Abusive leadership – a Barrier to Employee Empowerment

Krishna Murari*

Composites Manufacturing Division, Hindustan Aeronautics   Limited, Marathahalli Post, Bangalore, India
E-mail: Krishnamurari1962@gmail.com

Abstract

This research is conducted to understand the negative impact of abusive leadership on employee empowerment. Employee Empowerment plays a vital role in an organization in achieving a competitive advantage in this era of cut throat competition. Empowerment of employee enables the employee to take a quick decision to respond to changes in the business environment. Various types of Leadership styles have different impact on employee empowerment. Abusive leadership style has adverse effect on employee empowerment. The study is conducted in Indian business organizations in Bangalore that use world class technologies in India by using a questionnaire developed by me consisting of 54 items based on literature survey, content validity, pilot study and factor analysis. Correlation and regression analysis are carried out to find the relationship among abusive leaderships variables, empowerment variables and consequence variables. The study highlights that arrogance and interpersonal insensitivity characteristics of abusive leadership reduce the employee empowerment. Abusive leadership also has a harmful impact on   consequences of empowerment viz. Organizational commitment, work environment satisfaction and job involvement of employees resulting in poor performance of the organization wearing away the competitive advantage of the organization.

Keywords: Abusive leadership; employee empowerment, commitment, work environment satisfaction, job involvement

1. Introduction

To meet the challenges of globalization, employee empowerment is necessary in the organization so that employees can take decision to respond to the changing business environment. Nick N, Jack L.S., Warren, R.N., Barbara, W. (1994) emphasis that an organization which believes in employee empowerment, motivates and retains their employees. It helps in job satisfaction, employee performance and productivity. But they caution that employee empowerment is a complex tool and should be used with care. In a free market economy, empowerment is required for increasing innovation, quality of products and services to meet the challenges of open competition. Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Quinn and Spreitzer, 1997; Sundbo, 1999 and Forrester, 2000 highlight that the empowered workforce lead to achieve a competitive advantage.

Leadership styles are vital to success. Some leaders are more successful while others are not. Some get respect from their employees while others do not. Amazingly some of the successful leaders do not get admiration rather people extreme dislike them. This is due to the leadership style adopted by them. There are an enormous number of leadership depend on the enormous number of the leaders of past and present such as Akbar, George Washington, Churchill, Hitler, Mahatma Gandhi,   Martin Luther King,   Jack Welch, Indira Gandhi, Nelson Mandela.

The each type of leadership style has a specific impact on the empowerment of the employees. Leaders who abusive do not get respect even though they may be successful but subordinates hate them. Murari and Gupta (2009) explain that such leaders are dangerous for the growth of the organization. As an individual they may be successful but they harm the organization as many knowledgeable employees leave the organization as they cannot bear the rude and abusive behavior of their leaders.

This paper highlights the significance of empowerment in the success of an organization and harmful role of Abusive leadership in employee empowerment. It emphasizes that the abusive leadership craft a barrier for employee empowerment.   It also highlights that abusive leadership lessens work culture satisfaction, employee commitment and job involvement.

2. Research methodology

This research used an amalgamation of exploratory and descriptive research methodology. I have used a questionnaire method to measure the implication and the relationship of various variables of abusive leadership style, employee empowerment and consequences. Initially, I carried out a pilot study for factor analysis and to test the reliability of the questionnaire and then I modified it after analyzing the outcomes by finding out reliability and validity using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) software. I have used SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) software package for the statistical tests viz. Factor analysis, correlation and regression to find out significant relationships and interactions among the various variables of abusive leadership, employee empowerment and its consequences.

3. Literature review

Baron and Neuman, 1998; Keashly, L., Trott, V. and MacLean, L.M., 1994; Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K. and Hjelt-Back, M., 1994; Hoel, H., Rayner, C. and Cooper, C.L., 1999 highlighted that there is an assortment of literature on abuse and its forms in the organizations in Europe and America but abusive leadership, the area under discussion, not probed or researched methodically (Tepper, 2007). Studies have used a range of terms to describe abusive leadership such as narcissist leadership used by Kets de Vries and Miller (1985) and Kets de Vries (2004); petty tyranny used by Ashforth (1994, 1997); workplace aggression used by Baron and Neuman, (1998) and Schat and Kelloway (2000); emotional abuse by Keashly (1998); perceived leader integrity by Craig and Gustafson (1998); workplace bullying by Hoel and Cooper (2001); supervisor undermining Duffy, M.K., Ganster, D.C. and Pagon, M. (2002); bad leadership by Kellerman (2004); toxic leaders by Lipman-Blumen (2005); abusive supervision by Tepper, (2007); leader bullying by Ferris, G.R., Zinko, R., Brouer, R.L., Buckley, R.M. and Harvey, M.G. (2007) and destructive leadership by Einarsen, S., Schanke Aasland, M. and Skogstad, A. (2007) and Padilla, A., Hogan, R. and Kaiser, R.B. (2007). There is no agreement on one name and one definition. It has made difficult to take a broad view in the research.

Kets de Vries (2006) expresses that all leaders in various fields like those in organizations, in communities and in the countries are vulnerable to the murkier side of power i.e. being abusive. Bassman and London, 1993; Tepper, 2000; and, Tierney and Tepper, 2007 have found that there is only a partial research carried out to examine the "murky" side of leadership and workplace.

Tepper (2007) finds that studies on abusive leadership are not well thought-out although previous circumstances and consequences are being recognized. Most studies have used available research in other areas such as interpersonal justice, workplace bullying, etc. to examine abusive leadership. Tepper, 2000 and Keashly, 2001 argue that using the results from another area to abusive leadership create bias and asked to study the experience of people who undergo the abusive behavior of their superiors and impact of such behavior on those persons Kellerman's (2004) feels that abusive leadership should be treated as something other than leadership in place of taking into consideration it as a part of bad leadership.

From the literature review, it is quite evident that there is no specific quantitative research study on the impact of Abusive leadership style on employee empowerment. This emphasizes a need for quantitative study to correlate the empowering variable with abusive leadership characteristics.

3.1 Abusive Leadership

Abusive leaders exercise power to serve their own interest by dominating and authoritative ways to achieve what they want. They manipulate others to gain their purposes. They want to win at any cost. Although they know how to show that they are loyal and working for the organization, actuality they are preoccupied to be number one. Baron and Neuman (1998) explain that abusive behavior is the behavior which is harmful to others.

Ashforth (1994, 1997) defines petty tyranny as a manager's use of power and authority cruelly, erratically, and unkindly. He finds following six dimensions of a petty tyrant:behaving in an illogical and conceited manner; putting down subordinate; lacking kindness for other; forcing divergence ruling; discouraging inventiveness and using non-contingent penalty.

Tepper (2000) defines abusive supervision as the perception of subordinates about the hostile verbal and nonverbal behavior of their supervisors which does not include physical abuse. He feels that supervisors may not mean to cause harm and are forced to act abusively in order to achieve some other goal.

Keashly (2001) finds that the abusive behaviors are those behaviors that are alleged as thoughtless of an individual's integrity and result in hurt or damage to the target and these are frequent.Duffy et al. (2002) describes the abusive behavior is a behavior that creates negatively effect on an individual's ability in creating and maintaining relations with others, success related to work   and favorable standing.

  Most of the present literature on abusive leadership contemplates on the negative behavior andresults associated with it. Kets de Vries and Miller (1985) and Kets de Vries (2004) research on narcissistic leadership and Einarsen et al. (2007) research on destructive leadership emphasis positive and negative aspects of abusive leadership. Even, Kellerman (2004) also finds that bad leadership could be effective in some respects. Kets de Vries and Miller (1985) explain that there are three types of narcissistic leaders viz. reactive, self-deceptive and constructive. They find that narcissistic leaders behave abusively due to a sense of denial and worthlessness and in an attempt to cover up insecurities. Also, they often become fanatical to continuously ascertain their sufficiency, status and supremacy. Kets de Vries and Miller (1985) also explain that all the persons display some signs of narcissistic behavior.

Einarsen et al. (2007) define destructive leadership as repetitive behavior of a leader that infringes the acceptable interest of the organization. Destructive leadership can embrace behaviors directed toward employees, organizational goals and efficacy.

Murari and Gupta (2011) explain that abusive leaders follow set procedure if it satisfies their self-interests. They have the skill to create an impression that what they are doing in line with "the right thing to do. Jacques (1995) believes that leaders can lead to a manipulative abuse of personal power due to a mismatch between organizational roles and their capabilities. It results in an extremely poisonous and obnoxious environment. Wyatt and Hare (1997) stress that leaders or managers who lack personal power abuse their rightful role.   These are provoked by their lack of confidence and fear. NiCarthy, G., Gottlieb, N. and Coffman, S. (1993) identified many abusive leadership styles in workplace research. Unfortunately these styles are still present in many organizations. Some of the types of abusive leadership styles identified by NiCarthy et al. (1993) are Manipulators, Admirals, Pseudo-Democratic Crisis-Management, and Unpredictable.

3.2 Characteristics of Abusive Leadership

The characteristics of abusive leadership identified by   Sheehan (1996) include sarcasticism, verbal abusiveness, dishonest , Intimidator, harassing, cruelty, poor interpersonal skill development,   low self-esteem and inadequate competencies

Hughes, R., Ginnett, R., & Curphy, G, (1999) assert that leaders who have 'dark-side traits', including argumentativeness, interpersonal insensitivity, narcissism, impulsivity, perfectionism and fear of failure. Whittell (2005) identifies following characteristics of abusive leadership:sarcastic, insincerity, arrogance, insensitivity, remorselessness, impatience,   erraticism, unreliability, parasitism and lack of ethics.

A study by Alison Starratt, A.   and Grandy, G. (2010) on the young workers' experiences of abusive leadership identifies the following characteristics of abusive leadership : playing favorites, dealing dirty work as punishment, threatening employees, blurring the lines between personal and professional, talking behind employees' backs, putting employees down, public criticism, unrealistic expectations, telling lies and   illegal practices.

Bases on the characteristics identified by Starratt et al. (2010), Whittell (2005) , Hughes, et al. (1999),   Sheehan (1996) and Ashforth (1994), the   characteristics of abusive leadership are low self esteem, insincerity, verbally abusive or harassing , interpersonal insensitivity, arrogance, remorselessness, perfectionism, impatience, j) unreliability, unethical   and   parasitism.

3.3 Outcomes of Abusive Leadership

Ashforth (1994) explains that this type of leadership causes   low self-esteem, poor performance, no team functioning, stress, helplessness and work alienation.Starratt et al. (2010) with. found that there are three emotional responses on abusive leadership namely:feeling hopeless;feeling humiliated; and feeling anxious. They also found three physical outcomes namely: mitigating vengeance;separation; and parting to deal.

3.4   Empowerment

Different social scientists and management gurus take empowerment in different meanings. Kizilos (1990), Shipper and Manz (1992) associate it with "giving the Powers". Conger & Kanungo (1988), Byham and Cox (1988), Manz

(1992), and Thomas &Venthouse (1990) highlight that empowerment motivate the people to improve. Thus empowerment consists of those processes which make the people motivated. Block (1990) and Shipper & Manz (1992) define it as a culture that values initiative, absolute honesty and achievement. Matza (1990) tells that empowerment is getting employees to take care of the customer.

Gupta and Murari (1996) consider empowerment as a process of developing a culture in the organization which makes the organization flexible and responsive which encourages employees to be responsive, innovative and decision makers by sharing the power and responsibility. It creates an environment of continuous learning. However, leadership needs to transform to release the power.

Avelino (2007) explains that power is largely defined as the ability of actors to muster resources, empowerment as the communication between actors of the resources, processes and competences necessary to use power and leadership as the proficiency to persuade other actors in terms of ncreasing their readiness (or reluctance) to use certain type of power and doing that to reach an explicit goal. Schermerhorn et al. (1991) stress that managers in competitive organizations empower their subordinates against the concentrating power at higher levels. They emphasized that the power should be shared among the employees specifically in flatter organizations.

Efraty (1995) emphasizes that empowerment is more practical while downsizing the organization. When the number of employees in an organization reduces, people gain decision-making power. Klidas (2001) define empowerment as "the concept of delegating the decision-making authority and responsibility to the employees at the forefront so that they can control and increase the quality of the service and customer satisfaction".

Chandler (1992) explains that in the management literature, the empowerment has been linked to organizational efficiency, team building, leadership efficacy, commitment, agreement, and high productivity. McDermett et al. (1996) emphasize work redesign initiatives to empower workers to better manage their jobs under the restriction of cost-driven changes and to give more control to the employees that actually execute the work.

3.5 Characteristics of Empowerment and Its Consequences

Empowerment characteristics of leadership, organization and employees are identified by many scholars viz. Kanter (1977), Bandura (1986; 1997), Block (1987), Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), Quinn and Spreitzer (1997), Ginnodo (1997), Ozaralli (2003) and Samad (2007). Characteristics identified by Gupta (2009) are based on his research on Indian business organizations. Hence these characteristics are taken for research. These include respect for team members, top-management attitude, open communication, opportunities for learning application, organizational support for innovation, responsive superiors, opportunities for self-development, degree of formalization, performance-linked feedback and autonomy. Gupta (1999) also identified the following consequences of empowerment:Self –efficacy, Organizational., commitment, Work Environment Satisfaction, Role satisfaction and Job Involvement

4.0 Developments of instrument (questionnaire)

Questionnaire method is being used in this research to identify the leadership style, characteristics of leadership style, the level of employee empowerment and their interrelationships in the organization.

No questionnaire is found during the literature survey which covers abusive leadership style selected for the research and empowerment level in the organization. Hence, a questionnaire is developed selecting relevant questions from the various questionnaires used by research scholars like A.A. Schmidt (2008), Tepper (2000), Kathie L. Pelletier(2010) to capture the leadership style of superiors and the empowerment level of the organization.

Initially 84 questions were taken from various research papers. I took the help of 3 experts (Professors of Organizational Behavior in 3 different Management Schools) for content and construct validity. I asked them to categorize the 84 statements related to leadership styles independently. I asked them to rate the statements which represent abusive leadership by rating scale: 1: for not at all representing, 6: neutral and 11: representing fully. I retained 23 statements which have the highest average rating after discussing with them and arriving at consensus with some modifications in the statements.

The instrument was divided into three areas: a) Demographic data, b) characteristics of leadership style and c) Empowerment level in the organization. Questionnaire for the empowerment level in the organization is taken from the instrument developed by Gupta (2009) with reliability Cronbach alpha 0.91.

There were 70 items in the intial questionnaire. Demographic data related information such as age, gender, qualification, experience, hierarchical level and functions performed were also sought in the questionnaire to study the relationships of these factors on the abusive leadership and level of empowerment in the organization. Likert 5 Point Rating Scale, ranging from 1 for Never to 5 for Very Often, is used for rating by the respondents.

4.1 Pilot Study and Reliability of the Instrument

In the pilot study, an effort was made to measure the reliability of the instrument (questionnaire) as I had developed the questionnaire. The Sample was collected from highly technology oriented organizations in Bangalore, India where various kinds of leaderships were quite visible.   The sample of 144 covering 16 females and 118 males was collected.

The respondents were from both sexes belonging to eight different functional groups, four different qualifications, age varying from 24 to 57 years, three levels (junior, middle and senior) in the organizational hierarchy, four different educational qualifications and varied number of experienced in the organization. Cronbach Alpha is found to be 0.93 with. Which shows that questionnaire developed for the study is very reliable.

4.2 Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was carried out with items related to abusive leadership style, employees empowerment & consequences. The results are discussed in following Para.

Factor analysis of Leadership questionnaire and labeling. Prior to performing principal component analysis (PCA), the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed. Correlation matrix has many coefficients of 0.3 and above., Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was 0.83 exceeding the recommended value of 0.6 (Kaiser, 1970, 1974) and the Barlett's Test of Sphericity 9297.73 with Significance = 0.00 supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. (Bartlett, 1954)

All 23 items were factor analyzed with the help of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences release 16. Principal components analysis revealed the presence of 6 components with Eigen values exceeding 1.00 which were obtained using the Varimax Rotation Algorithm. The rule says that the factor with an Eigen values less than unity should not be used because it account for less than the variance explained by the factor (Aczel and Roberts, 1989). The 15 items are found to have loading more than 0.5. These are grouped under 6 factors. They are given suitable labels representing the common characteristics of all those items. The identified abusive leadership variables are: a) Remorselessness, b) Arrogance, c) Manipulator, d) Harassing, e) Interpersonal insensitivity and f) Perfectionism.

4.2.1 Factor analysis of Empowerment and Consequences questionnaire and labeling. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was 0.95 exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Kaiser, 1970, 1974) and the Barlett's Test of Sphericity was 12268.16 with significance 0.00 which supports the factorability of the correlation matrix (Bartlett, 1954).

All 48 items were factor analyzed with the help of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences release 16. Principal components analysis discovered the existence of 10 components with Eigen values more than 1.00 which were found by using the Varimax Rotation Algorithm. The 39 items were found to have loading more than 0.5. These were grouped under 8 factors. Out of 8 factors, 5 were grouped as empowering variables and 3 as consequences. Identified employee empowerment variables are as follows.

4.2.2 ***Empowerment variables***. Empowerment   variables identified by factor analysis are :a) Creative individual development, b) Organizational support for innovation, c) Autonomy, d) Responsive superior a   e) Degree of formalization.

4.2.3 ***Consequences variables***. Empowerment   variables identified by factor analysis are :a) Work culture satisfaction, b) Commitment andc) Job involvement

4.3 Reliability of Modified Scale

Overall reliability coefficient of 54 iems was 0.94. the   reliability of set of abusive leadership was found to be 0.83 and reliability of set of empowerment level questions   was found to be 0.96.From above discussion, I concluded that the questionnaire developed me is appropriate for   the research.

5. Data collection , analysis and results

The data were collected from highly technology oriented organizations in Bangalore, India where various kinds of leaderships were quite visible. Being an information technology hub, it has people from all over the country and from various spheres of life.   The Sample was collected from highly technology oriented organizations where various kinds of leadership were quite visible. The sample of 477 covering 42 females and 435 males was collected.

The respondents were from both sexes belonging to eight different functional groups, four different qualifications, age varying from 24 to 57 years, three levels (junior, middle and senior) in the organizational hierarchy, four different educational qualifications and varied number of experienced in the organization (less than 5 years to more than 30 years), thus covering a wide spectrum of the population.

The education qualifications of the respondents were diploma in engineering, graduates (including engineering) and post graduates (including engineering and management). 99 diploma holders, 264 degree holders, 108 postgraduates and 6 other qualification were covered in the pilot study.

The experience of the sample covered a wide range from 1 year to more than 35 years. The sample also covered the respondents who worked under more than 1 supervisor. The sample of respondents was grouped under eight different functions (professions). These are Production, Marketing, Integrated Material Management, Personal & Admin, Research and Development, Engineering, Finance, and Maintenance.

5.3   Correlation Analysis

I have carried out correlation analysis of abusive leadership, employee empowerment and consequences variables using the statistical package for social science release 16. The details of the results are given below.

5.3.1 Abusive leadership, employee empowerment and consequence variables. I have computed the correlations among 6 abusive leadership variables, 7 empowerment variables and 3 consequences variables for 477 respondents. The results are given in tables 1a and 1b.

Remorselessness, arrogance, manipulator, harassing and interpersonal insensitivity variables. have positive and large association with abusive   leadership with correlation coefficient 0.88, 0.83, 0.87, 0.89 and   0.85   while perfectionism   has low association with abusive leadership with correlation coefficient 0.16.

Remorselessness, arrogance, harassing and interpersonal insensitivity and manipulator have negative and low association with empowerment variables creative individual development, organizational support for innovation, autonomy, responsive superior and degree of formalization. Perfectionism has positive and low association with creative individual development, work culture satisfaction, and organizational support for innovation, autonomy and degree of formalization with correlation coefficient 0.40, 0.37, 0.34, 0.35 and 0.26 respectively.

Remorselessness, arrogance, manipulator, harassing, and interpersonal insensitivity have negative and low association with consequence variables work culture satisfaction, commitment and job involvement.

Perfectionism has positive and low association with consequence variables work culture satisfaction, commitment and job involvement with correlation coefficients 0.37, 0.32 and 0.24.

  Remorselessness, arrogance, manipulator, harassing and interpersonal insensitivity have a low and negative association with employee empowerment and Consequences while perfectionism has positive and low association with employee empowerment and consequences with correlation coefficient0. 44 and 0.40. Abusive leadership has negative and low association with empowerment and consequences with correlation coefficients -0.17 and -0.29 respectively.

5.4   Regression Analysis

I have carried out stepwise regression analysis using statistical package for social science release 16 for abusive leadership variables with employee empowerment; abusive leadership and empowerment; abusive leadership and work culture satisfaction; abusive leadership and commitment;   and   abusive leadership and job involvement. The results are discussed below.

5.4.1 Abusive leadership variables and empowerment. The model was statistically significant as p-value was zero. The R-squared was 0.263 (in model 3), which means that approximately 26.3% of the variability of empowerment was due to the variables in the model. t-test value for perfectionism, interpersonal insensitivity and arrogance are

10.575, -3.619 and -2.162. These are statistically significant. Hence, the regression coefficients for these variables are appreciably different from zero

Perfectionism has the largest beta coefficient, 0.425 and arrogance has the smallest beta -0.109. The Durbin Watson test has the value 2.162 which shows that the error deviations are unrelated. The summarized results are given in table 2.

Regression equation among empowerment and abusive leadership variables is as given below. It indicates that interpersonal insensitivity and arrogance reduces the empowerment while perfectionalism increase the empowerment.

Empowerment= 2.443 +0.313Perfectionism-0.110 Interpersonal insensitivity-0.066 Arrogance

5.4.2 Abusive leadership and Empowerment. The model was statistically significant as p value was zero. The R-square was 0.029, which shows that approximately 2.9% of the variability of empowerment was due to abusive leadership in the model. In this case, t-test value for abusive leadership was -3.796. This was statistically significant. Hence, the regression coefficient for abusive leadership was appreciably different from zero.Abusive leadership has beta coefficient -0.172. The Durbin Watson test has the value 1.992 which shows that the error deviations are unrelated. The results are summarized in table 3.

Regression equation. A regression equation between empowerment and abusive leadership is given below. It indicates that an increase in abusive leadership decreases the empowerment.

Empowerment= 3.416-0.142 Abusive leadership

5.4.3 Abusive leadership and work culture satisfaction. The model was statistically significant as p value was zero. The R-square was 0.086, which shows that approximately 8.6% of the variability of work culture satisfaction was due to abusive leadership in the model. t-test value for abusive leadership was -6.677. This was statistically significant. Hence, the regression coefficient for abusive leadership was appreciably different from zero. Abusive leadership has beta coefficient -0.293. The results are summarized in table 4.

Regression Equation. A regression equation between work culture satisfaction and abusive leadership is given below. It indicates that an increase in abusive leadership decreases the work culture satisfaction.

Work culture satisfaction = 3.988-0.303 Abusive leadership

5.4.4 Abusive leadership and commitment. Regression analysis was carried out using SPSS16 between abusive leadership and commitment.

The model was statistically significant. The R-square was 0.056, which shows that approximately 5.6% of the variability of commitment was due to   abusive leadership in the model.   t-test value for AL was -5.302. This was statistically significant. Hence, the regression coefficient for abusive leadership was appreciably different from zero.Abusive leadership has   beta coefficient -0.236. The results are summarized in table 5.

Regression equation. A regression equation between commitment and abusive leadership is given below. It indicates that an increase in abusive leadership decreases the Commitment.

Commitment= 4.051-0.246Abusive leadership

5.4.5 Abusive leadership and job involvement. The model was statistically significant as p value was zero. The R-square was 0.026 which shows that approximately 2.6% of the variability of job involvement was due to abusive leadership in the model.   t-test value for abusive leadership was -3.550. This was statistically significant. Hence, the regression coefficient for abusive leadership was appreciably different from zero. Abusive leadership   has   Beta coefficient -0.236. The results are summarized in table 6.

Regression equation. A regression equation between job involvement and abusive leadership is given below. It indicates that an increase in abusive leadership decreases the Job Involvement.

Job involvement= 3.648-0.206 abusive leadership

6. Discussions

This research examined how abusive leadership relates to employee empowerment. How it works as barrier to the employee empowerment. I found that abusive leadership reduces the employees work culture satisfaction,

commitment and job involvement. The findings of the research have interesting theoretical and practical implications.

6.1 Theoretical Implication

My findings contribute to leadership and empowerment literature. It increases the understanding of the negative role of abusive leadership. Abusive leaders exercise power to serve their own interest by dominating and authoritative ways to achieve what they want in place of working for the success of the organization, From this study, it is quite evident that remorselessness, arrogance, manipulator, harassing and interpersonal insensitivity are the significant characteristics of abusive leadership. Which support theoretical aspects of abusive leadership characteristics identified by (Starratt et al. ,2010;   Whittell, 2005;   Hughes, et al., 1999;   Sheehan,   1996) and Ashforth, 1994).

This research highlights that Abusive leadership characteristics viz. remorselessness, arrogance, harassing and interpersonal insensitivity and Manipulator have a negative impact on empowerment variables creative individual development, organizational support for innovation, autonomy, responsive superior and the degree of formalization. They also have low association with consequence variables work culture satisfaction, commitment and job involvement. Perfectionism characteristics of abusive leadership have positive and low association with empowerment and consequence variables. Abusive leadership has negative and low association with empowerment and consequences.

Abusive leadership variables namely interpersonal insensitivity and arrogance reduces the empowerment while perfectionism increases the empowerment. Abusive leadership has negative impact on work culture satisfaction, commitment and job satisfaction in the employees.

6.2 Practical Implications

My research shows that Abusive leadership style plays a negative role in employee empowerment. It reduces work culture satisfaction, commitment and job involvement in employees. By using abusive leadership style, leader reduces the empowerment in employee which results in low competitiveness in the organization. The organization has the accountability to remove obstacles that bound the capability of employees to operate in an empowering manner. Hence, it must control such leaders who have abusive leadership styles so that it can survive and flourish in this era of competitiveness.

7. Limitations of the study and scope for further research

This study was limited by the organizational context of the sample groups.   The research examined the employees in various sectors in Bangalore only considering it as a representative of the whole country being an IT hub. The generalization to other populations cannot be claimed. Second, the sample size being small, the results cannot be claimed as absolute and complete in itself.

Cultural aspects of the organization and its impact on outcomes were not taken into account in the research. I also did not consider the role of subordinates in abusive behavior of the leaders. Employees' personality factors are also not considered in the research

The study can be carried out taking above aspects into account. It may be carried out in many industries and in many cities of India. The study also can be carried out in different countries like underdeveloped; developing and developed countries and result can be compared to see the effect of development on leadership style and empowerment.

8. Conclusion

Abusive leadership variables specifically, arrogance and interpersonal insensitivity have a negative role in employees empowerment resulting in poor work culture satisfaction, low commitment and less job involvement in the employee in an organization. However perfectionism variable of abusive leadership has a low but positive effect on employee empowerment.

It is quite evident from the study that Abusive leadership is a barrier to Employee Empowerment. This in turn, reduces the competitiveness of the organization.

9.0 References

Aczel, J. & Roberts, F. S.(1989). On the possible merging functions. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 17:205-143.

Ashforth, B.E.(1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations,* 47: 755-78.

Ashforth, B.E. (1997). Petty tyranny in organizations: a preliminary examination of antecedents and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 14:126-40.

Avelino F. (2007). *Empowerment and Transition Management*. Paper presented at the International Workshop on Politics and Governance in Sustainable, Socio-technical Transitions, September,Berlin,(source:http://www.concisenet.eu/fileadmin/download/ws/abstract_avelino.pdf seen on 10.10.2012)

Bassman, E. & London, M. (1993). Abusive managerial behavior. ***Leadership** & Organization Development Journal,* 14:18-24.

Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional (in) justice: The sacred and the profane. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), Advances in organizational justice (pp. 89–118). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press

Block, P. (1987). *The Empowered Manager: Positive political skills at work*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Block P. (1990).*The Empowered Manager*, Maxwell Macmillan, New York

Byham, W. & Cox, J.(1988). *Zapp! The Lightening of Empowerment.* Development Dimension International, harmony books, New York

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A social -cognitive view*, Englewood Cliffs; NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control*, Freeman; New York, NY

Bartlett, M.S. (1954). A Note on the Multiplying Factors for Various Chi Square Approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 16 (Series B): 296-298.

Baron, R.A. & Neuman, J.H. (1998). Workplace Aggression – the iceberg beneath the tip of workplace violence: evidence on its forms, frequency and targets, *Public Administration Quarterly*, 21 (4): 446-464.

Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K. & Hjelt-Back, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior*, 20 (3): 173-184.

Chandler, G. (1992). The Source and process of Empowerment. *Nursing Administration quarterly*, 16 (3): 65 – 71.

Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13:471-482.

Craig, S.B. & Gustafson, S.B. (1998). Perceived leader integrity scale: an instrument for assessing employee perceptions of leader integrity. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9:127-145.

Duffy, M.K., Ganster, D.C. & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45: 331-151.

Efraty D. (1995). Leadership and Empowerment: An Experiential Exercise in Decision-Making. *Developments in Business Simulation & Experiential Exercises*, 22:268-269

Einarsen, S., Schanke Aasland, M. & Skogstad, A. (2007).Destructive leadership behavior:A definition and conceptual model. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18: 207-216.

Ferris, G.R., Zinko, R., Brouer, R.L., Buckley, R.M. & Harvey, M.G. (2007). Strategic bullying as a supplementary, balanced perspective on destructive leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18: 195-206.

Forrester R (2000). *Empowerment: rejuvenating a potent idea*. Academy of Management Executive, 14 (3): 67-80.

*Ginnodo, B. (Ed.) (*1997). *The power of empowerment: What the experts say and 16 actionable case studies.* Arlington Heights, IL: Pride

Gupta, K.S.& Murari, K. (1996)*. Empowerment approach to employee involvement*. Paper presented in the seminar on Challenges and opportunities, 21st Century conducted at the 38th National Convention of Indian Institution of Industrial Engineering; Dec.6-7, Mumbai, India

Gupta K.S. (1999). *Empowerment: A Conceptual and Exploratory Study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation of Indian Institute of Technology, Mumbai, India

Gupta, K.S. (2009).New Empowerment Inventory. *The Pfeiffer Annual 2009*, 2, Consultancy, USA, Wiley Publication.

Guy, R.F., Edgley, C.E. Arafat, I. & Allen, D.E. (1987). *Journal Social Research Methods: Puzzles and Solutions*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Hoel, H., Rayner, C. & Cooper, C.L. (1999). Workplace bullying. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 14: 195-230.

Hoel, H. & Cooper, C.L. (2001). Origins of bullying: theoretical frameworks for explaining workplace bullying. In Tehrani, N. (Ed.), *Building a culture of respect: managing bullying at work*: 3-19.Taylor and Francis, London.

Hughes, R., Ginnett, R., & Curphy, G. 1999. ***Leadership: enhancing the lessons of experience***. Irwin McGraw-Hill, Boston

Jacques, E. (1995). Why the psychoanalytical approach to understanding organizations is dysfunctional. *Human Relations*, 48 (4): 343-350

Kaiser, H. (1970). A second generation little   jiffy. *Journal of Psychometrika*, 35:401-415.

Kaiser, H. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Journal of Psychometrika*, 39:31-36.

Kanter, R. M.(1977). *Men and women on the corporation*. Basic Books, New York.

Keashly, L. (1998). Emotional abuse in the workplace: conceptual and empirical issues. *Journal of emotional abuse*, 1: 85-117.

Keashly, L. (2001). Interpersonal and systematic aspects of emotional abuse at work: the target's perspective. *Violence and Victims*, 16: 233-266.

Keashly, L., Trott, V. & MacLean, L.M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: a preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims*, 9: 341-57.

Kellerman, B. (2004). *Bad leadership*. Harvard Business Review Press, Boston, MA.

Kets de Vries, M. & Miller, D. (1985). Narcissism and leadership: an object relations perspective. *Human Relations*, 38:583-601.

Kets de Vries, M. (2004). Organizations on the couch: a clinical perspective on organizational Dynamics. *European Management Journal*, 22:183-200.

Kets de Vries, M. (2006). The spirit of despotism: understanding the tyrant within. ***Human Relations***, 59 :195-220.

Kizilos, P. (1990). Crazy about empowerment *Training*, Dec, 27 (12): 47-56.

Klidas, A. K.(200)1. An employee empowerment in the European hotel industry: meaning, process and cultural relativity. PhD thesis: 34-35,Amsterdam: Rozenberg Publishers.

Lipman-Blumen, J.(2005). *The allure of toxic leaders,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Manz, C. (1992). Self leadership: The heart of empowerment. *Journal of Quality and Participation*, 15: 80-85.

Matza, B.(1990). Empowerment: The Key Management Skill of the 90s. *Retail Control*, Nov, 20-23

McDermett, K. L, H. & Shamian, J. (1996). Work empowerment and organizational commitment. *Nursing Management*, 27 (5): 44 – 47.

Murari, K. & Gupta, K.S.(2009). Abusive Leadership- A   road block to innovative strategy. In Bansal, A.,   Phatak, Y., Gupta, I.C. and   Jain, R. (Eds.), Transcending Horizons Through Innovative Global Practices, 186-195, New Delhi, Excel Books.

Murari, K. & Gupta, K.S. (2012). Impact of servant leadership on employee empowerment. Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management, 1 (Issue 1): 29-37.

NiCarthy, G., Gottlieb, N. & Coffman, S. (1993). *You don't have to take it! A woman's guide to confronting emotional abuse at work*. Seattle, WA.: Seal.

Nick N, Jack L.S., Warren, R.N. & Barbara, W. (1994). Employee empowerment. *Empowerment in organizations*, 2 (3): 45-55.

Ogunfowora, B. (2012). When the abuse is unevenly distributed: The effects of abusive supervision variability on work attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 34 (Issue1)   date of posting on the web: 7 December 2012. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/job.1841/abstract

Ozaralli, W. N. (2003). Effect of transformational leadership on empowerment and team effectiveness*.   Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 24 (5/6): 335-344.

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.

Pelletier, K.L.(2010), Leader toxicity: An empirical investigation of toxic behavior and rhetoric. *Leadeship*, 6(4) 373–389

Quinn R.E. & Spreitzer G.M. (1997). The road to empowerment: seven questions every leader should consider. *Organizational Dynamics*, 26 (2): 37-49.

Rousseau, D. M.(1995). *Promises in action: Psychological contracts in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sara G. W. & George B. Y. (2010). The impact of dark leadership on organizational commitment and turnover. Kravis Leadership Institute*, Leadership Review*, 10:104 - 124.

Schermerhorn   J.A., Hunt J. B. & Osborn R. N. (1991). *Managing   organizational behavior.*   Fourth Edition, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Schat, A.C.H. & Kelloway, E.K.(2000). Effects of perceived control on the outcomes of workplace aggression and violence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5: 386-402.

Schmidt, A.A. (2008). Development and validation of the toxic leadership scale (online)   available http://drum.lib.umd.edu/bitstream/1903/8176/1/umi-umd-5358.pdf (07.01.2013)

Shipper, F. & Manz, C. C. (1992). Employee self-management without formally designated teams: an alternative road to empowerment**.** *Organizational Dynamics*, 20:48-61.

Sheehan, M. (1996). *Case studies in Organizational Restructuring.* Dyer, E.J. (Ed*.), Beyond bullying.* Association Inc, Millennium Books, New South Wales.

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

Sundbo, J. (1999). Empowerment of employees in small and medium sized service firms. ***Employee Relations***, 21 (2): 105–27.

Tepper, Bj. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43:178-190.

Tepper, Bj. (2007) . Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 33: 261-89.

Tierney, P. & Tepper, B. (2007). Introduction to the Leadership Quarterly special issue:Destructive leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18: 171-173.

Thamos, K.W. & Venthos, B.A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment : An interpretive model of intrinsic task motivation",   *Academy of Management Review*, 15: 666-681

Whittell, G. (2005). *Snakes in suits: Spot the true psychopath among the sharks in your office*. Source: http://www.beyondbullying.co.nz accessed on 20.10.2012

Wyatt, J., & Hare, C. (1997). *Work Abuse: How to recognize and survive it.* Schenkman Books, Rochester, Vermont.

Table 1a. Results of Correlation Analysis – Abusive Leadership, Employee Empowerment and Consequences Variables

Variable	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Remorselessness	0.66**	0.76**	0.75**	0.76	-0.01	-0.27**	-0.34**
2. Arrogance		0.68**	0.68**	0.61	0.06	-0.26**	-0.24**
3. Manipulator			0.74**	0.79	-0.13**	-0.31**	-0.38**
4. Harassing				0.73	0.08	-0.21**	-0.29**
5. Interpersonal insensitivity					-0.11**	-0.29**	-0.36**
6. Perfectionism					1.00	0.40**	0.37**
7. Creative individual development						0.40**	0.37**	0.71**
8. Work Culture Satisfaction							1.00

*correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed)   **correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2 tailed) n=477

Table 1b.   Results of Correlation Analysis – Abusive Leadership, Employee Empowerment and Consequences Variables

Variable	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. Remorselessness	-0.16**	-0.09	-0.27**	-0.23**	-0.13*	-0.02	0.88**	-0.21*	-0.31**
2. Arrogance	-0.16*	-0.02	-0.19**	-0.29**	-0.21**	-0.06	0.83**	-0.20*	-0.27**
3. Manipulator	-0.16*	-0.12*	-0.25**	-0.30**	-0.22**	-0.07	0.87**	-0.25*	-0.36**
4. Harassing	-0.13*	-0.15*	-0.27**	-0.18**	-0.17*	-0.01	0.89**	-0.18*	-0.31**
5. Interpersonal insensitivity	-0.23**	-0.20**	-0.34**	-0.31**	-0.17*	-0.04	0.85**	-0.30**	-0.37**
6. Perfectionism	0.34**	0.35**	0.32**	0.30**	0.24**	0.26**	0.16*	0.44**	0.40**
7. Creative individual development	0.74**	0.50**	0.47**	0.64**	0.23**	0.38**	-0.23**	0.84**	0.59**
8. Work culture satisfaction	0.67**	0.48**	0.54**	0.56**	0.25**	0.32**	-0.29**	0.71**	0.74**
9. Organizational support for innovation		0.48**	0.42**	0.60**	0.23**	0.38**	-0.12*	0.83**	0.55**
10. Autonomy			0.47**	0.44**	0.40**	0.34**	-0.06	0.69**	0.59**
11. Commitment				0.46**	0.39**	0.14*	-0.24**	0.51**	0.81**
12. Responsive Supervisor					0.22**	0.36**	-0.24**	0.80**	0.52**
13. Job involvement						0.10*	-0.16*	0.31**	0.76**
14.Degree of formalization							0.01	0.61**	0.24**
15. Abusive leadership								-0.17*	-0.29**
16. Empowerment									0.65**
17. Consequences									1.00

*correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed)   **correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2 tailed) n=477

Table 2. Summarized results – Abusive Leadership Variables and Empowerment

Dependent Variable	Independent variable	Predicator variable entered in step no.	R square	Adjusted R Square	t	B	Beta	F ratio	Sign F
Empowerment	Perfectionism	1	0.19	0.19	10.58	0.31	0.43	113.67	0.00
	Interpersonal insensitivity	2	0.26	0.25	-3.62	-0.11	-0.18	81.26	0.00
	Arrogance	3	0.26	0.26	-2.16	-0.07	-0.11	56.15	0.00
Constant	2.44								

Table 3. Summarized results – Abusive Leadership and Empowerment

Dependent Variable	Independent variable	Predictor variable entered in step no.	R square	Adjusted R Square	t	B	Beta	F ratio	Sign F
Empowerment	Abusive leadership	1	0.03	0.03	-3.80	-0.14	-0.17	14.41	0.00
Constant	3.42								

Table 4. Summarized Results – Abusive Leadership and Work Culture Satisfaction

Dependent Variable	Independent variable	Predictor variable entered in step no.	R square	Adjusted R Square	t	B	Beta	F ratio	Sign F
Work culture satisfaction	Abusive leadership	1	0.09	0.08	-6.68	-0.30	-0.29	44.58	0.00
Constant	3.99								

Table 5. Summarized Results – Abusive Leadership and Commitment

Dependent Variable	Independent variable	Predicator variable entered in step no.	R square	Adjusted R Square	t	B	Beta	F ratio	Sign F
Commitment	Abusive leadership	1	0.06	0.05	-5.30	-0.25	-0.24	28.11	0.00
Constant	4.05								

Table 6. Summarized results – Abusive Leadership and Job Involvement

Dependent Variable	Independent variable	Predicator variable entered in step no.	R square	Adjusted R Square	t	B	Beta	F ratio	Sign F
Job involvement	Abusive leadership	1	0.03	0.02	-3.55	-0.21	-0.24	12.60	0.00
Constant	3.65								

Biography:

Name : Krishna Murari

Author was born on 5 Jan 1962 in Kanpur, India. He is B.Tech in Mech Engg. and MBA in operations management. He is working as a Deputy General manager (Quality) in Composite Manufacturing Division, Hindustan Aeronautics Limited , Bangalore, He has presented/published more than 20 technical and managerial papers in various national and international journals and seminars. He was awarded Defence Minister awards 2003 and he has one patent in his name. He is doing PhD from IGNOU, New Delhi