



Research Article

Impact of destructive leadership styles on the psychological contract breach with the moderating effect of proactive personality

Muhammad Bilal Kayani^{1*}, Imran Ibrahim Alasan²^{1,2}Department of Business Management, Limkokwing University of Creative Technology, Cyberjaya, Malaysia

*Corresponding Author email: mbkiani@gmail.com

Submitted: 29 April 2021

Revised: 15 May 2021

Accepted: 21 May 2021

ABSTRACT

This research has an aim to investigate the impact of toxic and exploitative leadership and subordinate psychological contract breach, the moderation role of proactive personality within the proposed framework between the toxic leadership with psychological contract breach and exploitative leadership with psychological contract breach. Data was gathered utilizing a cross-sectional research technique. The sample of the study constituted 386 frontline nurses from public sector hospitals of Pakistan. Structural equation modelling was utilized for analyzing the collected data. Toxic and exploitative leadership had a significant positive impact on psychological contract breach. However, moderation of proactive personality was found to be insignificant between both relations.

Keywords: *Toxic Leadership; Exploitative; Psychological Contract Breach; Proactive Personality*

1. INTRODUCTION

Human psychology has become an important phenomenon to be understood nowadays by many researchers due to its prime importance in an organisation's overall productivity and performance, for the purpose discussed two significant aspects of human psychology in the workplace. One is the leader/manager/boss aspect or side, and the other one is the follower/subordinate/staff aspect or side. Past many researchers have discussed the brighter shade or the sweet flavor of this leader-follower relationship. Most of the researchers, including Gilbert and Kelloway (2018); Jada, Mukhopadhyay, and Titiyal (2019) Gyanchandani (2017), have discussed the constructive and positive side of leadership with associated constructive approaches, methods, consequences etc.

However, the researchers have drawn their attention towards the darker shade or bitter flavour of leadership from the past few years. Most of the researchers, including Aravena (2019); Ashforth and Anand (2003); Asrar-ul-Haq and Anjum (2020); Beale and Hoel (2010); Clive R Boddy (2014); Collins and Jackson (2015); Crawford, Dawkins, Martin, and Lewis (2017); Gallos (2008); Goldman (2009); Jabbar, Saleem, Malik, Qureshi, and Thursamy (2020); Kant, Skogstad, Torsheim, and Einarsen (2013); Milosevic, Maric, and Lončar (2020); Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser (2007); Rosenthal and Pittinsky (2006); Shaw, Erickson, and Harvey (2011); Thoroughgood, Padilla, Hunter, and Tate (2012) etc. have encompassed the darker aspect



with its possible outcomes and causes in their articles. Also, scholars have discussed dark leadership previously with its associate malpractices within an organization (Aravena, 2019; Burns Jr, 2017; Harris & Jones, 2018; Kayani, Zafar, Aksar, & Hassan, 2019; Nonis-Tramonte, 2021). The reason to study the darker aspect is its impact on the employee psychological health, causing even worse effects than a constructive leader can cause positive ones. The variable of dark leadership has been given several different names like leadership derailment (Ross, 2019), adverse or wicked or dark leadership (Furtner, Maran, & Rauthmann, 2017), toxic leadership (Milosevic et al., 2020), unethical leaders (Crawford et al., 2017), despotic leadership (Nauman, Zheng, & Basit, 2020), petty tyranny (Ashforth, 1997; G. Thompson & Glasø, 2018) bad leadership (Chandler, 2021), narcissistic leaders (Asrar-ul-Haq & Anjum, 2020), aversive leadership (Fatima, Majeed, & Shah, 2018), abusive leaders (Jabbar et al., 2020), destructive leadership (Aravena, 2019; Einarsen, Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007) and corporate psychopaths (C. Boddy & Taplin, 2017; Clive Roland Boddy, 2015).

However, this paper discussed only two of the darker leadership styles, i.e., Exploitative and Toxic Leadership, to evaluate the impact these styles have on employees' psychological health. These styles are mainly studied in the nursing sector of Pakistan. The job of nursing leadership in advancing the mental prosperity of medical attendants can't be deprived of (Adams, Chamberlain, & Giles, 2019; Pishgooie, Atashzadeh-Shoorideh, Falcó-Pegueroles, & Lotfi, 2019). Various foundations have recognized the positive results of solid nursing leadership (Fallatah, Laschinger, & Read, 2017; Samuel, Sehar, Afzal, & Gilani, 2018). Nonetheless, in the progress of the evolution of dark leadership styles in organizational conduct writing, nursing specialists have begun to understand that a portion of the nursing bosses, because of their leadership style, are making more mischief attendants' prosperity instead of giving advantages (Roter, 2011). The idea of dark leadership is moderately new in the nursing area (Roter, 2011) in correlation with positive supervisory styles, for example, transformational leadership, servant leadership and supportive leadership (Alzahrani, 2019; Bowers, Hall, & Srinivasan, 2017; Samuel et al., 2018). Albeit all nursing bosses are not mean, a few bits of proof demonstrate that some nursing bosses show harmful practices (Roter, 2011; Sarwar, Naseer, & Zhong, 2020). It is critical to propel the writing on the dark side of nursing supervision by recognizing the utmost happening and undetected adverse conduct of nursing bosses (Pishgooie et al., 2019).

Toxic leadership has a spill-over effect and is accused of contaminating the entire organization with its toxicity, starting from the individual employee to teams and the entire firm (Goldman, 2009; Vreja, Balan, & Bosca, 2016). Lipman-Blumen (2005) depicts toxic leaders as the individuals who perform lacking decency by camouflaging and participating in different other shocking practices, counting practices like defilement, lousy faith, damage and control, just as other arranged evil, unlawful, and criminal demonstrations. Several other authors like Pelletier (2010) and Schmidt (2008) have described different classifications of toxic leadership and their behaviors comprising laissez-faire, promoting inequity, divisiveness, social exclusion and threatening followers' security and self-esteem. Toxic leaders are known to be toxic when they either physically or psychologically harm their subordinates, and their harmful actions create long-term bad effects on their subordinates (Pelletier, 2010). Toxic leaders are also considered responsible for creating

conflicts within the organization, spoiling the overall organizational environment and adversely affecting the subordinates' emotions (Illies & Reiter-Palmon, 2008). According to Maxwell (2015) and Schyns (2015), adopting negative behaviour and being confident about it as correct and socially accepted is another behavioural side of toxic leaders.

Exploitative Leadership style is another dark leadership style or another shade of destructive leadership style that depicts various adverse behaviors (Schmid, Pircher Verdorfer, & Peus, 2019). Previous research has discussed leaders' self-interest factor, but there is still limited research on exploitation by leadership. To understand the leaders' exploitation and manipulation Schmid et al. (2019) has defined the term exploitative leadership. They also have established the measuring scale, which is also validated for exploitative leadership. Exploitative leadership style is described by Schmid et al. (2019) as a pessimistic leadership approach in which leaders (a) depict egoistic traits, (b) practice manipulation of subordinates creating pressure on them, (c) overburdening the subordinates reduce their productivity and effectiveness and hurdles in individual growth. Exploitative leaders are hard to be pointed out compared to other destructive leadership styles as they rely on pretending and have a dual face (Schmid et al., 2019). They act and pretend friendly with a smile on their face towards their subordinates to make them achieve his/her objectives (Schmid et al., 2019). This contrary behavior types them riskier than other dark leaders; because of this, there is an instant requirement to investigate exploitative leadership and its adverse outcomes (Schmid et al., 2019). These leaders are often found to be taking credit for the work of their subordinates (Majeed & Fatima, 2020). The exploration of exploitative leadership is right now in the beginning stage. As of recently, just two examinations have straightforwardly explored exploitative leadership (Schmid et al., 2019; Schmid, Pircher Verdorfer, & Peus, 2018). The two examinations were directed in Germany. The preliminary examination tried the effect of exploitative leadership on worker feelings and turnover expectation, while the subsequent investigation uncovered its two unfriendly results, to be specific work environment abnormality and occupation burnout (Schmid et al., 2018; Schmid et al., 2019). For the purpose this study undertakes psychological contract breach as an outcome of exploitative leadership and is being studied in nursing profession of Pakistan.

In the space of psychological contracts, Argyris (1960) and Levinson, Price, Munden, and Mandl (1996) made critical commitments to the examination phrasing. Argyris (1960) first utilized the expression "psychological work contract" to depict a specific comprehension between a gathering of workers and their foreman that emerged because of a specific supervisory style. Levinson et al. (1996) characterized psychological contracts as "a progression of common assumptions for which the parties to the relationship may not themselves be faintly mindful but rather which in any case oversee their relationship to one another". The assumptions referenced incorporate both oblivious and conscious ones. The assumptions that lead to a psychological contract ought to have two qualities: (1) being implicit and (2) preceding the arrangement of the contract. In the early long periods of the psychological contract considers, the definitions and ideas presented by these creators showed slight contrasts. D. M. Rousseau (1989) contended that past researchers' ideas of assumptions were hard to appreciate overall, and can be considered more to be a various

group of assorted and varying assumptions held by a bunch of entertainers. D. M. Rousseau (1989) introduced a shorter definition from the person's perspective as the focal component, characterizing psychological contracts as a person's conviction concerning the terms and states of an arrangement between that individual and another party. Here, the main points of interest incorporate the conviction that a guarantee has been made and some thought offered in return for this arrangement, restricting the parties to some arrangement of proportional commitments. So, when individuals experience exploitation and toxicity by their leaders they assume it as breach of the mutual psychological contract which was to maintain a healthy relationship between both parties (the employer and the employee).

An employee's personality is an important factor in his/her performability at the job place, especially in a service environment (Choi & Hwang, 2019). Frequent conversations increase the certainty of the difficulties faced by service workers and make it more difficult for leaders to control and overcome each stage in the service procedure (Chong, Van Dyne, Kim, & Oh, 2021). Therefore, service performance should depend more on the convenience and initiative of frontline employees. Proactive personality is considered finding opportunities within the provided environment (Hu, Wang, Zhang, & Bin, 2018) and love to transform new ideas in the form of change into the current stage (Hansen, Shrader, & Monllor, 2011). In other words, a proactive personality is purpose-oriented, unaffected by the environment, persevering in the pursuit of goals, and seeking new experiences and activities.

Previously, Fatima et al. (2018) and Majeed and Fatima (2020) studied two of the destructive leadership styles on the sample population of nurses of the healthcare sector of Pakistan. Samad, Memon, and Ali (2021) also studied despotic leadership, another style of destructive leadership, in the nursing profession of Pakistan. The nurse to population ratio declared by WHO is six nurses per ten thousand people (Jamal, Fitchett, Lok, Mendelsohn, & Tsuyuki, 2009), giving rise to shady activities within the profession. A lack of nurses is a massive problem within the healthcare sector of Pakistan. Leaders who practice shady activities take advantage of such factors to blame for their specific destructive attitudes. The nurses' multiple types of research on leadership have progressively highlighted the negative aspect of leadership as harsh leadership; they have a self-centered approach for professional grooming by relying on employees' efforts (Baškarada, Watson, & Cromarty, 2016; Huang, Wang, & Xie, 2014). This paper mainly studies two of these destructive leadership styles, i.e., toxic and exploitative, in the psychological state of nurses in the public sector of Pakistan. As destructive leadership have severe consequences (Schmid et al., 2018) (work-family conflict, emotional distress, poor workplace performance) on the subordinates and organization, it is essential to study them and their impact.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. TOXIC LEADERSHIP AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT BREACH

Examination demonstrates that toxic leadership is connected to a few adverse results, which can be ordered comprehensively into mental and execution related results. Note

that pressure and mental prosperity of the subordinates are the most explored mental results of toxic leadership (Bhandarker & Rai, 2019; HADAVINEJAD, 2017; Kurtulmuş, 2020; Labrague, Lorica, Nwafor, van Bogaert, & Cummings, 2020). Toxic leadership is likewise fundamentally connected with execution-related results like diminished organizational responsibility, treachery discernments, job struggle, relational aberrance and helpless business-related mentalities among subordinates (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002; Hoobler & Hu, 2013; Mawritz, Mayer, Hoobler, Wayne, & Marinova, 2012). Toxic leadership is likewise discovered to be contrarily connected with OB fulfillment, OB commitment and work inspiration (Aryee, Sun, Chen, & Debrah, 2008; Elangovan & Xie, 2000; Reed, 2004; Reed & Bullis, 2009; Templer, 2018). The psychological effect of dark leaders on subordinates is examined in detail in the forthcoming area.

The impact is in the form of psychological contract violation when they perceive they are mistreated or bullied. It tells that subordinates under a toxic leader perceive its leader's toxicity in the form of rudeness and harshness as a breach of his/her psychological contract. Wu and Hu (2009) also stated in their findings that abusive supervision (like toxic leadership in this case) is inversely related to emotional exhaustion. A Bhandarker and Rai (2019) also stated that toxic leadership leads to criticism, ridiculing, harshness and rudeness generate stress and strain in employees, raising employee emotional distress.

Turnley and Feldman (2000) elaborated in their study when workers feel contented and satisfied with their organization their psychological contract is satisfied and fulfilled. However, if the worker feels unsatisfied, by any factor that was supposed to be not that way in the organizational environment is considered a breach of the psychological contract. Hobman, Restubog, Bordia, and Tang (2009) stated that when employees have regular interaction with toxic leaders, they bear stress and strain, reducing their psychological well-being. Another study stipulates similar findings that subordinates of toxic leadership have low self-worth and self-efficacy (Kusy & Holloway, 2009). Harvey, Harris, Gillis, and Martinko (2014) found that toxic leaders lower their subordinates by objectifying, being harsh and rude to them, which reduced self-worth, self-confidence, and self-efficacy. Salin and Notelaers (2017) stated in their research that subordinates might get negatively impacted and experience psychological contract violation when they feel they are being bullied or mistreated. It tells that subordinates under a toxic leader perceive its leader's toxicity in the form of rudeness and harshness as a breach of his/her psychological contract. Wu and Hu (2009) also stated in their findings that abusive supervision (like toxic leadership in this case) is inversely related to emotional exhaustion. A Bhandarker and Rai (2019) also stated that toxic leadership lead practices like criticism, ridiculing, harshness, and rudeness generate stress and strain in the employee, raising employee emotional distress. We hypothesized toxic leadership leads to psychological contract breach.

A psychological contract is a mutually perceived obligation between the employee and employer (Chih, Chiu, Lan, & Fang, 2017). And when these negative behaviors prevail in organizational environment, employees under toxic leaders consider it a violation or breach of their psychological contract. The reason is that employees perceive that the obligation (Chih et al., 2017) made to them by the employer of providing a good working environment free of stress and abusiveness is breached. It leads to our very first hypothesis:

H₁: Toxic Leadership has a significant positive impact on employee Psychological Contract Breach.

2.2. EXPLOITATIVE LEADERSHIP AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT BREACH

Exploitative leaders are found to be putting strain on employees. They ask employees to achieve unrealistic goals and manipulate them to accomplish self-benefits (Schmid et al., 2019). Also, this leadership style is found to have adverse outcomes upon subordinates (Schmid et al., 2019). The exploitative traits of these leaders exert stress and strain on subordinates creating a state of emotional stress (Schmid et al., 2019). Several pieces of research previously (Khan, Ali, Khan, & Jehan, 2019; Pyc, Meltzer, & Liu, 2017) have depicted a positive association of negative leaderships with emotional stress. This stress leads to psychological contract breach at the workplace (Duran, Bishopp, & Woodhams, 2019). According to Affective Event Theory, individuals' emotions are developed by the event they face, or the events trigger the emotions within an individual. In this case, when employees perceive exploitative leadership, they take it as an adverse event and develop a negative emotion that the employer has breached their psychological contract. Majeed and Fatima (2020) also found a positive association between exploitative leadership and employee psychological distress.

Majeed and Fatima (2020) articulated that exploitative leadership generates negative affectivity among subordinates, particularly to nurses. It leads to the breach of their psychological contract. In their study, G. H. Han, Harms, and Bai (2017) also identified a positive association of negative leadership styles with negative emotions. As per Schmid et al. (2018), exploitative leaders always rest on manipulating, exploiting, and undermining, leading to the development of negative emotions. These negative emotions within employees make them perceive that the employer has breached their psychological contract as emotions are correlated with psychological contracts (Liang, 2019).

A psychological contract is a workers' impression of what they do to the employer and what the employer does to them. It is impossible to always find loyalty in the psychological contract as the perceived psychological contract may differ over time (Sobaih, Ibrahim, & Gabry, 2019). Many employees believe that the employer has violated the psychological contract to some extent (Sobaih et al., 2019). The psychological contract is a person's opinion about the footings and ideas of the exchange relationship between the employee and employer in which the terms are signaled by the employer (Sobaih et al., 2019). The problem comes from the coverage between them and the related structure and psychological agreement. It is essential to check the employer's work to consider the employee's behavior (D. Rousseau, 1995). And if these mutual agreements are broken in the form of bad leadership by the employer, the employee perceives it as a breach of its psychological contract. It leads to the second hypothesis:

H₂: Exploitative Leadership has a significant positive impact on employee Psychological Contract Breach.

2.3. MODERATING IMPACT OF PROACTIVE PERSONALITY

Both positive personality and voluntary service methods emphasize the need to go beyond these direct character requirements. Proactive personality is also related to the responsibility to make constructive changes, or within this scope, the person feels personally responsible for re-execute (McCormick, Guay, Colbert, & Stewart, 2019). Therefore, a positive employee trend actively supports its organisation and engages in activities beyond the scope of its plan responsibilities. Employees with a proactive personality participate more actively; that is, their willingness to contribute arbitrarily in the form may increase performance (McCormick et al., 2019). Proactive employees invest more and more in their direction to achieve personal and organizational goals by demonstrating the diversity of the organization citizenship (Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002), for example, showing an positive personality. Organizational improvement positively impacts individual participation and can effectively improve measures and improve professional ethics (Liguori, McLarty, & Muldoon, 2013).

Individuals having a proactive personality will make positive changes to get the job done. Proactive people are particularly effective in finding the best methods to solve work problems (Bateman & Crant, 1993; S. Han, Harold, & Cheong, 2019). They work actively and can easily balance their job demands the resources provided to them by their organization, thus enhancing their output (Caniëls, Semeijn, & Renders, 2018). They are driven to appraise their information and skills to find new jobs. Create a more hospitable working environment for implementing and completing tasks (Kim, Hon, & Crant, 2009). They adopt a creative approach and develop opportunities within the provided environment (Akgunduz, Alkan, & Gök, 2018). These are necessary to complete the duties that exceeded normal expectations (Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001). Previous research has revealed that proactive personality is significantly related to personality excellent performance (J. A. Thompson, 2005).

In such a case, when these personalities encounter toxicity or explosiveness from their leaders, they are less likely to perceive it as a breach of their psychological contract. When exploitative leaders manipulate or deceive their subordinates into attaining their personal goals, these personalities are less likely to get affected (Schmid et al., 2019). Proactive personalities won't develop negative emotion (Majeed & Fatima, 2020) in response to this exploitation. They have the coping capabilities and the extra energy pack of cognitive resources to deal with this behavior. The same goes for toxic leadership. When proactive personalities encounter leaders' toxicity in the form of criticism, harshness, rudeness and pressure (Bhandarker & Rai, 2019) they cope with the situation by either ignoring it or finding an opportunity as proactive personalities are opportunists. It leads us to the formation of our third and fourth hypothesis:

H₃: Proactive Personality moderates the relationship between Exploitative Leadership and Psychological Contract Breach.

H₄: Proactive Personality moderates the relationship between Toxic Leadership and Psychological Contract Breach.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. SAMPLE

The current model is tested in the healthcare sector of Pakistan. The data were collected cross-sectionally. Nurses of Public sector hospitals were taken as the population for the current study. A total of 386 samples was taken. The data was collected using a quantitative approach. The sampling technique used was a quota and convenient sampling. The quota was divided as per the five provinces of Pakistan, i.e., Punjab, KPK, Baluchistan, Sindh and Gilgit Baltistan.

Further, the data was collected from each province with convenience. The data was analyzed using SMART PLS 3.3. Both the measurement and structural models are discussed in the progressing section. A five-point Likert scale was established to test the hypothesis. The scale ranged from 1= Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree with Nutrelity at its middle point 3 and was used to provide respondents with a uniform and balanced way to answer the questionnaires (Joshi, Kale, Chandel, & Pal, 2015).

Demographics details of the sample were also measured in terms of their gender, age, income status, qualification and experience. Most of the sample had an age between 20-29 (49.9%), income between Rs 41,000- Rs 50,000 (36.8%), education up to Bachelors (41.3%) and experience between 1-5 years (40.8%). Female nurses formed the majority of the sample population.

3.2. INSTRUMENTS

3.2.1. Exploitative Leadership

The toxic leadership is assessed on 15-item scale established by Schmid et al. (2019) with reliability $\alpha=0.88$. The sample items are "Sees employees as a mean to reach his/her personal goals. "Does not give me opportunities to further develop myself professionally, because his/her own goals have priority".

3.2.2. Toxic Leadership

The toxic leadership is assessed on a 15-item scale established by Yavaş (2016) with reliability $\alpha=0.79$. The sample items are "My supervisor puts his own failures on our shoulders" and "My supervisor, as personnel, we have to behave according to his mood".

3.2.3. Psychological Contract Breach

The psychological contract breach is assessed on a 5-item scale established by Robinson and Wolfe Morrison (2000) with reliability $\alpha=0.92$. The sample items are "Almost all the promises made by my employer during recruitment have been kept so far" and "I have not received everything promised to me in exchange for my contributions".

3.2.4. Proactive Personality

The proactive personality is assessed on a 10-item scale established by Seibert, Crant, and Kraimer (1999) with reliability $\alpha=0.86$. The sample items are “Wherever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change” and “I love being a champion for my ideas, even against others' opposition”.

4. RESULTS

Table 1. Measurement Model

Constructs	Cronbach's Alpha	rho_A	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
EL	0.928	0.934	0.939	0.608
PCB	0.811	0.822	0.889	0.728
PP	0.864	0.876	0.900	0.644
TL	0.881	0.892	0.905	0.577

In the first portion, the results for the measurement model are presented. In table 1 measurement model is represented, the items for each variable have acceptable values. In the measurement model of Exploitative leadership (EL), all ten remaining items have values greater than 0.6 and are significant with a p-value less than 0.05. Therefore, all ten items are included in the measurement of exploitative leadership (EL). Moreover, seven remaining items of Toxic Leadership (TL) have been taken into account to measure Toxic Leadership with values greater than 0.6 and P-value less than 0.05. Psychological Breach of Contract (PCB) and Proactive Personality (PP) have been measured by three, four and five items, respectively, with a value greater than 0.6 and a p-value less than 0.05.

Table 2. Discriminant Validity (HTMT)

Constructs	EL	PCB	PP
PCB	0.834		
PP	0.553	0.450	
TL	0.783	0.816	0.558

Table 3. Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Lacker)

Constructs	EL	PCB	PP	TL
EL	0.779			
PCB	0.743	0.853		
PP	0.509	0.415	0.801	
TL	0.738	0.731	0.497	0.759

Table 2 mentioned above displays the discriminant validity (HTMT) and table 3 displays the discriminant validity calculated with Fornell-Lacker approach. Furthermore, the cross-loading for each variable has been mentioned, which are showing the discriminant validity (HTMT & Fornell-Lacker). All have sufficient discriminant validity as Gold AH, Arvind Malhotra AH (2001) argued 0.9 as the threshold for sufficient discriminant validity.

Table 4. Cross Loadings

Items	EL	PCB	PP	TL
EL10	0.740	0.426	0.424	0.563
EL 11	0.760	0.462	0.426	0.587
EL 12	0.817	0.571	0.467	0.529
EL 13	0.811	0.582	0.425	0.512
EL 14	0.700	0.504	0.433	0.467
EL 4	0.804	0.581	0.342	0.690
EL 5	0.812	0.715	0.348	0.610
EL 6	0.819	0.732	0.327	0.606
EL 7	0.691	0.520	0.495	0.470
EL 3	0.824	0.569	0.357	0.706
TL 1	0.511	0.375	0.403	0.764
TL 4	0.680	0.691	0.360	0.738
TL 5	0.679	0.710	0.344	0.750
TL 2	0.476	0.403	0.379	0.761
TL 3	0.504	0.513	0.371	0.787
TL 4	0.498	0.511	0.397	0.768
TL 5	0.440	0.481	0.409	0.743
PCB 1	0.675	0.886	0.359	0.645
PCB 2	0.694	0.898	0.357	0.652
PCB 3	0.518	0.770	0.348	0.572
PP 1	0.321	0.183	0.805	0.364
PP 2	0.365	0.234	0.816	0.401
PP 3	0.396	0.300	0.815	0.360
PP 4	0.444	0.374	0.873	0.426
PP 5	0.427	0.424	0.682	0.397

In the table 4 are mentioned the cross loadings for all constructs. According to Muthén and Asparouhov (2012) cross loadings are used when variables are found to have more than one significant loadings.

Table 5. Correlation Analysis

Constructs	EL	PCB	PP	TL
EL	1.000			
PCB	0.743	1.000		
PP	0.509	0.415	1.000	
TL	0.738	0.731	0.497	1.000

The table 5 is showing the results for correlation analysis. All variables are showing a positive correlation with each other. Some variables are showing strong, and some are showing weak correlations to each other.

Table 6. Structural Model

Path	Original Sample	Sample Mean	Std. Dev.	T Statistics	P Values
EL -> PCB	0.459	0.462	0.068	6.753	0.000
Moderating Effect 1 -> PCB	-0.006	-0.006	0.064	0.091	0.928
Moderating Effect 2 -> PCB	0.036	0.039	0.060	0.604	0.546
PP -> PCB	-0.012	-0.010	0.037	0.326	0.745
TL -> PCB	0.391	0.387	0.062	6.345	0.000

Table 6 depicts the structural model for the selected constructs. Details of structural model are as follows:

H₁: Toxic Leadership has a significant positive influence on employee psychological contract breach.

The co-efficient of Toxic Leadership (TL) in the direction towards psychological contract breach (PCB) is positive with a p-value less than 0.05, which means TL has a significant positive influence on psychological contract breach (PCB). The co-efficient of TL, while PCB is the dependent variable, is 0.391 with a P-value of 0.000 (P-value<0.05), which indicates that if one unit of TL is increased then, PCB will also increase by 0.391 units and vice versa. This hypothesis shows that Toxic leadership (TL) positively influences psychological contract breach (PCB), and H2 is accepted.

H₂: Exploitative Leadership has a significant positive influence on employee psychological contract breach.

The co-efficient of Exploitative Leadership (EL) in the direction towards psychological contract breach (PCB) is positive with a p-value less than 0.06, which means EL has a significant influence on psychological contract breach. The co-efficient of EL, while PCB is the dependent variable, is 0.459 with a P-value of 0.000 (P-value<0.05), which indicates that if one unit of EL is increased then, CWB will increase by 0.459. This hypothesis shows that exploitative leadership (EL) positively and significantly influences psychological contract breach (PCB), and H1 is rejected.

H₃: Proactive Personality does not weak the relationship of Exploitative Leadership with Psychological Contract Breach.

The co-efficient of Proactive Personality (PP) in the direction towards psychological contract breach (PCB) is negative with a p-value greater than 0.05, which means PP has an insignificant negative influence on psychological contract breach (PCB). The co-efficient of PP, while PCB is the dependent variable, is -0.012 with a P-value of 0.745 (P-value>0.05), which indicates that if of PP is increased then, PCB will not get effected. Moreover, the Proactive Personality is not playing a moderating role in the relationship of Exploitative Leadership with Psychological Breach of contract as interaction term of PP, and EL (PPxEL) (Moderating Effect) is showing insignificant influence with P-value>0.05 on psychological contract breach (PCB). Moreover, the interaction term's coefficient (Moderating effect) is positive, i.e., 0.036 with P-value>0.05. These results show that proactive personality (PP) does not weakens the toxic leadership with psychological breach of contract.

H₄: Proactive Personality does not weaken the relationship of Toxic Leadership with Psychological Contract Breach.

The coefficient of Proactive Personality (PP) in the direction towards psychological contract breach (PCB) is negative with a p-value greater than 0.05, which means PP has an insignificant negative influence on psychological contract breach (PCB). The co-efficient of PP, while PCB is the dependent variable, is -0.012 with a P-value of 0.745 (P-value>0.05), which indicates that if PP is increased then, PCB will not get affected. Moreover, the Proactive Personality is not playing a moderating role in the relationship of Exploitative

Leadership with Psychological Breach of contract as interaction term of PP, and EL (PPxTL) (Moderating Effect) is showing insignificant influence with $P\text{-value} > 0.05$ on psychological contract breach (PCB). Moreover, the interaction term's coefficient (Moderating effect) is negative, i.e., -0.006 with $P\text{-value} > 0.05$. These results show that proactive personality (PP) does not weaken the exploitative leadership with psychological breach of contract.

5. DISCUSSION

Our results support our first hypothesis that toxic leadership has a significant positive impact on psychological contract breach. Harvey et al. (2014) found that toxic leaders lower their subordinates by objectifying, being harsh and rude to them, which reduced self-worth, self-confidence, and self-efficacy. Salin and Notelaers (2017) stated in their research that subordinates might negatively impact psychological contract violation when they feel they are being bullied or mistreated. It tells that subordinates under a toxic leader perceive its leader's toxicity in the form of rudeness and harshness as a breach of his/her psychological contract. Wu and Hu (2009) also stated in their findings that abusive supervision (like toxic leadership in this case) is inversely related to emotional exhaustion. A Bhandarker and Rai (2019) also stated in their article that toxic leadership lead practices like criticism, ridiculing, harshness, and rudeness generate stress and strain in the employee, raising employee emotional distress for the reason we hypothesized toxic leadership leads to psychological contract breach.

Our results support our the second hypothesis as well. Majeed and Fatima (2020) articulated that exploitative leadership generates negative affectivity among subordinates, particularly to nurses. It leads to the breach of their psychological contract. In their study, G. H. Han et al. (2017) also identified a positive association of negative leadership styles with negative emotions. As per Schmid et al. (2018), exploitative leaders always rest on manipulating, exploiting, and undermining, leading to the development of negative emotions. These negative emotions within employees make them perceive that the employer has breached their psychological contract as emotions are correlated with psychological contracts (Liang, 2019).

However, our third and fourth hypothesis that proactive personality moderates the relationship between toxic leadership with psychological contract breach and exploitative leadership with psychological contract breach. Simon, Bauer, Erdogan, and Shepherd (2019) further examined proactive personalities and stated that a conducive environment is essential for even overqualified people to be proactive at the workplace. Lack of training by the organizations might be a reason that might lead proactivists nurses to not to show up (Simon et al., 2019) even when they face toxic and exploitative leadership and perceive psychological contract breach from hospitals. Indeed, few firms are starting to propose 'Proactivity Training' to reassure hires to participate in the onboarding process actively. For instance, Google —nudges workers to take action by emailing them with appropriate material about processes they should go through to further their adjustment (Bock, 2015).

As Belschak and Hartog (2010) described in their article, proactive personalities might not always use their extra bank of resources to achieve organizational goals. When nurses

perceive that they are receiving destructive behavior from the head nurses they perceive it as a psychological contract breach by the hospitals' administration. But when nurses, even with proactive personalities, realize the administration is shattering their personal goals, they tend to develop negative emotions. As such, nurses only utilize their proactivist approach for self-goals (Belschak & Hartog, 2010).

6. THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Nurses are terribly crucial and very important to the health care sector. Disturbances in their work behaviour can cause serious setbacks associated with the general health level of society. This research conjointly adds to the literature on nursing sector psychology. Our analysis has brought researchers' attention to the consequences of destructive leaders upon the nurses of a third-world country's general public hospital. The analysis contains complicated nurses' responses to the destructive behaviours of their bosses. It additionally signifies the role of human psychology within the organizational environment. The study has additionally highlighted the necessity and requirement of a healthy environment and bosses, particularly regarding the health care sector. The various sorts of destructive leaders mentioned above can have different responses. On the other hand, it also adds to the researcher's information that subordinates can have different reactions below the constant style of in-charge or boss. This outcome of the present study adds to literature with completely different psychological contract perceptions below the same leader.

In Pakistan, public sector nurses are paid enough; however, they still aren't happy due to their in-charges' destructive behaviours at hospitals. This outcome concludes that job satisfaction doesn't suppose salaries or monetary advantages; however, it also needs a healthy environment. The analysis has additionally mentioned different leadership styles within the context of the health care sector. The psychological contract is antecedently mentioned as a mediator with many Independent Variables and Dependent Variable; however, it is not with destructive leadership shades that have been researched during this study. The above-tested leadership styles haven't been mentioned earlier in research with the mediator's psychological contract breach.

7. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study was conducted at an individual level. This study doesn't signify the impact of destructive behaviours on PCB at multilevel or in teams. An equivalent model can be tested at multilevel. As individuals might behave differently in response to destructive behaviours when operating in teams or groups. The above-studied model was sorely tested within the health care sector; in several different service sectors, this model can be studied like education, municipal, hoteling, banking, etc. An equivalent study can also be created within the manufacturing business.

Furthermore, this model is tested cross-sectionally, which limits the generalizability of the research. As per the Lim Law, the leaders behave differently in different situations. This situational context can only be incorporated if a longitudinal study is conducted. For this purpose, future researchers can extend the study by analyzing the impacts of these two

shades of destructive leaders upon subordinates at different times. Behaviour may not always be the same by the leaders towards their followers.

Furthermore, this study solely tests the impact of bad leaders upon subordinates; however, not on their colleagues and staff mates, which might be studied within the future. Similarly, these leaders' destructive or immoral isn't known during this paper, which can be an exciting topic for future researchers. These leaders are either born destructive or are themselves a product of the organizational atmosphere.

8. CONCLUSION

The research concluded that nurses in public hospitals of Pakistan are found to have violated or breached contract under the supervision of toxic and exploitative leadership. This study depicts that this happens so because employees develop negative emotions in response to negativity by these destructive leaders, which are exploitation and manipulation in exploitative leadership and rudeness and harshness in toxic leadership. The study is supported by Affective Event Theory, which states that employees perceive negative emotions (PCB) in response to negative events (Toxic and Exploitative Leadership) they experience. However, proactive personalities were found to show the same pattern despite additional psychological resources. The reasons supported by literature might vary by the environment of the benefit to cost ratio associated with their proactiveness. This research has mutually theoretical and practical implications with few limitations.

Reference:

- Adams, A. M. N., Chamberlain, D., & Giles, T. M. (2019). The perceived and experienced role of the nurse unit manager in supporting the wellbeing of intensive care unit nurses: An integrative literature review. *Australian Critical Care*, 32(4), 319-329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aucc.2018.06.003>
- Akgunduz, Y., Alkan, C., & Gök, Ö. A. (2018). Perceived organizational support, employee creativity and proactive personality: The mediating effect of meaning of work. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 34, 105-114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.01.004>
- Alzahrani, S. (2019). Transformational leadership style on nursing job satisfaction amongst nurses in hospital settings: Findings from systematic review. *Global Journal of Health Science*, 11(6), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v11n6p25>
- Aravena, F. (2019). Destructive leadership behavior: An exploratory study in Chile. *Leadership and policy in schools*, 18(1), 83-96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2017.1384501>
- Argyris, C. (1960). *Understanding organizational behavior*, Dorsey, USA.
- Aryee, S., Sun, L. Y., Chen, Z. X. G., & Debrah, Y. A. (2008). Abusive supervision and contextual performance: The mediating role of emotional exhaustion and the moderating role of work unit structure. *Management and Organization Review*, 4(3), 393-411. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2008.00118.x>

- 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(2), 126-140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-4490.1997.tb00124.x>
- Ashforth, B. E., & Anand, V. (2003). The normalization of corruption in organizations. *Research in organizational behavior*, 25, 1-52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085\(03\)25001-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(03)25001-2)
- Asrar-ul-Haq, M., & Anjum, T. (2020). Impact of narcissistic leadership on employee work outcomes in banking sector of Pakistan. *Future Business Journal*, 6(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-020-00040-x>
- Baškarada, S., Watson, J., & Cromarty, J. (2016). Leadership and organizational ambidexterity. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(6), 778-788 <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-01-2016-0004>
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 14(2), 103-118. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030140202>
- Beale, D., & Hoel, H. (2010). Workplace bullying, industrial relations and the challenge for management in Britain and Sweden. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 16(2), 101-118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959680110364826>
- Belschak, F., & Hartog, D. D. (2010). Being proactive at work—blessing or bane? *The Psychologist*, 23(11), 886–889.
- Bhandarker, A., & Rai, S. (2019). Toxic leadership: Emotional distress and coping strategy. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 22(1), 65-78. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-03-2018-0027>
- Boddy, C., & Taplin, R. (2017). A note on workplace psychopathic bullying—Measuring its frequency and severity. *Aggression and violent behavior*, 34, 117-119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.02.001>
- Boddy, C. R. (2014). Corporate psychopaths, conflict, employee affective well-being and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 121(1), 107-121. Retrieved March 30, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42921368>
- Boddy, C. R. (2015). Organisational psychopaths: A ten year update. *Management Decision*, 53(10), 2407–2432. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-04-2015-0114>.
- Bowers, M. R., Hall, J. R., & Srinivasan, M. M. (2017). Organizational culture and leadership style: The missing combination for selecting the right leader for effective crisis management. *Business Horizons*, 60(4), 551-563. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2017.04.001>
- Burns Jr, W. A. (2017). A Descriptive Literature Review of Harmful Leadership Styles: Definitions, Commonalities, Measurements, Negative Impacts, and Ways to

- Improve These Harmful Leadership Styles. *Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership*, 3(1), 33-52. <https://doi.org/10.17062/cjil.v3i1.53>
- Campbell, W. K., Foster, C. A., & Finkel, E. J. (2002). Does self-love lead to love for others? A story of narcissistic game playing. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 83(2), 340-354. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.2.340>
- Caniëls, M. C., Semeijn, J. H., & Renders, I. H. (2018). Mind the mindset! The interaction of proactive personality, transformational leadership and growth mindset for engagement at work. *Career Development International*, 23(1), 48-66. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-11-2016-0194>.
- Chandler, J. L. S. (2021). Analyzing bad leadership through a critical leadership theory lens. In A. Örtenblad (Ed.), *Debating bad leadership: Reasons and remedies* (pp. 224-233). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65025-4>
- Chih, W.-H., Chiu, T.-S., Lan, L.-C., & Fang, W.-C. (2017). Psychological contract violation. *International journal of conflict management*, 28(1), 103-121. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCMA-02-2016-0010>.
- Choi, L., & Hwang, J. (2019). The role of prosocial and proactive personality in customer citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 36(2), 288-305. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-01-2018-2518>.
- Chong, S., Van Dyne, L., Kim, Y. J., & Oh, J. K. (2021). Drive and direction: empathy with intended targets moderates the proactive personality–job performance relationship via work engagement. *Applied Psychology*, 70(2), 575-605. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12240>
- Collins, M. D., & Jackson, C. J. (2015). A process model of self-regulation and leadership: How attentional resource capacity and negative emotions influence constructive and destructive leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(3), 386-401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.02.005>
- Crawford, J., Dawkins, S., Martin, A., & Lewis, G. (2017). Understanding the organizational climate of unethical leadership in the Australian Football League. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 11(2), 52-54. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21525>
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of management Journal*, 45(2), 331-351. <https://doi.org/10.5465/3069350>
- Duran, F., Bishopp, D., & Woodhams, J. (2019). Relationships between psychological contract violation, stress and well-being in firefighters. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 12(3), 120–133. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJWHM-09-2018-0114>.
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 207-216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002>

- Elangovan, A., & Xie, J. L. (2000). Effects of perceived power of supervisor on subordinate work attitudes. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 21(6), 319–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730010343095>.
- Fallatah, F., Laschinger, H. K., & Read, E. A. (2017). The effects of authentic leadership, organizational identification, and occupational coping self-efficacy on new graduate nurses' job turnover intentions in Canada. *Nursing outlook*, 65(2), 172-183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2016.11.020>
- Fatima, T., Majeed, M., & Shah, S. Z. (2018). Jeopardies of aversive leadership: a conservation of resources theory approach. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 1935. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01935>
- Furtner, M. R., Maran, T., & Rauthmann, J. F. (2017). Dark leadership: The role of leaders' dark triad personality traits *Leader development deconstructed* (pp. 75-99): Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64740-1_4
- Gallos, J. V. (2008). Learning from the toxic trenches: The winding road to healthier organizations—and to healthy everyday leaders. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 17(4), 354-367. doi:10.1177/1056492608320580
- Gilbert, S., & Kelloway, E. K. (2018). Self-determined leader motivation and follower perceptions of leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39(5), 608-619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-09-2017-0262>.
- Goldman, A. (2009). *Destructive leaders and dysfunctional organizations: A therapeutic approach*: Cambridge University Press. www.cambridge.org/978521717342
- Gyanchandani, R. (2017). The effect of transformational leadership style on team performance in IT sector. *IUP Journal of Soft Skills*, 11(3), 29-44.
- Hadavinejad, M. (2017). Investigating the consequences of unethical toxic leadership in organization Ethics in Science & Technology, 12(3), 0-0. <https://www.sid.ir/en/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?id=735898>.
- Han, G. H., Harms, P., & Bai, Y. (2017). Nightmare bosses: The impact of abusive supervision on employees' sleep, emotions, and creativity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 145(1), 21-31 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2859-y>.
- Han, S., Harold, C. M., & Cheong, M. (2019). Examining why employee proactive personality influences empowering leadership: The roles of cognition-and affect-based trust. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 92(2), 352-383 <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12252>.
- Hansen, D. J., Shrader, R., & Monllor, J. (2011). Defragmenting definitions of entrepreneurial opportunity. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(2), 283-304 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2011.00325.x>.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2018). The dark side of leadership and management, *Taylor & Francis* 38(5), 475-477, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2018.1509276>.

- Harvey, P., Harris, K. J., Gillis, W. E., & Martinko, M. J. (2014). Abusive supervision and the entitled employee. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(2), 204-217, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.08.001>.
- Hobman, E. V., Restubog, S. L. D., Bordia, P., & Tang, R. L. (2009). Abusive supervision in advising relationships: Investigating the role of social support. *Applied Psychology*, 58(2), 233-256, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00330.x>.
- Hoobler, J. M., & Hu, J. (2013). A model of injustice, abusive supervision, and negative affect. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 256-269, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.11.005>.
- Hu, R., Wang, L., Zhang, W., & Bin, P. (2018). Creativity, proactive personality, and entrepreneurial intention: the role of entrepreneurial alertness. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 951, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00951>
- Huang, J., Wang, L., & Xie, J. (2014). Leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of identification with leader and leader's reputation. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 42(10), 1699-1711, <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.10.1699>
- Illies, J. J., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2008). Responding destructively in leadership situations: The role of personal values and problem construction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(1), 251-272, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9574-2>.
- Jabbar, U. B., Saleem, F., Malik, M. I., Qureshi, S. S., & Thursamy, R. (2020). Abusive leadership and employee commitment nexus: Conservation of resources theory perspective. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), 1857993, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1857993>.
- Jada, U. R., Mukhopadhyay, S., & Titiyal, R. (2019). Empowering leadership and innovative work behavior: a moderated mediation examination. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(5), 915-930, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-08-2018-0533>.
- Jamal, S. A., Fitchett, D., Lok, C. E., Mendelssohn, D. C., & Tsuyuki, R. T. (2009). The effects of calcium-based versus non-calcium-based phosphate binders on mortality among patients with chronic kidney disease: a meta-analysis. *Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation*, 24(10), 3168-3174, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfp350>.
- Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D. K. (2015). Likert scale: Explored and explained. *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 7(4), 396-403, <https://doi.org/10.9734/BJAST/2015/14975>.
- Kant, L., Skogstad, A., Torsheim, T., & Einarsen, S. (2013). Beware the angry leader: Trait anger and trait anxiety as predictors of petty tyranny. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 106-124, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.08.005>.
- Kayani, M. B., Zafar, A., Aksar, M., & Hassan, S. (2019). Impacts of Despotic Leadership and Dark Personality Triad on Follower's Sense of Meaningful Work: Moderating Influence of Organizational Justice. *International Transaction Journal of*

- Engineering, Management, & Applied Sciences & Technologies(ITJEMAST)*, 11(2), 1-14, <https://doi.org/10.14456/ITJEMAST.2020.35>.
- Khan, A. N., Ali, A., Khan, N. A., & Jehan, N. (2019). A study of relationship between transformational leadership and task performance: The role of social media and affective organisational commitment. *International Journal of Business Information Systems*, 31(4), 499-516, <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBIS.2019.101583>.
- Kim, T.-Y., Hon, A. H., & Crant, J. M. (2009). Proactive personality, employee creativity, and newcomer outcomes: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24(1), 93-103, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9094-4>.
- Kurtulmuş, B. E. (2020). Toxic Leadership and Workplace Bullying: The Role of Followers and Possible Coping Strategies. *The Palgrave Handbook of Workplace Well-Being*, 1-20, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02470-3_24-1.
- Kusy, M., & Holloway, E. (2009). *Toxic workplace!: Managing toxic personalities and their systems of power*. John Wiley & Sons, ISBN 978-0-470-428484-1.
- Labrague, L. J., Loriga, J., Nwafor, C. E., van Bogaert, P., & Cummings, G. G. (2020). Development and psychometric testing of the toxic leadership behaviors of nurse managers (ToxBH-NM) scale. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 28(4), 840-850, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.13008>.
- Levinson, H., Price, C., Munden, K. M., & Mandl, H. (1996). H., and Solley, C.(1962). *Men, management, and mental health*: Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, USA. ISBN: 9780674424739.
- Liang, H.-L. (2019). Are emotions transmitted from work to family? A crossover model of psychological contract breach. *Psychological reports*, 122(1), 288-304, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294117750630>.
- Liguori, E. W., McLarty, B. D., & Muldoon, J. (2013). The moderating effect of perceived job characteristics on the proactive personality-organizational citizenship behavior relationship. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 34(8), 724-740, <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-01-2012-0014>.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). The allure of toxic leaders: Why followers rarely escape their clutches. *Ivey Business Journal*, 69(3), 1-40.
- Majeed, M., & Fatima, T. (2020). Impact of exploitative leadership on psychological distress: A study of nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 28(7), 1713-1724, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.13127>.
- Mawritz, M. B., Mayer, D. M., Hoobler, J. M., Wayne, S. J., & Marinova, S. V. (2012). A trickle-down model of abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 65(2), 325-357, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2012.01246.x>.
- Maxwell, S. M. (2015). An exploration of human resource personnel and toxic leadership, *Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies*. 548, <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/548>.

- McCormick, B. W., Guay, R. P., Colbert, A. E., & Stewart, G. L. (2019). Proactive personality and proactive behaviour: Perspectives on person–situation interactions. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 92(1), 30-51 <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12234>.
- Milosevic, I., Maric, S., & Lončar, D. (2020). Defeating the toxic boss: the nature of toxic leadership and the role of followers. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27(2), 117-137, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051819833374>.
- Muthén, B., & Asparouhov, T. (2012). Bayesian structural equation modeling: a more flexible representation of substantive theory. *Psychological methods*, 17(3), 313, <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026802>.
- Nauman, S., Zheng, C., & Basit, A. A. (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. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-11-2019-0476>.
- Nonis-Tramonte, E. (2021). *The Detection of Destructive Leadership: A Systematic Literature Review for Early Screening*. Ashford University.
- Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 176-194, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.001>.
- Pelletier, K. L. (2010). Leader toxicity: An empirical investigation of toxic behavior and rhetoric. *Leadership*, 6(4), 373-389, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715010379308>.
- Pishgooie, A. H., Atashzadeh-Shoorideh, F., Falcó-Pegueroles, A., & Lotfi, Z. (2019). Correlation between nursing managers' leadership styles and nurses' job stress and anticipated turnover. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 27(3), 527-534, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12707>.
- Pyc, L. S., Meltzer, D. P., & Liu, C. (2017). Ineffective leadership and employees' negative outcomes: The mediating effect of anxiety and depression. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 24(2), 196, <https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000030>.
- Reed, G. E. (2004). Toxic leadership. *Military review*, 84(4), 67-71.
- Reed, G. E., & Bullis, R. C. (2009). The impact of destructive leadership on senior military officers and civilian employees. *Armed Forces & Society*, 36(1), 5-18, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X09334994>.
- Robinson, S. L., & Wolfe Morrison, E. (2000). The development of psychological contract breach and violation: A longitudinal study. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 21(5), 525-546, [https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379\(200008\)21:5<525::AID-JOB40>3.0.CO;2-T](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379(200008)21:5<525::AID-JOB40>3.0.CO;2-T).
- Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 617-633, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.005>.

- Ross, S. (2019). Leadership Derailment: A Neglected Field in Talent Management *Managing Talent: A Critical Appreciation*: Emerald Publishing Limited, Bingley, pp. 71-86, <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83909-093-620201007>.
- Roter, D. L. (2011). Oral literacy demand of health care communication: challenges and solutions. *Nursing outlook*, 59(2), 79-84, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2010.11.005>.
- Rousseau, D. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*: Sage publications.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee responsibilities and rights journal*, 2(2), 121-139, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01384942>.
- Salin, D., & Notelaers, G. (2017). The effect of exposure to bullying on turnover intentions: the role of perceived psychological contract violation and benevolent behaviour. *Work & Stress*, 31(4), 355-374, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2017.1330780>.
- Samad, A., Memon, S. B., & Ali, I. (2021). Despotic leadership and job satisfaction among nurses: role of emotional exhaustion. *Independent Journal of Management & Production*, 12(1), 127-142, ISSN: 2236-269X.
- Samuel, H., Sehar, S., Afzal, M., & Gilani, S. A. (2018). Influence of supportive leadership on nursing clinical decision making in critical care units at tertiary care hospital Lahore. *International Journal of Nursing*, 5(2), 45-71, <https://doi.org/DOI:10.15640/ijn.v5n2a5>.
- Sarwar, A., Naseer, S., & Zhong, J. Y. (2020). Effects of bullying on job insecurity and deviant behaviors in nurses: Roles of resilience and support. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 28(2), 267-276, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12917>.
- 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, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317707810>.
- Schmid, E. A., Pircher Verdorfer, A., & Peus, C. V. (2018). Different shades–different effects? consequences of different types of destructive leadership. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 1289, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01289>.
- Schmidt, A. A. (2008). *Development and validation of the toxic leadership scale*. <http://hdl.handle.net/1903/8176>
- Schyns, B. (2015). Dark Personality in the Workplace: Introduction to the Special Issue. *Applied Psychology*, 64(1), 1-14, <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12041>.
- Seibert, S. E., Crant, J. M., & Kraimer, M. L. (1999). Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(3), 416, <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.3.416>
- Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Crant, J. M. (2001). What do proactive people do? A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(4), 845-874, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00234.x>

- Shaw, J. B., Erickson, A., & Harvey, M. (2011). A method for measuring destructive leadership and identifying types of destructive leaders in organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(4), 575-590, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.05.001>
- Simon, L. S., Bauer, T. N., Erdogan, B., & Shepherd, W. (2019). Built to last: Interactive effects of perceived overqualification and proactive personality on new employee adjustment. *Personnel Psychology*, 72(2), 213-240, <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12297>
- Sobaih, A. E. E., Ibrahim, Y., & Gabry, G. (2019). Unlocking the black box: Psychological contract fulfillment as a mediator between HRM practices and job performance. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 30, 171-181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2019.03.001>
- Templer, K. J. (2018). Dark personality, job performance ratings, and the role of political skill: An indication of why toxic people may get ahead at work. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 124, 209-214, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.11.030>
- Thompson, G., & Glasø, L. (2018). Situational leadership theory: a test from a leader-follower congruence approach. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39(5), 574-591, <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-01-2018-0050>.
- Thompson, J. A. (2005). Proactive personality and job performance: a social capital perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 1011. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.1011>
- Thoroughgood, C. N., Padilla, A., Hunter, S. T., & Tate, B. W. (2012). The susceptible circle: A taxonomy of followers associated with destructive leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(5), 897-917. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.05.007>
- Turnley, W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2000). Re-examining the effects of psychological contract violations: unmet expectations and job dissatisfaction as mediators. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 21(1), 25-42, [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(200002\)21:1<25::AID-JOB2>3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200002)21:1<25::AID-JOB2>3.0.CO;2-Z)
- Vreja, L. O., Balan, S., & Bosca, L. C. (2016). An evolutionary perspective on toxic leadership. *Management and Economics Review*, 1(2), 217-228.
- Wu, T.-Y., & Hu, C. (2009). Abusive supervision and employee emotional exhaustion: Dispositional antecedents and boundaries. *Group & Organization Management*, 34(2), 143-169, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601108331217>
- Yavaş, A. (2016). Sectoral differences in the perception of toxic leadership. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 229, 267-276, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.07.137>