates with three items explained 10.129%.

Table 2. Factors of DL

Statement	\bar{x}	Item-Total Corr.	Alpha*	Communalities	Loadings	Eigenvalue	Expl. Variance
F1. Lack of Competence in Leadership	2.48		.963			6.648	26.590
My manager is ineligible to create a vision for our department	2.54	.903	.955	.855	.785		
My manager is not very skilled in problem-solving and decision making	2.35	.867	.957	.807	.783		
My manager is not very skilled in strategic planning	2.51	.882	.956	.826	.777		
My manager doesn't care about the needs of subordinates.	2.41	.851	.958	.793	.776		
My manager behaves as if there are no problems instead of solving problems.	2.39	.803	.961	.751	.770		
My manager cannot set business-related priorities.	2.37	.835	.959	.767	.763		
My manager cannot make regular planning to support subordinates' skills development.	2.68	.851	.958	.785	.739		
My manager doesn't know how to motivate subordinates.	2.60	.857	.958	.824	.728		
F2. Excessive Authoritarian	2.61		.922			4.956	19.824
My manager tries to control everything.	3.31	.588	.924	.637	.781		
When my manager wants something, she/he becomes obsessed with it.	2.77	.748	.911	.680	.737		
My manager is a despot.	2.32	.826	.905	.771	.702		
My manager is skeptical about many things.	2.75	.752	.911	.670	.694		
There is no valid reason for my manager when I fail to meet targets.	2.68	.689	.916	.598	.687		
My manager puts hard pressure on her subordinates.	2.17	.819	.906	.768	.676		
My manager tries to dominate everyone in an exaggerated way.	2.53	.765	.910	.684	.650		
My manager does not rely on that us are doing our jobs properly.	2.35	.730	.913	.695	.555		
F3. Favoritism	3.04		.942			2.690	10.761
My manager likes some subordinates more.	3.06	.906	.896	.917	.825		
My manager favors some subordinates.	3.02	.898	.902	.908	.787		
My manager has favorite subordinates.	3.04	.837	.949	.848	.763		
F4. Resistance to Technology and Change	2.48		.888			2.605	10.421
My manager avoids the use of new technologies.	1.81	.853	.778	.909	.876		
New technology is an enemy more than a friend for my manager.	1.90	.799	.823	.881	.862		
My manager resists all kinds of changes at work.	1.91	.696	.915	.726	.614		
F5. Insensitivity to Subordinates			.849			2.532	10.129
My manager rarely expresses what he/she expects from me.	2.44	.730	.777	.815	.827		
I have to guess what my manager expects from me.	2.37	.763	.749	.807	.737		
I don't know very well what my manager thinks about my performance.	2.64	.665	.842	.709	.736		

Note. Extraction Method = Principal Component Analysis; Rotation Method = Varimax With Kaiser Normalization; KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 95.6%; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity- Chi-Square = 11,770; $df = 300$; $p < .0001$; Total Explained Variance = 77.726%; $n = 486$; Mean = 2.52; Standard Deviation = 0.94; Alpha of the Scale = .966; Response Categories = 1 = Strongly disagree; 5 = Strongly agree. *The written values for the items show the alpha coefficient of the dimension when the related item is deleted.

SE Scale

Factor analysis was not utilized for this scale and all the statistical procedures were performed on summed scores through the relevant literature (Erkoc, 2015; Yildirim & Ilhan, 2010; see

Appendix).

CWBs Scale

As a result of the factor analysis, two dimensions were reached after removing two items composing a factor and two items having communalities lower than .500 (KMO = 69.8% Bartlett Sphericity Test: $\chi^2 = 546,120$; $df = 15$; $p < .001$; total variance explained = 61.02%). The analysis resulted in two factors each of which had three items (see Table 3): individual-oriented CWBs explaining 31.217% of the variance and organizational-oriented CWBs explaining 29.804% of the variance.

Table 3. Factors of CWBs

Statement	\bar{x}	Item-Total Corr.	Alpha*	Communalities	Loadings	Eigenvalue	Expl. Variance
F2. Individual-Oriented CWBs	1.26		.650			1.873	31.217
I made fun of someone's private life	1.18	.573	.439	.738	.858		
I insulted or made fun of someone at work	1.15	.462	.587	.606	.766		
I made fun of someone for her/his performance at work	1.44	.459	.669	.606	.543		
F2. Organizational-Oriented CWBs	1.57		.633			1.788	29.804
I complained about trivial things at work.	1.75	.466	.504	.601	.772		
I told people outside of my workplace in what a lousy workplace I work	1.71	.477	.499	.606	.757		
I deliberately wasted my employer's materials/tools at work	1.25	.449	.578	.568	.739		

Note. Extraction Method = Principal Component Analysis; Rotation Method = Varimax With Kaiser Normalization; KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 69.8%; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity- Chi-Square = 546,120; $df = 15$; $p < .0001$; Total Explained Variance = 61.022%; $n = 486$; Mean = 1.41; Standard Deviation = 0.43; Alpha of the Scale = .677; Response Categories = 1 = Never; 5 = Always. *The written values for the items show the alpha coefficient of the dimension when the related item is deleted.

Findings

Sample Profile

Approximately half of the participants were male (50.6%), and the other half were female. While 52.7 % of participants were single, around 45% of them were in the 30-39 age bracket and 60% of them had an associate degree or bachelor's degree. The majority of the participants had a monthly income between 3,001-4,000 TL, which was almost equivalent to 500 to 666 USD by the currency of 28th September 2018, where \$1 equals 6.0 TL (Central Bank of Turkish Republic, n.d.). 42.4% of the participants had 1-5 years of work experience while around 35% had more than 6 years of work experience, and 73.5% of the participants had employee status.

The Effect of DL on CWBs

Simple and multiple regression analyses were conducted to test the effect of DL on CWBs (see Table 4). DL positively affected CWBs. When perceived DL increased by one unit, CWBs also increased by .382 units; and perceived DL explains 14.4% of CWB.

When the effects of DL dimensions on CWB-O were examined, four sub-dimensions were effective. In the factor analysis, the dimension of unethical behavior could not be extracted. Therefore, the hypotheses of H_{1k} and H_{1l}, which claim that leaders' unethical behavior affects the tendency to develop organization-oriented and individual-oriented CWBs, could not be tested. The dimensions of insensitivity to subordinates had no impact on the CWB-O. While perceived *lack of competence in leadership* ($\beta = .333$), *excessive authoritarianism* ($\beta = .143$), and *favoritism* ($\beta =$

.156) positively affect the CWB-O, *resistance to technology and change* ($\beta = -.110$) negatively affects the CWB-O. The entire model explains 21.4 % of the CWB-O.

When the effect of DL dimensions on CWB-I was examined, no dimension had a significant effect. Thus, DL is assumed to lead to a negative attitude towards production in the organization rather than an attitude towards the leader. In this context, H₁, H_{1a}, H_{1c}, H_{1e}, and H_{1g} hypotheses were supported and H_{1b}, H_{1d}, H_{1f}, H_{1h}, H_{1i} and H_{1j} hypotheses were not supported (see Table 4).

Table 4. The Effect of DL on CWBs

H	Model	Std. β	t	F	R	R ²	ΔR^2
H ₁	DL → CWB	.382	9.094***	82.703***	.382	.146	.144
H _{1a}	LOC → CWB-O	.333	4.459***				
H _{1c}	EA → CWB-O	.143	2.209*				
H _{1e}	RTC → CWB-O	-.110	-1.983*	26.339***	.464	.214	.207
H _{1g}	F → CWB-O	.156	2.598**				
H _{1i}	IS → CWB-O	-.072	-1.304				
H _{1b}	LOC → CWB-I	.144	1.791				
H _{1d}	EA → CWB-I	-.015	-0.209				
H _{1f}	RTC → CWB-I	.010	0.168	3.518**	.188	.035	.025
H _{1h}	F → CWB-I	.075	1.138				
H _{1j}	IS → CWB-I	-.015	-0.242				

Note. DL = Destructive Leadership; CWB = Counterproductive Work Behaviors; LOC = Lack of Competence in Leadership; CWB-O = Organization-Oriented Counterproductive Work Behavior; EA = Excessive Authoritarianism; RTC = Resistance to Technology and Change; F = Favoritism; IS = Insensitivity to Subordinates; CWB-I = Individual-Oriented Counterproductive Work Behavior. For multiple regression analysis; minimum tolerance = .294; Maximum VIF = 3.403; Maximum CI = 12.938; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

The Effect of DL on SE

Simple and multiple regression analyses were done to test the effect of DL on employees SE. The hypothesis H_{2f}, which claims that a leader’s unethical behavior affects the employees SE, could not be tested. When the findings were considered, DL did not affect employees SE (see Table 5) because the hypotheses that aim to test these relationships were not supported. Accordingly, perceived DL dimensions also did not affect SE. For this reason, DL of the leaders and the SE perceptions of the employees were assumed to be independent of each other and employees SE cannot be shaped by the behaviors of the manager or other individuals.

Table 5. The Effect of DL on SE

Hyp.	Model	Std. β	t	F	R	R ²	ΔR^2
H ₂	DL → SE	-.020	-0.434	0.193	.020	.000	.000
H _{2a}	LOC → SE	-.101	-1.234				
H _{2b}	EA → SE	.083	1.158				
H _{2c}	RTC → SE	.072	1.175	0.732	.087	.008	.003
H _{2d}	F → SE	-.020	-0.297				
H _{2e}	IS → SE	-.047	-0.762				

Note. DL = Destructive Leadership; SE = Self efficacy; LOC = Lack of Competence in Leadership; EA = Excessive Authoritarianism; RTC = Resistance to Technology and Change; F = Favoritism; IS = Insensitivity to Subordinates. For multiple regression analysis, Minimum tolerance = .311; Maximum VIF = 3.216; Maximum CI = 12.606

The Effect of SE on CWBs

Simple regression analysis tested the effect of SE perception on CWBs. Although the ratio of determination was very low, the employees SE in general negatively affected the CWBs ($\beta = -.195$; $R^2 = 3.8\%$). Similarly, SE negatively affected CWB-O ($\beta = -.167$; $R^2 = 2.8\%$) and CWB-I ($\beta = -.152$; $R^2 = 2.3\%$). As a result of these findings, the hypotheses H₃, H_{3a}, and H_{3b} were supported (see Table 6).

Table 6. The Effect of SE on CWBs

Hyp.	Model	Std. β	t	F	R	R^2
H ₃	SE → CWB	-.195	-4.367***	19.070***	.195	.038
H _{3a}	SE → CWB-O	-.167	-3.715***	13.805***	.167	.028
H _{3b}	SE → CWB-I	-.152	-3.378***	11.408***	.152	.023

Note. SE = Self efficacy; CWB = Counterproductive Work Behaviors; CWB-O = Organization-Oriented Counterproductive Work Behavior; CWB-I = Individual-Oriented Counterproductive Work Behavior. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Conclusion and Discussion

Theoretical Implications

The Effect of DL on CWBs

While DL increased the tendency to develop CWBs as a general effect, it also increased organization oriented CWBs. However, DL had no effect on individual oriented CWBs. Accordingly, there was a relationship between DL and CWBs and work-related behaviors were mainly affected by DL (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Based on the relationships between dimensions, *lack of competence in leadership*, *excessive authoritarianism*, and *favoritism* dimensions increase the organization oriented CWBs, while the *resistance to technology and change* dimension had a reducing effect. However, the *insensitivity to subordinates* dimension had no effect on CWBs.

The effect of the DL on the counterproductive work behavior dimensions made significant contributions to the literature because the effect was observed just on organization oriented CWBs. This effect is assumed to be a reasonable reaction of employees because employees consider CWBs a strategy to cope with problems (Rhodes, 2013). Thus, the employees are likely to harm the organization rather than harm its members. The absence of any effect on individual oriented CWBs showed that DL may lead to negative attitudes towards production rather than towards leaders or others. These implications are considered significant theoretical contributions of the study.

Based on the relationship between the dimensions of DL and organization oriented CWBs, three results were obtained showing an increasing effect. As leaders steer away from demonstrating competence, become more authoritarian, and favor some employees, the employees develop more organization oriented CWBs. These relationships explain the effects of managers' negative behaviors on employees and provide new perspectives; for example, a leader's lack of competence corresponds to the situations that the leader cannot motivate employees and support their improvement, or the leader is inadequate in creating a vision, planning, problem-solving, and decision-making. Accordingly, leaders who adopt DL, which is a negative leadership style, are assumed not to have these competencies. Unlike constructive leaders (Einarsen et al., 2017), destructive leaders have a negative effect on employees and do not develop any supportive attitude. There is, for instance, a negative relationship between DL and employee motivation (Schyns & Schilling, 2013).

According to another finding based on the relationship between DL dimensions and CWBs, as the authoritarianism of leaders increases, employees develop organization oriented CWBs. Thus, as the dominance of the leaders would lead the employees to negative emotional reactions (Matta et al., 2014), excessive authoritarian behaviors of managers can also be considered CWBs' triggers.

The last dimension with an increasing effect is leaders' favoritism behaviors. Based on the results, when leaders' favoritism behavior increases, employees develop more negative behaviors to harm the organization. This finding is compatible with the literature as the managers' favoritism is a predictor of organizational opposition behavior (Ucar, 2016). Accordingly, employees' setting the organization as a target for harming can be considered a rationalized behavior in case of favoritism. This finding is significant as it draws attention to the danger of targeting the organization in response to the leaders' favoritism. The evaluations for these three dimensions of DL support that the findings are in accordance with the current literature and make valuable contributions.

Contrary to the findings, one dimension of the DL showed a decreasing effect. Based on this finding, employees develop less organization oriented CWBs when the resistance of leaders to technology and change increases. This finding revealed that the resistance to change and technology might be a common issue for all the members of organizations even though there are relative differences. Resistance to organizational change and concern those new technologies will lead to negative situations (e.g., unemployment) support this finding (Bovey & Hede, 2001) because resistance to change is associated with the lack of technical knowledge, the fear of changes in working conditions and failure, unwillingness to give up habits, avoiding the difficulty of learning new things, economic concerns, and beliefs that the status quo will deteriorate. Strebel (1996) also stated that middle-level managers do not like change and according to these managers, change generally refers to an unexpected or uncomfortable situation. This finding is interesting because it emphasizes that managers and employees share common opinions in terms of negativity.

One of the dimensions of DL had no effect on CWBs. This dimension was the insensitivity of the leaders to the subordinates. The absence of any effect can be explained by culture-specific situations as well as scale items because the items for this dimension mostly refer to the managers' insensitivity to giving feedback. However, the sensitive leader perception of the employees corresponds to expectations other than receiving feedback. Because insensitivity of leaders includes ignoring the problems and expectations of employees, usurping their rights, humiliating and not valuing them, constantly criticizing and distrusting the employees, and these are some signs of insensitivity for Turkish employees (Aydinay & Cakici, 2019). Thus, reviewing the items of this dimension and considering the culture-specific situations will contribute to future studies.

The Effect of DL on SE

One of the interesting findings of the current study is that DL and its dimensions had no effect on the employees' SE. SE is a belief and confidence in the capacity, ability and skills that are fundamentally owned, and people with a high level of SE are more challenger and less affected by negative emotions or situations (Bandura, 1994). Although some studies point out that DL affects employees negatively under all circumstances (Johansen & Platek, 2017), the reason for not obtaining such a finding in this study may be the differences among the sectors. In addition, if a study is to be conducted on the relationship between employees' subjective perception and DL, considering a variable different from SE and a sector other than the service sector might provide more significant results.

The Effect of SE on CWBs

Employee SE negatively affected employee tendency to develop CWBs. When employee SE

increases, CWBs decrease, whereas when employee SE decrease, they develop more CWBs towards both the organization itself and the individuals in the organization. These findings are consistent with the organizational literature (Cretu & Burcas, 2014; Pal, 2015; Rhodes, 2013; Stremic et al., 2017).

Practical Implications

DL affects organization oriented CWBs, and this effect points to the managerial attitudes and behaviors, thus the importance of the selection of the manager. For this reason, employers are advised to make a final decision after multiple observation and evaluation processes for manager selection and after observing the behaviors of the selected managers more frequently. Conducting different scales to measure employees' perceptions about the selected managers' behaviors and attitudes regarding organizational life could give more ideas to employers. If the general perception reveals that managers have negative behaviors, sensitivity training group workshops or behavior reflection studies with focus group workshops will help raise managers' awareness of their own behaviors.

Although DL does not affect employees' SE, it should be considered that each employee has a different psychological state, and their self-esteem should be respected. There are some findings that lead to negativity even if it is not directly related to SE and show that SE could have similar potential—such as the negative relationships between supervisor respect and interpersonal deviance (Al-Atwi & Bakir, 2014), and self-esteem and CWBs (Whelpley & McDaniel, 2016).

Managers should carry out some participatory policies to foster employees' SE in all circumstances because a high level of SE perception has a positive effect on the perception of employees to see their own problems as more solvable, have higher motivation for goal setting, develop their behaviors more confidently (Walumbwa et al., 2005) and have more proactive behaviors (Parker, 1998). Based on managers' attempts to support employees' SE, expected results are more likely because;

Employees who felt more self-efficacious on a given day were more likely to mobilize their job resources on that day. Daily job crafting, in turn, was positively correlated to work enjoyment and indirectly associated with performance. Participants reported elevated levels of performance on the days on which they enjoyed their work most (Tims et al., 2014, p. 490).

Almost every employee has been negatively affected by favoritism, excessive authoritarianism, lack of competence in leadership, and other negative behaviors of their managers. Even though the employees develop acquiescent, defensive, and prosocial silence behavior (Cakici, 2010) in the face of some negative situations, that employees develop organization oriented CWBs reveals they do not remain constantly silent. Thus, managers are advised to conduct their business in accordance with written rules and merit, engage in activities that increase their competencies and support their professional or personal development, adopt a more participatory management style, and create a strong *we, too* organizational culture.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

In this study, three scales measured the effect of DL on employee SE and CWBs. Examination of the insensitivity to subordinates dimension of the DL and the individual-oriented dimension of

CWBs in the context of different cultures or variables will contribute to the literature. Additionally, focusing on employees working in sectors other than the service sector through future research will raise the significance of this contribution. The items of the dimension individual oriented CWBs correspond to items focusing on other employees, not managers. Accordingly, this dimension could be revised by adding new items related to managers-oriented CWBs or creating a new dimension that aims to measure managers-oriented CWBs (organization, manager, and individual-oriented). This revision will contribute to the scale and provide more accurate results for future research. Even though participation in this study was voluntary, it was possible to assume they have been under the influence of evaluating their leaders and themselves. For this reason, using new or different scales or structuring the data collection process with the existing scales would eliminate this influence, such as creating scenarios where five dimensions of DL behavior are manipulated separately and conducting a quasi-experimental research design. The data collection process could also be conducted with the existing scales but outside employees' workplaces.

Acknowledgement

This study was derived from a doctoral dissertation which was completed in 2019 by Murat Aydinay and named *Yıkıcı liderliğin çalışanların öz-yeterlilik algısı ve üretim karştı davranış geliştirme eğilimleri üzerine etkisi* [The effect of DL on employees' SE perception and tendency of develop counterproductive work behavior].

References

- Aasland, M., Skogstad, A., Notelaers, G., Nielsen, M., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The prevalence of destructive leadership behaviour. *British Journal of Management*, 21, 438- 452.
- Aftab, H., & Javeed, A. (2012). The impact of job stress on the counter-productive work behavior (CWB): A case study from the financial sector of Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(7), 590-604.
- Al-Atwi, A. A., & Bakir, A. (2014). Relationships between status judgments, identification, and counterproductive behavior. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(5), 472-489.
- Aravena, F. (2017). Destructive leadership behavior: An exploratory study in Chile. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 18, 1-14.
- Arkan, O. (2016). *Determinants of organizational citizenship and counterproductive work behavior: The role of personality, job characteristics, job satisfaction and organizational commitment* [Unpublished master's dissertation]. Middle East Technical University.
- Attaran, M., Attaran, S., & Kirkland, D. (2019). Technology and organizational change: Harnessing the power of digital workplace. In M. Attaran, S. Attaran, & D. Kirkland, (Eds.), *Handbook of research on social and organizational dynamics in the digital era* (pp. 383-408). IGI Global.
- Aydinay, M., & Cakici, A. (2019, May 2-4). *Yöneticinin olumsuz (yıkıcı) davranışları: Çalışanlara etkisi ve verilen tepkiler* [Negative (destructive) behaviors of the manager: The effect on the employees and the reactions given] [Conference presentation]. 18th International Business Congress, Osmaniye, Turkey.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (pp. 71-81). Academic.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.
- Baron, R. A. (1988). Negative effects of destructive criticism: Impact on conflict, self-efficacy, and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 199-207.
- Bovey, W., & Hede, A. (2001). Resistance to organisational change: The role of defence mechanisms. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 16(7), 534-548.
- Brandebø, F. M. (2020). Destructive leadership in crisis management. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 41(4), 567-580.

- Brandebo, F. M., Nilsson, S., & Larsson, G. (2016). Leadership: Is bad stronger than good? *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 37(6), 690-710.
- Brophy, J. (1998). *Motivating students to learn*. McGraw Hill.
- Brown, M. E., & Mitchell, M. S. (2010). Ethical and unethical leadership: Exploring new avenues for future research. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20, 583-616.
- Caesens, G., Stinglhamber, F., & Ohana, M. (2016). Perceived organizational support and well-being: A weekly study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(7), 1214-1230.
- Cakici, A. (2010). *Örgütlerde işgören sessizliği* [Employee silence at organizations]. Detay.
- Carnevale, J., Huang, L., & Harms, P. (2018). Speaking up to the emotional vampire: A conservation of resources perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 91, 48-59.
- Central Bank of Turkish Republic. (n.d.). *Indicative exchange rates*. Retrieved April 24, 2020, from <https://www.tcmb.gov.tr/wps/wcm/connect/EN/TCMB+EN/Main+Menu/Statistics/Exchange+Rates/Indicative+Exchange+Rates>
- Chan, S. C., Huang, X., Snape, E., & Lam, C. K. (2012). The Janus face of paternalistic leaders: Authoritarianism, benevolence, subordinates' organization-based self-esteem, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34, 108-128.
- Cherian, J., & Jacob, J. (2013). Impact of self efficacy on motivation and performance of employees. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(14), 80-88.
- Cretu, R. Z., & Burcas, S. (2014). Self efficacy: A moderator of the relation between emotional dissonance and counterproductive work behavior. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 127, 892-896.
- Davis, K. (1977). *Human behaviour at work: Organizational behaviour* (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Denissen, A. M., & Saguy, A. C. (2014). Gendered homophobia and the contradictions of workplace discrimination for women in the building trades. *Gender and Society*, 28(3), 381-403.
- Diliello, T., & Houghton, J. (2006). Maximizing organizational leadership capacity for the future: Toward a model of self-leadership, innovation and creativity. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(4), 319-337.
- Dischner, S. (2015). Organizational structure, organizational form, and counterproductive work behavior: A competitive test of the bureaucratic and post-bureaucratic views. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 31(4), 501-514.
- Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 547-559.
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 5, 331-351.
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., Shaw, J. D., Johnson, J. L., & Pagon, M. (2006). The social context of undermining behavior at work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 101, 105-126.
- Einarsen, S. V., Skogstad, A., & Aasland, M. S. (2017). Destructive leadership. In D. Poff, & A. Michalos (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of business and professional ethics*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-23514-1_54-1
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behavior: A definition and conceptual model. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 207-216.
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2016). The nature and outcomes of destructive leadership behavior. In R. J. Burke, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Organizations, risky business: Psychological, physical and financial costs of high risk behavior in organizations* (pp. 323-342). Gower.
- Ensher, E. A., Grant-Vallone, E. J., & Donaldson, S. I. (2001). Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12, 53-72.
- Ergun, E., & Yalcinkaya, K. (2018). The effects of leadership behaviors on employees' change capacity: A research study. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 9, 681-696.
- Erkoc, I. C. (2015). *Algılanan örgütsel destek ve iş performansı arasındaki ilişkide öz yeterlilik faktörünün düzenleyici rolü: Bankacılık sektöründe bir araştırma* [Regulating role of self-sufficiency factor with regard to the relationship between perceived organizational support and work performance: A research in banking business] [Unpublished master's thesis]. Istanbul Kultur University.
- Featherston, M. (2012). *Effective processes for dealing with destructive managers* [Unpublished master's thesis]. St. Catherine University.
- Haider, S., Nisar, Q. A., Baig, F., & Azeem, M. (2018). Dark side of leadership: Employees' job stress and deviant behaviors in pharmaceutical industry. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research and Allied Sciences*, 7(2), 125-138.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson.

- Hammond, W. P., Gillen, M., & Yen, I. H. (2010). Workplace discrimination and depressive symptoms: A study of multi-ethnic hospital employees. *Race and Social Problems, 1*, 19-30.
- Ho, R. (2006). *Handbook of univariate and multivariate data analysis and interpretation with SPSS*. Taylor and Francis.
- Johansen, R. B., & Platek, T. A. (2017). Running head: Destructive leader behavior in the norwegian armed forces. *Arts and Social Sciences Journal, 8*(2), 1-7.
- Kalayci, S. (2006). *SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri [SPSS applied multivariate statistical techniques]* (2nd ed.). Asil.
- Keashly, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims, 9*(4), 341-357.
- Khan, N. Z. A., Imran, A., & Anwar, A. (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), 135-144.
- Kiyikci, M. (2016). *Yıkıcı liderlik algısı ve tükenmişlik arasındaki ilişki: Bankacılık sektöründe bir inceleme* [The relationship between destructive leadership and emotional exhaustion: A research in Banking sector] [Unpublished master thesis]. Dumlupınar University.
- Kozako, I. N. A. M. F., Safin, S. Z., & Rahim, A. R. A. (2013). The relationship of big five personality traits on counterproductive work behaviour among hotel employees: An exploratory study. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 7*, 181-187.
- 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.
- Lasakova, A., & Remisova, A. (2015). Unethical leadership: Current theoretical trends and conceptualization. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 34*. 319-328.
- Mansouri, A. S., & Arani, M. S. (2015). The effect of transformational leadership on employees' self-efficacy. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences, 9*(8), 1328-1339.
- Marcus, B., & Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of counterproductive work behavior at work: A general perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(4), 647-660.
- Matta, F., Erol-Korkmaz, H. T., Johnson, R., E., & Bicaksiz, P. (2014). Significant work events and counterproductive work behavior: The role of fairness, emotions, and emotion regulation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*(7), 920-944.
- Mehmood, S. (2017). *Impact of ethical leadership on creative self efficacy: Mediating role of ethical orientation and moderating role of supervisor support for creativity a study on higher educational sector in Pakistan*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Capital University of Science and Technology.
- Meriac, J. P. (2012). Work ethic and academic performance: Predicting citizenship and counterproductive behavior. *Learning and Individual Differences, 22*(4), 549-553.
- Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (2005). Aggression in the workplace: A social psychological perspective. In S. Fox., & Spector, P. E. (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 13-40). American Psychological Association.
- O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., & McDaniel, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the dark triad and work behavior: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(3), 557-579.
- Oscar, A., Urien, B., Camino, G. G., Pérez, M. D. M., & Pérez, N. M. (2005). Organisational support and group efficacy: A longitudinal study of main and buffer effects. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 20*(3/4), 292-311
- Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. *Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 176-194.
- Pal, R. (2015). Psychological characteristics as determinant of counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Culture, Society and Development, 12*, 77-86.
- Parker, S. K. (1998). Enhancing role breadth self-efficacy: The roles of job enrichment and other organizational interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(6), 835-852.
- Pascoe, E. A., & Richman, L. S. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*(4), 531-554.
- Rachel, J. (2017). *The relationship between perceived gender discrimination and CWBs* [Unpublished bachelor's thesis]. University of Central Florida.
- Raver, J. L., & Nishii, L. H. (2010). Once, twice, or three times as harmful? Ethnic harassment, gender harassment, and generalized workplace harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(2), 236-254.

- Reed, G. E., & Bullis, R. C. (2009). The impact of destructive leadership on senior military officers and civilian employees. *Armed Forces and Society*, 36, 5-18.
- Rhodes, D. (2013). *Counterproductive work behavior as coping: An examination of beneficial outcomes and repercussions in the workplace* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Houston.
- Robbins, S. P., & Timothy A. J. (2013). *Essentials of organizational behavior* (13th Ed.). Pearson.
- Rooney, J., Gottlieb, B., & Newby-Clark, I. (2009). How support-related managerial behaviors influence employees: An integrated model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(5), 410-427.
- Roux, S. (2010). *The relationship between authentic leadership, optimism, self-efficacy and work engagement: An exploratory study* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Stellenbosch University.
- Salgado, J. F. (2002). The big five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1/2), 117-125.
- Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 138-158.
- Seggelen-Damen, I., & Dam, K. (2016). Self-reflection as a mediator between self-efficacy and well-being. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(1), 18-33.
- Sheard, A. G., Kakabadse, N., & Kakabadse, A. (2013). Destructive behaviours and leadership: The source of the shift from a functional to dysfunctional workplace? *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 73-89.
- Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports*. 51(2), 663-671.
- Shishigu, A. D., Dargie, E., & Aychilie, S. (2015). Assessing employees' perception of destructive leadership behavior and their silence. *International Journal of Management Research and Review*, 5(4), 275-284.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior (CWB) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). *Human Resources Management Review*, 12(2), 1-24.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work behavior. In S. Fox, & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp.151-174). American Psychological Association.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(3), 446-460.
- Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(4), 781-790. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0019477>
- Spradbrow, E. (2016). *Overcoming the dark side, consequences of DL, and the moderating role of hardiness* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Norwegian Defence University.
- Strebel, P. (1996). Why do employees resist change? *Harvard Business Review*, 1996(May/June), 85-92.
- Stremic, S. M., Reichin, S. L., Thiele, A., Jackson, A. T., & Frame, M. C. (2017, October 28). *The effects of self-efficacy, perceptions of ethical misconduct, and guilt-proneness on CWBs* [Conference presentation]. 13th Annual River Cities Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference. <https://scholar.utc.edu/rcio/2017/sessions/16/>.
- Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., & Duffy, M. K. (2011). Predictors of abusive supervision: Supervisor perceptions of deep-level dissimilarity, relationship, conflict, and subordinate performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(2), 279-294
- Tian, Z., & Huang, P. (2013) Researches on the effects of leader empowerment behavior on employees' voice behavior: The mediating effect of self-efficacy. In E. Qi, J. Shen, & R. Dou (Eds.), *Proceedings of 20th International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40063-6_75
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2014). Daily job crafting and the self-efficacy performance relationship. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(5), 490-507.
- Torregiante, J. (2005). *Destructive personality traits and leadership performance: A pattern-oriented approach* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. North Carolina State University.
- Turkish Statistical Institute. (2018). *Gelir ve yaşam koşulları araştırması, 2018* [Income and living conditions survey, 2018]. <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Gelir-ve-Yasam-Kosullari-Arastirmasi-2018-30755>

- Ucar, A. (2016). *Yöneticilerin kayırmacı davranışlarının, örgütsel muhalefet üzerindeki etkisi* [The effect of administrators' behaviors that involves favoritism on organizational opposition] [Unpublished master's dissertation]. Siirt University.
- Unal, A. F., Warren, D. E., & Chen, C. C. (2012). The normative foundations of unethical supervision in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 107*, 5-19.
- Uymaz, A. O. (2013). Yıkıcı liderlik ölçeği geliştirme çalışması [A study of development of destructive leadership scale]. *Istanbul Management Journal, 24*(75), 37-57.
- Viktorovich, B. D. (2013). Theoretical analysis of approaches to the conception of destructive leadership in small groups. *Scientific Journal of the Kuban State Agrarian University, 89*(05), 1-23.
- Vogel, R. M., & Mitchell, M. S. (2017). The motivational effects of diminished self-esteem for employees who experience abusive supervision. *Journal of Management, 43*(7), 2218-2251.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Lawler, J. J., Avolio, B. J., Wang, P., & Shi, K. (2005). Transformational leadership and work-related attitudes: The moderating effects of collective and self-efficacy across cultures. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 11*(3), 2-16.
- Webster, V., Brough, P., & Daly, K. (2014). Fight, flight or freeze: Common responses for follower coping with toxic leadership. *Stress and Health, 32*(4), 346-354.
- Whelpley, C., & McDaniel, M. (2016). Self-esteem and CWBs: A systematic review. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31*(4), 850-863.
- Woestman, D. S. (2014). *Destructive leader behavior: Assessing public school leader behaviors and workplace attitudes* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Northern Illinois University.
- Wu, M., Peng, Z., & Estay, C. (2018). How role stress mediates the relationship between destructive leadership and employee silence: The moderating role of job complexity. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology, 12*(1), 1-11.
- Yildirim, F., & İlhan, I. O. (2010). Genel öz yeterlilik ölçeği Türkçe formunun geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması [The validity and reliability of the general self-efficacy scale-Turkish form]. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi, 21*(4), 301-308.
- Yu, K., Liu, C., & Li, Y. (2019). Beyond social exchange: Career adaptability linking work stressors and counterproductive work behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 1-12.
- Zhang, S., Chen, L., & Yan, J. (2020). How protestant work ethic impacts employees' CWBs: The moderating effects of gender and party affiliation. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 28*(2), 531-540.

Appendix: Self Efficacy scale

Response categories. 1 = Does not represent me at all; 2 = Represents me very little; 3 = Represents me a little; 4 = It represents me a lot; 5 = It represents me very well; R = Reverse Coding

1. When I make plans, I can be sure that I will implement them all.
2. One of my problems is that I can't start to work on time. (R)
3. If I am not successful the first time while fulfilling a duty, I do not give up until I am successful.
4. I cannot be very successful in achieving the important goals that I have set. (R)
5. I leave everything undone. (R)
6. I avoid facing difficulties. (R)
7. If a duty looks too complicated, I wouldn't even attempt to try it. (R)
8. When I have to do something that I don't like, I push myself until I finish it.
9. When I decide to do something, I immediately get to work.
10. If I am not successful at the beginning while trying something new, I give up quickly. (R)
11. When I face unexpected problems, I cannot overcome them easily. (R)
12. I avoid trying to learn new things that seem difficult to me. (R)
13. Failure increases my tenacity.
14. I am not very confident in my skills in general. (R)
15. I am a self-confident person.
16. I am an easy quitter person. (R)
17. I don't think I will be able to overcome most of the problems that I will face. (R)