



The Impact of the Dark Side of Leadership on the Psychological State of Employees after the Covid-19 Pandemic: A Psychological Perspective

Hillman Wirawan^{1,2}

¹School of Psychology, Faculty of Health, Deakin University, Geelong, Victoria,
Australia

²Department of Psychology, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Hasanuddin, Makassar,
Sulawesi Selatan, Indonesia

E-mail: hwirawan@deakin.edu.au¹

(Received: July-2023; **Reviewed:** August-2023; **Accepted:** November-2023;

Available Online: November-2023; **Published:** November-2023)

ABSTRACT

This study aims to review the adverse effects of the dark side of leadership on employees' psychological states, including distress and anxiety, after the COVID-19 pandemic, through the lens of psychological theories. A literature review was used to examine the dark side of leadership, which included any form of abusive, toxic, or destructive behaviors and characteristics that negatively affect the psychological states of employees. The effect on employees' psychological state is crucial as it can influence their attitudes and performance. The Conservation of Resources and the Psychological Contract theory were employed to explain the emergence of the dark leaders' behaviors and their consequences on employees' psychological states in anticipation of extreme organizational changes after the pandemic. The employees' psychological resources could be depleted due to exposure to abusive leaders while adapting to organizational changes post the pandemic. Also, the mistreatments from the destructive leaders could breach the employees' psychological contract. The emergence of dark leadership practices might cause psychological distress. Previous psychological studies suggest that the psychological resources of employees can be replenished by seeking social support, while the organization can contribute by implementing intervention programs.

Keywords: leadership; the dark side of leadership; psychological state; employee; COVID-19.

INTRODUCTION

According to scientific evidence, the role of a leader is highly expected to create positive changes in organizations during a pandemic (Ball, 2020; Beilstein et al., 2021; Hutagalung, Purwanto, & Prasetya, 2020). There are several leadership styles associated with positive impacts on employee behavior, such as transformational leadership, authentic leadership, and

servant leadership (Antonakis, 2012; Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000; Dinh et al., 2014; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). On the contrary, some leaders approach their followers with uncivil, hostile, and abusive behaviors, which can cause detrimental effects on their followers' psychological states, attitudes, and performance (Hershcovis, 2011; B. Tepper, 2007).

Tepper (2000) created the concept of Abusive Supervision in response to the disruptive behavior of some leaders at the time. Leaders who abuse their power will repeatedly demonstrate unruly behaviors such as threats, humiliation, verbal attacks, and other demeaning actions to subordinates, even if they do not physically attack them (B. J. Tepper, 2000; B. J. Tepper, Moss, Lockhart, & Carr, 2007). Previous studies corroborate claims from various experts that some hostile leader's behaviors are also called destructive leadership (Erickson, Shaw, Murray, & Branch, 2015), toxic leadership (Boddy, 2019), and leaders' incivility (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001). Consequently, all of these negative behaviors can be categorized as forms of the dark side of leadership (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Mackey, Parker Ellen, McAllister, & Alexander, 2021; Piotrowski, 2018; Sarwar, Khan, & Mujtaba, 2017; Spain, Harms, & Wood, 2016). Hence, some experts also have investigated the impact of the dark side of a positive leader's personality, such as charisma or transformational leadership (Ateş, Tarakci, Porck, van Knippenberg, & Groenen, 2020; Christie, Barling, & Turner, 2011).

The emergence of dark leadership is contextual, meaning the context is an essential element in understanding a leader's behaviors (Brandebo, 2021; Khan, 2020; Oc, 2018). The Covid-19 crisis might influence how leaders exercise their power and communications. During the Covid-19 crisis, work-from-home or WFH has been used to contain the spread of the virus by limiting human physical interactions (Dingel & Neiman, 2020). The WFH mode is not a new approach, as some scholars have previously introduced this term (Felstead, Jewson, Phizacklea, & Walters, 2002; Shamir & Salomon, 1985). Several industries and organizations have implemented the WFH mode to enable employees to complete tasks at home. However, this work mode has provided both advantages (e.g., work-life balance) and disadvantages (e.g., limited facility) to employees' outcomes (Mustajab et al., 2020).

Previous results indicated that just 37% of jobs in the United States could be completed from home, although the remote team approach and the usage of social media applications are being applied (Dingel & Neiman, 2020). Therefore, the implementation of WFH has forced around 63% of jobs to be completed from home, resulting in increased poor performances in several industries and organizations. This situation might put many leaders in a difficult situation and challenge their leadership skills, increasing the leaders' job strain.

Considering the WFH approach, the face-to-face interactions between leaders and subordinates were limited during the COVID-19 pandemic. Work at home can reduce and impair socialization and leader's consideration (Shamir & Salomon, 1985). However, virtual interactions were possible with the help of communication technology and online communication media, which maintained the leadership process in several organizations. A leader's ability to implement communication technology for leadership practices (i.e., e-leadership) can sustain the impact of leadership and goodwill of an organization (Avolio, Sosik, Kahai, & Baker, 2014; Kissler, 2001). This adjustment indicates that the dark side of leadership can continuously affect employees at the office or from home.

The question related to the dark side of leadership is whether the dark side of leadership could emerge during and after the Covid-19 pandemic? Also, how the dark leadership continuously adapts and develops as people in organizations adjust to a new normal? Many investigations on the dark dan destructive leadership behaviors were studied during a typical leader-follower interaction involving a traditional face-to-face leader-member exchange (Martinko, Harvey, Brees, & Mackey, 2013; B. Tepper, 2007; Zhang & Liao, 2015). Empirical

evidence regarding the effect of dark leadership on employees' outcomes during the Covid-19 crisis is still limited (Abbas 2021).

Many employees engage in the WFH mode during the Covid-19 pandemic, and this work mode possibly changes the leader-follower interactions. For example, leaders and their teams can show effective communication and performance via virtual communication technology (Purvanova & Bono, 2009; Vought, 2017). However, some employees might need extra support from their leaders while working online from home due to some challenges such as work-family conflict (Daraba, Wirawan, Salam, & Faisal, 2021). The pandemic has provided an opportunity for leaders to exercise effective leadership (Beilstein et al., 2021; Hutagalung et al., 2020). They should be able to manage crises effectively, build a better leader-member exchange, and provide support for their team members (Ball, 2020).

Unfortunately, some leaders might also experience emotional exhaustion, burnout, and strain during a crisis, leading to abusive supervisory behaviors (Zhang & Bednall, 2016). Consequently, some leaders become more destructive and ineffectively manage the crisis (Brandebo, 2020). Undoubtedly, organizations can maintain leader-member interactions throughout the Covid-19 crisis using digital platforms (e.g., zoom, google meet). However, at the same time, employees might demand extra support from their leaders while their leaders are overwhelmed with some challenges related to the Covid-19 situation. This Covid-19 situation and the WFH mode might trigger the dark side of leadership even after limiting the traditional leader-follower interactions.

Some previous studies have suggested that high leader-member exchange exacerbates the effect of dark leadership on employees' performance (Gan, Guo, Chai, & Wang, 2019; Xu, Loi, & Lam, 2015) and perception of justice (Othman, Fang Ee, & Lay Shi, 2010). Although high leader-follower interactions can reduce psychological distress (Harms, Credé, Tynan, Leon, & Jeung, 2017), the results would be the opposite when employees were mistreated by abusive leaders (Peng, Schaubroeck, & Li, 2014). The perception of hostile leader behaviors will be high for employees with intensive and frequent leader-member interactions (Martinko, Sikora, & Harvey, 2012).

The way people work during and after the Covid-19 pandemic will show some differences. The changes in the organization are inevitable, leading to many unexpected outcomes. Considering the importance of this issue, this paper aims to explain the emergence of dark leadership and its impacts on employees' psychological states following the Covid-19 pandemic using the lens of psychological theories. Conservation of Resource and Psychological Contract theory are two prominent psychological theories that have been used to explain the dark leaders' behaviors and their impacts on employees' outcomes (see Carlson et al. 2012; Ghani et al. 2020; Lopes, Kamau, and Jaspal 2019; Tillman et al. 2018; Wang et al. 2019; Wei and Si 2013). In the end, some recommendations will be offered to deal with the negative effect of the dark side of leadership.

The Dark Side of Leadership and Psychological Theories

The Dark Side of Leadership, as previously stated, is a pattern of leader behavior that has a regular negative impact on employees or the entire organization. The term "dark" is commonly used to describe the "dark triad" traits, such as Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and Narcissism of the leader (Mathieu & Babiak, 2016; Mathieu, Neumann, Hare, & Babiak, 2014; Paulhus, 2014). However, the concept of the dark side of leadership has proliferated and includes various terms such as toxic (Pelletier, 2010), abusive (B. J. Tepper, 2000), and destructive leadership (Einarsen, Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007). Therefore, the term "the dark side of leadership" can refer to a leader's behavior or personality traits that negatively impact employees and the entire

organization.

The negative impacts of the dark side of leadership on employees have been a major concern. Multiple studies have been conducted for over 20 years, and in the last decade, several meta-analyses have consistently reported the impact of some of these “dark” leadership styles (Koehn, Okan, & Jonason, 2019; Mackey et al., 2021; Zhang, Liu, Xu, Yang, & Bednall, 2019). The details of some of these negative impacts are explained below.

According to a meta-analysis conducted by Schyns and Schilling (2013), destructive leadership can negatively affect subordinates’ attitudes toward leaders, their psychological well-being, and performance. Furthermore, this form of dark leadership increases undesirable outcomes such as turnover intention, refusal to be in the presence of a leader, and other deviant work behaviors (Erickson et al., 2015; Nyberg et al., 2011; Wen, 2013; Woestman & Wasonga, 2015). Subsequently, a meta-analysis showed that a dark leader who perpetrates abusive supervision adversely impacts the employees’ psychological state, such as increased stress, decreased well-being, and performance (Mackey, Frieder, Brees, & Martinko, 2017). The results are consistent with studies from Tepper (2000) and the meta-analysis of Zhang and Liao (2015), which found that abusive supervision harmed employee performance.

Zhang and Liao (2015) discovered that cultural dimensions such as “power distance” (where many Asia countries have a high power distance) also determine the impact of dark leadership practices on employees. For example, the employees in Asian countries do not desire to leave work when they receive abusive treatment from their leaders, but the employees in North American countries might prefer to quit (Martinko et al., 2013; Ospina & Foldy, 2009). Additionally, the rates of abusive supervision are higher in Asian countries (Zhang & Liao, 2015), but these workers feel obligated to keep their jobs. Unfortunately, this dark leadership phenomenon is rarely reported (Fischer, Tian, Lee, & Hughes, 2021). Thus, the victims might suffer some discomfort, exhaustion, and resource depletion without being noticed. This condition can affect the psychological well-being of employees in the workplace because they continue to work under unpleasant conditions.

The consequences of the dark side of leadership can be explained using a psychological perspective. This review employs two popular psychological theories: the Conservation of Resources (Hobfoll, 1989; Hobfoll, Halbesleben, Neveu, & Westman, 2018) and the Psychological Contract Theory (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1989, 1990, 2005).

The Conservation of Resources (COR) theory has been commonly used to explain employee stress (Hobfoll et al., 2018). According to this theory, employees need their resources to execute tasks effectively. However, as they are overwhelmed with stressors (e.g., job demands, hostile behaviors), they need to allocate resources to deal with the stressors. Consequently, this situation causes resource depletion and requires employees to conserve the remaining resources by avoiding the stressors (e.g., threats) and locating potential resources (e.g., social support). Employees try to mitigate the impact of dark leadership (e.g., abusive, hostile) by using their psychological resources and avoiding threats from their dark leader (Gopakumar & Singh, 2019; Kim, Lee, & Yun, 2016; R. Wang, Jiang, Yang, & Shing Chan, 2016). Drawing from this COR theory, frequent exposure to bad leadership will cause the employees to constantly run out of psychological resources and cause emotional exhaustion (I. Ahmad & Begum, 2020; Aryee, Sun, Chen, & Debrah, 2008). Eventually, the employees feel threatened, stressed, and anxious, which worsens their psychological state and ultimately decreases their performance (Aryee et al., 2008; Y. Lyu, Zhu, Zhong, & Hu, 2016).

On the other hand, the Psychological Contract theory discusses employees’ expectations of leaders before they join an organization, which is a psychological expectation formed by employees rather than a written agreement because they expect good things to happen at work (Lambert, Edwards, & Cable, 2003; Robinson, 1996; Rousseau, 1990). The “Psychological

Contract” is breached when employees feel the organization is not treating them as expected due to the dark leaders’ behaviors (Ghani et al., 2020; Pradhan, Srivastava, & Mishra, 2019; Wei & Si, 2013). This condition leads the employees to quit or perform their jobs without any enthusiasm or interest in the organization’s success (Haar, De Fluiter, & Brougham, 2016; Saleem, Yusaf, Sarwar, Raziq, & Malik, 2021).

According to the results above and the ideas presented in the two major theories, it is likely that the Dark Side of Leadership negatively affects employees’ psychological states and has a systemic impact on the organization’s survival. Leaders will still play significant roles regardless of the work modes (e.g., office, virtual) and their dark behavior might develop and negatively influence employees’ psychological well-being. Therefore, it is crucial to understand this phenomenon and anticipate adverse impacts on employees’ psychological states (e.g., distress) during and after the pandemic.

Work from Home (WFH) during and after the Covid-19 crisis

The Work from Home (WFH) policy was offered as a solution by many countries and organizations to prevent the spread of COVID-19 (Mustajab et al., 2020; Shirmohammadi, Au, & Beigi, 2022). Scientists had always considered the possibility of WFH (Bloom, Liang, Roberts, & Ying, 2015; Felstead et al., 2002; Shamir & Salomon, 1985), despite its massive implementation due to the Covid-19 crisis (Kane, Nanda, Phillips, & Copulsky, 2021). Some early scholars have documented evidence related to the productivity of individuals when working from home (Felstead et al., 2002; Peeters, Montgomery, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2005; Shamir & Salomon, 1985).

The WFH mode has both advantages and disadvantages. In some jobs, work-from-home can improve workers’ performance but worsen various aspects of family life and career, such as social and professional isolation (Charalampous, Grant, Tramontano, & Michailidis, 2019). Several years ago, an experiment revealed that WFH could increase performance by up to 13% due to lowered absenteeism rates and increased employee satisfaction (Bloom et al., 2015). With the help of technology, leaders can coordinate remote teams while working at home during the pandemic (Rysavy & Michalak, 2020).

However, the WFH experiments mentioned above (Bloom et al., 2015) were obtained under normal conditions, not during a pandemic or crisis. The WFH experience is expected to differ from one context to another. Some major determinants of the success of WFH are family resources and family-related events (Daraba et al., 2021; Du, Derks, & Bakker, 2018). Some workers could not provide maximum performance during the pandemic due to their obligations to their family members. Furthermore, there was no easy way to allocate time to work and family. For example, in Indonesia, a mother is expected to exert her role as a teacher at home and also carter for her children (Daraba et al., 2021). Also, some employees are more vulnerable while working from homes, such as employees with caring responsibilities, single parents, and those with disabilities (Biereema, 2020).

Although some employees feel a better work-life balance when working at home (Mustajab et al., 2020), this condition and other tasks and workloads at home can overwhelm people. The line between work and home/family domain becomes less clear (Clark, 2000). Consequently, employees might experience work-family conflicts (Bird, Bird, & Scruggs, 1984; Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992), where the stressors from the workplace and home interfere with each other, drain employees’ psychological resources and cause psychological distress (Greenhaus, Allen, & Spector, 2006). During the Covid-19 crisis, employees will find it challenging to be fully efficient at both work and home as they must

allocate more energy to deal with work, home, and Covid-19-related stressors (Como, Hambley, & Domene, 2021; Ghislieri, Molino, Dolce, Sanseverino, & Presutti, 2021).

On the other hand, according to Lopez-Leon, Forero, and Ruiz-DIáz (2020), there are several ways to increase productivity and reduce work strain while working at home during the pandemic, such as building work area, avoiding multitasking, separating work time and family time, utilize technology effectively, and learn to improve the situation at home and work. In line with the previous discussion about work-life balance, these strategies intend to reduce work stress and avoid the spillover of workload between home and work. Lopez-Leon et al. (2020) also stated that employees must learn new skills and techniques to improve productivity, such as the internet and other digital devices.

Employees need to understand that the world of work will never return to the way it was before because the WFH phenomenon will affect both work and domestic life (Agba, Ocheni, & Agba, 2020). Recently, humans have become accustomed to using technology to work from home, manage time, and complete tasks without requiring a large space, which leads to new ideas and innovations at work (Kane et al., 2021; Shirmohammadi et al., 2022). The adoption of technology at home will also change the way humans interact in the world of work. Therefore, there is a need for the WFH policy to be maintained even after the COVID-19 pandemic because people have become used to this style of work and are expected to embrace the changes.

The Dark Side of Leadership and Work-Life after the COVID-19 Pandemic

Previously, it has been stated that leaders with “dark” characteristics and behaviors have a detrimental impact on employees and the organization (Martinko et al., 2013; Schyns & Schilling, 2013; B. Tepper, 2007). The psychological resources of employees are depleted when they continuously deal with leaders who have the character of a “dark leader,” resulting in poor psychological well-being (Nyberg et al., 2011; Spain et al., 2016; Van Dierendonck, Borrill, Haynes, & Stride, 2004; Volmer, Koch, & Göritz, 2016).

The workplace is also expected to change following the pandemic (Kane et al., 2021), which possibly cause employee stress due to a high level of uncertainty and threats to job security (Nemteanu, Dinu, & Dabija, 2021; Vo-Thanh et al., 2021; Wilson et al., 2020). Previously, employees probably have had a high level of employment mobility, allowing them to move from one workplace to another. However, the post-pandemic conditions are possibly more challenging as employees must embrace new working methods.

Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic has prompted numerous companies to streamline structures, reduce employee numbers, and adjust work contracts, which might lead to few job vacancies and high unemployment rates (Agba et al., 2020; Spurk & Straub, 2020). During the pandemic, many businesses and organizations have learned to utilize technology to perform tasks effectively (Lopez-Leon et al., 2020). For instance, health care services have transformed to telemedicine, and restaurants can engage customers using an online delivery system. The use of digital technology will change how people interact in workplaces and change how businesses are designed and performed.

On the other hand, the transition from traditional work routine to post-pandemic work mode (e.g., WFH) can cause a spillover of stress from traditional to a virtual office and vice versa (Stich, 2020). Employees who attempt to return to (new) normal activities following the pandemic are those who are psychologically drained due to the pandemic’s impact. Some might return after being laid off indefinitely, some just lost their loved ones, and others found themselves in various living situations due to COVID-19. After being knocked down by the

pandemic, they are trying to get back on their feet. Unfortunately, life after the pandemic will never be the same again because of the undesirable events that occurred during the pandemic.

Organizations and employees have adopted new ways of working during the pandemic, and potentially the trend will likely continue after the pandemic (Agba et al., 2020; Bierema, 2020; Spurk & Straub, 2020). The WFH mode might also become a more widespread strategy to work effectively. As the people of organizations embrace the WFH mode and digital technology to complete tasks, leadership practices also evolve into e-leadership (Avolio & Kahai, 2003; Avolio et al., 2014). The dark side of leadership will also enter a new form post the pandemic. Leaders with dark personality traits, abusive, destructive, and uncivil behaviors might still influence employees' psychological states.

The adverse impact of dark leadership (e.g., abusive supervision) occurs while employees engage in a virtual work routine (Abbas, 2021). Those destructive leader behaviors can evolve from typical face-to-face interactions to virtual and remote interactions. Digitalization of communication might change social interactions, but it will not eliminate the presence of dark leadership. Like bullying that can evolve into cyberbullying (Chan, Cheung, & Lee, 2021; Kowalski, Toth, & Morgan, 2017; Slonje & Smith, 2008), the dark leadership might continuously impact employees' outcomes regardless of the work mode (e.g., WFH, virtual office). Similar to cyber incivility in the workplace (Lim & Teo, 2009; Niven, Connolly, Stride, & Farley, 2021; Park, Fritz, & Jex, 2018), utilizing some modern virtual applications (e.g., zoom) and social networking sites (e.g., Whatsapp), those leaders can still display their hostile behaviors and drain employees' resources.

Leaders with characteristics that intimidate, bully, insult, humiliate, and belittle subordinates will aggravate the employees' psychological condition (Krasikova, Green, & LeBreton, 2013; Martinko et al., 2013; B. Tepper, 2007). Even after changing the work mode and embracing advanced technology, these destructive and toxic behaviors might still exist and adversely impact employees' outcomes. Supervisors and managers can still abuse their subordinates via social networking sites and virtual applications.

Following the COR theory, their dark leader behaviors will become another source of stress, drain employees' energy, and deteriorate psychological well-being. When employees work from home, they also must anticipate the work overload and spillover of stress. Instead of receiving support from their leaders, employees must deal with multiple stressors caused by work and family demands, Covid-19-related issues, and some organizational changes. Thus, they will need to conserve some resources, prevent further resource loss, and implement some coping strategies.

Concerning psychological contract violation (Robinson, 1996; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1989), the employees who return to the workplace expect that their "psychological contract" will be fulfilled, but the presence of the dark leaders violates their psychological contract (B. J. Tepper, Simon, & Park, 2017; Valle, Kacmar, Zivnuska, & Harting, 2019; Wu & Lee, 2016). The consequences associated with the presence of an abusive leader include psychological distress and decreased desirable work outcomes (Mackey et al., 2017; Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Employees will likely return to their organizations post the pandemic with some expectations. They might expect their leader to be more welcome and become another source of job resources after juggling some Covid-19 issues and work-family conflicts. However, the expectation will not be fulfilled as the leaders display their dark behaviors causing damage to employees' psychological well-being.

The COVID-19 post-pandemic conditions that consume much energy and the behaviors of dark leadership will aggravate their psychological condition, leading to a gradual decline in self-esteem, self-confidence, work motivation, and poor performance over time. In some cases, those with a high level of psychological resources in the form of Psychological Capital can withstand

the abuse (Agarwal & Avey, 2020; J. Ahmad, Athar, Azam, Hamstra, & Hanif, 2019; Calheiros, 2018) but will eventually break down if the dark leadership persists.

In many cases, dark leadership results in a strong desire for employees to quit or change their jobs (Haar et al., 2016; D. Lyu, Ji, Zheng, Yu, & Fan, 2019; B. J. Tepper et al., 2009). Unfortunately, the effects of the pandemic, such as low job opportunities, failed businesses, and difficulty in finding jobs, can make the situation even worse for the employees. Employees will most likely adapt to the situation, tolerate the leader's dark behavior, and retain the job despite their psychological distress. On the other hand, the leaders will gradually learn to exercise and abuse their power in a new work mode. Although not all organizations experience this phenomenon, the dark leadership in the organization will aggravate the psychological states of employees in dealing with some challenges after the pandemic.

Recommendations

1. For employees

Recently, numerous studies have found a correlation between employee's Psychological Capital (PsyCap) and the dark side of leadership (J. Ahmad et al., 2019; Calheiros, 2018; Cassidy, McLaughlin, & McDowell, 2014; Seo & Chung, 2019). Psychological Capital is a state-like dimension consisting of four positive psychological states: hope, optimism, resilience, and efficacy (Luthans, Luthans, & Luthans, 2004). Drawing from the COR theory, positive PsyCap dimensions can provide personal resources to mitigate the negative consequences of dark leadership (J. Ahmad et al., 2019). A good way for employees to ensure that these four psychological dimensions are maintained is by surrounding themselves with people who can help develop their hope, optimism, resilience, and self-efficacy (Newman, Ucbasaran, Zhu, & Hirst, 2014). Also, some studies have revealed that systematic development of PsyCap through training and intervention is a viable option (Dello Russo & Stoykova, 2015; Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman, & Combs, 2006; Luthans, Avey, & Lincoln, 2008).

According to Bhandarker and Rai (2019), the three strategies to deal with dark leaders include assertiveness, avoidance, or adaptation to their circumstances. Among these strategies, the best option is to develop a support system where employees can have their voices heard. If this system is available, employees must use it to prevent the abuse of power and the emergence of the dark side of leadership. However, this should be coupled with social and organizational support to anticipate retaliation from the leaders (Webster, Brough, & Daly, 2016).

2. For policymakers and human resource development (HRD) practitioners

The first step is to renew the psychological contracts. The psychological contract must be renewed due to changes in expectations before and after the Covid-19 crisis. This possibly includes the prospect of negative company growth or the definite layoff of some employees, explaining what they can expect from the organization and what the organization expects from them. The presentation of psychological contracts to employees will improve their trust and perceptions of fairness (Robinson, 1996).

Secondly, policymakers can build a system that helps employees strengthen their psychological resources. Furthermore, supervisors, managers, and directors can receive coaching related to employees' psychological resources. The approach must be positive rather than judgmental to prevent a mindset of retaliation. Lastly, it should be understood that the "dark" behavior of the leadership is probably part of the climate that has been formed in the organization over time. Hence, all parties are needed to reduce the hostile climate.

Lastly, the HRD practitioners must also support the transition from traditional to post-pandemic work routine. Organizations' learning and support must be systematically developed for leaders and employees. Some of them might still struggle to utilize digital technology, which can cause technostress for leaders and employees (Shirmohammadi et al., 2022). Training and other relevant interventions for effective technology use at work will improve the leader-member exchange in remote working.

CONCLUSION

This paper is a psychological perspective on the effect of the dark side of leadership on employees' psychological states after the Covid-19 crisis. The transition from traditional to post-pandemic work routines will also change leadership practices. However, the dark side of leadership will still proliferate through communication technology and various work mode (e.g., WFH). Employees, HRD practitioners, and policymakers are expected to develop systematic intervention programs (e.g., training) to mitigate the emergence and adverse impacts of the dark side of leadership.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, K. N. (2021). Determinants of Proactive Work Behavior of Employees During the COVID-19 Crisis. *European Journal of Psychology Open*, 80(1–2), 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.1024/2673-8627/a000007>
- Agarwal, U. A., & Avey, J. B. (2020). Abusive supervisors and employees who cyberloaf: Examining the roles of psychological capital and contract breach. *Internet Research*, 30(3), 789–809. <https://doi.org/10.1108/INTR-05-2019-0208>
- Agba, A. M. O., Ocheni, S. I., & Agba, M. S. (2020). COVID-19 and the world of work dynamics: A critical review. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 10(5), 119–130. <https://doi.org/10.36941/JESR-2020-0093>
- Ahmad, I., & Begum, K. (2020). Impact of abusive supervision on intention to leave: a moderated mediation model of organizational-based self esteem and emotional exhaustion. *Asian Business & Management*, 19(4), 379–406. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41291-020-00116-0>
- Ahmad, J., Athar, M. R., Azam, R. I., Hamstra, M. R. W. W., & Hanif, M. (2019). A Resource Perspective on Abusive Supervision and Extra-Role Behaviors: The Role of Subordinates' Psychological Capital. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 26(1), 73–86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051818767391>
- Antonakis, J. (2012). Transformational and charismatic leadership. *The Nature of Leadership*, 41(0), 256–288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.05.002>
- 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>
- Ateş, N. Y., Tarakci, M., Porck, J. P., van Knippenberg, D., & Groenen, P. J. F. F. (2020). The Dark Side of Visionary Leadership in Strategy Implementation: Strategic Alignment, Strategic Consensus, and Commitment. *Journal of Management*, 46(5), 637–665. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318811567>
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001>

- Avolio, B. J., & Kahai, S. S. (2003). Adding the “E” to E-leadership: How it may impact your leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 31(4), 325–338. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616\(02\)00133-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(02)00133-X)
- Avolio, B. J., Sosik, J. J., Kahai, S. S., & Baker, B. (2014). E-leadership: Re-examining transformations in leadership source and transmission. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 105–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.003>
- Ball, C. G. (2020). Leadership during the COVID-19 crisis and beyond. *Canadian Journal of Surgery*, 63(4), E370. <https://doi.org/10.1503/CJS.016020>
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207–218. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.207>
- Beilstein, C. M., Lehmann, L. E., Braun, M., Urman, R. D., Luedi, M. M., & Stüber, F. (2021). Leadership in a time of crisis: Lessons learned from a pandemic. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Anaesthesiology*, 35(3), 405–414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BPA.2020.11.011>
- Bhandarker, A., & Rai, S. (2019). Toxic leadership: emotional distress and coping strategy. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 22(1), 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-03-2018-0027>
- Bierema, L. L. (2020). HRD research and practice after ‘The Great COVID-19 Pause’: the time is now for bold, critical, research. *Human Resource Development International*, 23(4), 347–360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2020.1779912>
- Bird, G. W., Bird, G. A., & Scruggs, M. (1984). Determinants of Family Task Sharing: A Study of Husbands and Wives. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 46(2), 345. <https://doi.org/10.2307/352466>
- Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2015). Does Working from Home Work? Evidence from a Chinese Experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(1), 165–218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/QJE/QJU032>
- Boddy, C. R. (2019). Toxic Leadership. In *Encyclopedia of Business and Professional Ethics* (pp. 1–3). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-23514-1_6-2
- Brandebo, F. M. (2020). Destructive leadership in crisis management. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 41(4), 567–580. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-02-2019-0089>
- Brandebo, F. M. (2021). How contextual is destructive leadership? A comparison of how destructive leadership is perceived in usual circumstances versus crisis. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 29(1), 220–239. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-11-2019-1924>
- Calheiros, A. (2018). The Effect of Positive Psychological Capital in Preventing Destructive Leadership Behaviours in a Portuguese Retail Chain. *American Journal of Management*, 18(2), 43–55. <https://doi.org/10.33423/ajm.v18i2.291>
- Carlson, D., Ferguson, M., Hunter, E., & Whitten, D. (2012). Abusive supervision and work-family conflict: The path through emotional labor and burnout. *Leadership Quarterly*, 23(5), 849–859. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.05.003>
- Cassidy, T., McLaughlin, M., & McDowell, E. (2014). Bullying and health at work: The mediating roles of psychological capital and social support. *Work and Stress*, 28(3), 255–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2014.927020>
- Chan, T. K. H., Cheung, C. M. K., & Lee, Z. W. Y. (2021). Cyberbullying on social networking sites: A literature review and future research directions. *Information & Management*, 58(2), 103411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IM.2020.103411>
- Charalampous, M., Grant, C. A., Tramontano, C., & Michailidis, E. (2019). Systematically reviewing remote e-workers’ well-being at work: a multidimensional approach. *European Journal of Work and*

- Organizational Psychology*, 28(1), 51–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1541886>
- Christie, A., Barling, J., & Turner, N. (2011). Pseudo-Transformational Leadership: Model Specification and Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41(12), 2943–2984. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00858.x>
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747–770.
- Como, R., Hambley, L., & Domene, J. (2021). An Exploration of Work-Life Wellness and Remote Work During and Beyond COVID-19. *Canadian Journal of Career Development*, 20(1), 45–56.
- Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Menon, S. T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(7), 747–767. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379\(200011\)21:7<747::AID-JOB46>3.0.CO;2-J](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379(200011)21:7<747::AID-JOB46>3.0.CO;2-J)
- Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(1), 64–80. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.6.1.64>
- Daraba, D., Wirawan, H., Salam, R., & Faisal, M. (2021). Working from home during the corona pandemic : Investigating the role of authentic leadership , psychological capital , and gender on employee performance. *Cogent Business & Management*, 8(1), 0–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1885573>
- Dello Russo, S., & Stoykova, P. (2015). Psychological Capital Intervention (PCI): A Replication and Extension. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 26(3), 329–347. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21212>
- Dingel, J. I., & Neiman, B. (2020). How many jobs can be done at home? *Journal of Public Economics*, 189, 104235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104235>
- Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 36–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.005>
- Du, D., Derks, D., & Bakker, A. B. (2018). Daily spillover from family to work: A test of the work-home resources model. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(2), 237–247. <https://doi.org/10.1037/OCP0000073>
- Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. A. (1991). Gender differences in work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(1), 60–74. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.1.60>
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 207–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002>
- Erickson, A., Shaw, B., Murray, J., & Branch, S. (2015). Destructive leadership: Causes, consequences and countermeasures. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44(4), 266–272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2015.09.003>
- Felstead, A., Jewson, N., Phizacklea, A., & Walters, S. (2002). Opportunities to work at home in the context of work-life balance. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 12(1), 54–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2002.tb00057.x>
- Fischer, T., Tian, A. W., Lee, A., & Hughes, D. J. (2021). Abusive supervision: A systematic review and fundamental rethink. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 32(6), 101540. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LEAQUA.2021.101540>
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Prevalence of work-family conflict: Are work and family boundaries asymmetrically permeable? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(7), 723–729. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JOB.4030130708>

- Gan, C., Guo, W., Chai, Y., & Wang, D. (2019). Unethical leader behavior and employee performance: a deontic justice perspective. *Personnel Review*, 49(1), 188–201. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-08-2018-0290>
- Ghani, U., Teo, T., Li, Y., Usman, M., Islam, Z. U., Gul, H., ... Zhai, X. (2020). Tit for tat: Abusive supervision and knowledge hiding-the role of psychological contract breach and psychological ownership. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(4), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17041240>
- Ghislieri, C., Molino, M., Dolce, V., Sanseverino, D., & Presutti, M. (2021). Work-family conflict during the Covid-19 pandemic: teleworking of administrative and technical staff in healthcare. An Italian study. *La Medicina Del Lavoro*, 112(3), 229. <https://doi.org/10.23749/MDL.V112I3.11227>
- Gopakumar, K. V., & Singh, S. (2019). Can subordinate voice prevail with abusive supervision?: A conceptual model using conservation of resources perspective. *Management Research Review*, 43(7), 773–786. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-07-2019-0324>
- Greenhaus, J. H., Allen, T. D., & Spector, P. E. (2006). Health Consequences of Work–Family Conflict: The Dark Side of the Work–Family Interface. In *Research in Occupational Stress and Well Being* (Vol. 5, pp. 61–98). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3555\(05\)05002-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3555(05)05002-X)
- Haar, J. M., De Fluiter, A., & Brougham, D. (2016). Abusive supervision and turnover intentions: The mediating role of perceived organisational support. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 22(2), 139–153. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2015.34>
- Harms, P. D., Credé, M., Tynan, M., Leon, M., & Jeung, W. (2017). Leadership and stress: A meta-analytic review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(1), 178–194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.10.006>
- Hershcovis, M. S. (2011). “Incivility, social undermining, bullying...oh my!”: A call to reconcile constructs within workplace aggression research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(3), 499–519. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.689>
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of Resources: A New Attempt at Conceptualizing Stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>
- Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J.-P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of Resources in the Organizational Context: The Reality of Resources and Their Consequences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 103–128. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104640>
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing Leadership: A View from the Dark Side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1&2), 40–51. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00162>
- Hutagalung, L., Purwanto, A., & Prasetya, A. B. (2020). The Five Leadership Style in Time of Pandemic Covid-19 throughout Industrial Revolution 4.0 as compared to Humane Leadership. *International Journal of Social, Policy, and Law*, 1(1), 79–87. Retrieved from <https://ijospl.org/index.php/ijospl/article/view/21>
- Kane, G. C., Nanda, R., Phillips, A., & Copulsky, J. (2021). Redesigning the Post-Pandemic Workplace. *Sloan Management Review*, 62(3), 19. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/openview/5626eedc2b43e877a8c69529e0362451/1?pq-origsite=scholar&cbl=26142>
- Khan, S. (2020). Do workplace contextual factors engender abusive supervision? *Australian Journal of Management*, 46(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0312896219899435>
- Kim, S. L., Lee, S., & Yun, S. (2016). Abusive supervision, knowledge sharing, and individual factors: A conservation-of-resources perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(6), 1106–1120.

- <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-05-2015-0169>
- Kissler, G. D. (2001). e-Leadership. *Organization Dynamics*, 30(2), 121–133.
- Koehn, M. A., Okan, C., & Jonason, P. K. (2019). A primer on the Dark Triad traits. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 71(1), 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajpy.12198>
- Kowalski, R. M., Toth, A., & Morgan, M. (2017). Bullying and cyberbullying in adulthood and the workplace. *https://Doi.Org/10.1080/00224545.2017.1302402*, 158(1), 64–81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2017.1302402>
- Krasikova, D. V., Green, S. G., & LeBreton, J. M. (2013). Destructive Leadership: A Theoretical Review, Integration, and Future Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, 39(5), 1308–1338. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312471388>
- Lambert, L. S., Edwards, J. R., & Cable, D. M. (2003). Breach and fulfillment of the psychological contract: A comparison of traditional and expanded views. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(4), 895–934. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00244.x>
- Lim, V. K. G., & Teo, T. S. H. (2009). Mind your E-manners: Impact of cyber incivility on employees' work attitude and behavior. *Information & Management*, 46(8), 419–425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IM.2009.06.006>
- Lopes, B. C., Kamau, C., & Jaspal, R. (2019). Coping With Perceived Abusive Supervision: The Role of Paranoia. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 26(2), 237–255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051818795821>
- Lopez-Leon, S., Forero, Di. A., & Ruiz-Díaz, P. (2020). Recommendations for working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic (and beyond). *Work*, 66(2), 371–375. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-203187>
- Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., Norman, S. M., & Combs, G. M. (2006). Psychological capital development: Toward a micro-intervention. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(3), 387–393. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.373>
- Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., & Lincoln, N. (2008). Experimental analysis of a web-based training intervention to develop positive psychological capital. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7(2), 209–221. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2008.32712618>
- Lyu, D., Ji, L., Zheng, Q., Yu, B., & Fan, Y. (2019). Abusive supervision and turnover intention: Mediating effects of psychological empowerment of nurses. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences*, 6(2), 198–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2018.12.005>
- Lyu, Y., Zhu, H., Zhong, H.-J., & Hu, L. (2016). Abusive supervision and customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of hostile attribution bias and work engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 53(February), 69–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.12.001>
- Mackey, J. D., Frieder, R. E., Brees, J. R., & Martinko, M. J. (2017). Abusive Supervision: A Meta-Analysis and Empirical Review. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1940–1965. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315573997>
- Mackey, J. D., Parker Ellen, B., McAllister, C. P., & Alexander, K. C. (2021). The dark side of leadership: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis of destructive leadership research. *Journal of Business Research*, 132(8), 705–718. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.10.037>
- Martinko, M. J., Harvey, P., Brees, J. R., & Mackey, J. (2013). A review of abusive supervision research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(1), 120–137. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1888>
- Martinko, M. J., Sikora, D., & Harvey, P. (2012). The relationships between attribution styles, LMX, and perceptions of abusive supervision. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 19(4), 397–406. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051811435791>

- Mathieu, C., & Babiak, P. (2016). Corporate psychopathy and abusive supervision: Their influence on employees' job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Personality and Individual Differences, 91*(1), 102–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.12.002>
- Mathieu, C., Neumann, C. S., Hare, R. D., & Babiak, P. (2014). A dark side of leadership: Corporate psychopathy and its influence on employee well-being and job satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences, 59*(1), 83–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.11.010>
- Mustajab, D., Bauw, A., Rasyid, A., Irawan, A., Akbar, M. A., & Hamid, M. A. (2020). Working From Home Phenomenon As an Effort to Prevent COVID-19 Attacks and Its Impacts on Work Productivity. *The International Journal of Applied Business, 4*(1), 13–21. <https://doi.org/10.20473/tijab.V4.I1.2020.13-21>
- Nemteanu, M.-S., Dinu, V., & Dabija, D.-C. (2021). Job Insecurity, Job Instability, and Job Satisfaction in the Context of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Competitiveness, 13*(2), 65–82. <https://doi.org/10.7441/joc.2021.02.04>
- Newman, A., Ucbasaran, D., Zhu, F., & Hirst, G. (2014). Psychological capital: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*(1), 120–138. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1916>
- Niven, K., Connolly, C., Stride, C. B., & Farley, S. (2021). Daily effects of face-to-face and cyber incivility via sadness, anger and fear. *Work & Stress, 1*–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2021.1976882>
- Nyberg, A., Holmberg, I., Bernin, P., Alderling, M., Åkerblom, S., Widerszal-Bazyl, M., ... Theorell, T. (2011). Destructive managerial leadership and psychological well-being among employees in Swedish, Polish, and Italian hotels. *Work, 39*(3), 267–281. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-2011-1175>
- Oc, B. (2018). Contextual leadership: A systematic review of how contextual factors shape leadership and its outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly, 29*(1), 218–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.004>
- Ospina, S., & Foldy, E. (2009). A critical review of race and ethnicity in the leadership literature: Surfacing context, power and the collective dimensions of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 20*(6), 876–896. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.09.005>
- Othman, R., Fang Ee, F., & Lay Shi, N. (2010). Understanding dysfunctional leader-member exchange: antecedents and outcomes. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 31*(4), 337–350. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731011043357>
- Park, Y., Fritz, C., & Jex, S. M. (2018). Daily Cyber Incivility and Distress: The Moderating Roles of Resources at Work and Home. *Journal of Management, 44*(7), 2535–2557. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315576796>
- Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Toward a Taxonomy of Dark Personalities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 23*(6), 421–426. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414547737>
- Peeters, M. C. W., Montgomery, A. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2005). Balancing Work and Home: How Job and Home Demands Are Related to Burnout. *International Journal of Stress Management, 12*(1), 43–61. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.12.1.43>
- 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>
- Peng, A. C., Schaubroeck, J. M., & Li, Y. (2014). Social exchange implications of own and coworkers' experiences of supervisory abuse. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*(5), 1385–1405. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0080>
- Piotrowski, C. (2018). The dark triad in leadership research: The adult bully syndrome in action. *Psychology and Education, 55*(3–4), 101–110.
- Pradhan, S., Srivastava, A., & Mishra, D. K. (2019). Abusive supervision and knowledge hiding: the

- mediating role of psychological contract violation and supervisor directed aggression. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 24(2), 216–234. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-05-2019-0248>
- Purvanova, R. K., & Bono, J. E. (2009). Transformational leadership in context: Face-to-face and virtual teams. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20(3), 343–357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.03.004>
- Robinson, S. L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(4), 574–599. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393868>
- Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15(3), 245–259.
- 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>
- Rousseau, D. M. (1990). New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: A study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(5), 389–400. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110506>
- Rousseau, D. M. (2005). Developing psychological contract theory. In *Great Minds in Management* (pp. 190–214). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rysavy, M. D. T., & Michalak, R. (2020). Working from Home: How We Managed Our Team Remotely with Technology. *Journal of Library Administration*, 60(5), 532–542. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2020.1760569>
- Saleem, S., Yusaf, S., Sarwar, N., Raziq, M. M., & Malik, O. F. (2021). Linking Abusive Supervision to Psychological Distress and Turnover Intentions Among Police Personnel: The Moderating Role of Continuance Commitment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(9–10), 4451–4471. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518791592>
- Sarwar, A., Khan, M., & Mujtaba, B. (2017). Despotism Leadership , Workplace Ostracism and Knowledge Hoarding : A Serial Mediation Model. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 82(4), 4–19. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-567547340/despotism-leadership-workplace-ostracism-and-knowledge>
- Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 138–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.001>
- Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant Leadership: Its Origin, Development, and Application in Organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(2), 57–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190200900205>
- Seo, Y., & Chung, S. W. (2019). Abusive Supervision, Psychological Capital, and Turnover Intention: Evidence from Factory Workers in China. *Relations Industrielles / Industrial Relations*, 74(2), 377–404. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1062088ar>
- Shamir, B., & Salomon, I. (1985). Work-At-Home and the Quality of Working Life. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(3), 455–464. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4278957>
- Shirmohammadi, M., Au, W. C., & Beigi, M. (2022). Remote work and work-life balance: Lessons learned from the covid-19 pandemic and suggestions for HRD practitioners. *Human Resource Development International*, 25(2), 163–181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2022.2047380>
- Slonje, R., & Smith, P. K. (2008). Cyberbullying: Another main type of bullying? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 49(2), 147–154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-9450.2007.00611.X>
- Spain, S. M., Harms, P. D., & Wood, D. (2016). Stress, Well-Being, and the Dark Side of Leadership. In *Research in Occupational Stress and Well Being* (Vol. 14, pp. 33–59). Binghamton: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-355520160000014002>

- Spurk, D., & Straub, C. (2020). Flexible employment relationships and careers in times of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 119*(June), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103435>
- Stich, J.-F. (2020). A review of workplace stress in the virtual office. *Intelligent Buildings International, 12*(3), 208–220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508975.2020.1759023>
- Tepper, B. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 33*(3), 261–289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300812>
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(2), 178–190. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1556375>
- Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., Breaux, D. M., Geider, S., Hu, C., & Hua, W. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 109*(2), 156–167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.03.004>
- Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., Lockhart, D. E., & Carr, J. C. (2007). Abusive supervision, upward maintenance communication, and subordinates' psychological distress. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(5), 1169–1180. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20159918>
- Tepper, B. J., Simon, L., & Park, H. M. (2017). Abusive Supervision. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 4*(1), 123–152. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-041015-062539>
- Tillman, C. J., Gonzalez, K., Crawford, W. S., & Lawrence, E. R. (2018). Affective responses to abuse in the workplace: The role of hope and affective commitment. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 26*(1), 57–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijasa.12203>
- Valle, M., Kacmar, K. M., Zivnuska, S., & Harting, T. (2019). Abusive supervision, leader-member exchange, and moral disengagement: A moderated-mediation model of organizational deviance. *Journal of Social Psychology, 159*(3), 299–312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2018.1466776>
- Van Dierendonck, D., Borrill, C., Haynes, C., & Stride, C. (2004). Leadership Behavior and Subordinate Well-Being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 9*(2), 165–175. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.9.2.165>
- Vo-Thanh, T., Vu, T.-V., Nguyen, N. P., Nguyen, D. Van, Zaman, M., & Chi, H. (2021). How does hotel employees' satisfaction with the organization's COVID-19 responses affect job insecurity and job performance? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 29*(6), 907–925. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1850750>
- Volmer, J., Koch, I. K., & Göritz, A. S. (2016). The bright and dark sides of leaders' dark triad traits: Effects on subordinates' career success and well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences, 101*(October), 413–418. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.046>
- Vought, W. X. (2017). *E-leadership in Practice: The Components of Transformational Leadership in Virtual Business Environments* (St. John Fisher College). St. John Fisher College. Retrieved from https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/education_etd/323
- Wang, D., Li, X., Zhou, M., Maguire, P., Zong, Z., & Hu, Y. (2019). Effects of abusive supervision on employees' innovative behavior: The role of job insecurity and locus of control. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 60*(2), 152–159. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12510>
- Wang, R., Jiang, J., Yang, L., & Shing Chan, D. K. (2016). Chinese employees' psychological responses to abusive supervisors: The roles of gender and self-esteem. *Psychological Reports, 118*(3), 810–828. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294116644369>
- Webster, V., Brough, P., & Daly, K. (2016). Fight, Flight or Freeze: Common Responses for Follower Coping with Toxic Leadership. *Stress and Health, 32*(4), 346–354. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2626>

- Wei, F., & Si, S. (2013). Psychological Contract Breach, Negative Reciprocity, and Abusive Supervision: The Mediated Effect of Organizational Identification. *Management and Organization Review*, 9(3), 541–561. <https://doi.org/10.1111/more.12029>
- Wen, X. L. (2013). Research on the Destructive Leadership in Virtual Enterprises. *Advanced Materials Research*, 712–715(June), 3199–3202. <https://doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.712-715.3199>
- Wilson, J. M., Lee, J., Fitzgerald, H. N., Oosterhoff, B., Sevi, B., & Shook, N. J. (2020). Job Insecurity and Financial Concern During the COVID-19 Pandemic Are Associated With Worse Mental Health. *Journal of Occupational & Environmental Medicine*, 62(9), 686–691. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000001962>
- Woestman, D. S., & Wasonga, T. A. (2015). Destructive Leadership Behaviors and Workplace Attitudes in Schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, 99(2), 147–163. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636515581922>
- Wu, W. L., & Lee, Y. C. (2016). Do employees share knowledge when encountering abusive supervision? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(1), 154–168. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-12-2013-0410>
- Xu, A. J., Loi, R., & Lam, L. W. (2015). The bad boss takes it all: How abusive supervision and leader-member exchange interact to influence employee silence. *Leadership Quarterly*, 26(5), 763–774. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.03.002>
- Zhang, Y., & Bednall, T. C. (2016). Antecedents of Abusive Supervision: a Meta-analytic Review. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139(3), 455–471. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2657-6>
- Zhang, Y., & Liao, Z. (2015). Consequences of abusive supervision: A meta-analytic review. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 32(4), 959–987. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-015-9425-0>
- Zhang, Y., Liu, X., Xu, S., Yang, L. Q., & Bednall, T. C. (2019). Why Abusive Supervision Impacts Employee OCB and CWB: A Meta-Analytic Review of Competing Mediating Mechanisms. *Journal of Management*, 45(6), 2474–2497. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318823935>

