

Destructive leadership and gender differences

*“Are there differences in how women and men perceive
and react to destructive leadership?”*

Study Program: MSc in Business, Major in Leadership and Change

Supervisor: Anders Dysvik

Introduction	3
Literature review	4
<i>What is Leadership?</i>	4
<i>Full Range Leadership Model</i>	5
<i>Leadership in a Military Context</i>	5
<i>Destructive Leadership</i>	6
<i>Psychosocial factors</i>	8
<i>Leader – Member Exchange (LMX)</i>	9
<i>Gender Differences</i>	10
<i>Biological factors</i>	10
<i>Information processing</i>	11
<i>Stereotyping</i>	12
Hypotheses	15
Method	15
<i>Research strategy and research design</i>	15
<i>Data collection</i>	16
<i>Primary- and secondary data</i>	16
<i>Data analysis</i>	17
Sources	18

Introduction

This study is conducted as a collaboration with the Norwegian Armed Force (NAF). NAF is the Norwegian military organisation responsible for taking care of and protecting the country. Over the last years, Norway and Europe has faced an uncertain and demanding security situation which has affected the use and function of the NAF. Their goal of defending the country has developed into being an operative and mobile force for international missions. To be able to reach their goal, they are dependent upon a diverse workforce, and in 2015 NAF introduced compulsory military service for all girls (Forsvaret, 2018).

In 2016, only 17,39% of the people working within NAF were females, including both military and civilian employees (Forsvaret, 2016). Thus, there is a majority of male employees within the Norwegian Army, which might have implications on the work environment and social relations in the organisation. The jargon between employees might be affected by the fact that there is a majority of male employees. Furthermore, in such a masculine profession and with mostly male colleagues, women might more easily feel vulnerable. Research has actually shown that gender is the personal characteristic that capture the most attention by others and provides the strongest basis for categorising people. This even when compared to race, age and occupation (Singh, Dev, & Sengupta, 2017).

One of the reasons for increased focus on destructive leadership is the need to know more about the employees exposed to it (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Well-being at the workplace is important for employees, but also the effectiveness of an organisation. Research show that destructive leadership is present in several organisations in Norway (Aasland, 2012), which makes it reasonable to believe that such leadership might also be present within NAF. The employees in NAF are considered to be one of the organisation's most important resources. However, only a limited amount of research has examined whether these employees continually experience destructive leadership at their workplace. Furthermore, there has been little research on gender differences in relation to destructive leadership. The existing literature has not been focusing on separating the individuals affected by destructive leadership, but rather studied the effects on the workforce as a whole (Chua & Murray, 2015). Therefore, it is called for a closer

examination to enrich existing literature on destructive leadership and gender differences. The purpose of this study is to identify how men and women may experience destructive leaders differently. Thus, our preliminary research question is:

“Are there differences in how women and men perceive and react to destructive leadership?”

This research examines destructive leadership in NAF intentionally to investigate gender differences in perceptions and reactions of destructive leadership. The study aims to see if there are any connections between how the leader is perceived and the psychosocial work environment. An employee survey that is carried out every second year within NAF forms the basis of our data. The analysis of destructive leadership in the survey measures all instances of destructive leadership as a whole, which makes us unable to distinguish between whether the leader is male, female, civilian or military.

Literature review

What is Leadership?

Leadership in an organisation is a critical factor for the success of an organisation (Bass & Stogdill, 1990). Despite many years of research on leadership and several studies, there is still not a clear understanding of what leadership is and how it can be defined (Bolden, 2004). However, there are several researchers that have attempted to define leadership: House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, and Gupta (2004) defines leadership as: “the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute towards the effectiveness and success of the organisation of which they are members”. Further, E. H. Schein (2010) approaches the definition of leadership by stating it as “the ability to step outside the culture... to start evolutionary change processes that are more adaptive”. Finally, the process of leadership is defined by Yukl (2013) as “ influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives”.

Full Range Leadership Model

Bass and Avolio investigated transformational leadership and transactional leadership, and concluded them to be complementary and important.

Transformational leaders are seen to broaden and evaluate the interest of their employees, as they pay attention to differences among their employees, helping them to grow and develop (Bass, 1990). This means that transformational leadership aims to satisfy the needs of the employees and try to influence and motivate them to contribute more than expected (Yukl, 2013). In contrast, transactional leaders are seen to be task oriented and to motivate employees through a barter (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Yukl, 2013). The leader gives the employees something they want, in exchange for something in return. In addition to transformational and transactional leadership Bass another type of leadership style was identified, a passive leadership style, called laissez- faire leadership. This leadership style implies non-leadership, and describes the absence of leadership within an organisation (Avolio, 2010).

The full range leadership model was first launched in 1990 by Avolio and Bass, based on the perspectives from the three different leadership styles (Avolio, 2010). Every leader is seen to display the leadership styles at different levels, and the model is described as a process that involves both unstructured and structured experiences that has impact on leaders and followers (Avolio, 2010). The model is not considered to be a continuum where one can fluctuate from being a bad leader to a good one. Rather, the model demonstrates that different circumstances requires different behaviours. According to Avolio (2010) this implies that a leader might utilise several behaviours at the same time. Thus, a good balance of the three leadership styles proves to be essential for a leader to be effective (Avolio, 2010).

Leadership in a Military Context

According to NAF, leadership can be defined as “an activity where one through different measures tries to reach goals through others” (Forsvarsstaben, 2014). Within a military context, leadership is formally based on command authority to military leaders, for the purpose of directing, coordinating and controlling different military operations. This is primarily done through allocation of command authority and a command- and control system consisting of personnel,

methods and procedures (Forsvarsstaben, 2014). Consequently, this indicates that officers traditionally are considered to be military leaders as they are given command authority. The role and position of an officer however, has changed considerably over the years and is no longer necessarily associated with the same command authority. Despite having the same core tasks of carrying out military operations and defending the country (Forsvarsstaben, 2007), the environment of NAF has changed, which makes the position as a leader within the organisation a more differentiated role to possess.

Mission-based leadership is central to the leadership philosophy of NAF, and entails that all operations must be seen in accordance with the intention of the operation. This form of leadership rooted within NAF's military doctrine and emphasise the importance of maintaining professionalism and mutual trust (Forsvarsstaben, 2014). The military leaders govern by specifying *what* is going to be achieved and *why* it is important. Thereafter, it is up to each subordinate to figure out *how* to proceed in order to reach the goal. In this way, there is room for decentralised decisions and actions in the mind of the leader (Forsvarsstaben, 2014). The way in which assignments are solved may also in certain situations be important, so that detailed orders and control are frequently used (Forsvarsstaben, 2014). Thereby, mission-based leadership implies a shift between giving strong orders and decentralisation. It is therefore important that military leaders undergo extensive training so that they are able to create proper balance and gain trust among employees (Forsvarsstaben, 2014).

Destructive Leadership

Destructive leadership is described in many different forms in the literature, but often in terms of leader characteristics and behaviours (Einarsen, Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007). According to Krasikova, Green, and LeBreton (2013) a destructive leader employs a leadership style that involves harmful methods of influence on followers. Einarsen et al. (2007) has defined destructive leadership as “the systematic and repeated behaviour by a leader, supervisor or manager that violates the legitimate interest of the organisation by undermining and/or sabotaging the organisation's goals, tasks, resources and effectiveness and/or the motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of subordinates”. The research conducted on destructive aspects of leadership clearly document that the

phenomenon includes a variety of different behaviours that is not limited to the absence of effective leadership behaviour (Einarsen et al., 2007). It includes many different forms of leadership such as abusive (Tepper, 2000), destructive (Einarsen et al., 2007), bullying (Einarsen, Skogstad, & Glasø, 2013), toxic (Lipman-Blumen, 2005), tyrannical (Ashforth, 1994) or laissez-faire (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939). Destructive leadership is thereby seen to encompass what leaders actually do and what they are expected to do, but also what they omit to do.

The authority of a destructive leader must be recognised by the followers. Lipman-Blumen (2005) states that what one follower considers to be behaviours of a destructive leader, might be what another follower considers to be behaviours of a successful leader. Accordingly, the perceptions of the followers determine whether the leader is regarded as destructive (Chua & Murray, 2015). A study conducted by Wong and Giessner (2015) further supports this argument, as it shows how employees use their own empowerment expectations to interpret the behaviours of their leader. If their expectations are either over- or under-fulfilled, the employees tend to attribute the delegation of autonomy and decision making to laissez-faire leadership (Wong & Giessner, 2015). Thus, leaders might be perceived as destructive if they fail to meet the expectations of their followers. In their research on the phenomenon, Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser (2007) emphasise the fact that destructive leadership is rarely absolute, in that all leaders will exercise both positive and negative leadership to a certain extent. A destructive leader may not practise destructive behaviour in all situations and towards all employees, but appear as destructive in some situations and constructive in others (Einarsen et al., 2007).

It will be difficult to understand destructive leadership without examining the entire leadership process. A key contribution to the theory of destructive leadership is introduced by Padilla et al. (2007), namely “The Toxic Triangle”. The concept highlights the fact that negative outcomes of destructive leadership may be related to three different domains: destructive leaders, susceptible followers and conducive environment. This is further emphasised by Schyns and Schilling (2013), stating that integrating leader, follower and organisational characteristics will be necessary to get a complete picture of the dynamics of

destructive leadership. Kellerman (2004) suggests that destructive leaders are not able to do harm without followers enabling them by either colluding with the leader, refusing to acknowledge the bad leadership or put in counteractive work. It will also be difficult for destructive leaders to succeed within stable systems that have strong institutions and proper checks and balances, as these systems tend to defeat attempts of long lasting destructive behaviour (Padilla et al., 2007). Thus, the research points to several different elements impacting the prevalence of destructive leadership in organisations.

Among the three suggested domains, the most extensive research has been conducted on the destructive leaders, and their traits, characteristics and behaviours (Thoroughgood, Padilla, Hunter, & Tate, 2012). People who emphasise self-interest over interests of others and at the extent of others (e.g. narcissism, machiavellianism, psychopathy, charisma, need for power, ideology of hate etc.) appears to be the common antecedents to destructive leadership (Krasikova et al., 2013; Padilla et al., 2007). The followers and the environment in the leadership process however, have received less attention in research literature (Thoroughgood et al., 2012).

Psychosocial factors

According to Skogstad (2000) psychosocial factors at work can be defined as factors that take place within social arenas, that are influenced by individual psychological processes, and that have consequences for job satisfaction, health and performance. It is possible to connect both positive and negative factors to this term (Skogstad, 2000), however, this study will focus on psychosocial factors that constitutes a burden for the employees within NAF. Destructive leadership can generate numerous consequences with various severity. Research has shown that the perceived behaviours of leaders affect subordinates' performance, and many subordinates note their leader as being the primary source of stress at work (Schaubroeck, Walumbwa, Ganster, & Kepes, 2007). Padilla et al. (2007) states that destructive leadership can cause reduced life quality for those affected, but also simultaneously make it difficult to reach the goals of the organisation. Destructive leadership can thereby have implications on both organisational and individual levels (Einarsen & Skogstad, 2015). On an organisational level, destructive leadership might contribute to increased turnover, absenteeism and

counterproductive work, in addition to lower task performance and organisational citizenship behaviour among employees (Einarsen et al., 2013). Furthermore, on an individual level it can create job tension (Harvey, Stoner, Hochwarter, & Kacmar, 2007), emotional exhaustion (Wu & Hu, 2009), stress and well-being (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). The subordinates of a destructive leader are likely to develop negative attitudes towards the leader, and show resistance. However, despite the bad influence, many followers tend to go along in order to avoid further destructive behaviour (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). A common denominator for all forms of destructive leadership is that it is harmful for the motivation, health and effectiveness of subordinates (Einarsen, Skogstad, & Aasland, 2010). Thus, it will be reasonable to presume that destructive leadership might impact important aspects within NAF such as motivation, stress and job satisfaction of the employees. Emphasis is placed on how the men and women react and respond differently to destructive leadership.

Leader – Member Exchange (LMX)

Leader-member exchange (LMX) is a key construct in the field of leadership and is the foremost dyadic, relational approach to the theory of leadership (Erdogan & Bauer, 2010). LMX focuses on the relationship between the leader and the followers (Gerstner & Day, 1997) and views the dyadic relationship quality between them as the key to understanding leader's effects on members, teams, and organisations (Erdogan & Bauer, 2010). Thus, it attempts to explain the relationship that is developed between supervisor and subordinates as a result of the interaction they have at the workplace.

LMX theory is grounded by the assumption that leaders will form distinct relationships with followers within a group that is categorised to be high-quality relationships or low-quality relationships (Seo, Nahrgang, Carter, & Hom, 2017). Research shows that leaders are more inclusive and communicative with some members compared to others (Erdogan & Bauer, 2010), and thereby separates followers by placing them in in-groups (high-quality relationship) or out-groups (low-quality relationship). The first is associated with social exchange in which mutual trust, respect, and obligation form the basis of the relationship between the leader and the follower (Seo et al., 2017). The latter, on the other hand, is based on economic exchanges or contractual transactions (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga,

1975; Seo et al., 2017). Previous research show that leaders are friendlier, more inclusive, and more communicative with members who report to them (Erdogan & Bauer, 2010). In contrast, they tend to have a lower-quality exchange that is limited to the employee and the leader's job description with other members (Erdogan & Bauer, 2010). The in-group has a closer relationship with the leader than the out group, which in turn can lead to a higher level of independency. Leaders tend to have high-quality relationships with only some of their employees (Erdogan & Bauer, 2010). Hence, the people in the out-group have a more formal and distant relationship with their leader.

The LMX model confirms that a leader develops different relationship with their subordinates (Varma & Stroh, 2001). Dienesch and Liden (1986) argued that individual characteristics, such as gender, can have an impact on LMX. Research conducted by Larwood and Blackmore (1978) found that members of the same gender were predominantly chosen as in-group. This founding was further supported by Wayne, Liden, and Sparrowe (1994) who found that employees with the same gender as their leader will develop a high-quality relationship with their leader, compared to employees of the opposite gender. In relation to destructive leadership, Pelletier (2012) found that out-group members perceived their leader to be more toxic than members with favoured status.

Gender Differences

Biological factors

Gender is seen as biological phenomenon, and is fundamental for all human beings as they by birth is placed within either one or the other category, namely male or female (Drake & Solberg, 1995). What determines the difference are the chromosomes and hormones, as they have an impact on the development of the brain and the body of the human being (Drake & Solberg, 1995). Even though there are numerous biological similarities between men and women, there are also some fundamental differences. Not only do the two genders differ in their physical attributes and reproductive function, but also with regards to solving intellectual problems (Kimura, 1992). According to Springer and Deutsch (1998), there are differences in brain lateralisation between men and women, which refers to the specialisation in the function of each hemisphere in the brain. The left hemisphere is associated with logic, abstract and analytical thinking in addition to

sequential information processing, while the right hemisphere is associated with visual skills, non-verbal information and institutions (Drake & Solberg, 1995). It is argued that men tend to specialize in the left hemisphere, while women do the opposite. However, over the years researchers there has been little agreement as researcher conclude differently regarding which hemisphere of the brain accounts for which gender (DeFrancisco & Palczewski, 2007). Moreover, a study conducted by Ingahalikar et al. (2014) specified that male brains have more connections *within* hemispheres, while female brains have more connections *between* the hemispheres. These results suggest that men have a better connection between perception and coordinated action, while women are good at combining analytical and intuitive thinking.

Information processing

The biological differences can also be extended to differences in information processing. It is argued that men and women tend to ascribe the same words different meaning. Tannen (1991) substantiate this by stating that even though one understands the spoken words, men and women may have totally different and emotional motives or actions behind their words. According to Chua and Murray (2015), there has been little attention towards how men and women perceive information differently based on their gender. However, in 1989 Meyers-Levy proposed what is named the selectivity hypothesis (Meyers-Levy & Loken, 2015), a theory stating that men and women practise different strategies and have different thresholds for processing information. Women tend to engage in substantial and detailed elaboration of message content, which makes them “comprehensive processors” of information (Meyers-Levy & Loken, 2015). This often leads to high imaginary creation and sensitivity to the particulars of message claims, which makes the source of information highly important (Chua & Murray, 2015). Furthermore, women are seen to look for assimilation of all available information rendering judgements (Putrevu, 2001). In contrast, men are more likely to be driven by overall message themes (Meyers-Levy & Loken, 2015). Men rely more on subsets of highly available and salient cues, which makes them “selective processors” of information (Putrevu, 2001).

Research conducted by Skowronski and Carlston (1989) show that extreme or negative information often receives more attention than positive information as it is perceived to more diagnostic. As reported by Putrevu (2001) this suggests that

women should elaborate more on negative information and emotions, because the negative is granted greater diagnostic value. Men are likely to value positive information and emotions over negative, as they are more heuristic processors (Putrevu, 2001). If men and women perceive and process information differently, this suggests that there might be differences to how the genders react to leadership, workplace culture and stimuli, which easily might lead to allegations of harassment, feelings of exclusion or sex discrimination (Adepoju, Ajiboye, & Koleoso, 2016). It is therefore possible that there might be gender differences to how the employees within NAF react to leaders considered to be destructive. Singh et al. (2017) found that perceived toxicity in leaders was best predicted by gender of the subordinates only, compared to other demographics such as age and education. Their findings suggested that toxicity will be perceived differently by the genders, in which women perceive more toxicity in their leader than men. Further, it is stated that women appear to be more sensitive and influenced by negative behaviours in interpersonal relationships than men (Singh et al., 2017).

Stereotyping

A social role concerns a shared expectation applied to people who take up specific social positions or have membership within certain social categories (Eagly, Wood, & Diekmann, 2000). A gender role is considered to be a social role, as it holds certain expectations towards people based upon whether they are perceived to be male or female. In relation to such roles, there are also often a large number of stereotypes. Gender role stereotyping is a belief that a set of characteristics is more likely to be found among one gender than the other (Kagan, 1964; V. E. Schein, 1978), and its presence has been addressed by numerous researchers throughout the years (Anastasi & Foley, 1949; Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968; V. E. Schein, 1973). Stereotypes provides simplifications of one's perceptions of a group, in which one tend to treat people within the group very similar without considering individual variations (Kaufmann & Kaufmann, 2003). Thus, there are several generalisations about the attributes of men and women. These simplified mental images are used frequently as it ease the burden of information processing and simplifies though efforts (Martin & Halverson, 1981).

The gender stereotypes that exist about men and women can be divided into descriptive norms and injunctive norms, where the former describe what different genders *are* like, while the latter describe what different genders *should* be like (Cialdini & Trost, 1998; Heilman, 2012). Since descriptive norms concerns what men and women actually do, they serve as a type of heuristic or shortcut for establishing impressions about people (Heilman, 2012). If one experience deviations from this descriptive norm, it is often associated with feelings of surprise (Eagly et al., 2000). Stereotyping is automatically activated and commonly shared (Kaufmann & Kaufmann, 2003), which makes descriptive gender stereotypes extremely impactful when forming impressions of men and women. For instance, Heilman (2012) explains how women may experience difficulties if they are believed to have a “lack of fit” between their attributes and the attributes believed to be required to succeed in male dominated professions and organisational positions.

Injunctive norms (also called prescriptive norms) tends to dictate appropriate and inappropriate behaviours of men and women (Heilman, 2012). In this way, they can be seen as guidelines to which types of behaviours and attitudes that are likely to be approved by others (Eagly et al., 2000). Deviations from the injunctive norm tend to produce emotions that are strongly associated with moral disapproval, and may produce both social disapproval and negativity (Heilman, 2012).

The research conducted on gender stereotyping address many different aspects in which men and women are believed to differ. The fact that women are perceived as more emotional than men, has been one of the most consistent gender stereotypes over the years (Rosenkrantz et al., 1968; Williams & Best, 1990). A study conducted by Barrett and Bliss-Moreau (2009) showed that participants more frequently evaluates female targets as “emotional” whereas male targets are considered to “have a bad day”, even though evidence to support such a belief is inconclusive. Thus, the stereotypical emotional woman is linked to a belief that women express emotions because they are emotional creatures, while men express emotions when the situation warrants it (Barrett & Bliss-Moreau, 2009). Other researchers have studied specific emotions that may differ in terms of gender. One study showed that women are seen to experience and express more emotions such as awe, embarrassment, fear, distress, happiness, guilt, sympathy, safeness, love,

surprise, shame and shyness than men, while men experience and express more pride and anger than women (Plant, Hyde, Keltner, & Devine, 2000). The difference however, were largest for expression than experience. This meaning that both genders may experience all emotions, but tend to suppress the expression of emotions that are inconsistent with their gender role (Plant et al., 2000). Furthermore, several studies point to the fact that communal personal characteristics (friendly and concerned with others) are often assigned to women, while agentic personal characteristics are assigned to men (independent and instrumentally competent) (Berninger & Desoto, 1985; Deaux & Lewis, 1983). The belief also comprises undesirable characteristics that the genders might hold, which often reflects an excess of communion or agency (Eagly et al., 2000).

On the other hand, it is argued that the gender categories consisting of men and women are extremely general as it applies to practically all people on the planet Eagly et al. (2000) states that the gender roles always coexist with more specific roles that are relevant to social interactions. In this way, the more specific roles people hold in their daily life (based on family, occupation etc.) may have an equally great impact on the individuals as their gender. Thereby, it will not always be appropriate to attribute the behaviour of a women to her gender, but rather other social roles she carries.

The inclination to attribute characteristics to gender is also prevalent in professions in which there is a majority of men (Eagly & Johnson, 1990), such as the military. In 2016 the Norwegian Armed Forces consisted of approximately 82,61% male employees (Forsvaret, 2016). Traditionally, the military profession has been considered masculine in which the psychological attributes for a successful soldier are stereotypical of men. According to Boyce and Herd (2003), this implies that military leaders, when selecting or promoting other soldiers, will look for personal attributes that are considered more characteristic of men than women. The discrepancy between stereotypes of women and the attributes required for military positions may produce disadvantageous evaluations of women in the military, if they are seen as lacking the masculine attributes (Boldry, Wood, & Kashy, 2001). In addition, the women within military professions may experience the token perspective, as they are members of a numerically small minority whereas males are seen as the majority group (Eagly

& Johnson, 1990). The token status suggests that the women might be victims of being categorised as more stereotypical than normal (Martinsen, 2015), and yield less positive evaluations than men (Boldry et al., 2001). According to Adler and Gundersen (2007) people within token teams might have difficulties in creating a synergetic culture that accommodates the perspectives of the token member. This because the minority (here: women) may be incorrectly discriminated due to their stereotype.

Hypotheses

Based on the literature review, the preliminary hypotheses in this study are:

- H1: Women will to a greater extent than men rate a destructive leader badly
- H2: More women than men will report that they experience destructive leadership at the workplace
- H3: Women will to a larger extent than men be negatively affected when experiencing a destructive leader at the workplace
 - o H3a: Women will report more stress than men when experiencing a destructive leader at the workplace
 - o H3b: Women will report lower job satisfaction than men when experiencing a destructive leader at the workplace
 - o H3c: Women will report less motivation than men when experiencing a destructive leader at the workplace

Method

Research strategy and research design

In general, the orientation to conduct research is a research strategy (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Typically, there are two different types of research strategies, quantitative and qualitative. A quantitative approach to the research strategy emphasises quantification in the collection and analysis of data, and entails a deductive approach to the relationship between theory and the research (Bryman & Bell, 2015). This research aims to use a quantitative approach, in order to investigate differences among men and women to see if their gender characteristics have an impact on the perception of a destructive leader.

The research design of a study provides the framework for data collection and analysis of the data (Bryman & Bell, 2015). This means that the research design will reflect the approach, priority and decisions that appear in the process of the research. The design includes decisions about the importance of casualization, generalisation, how behaviour fits into social context, but also how to appreciate social phenomena and their interconnections (Bryman & Bell, 2015). The present study will be conducted as a case study, as it seeks to give a detailed and intensive analysis of a single case, namely NAF.

Data collection

The present research is based on existing data collected by the Norwegian Armed Forces. Every second year, all employees within NAF are asked to answer the employee survey. The survey provides the basis of this study and we will look at differences between men and women by examining their evaluations of the psychosocial environment at work, though variables such as stress, motivation, well-being etc. Thus, we want to investigate whether gender has an impact on the perception of destructive leadership.

Primary- and secondary data

In relation to data collection, one can separate between primary data and secondary data (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Primary data is data that researchers have collected on their own, while secondary data is data that already is available (Bryman & Bell, 2015). The data from the employee survey conducted within NAF was collected in 2017. This indicates that the majority of the data used in this research is categorised to be secondary data.

The advantages of using secondary data is the fact that it is time saving, providing us with more time to focus on the analysis and the output of the analysis (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Because the data is collected by the Norwegian Defence Research Establishment, it can be regarded as a legitimate source. However, there are some limitations when using secondary data. The data can limit the research and raise issues regarding the quality of the data, but also the interpretation of the data. When using secondary data, the researchers will lack familiarity with the data set, such as structure and contours (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

Primary data will be collected if there is a lack of information or if the data proved to be insufficient to answer the research question. This means that we will be able to conduct an additional survey or in-depth interviews with key employees to collect further data if necessary.

Data analysis

The data in this research will be analysed through the professional software called SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science). SPSS software is one of the most popular software used for research (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

Sources

- Adepoju, O., Ajiboye, A., & Koleoso, G. B. (2016). *The Leader and His Giant: Overcoming the Leadership Giant*: BookBaby.
- Adler, N. J., & Gundersen, A. (2007). *International dimensions of organizational behavior*: Cengage Learning.
- Anastasi, A., & Foley, J. R. (1949). *Differential Psychology*. New York: Macmillan.
- Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human relations*, 47(7), 755-778.
- Avolio, B. J. (2010). *Full range leadership development*: Sage.
- Barrett, L. F., & Bliss-Moreau, E. (2009). She's emotional. He's having a bad day: Attributional explanations for emotion stereotypes. *Emotion*, 9(5), 649.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
- Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Handbook of leadership* (Vol. 11): New York: free press.
- Berninger, V. W., & Desoto, C. (1985). Cognitive representation of personal stereotypes. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 15(2), 189-211. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420150205
- Bolden, R. (2004). *What is leadership?* Retrieved from
- Boldry, J., Wood, W., & Kashy, D. A. (2001). Gender stereotypes and the evaluation of men and women in military training. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 689-705.
- Boyce, L. A., & Herd, A. M. (2003). The relationship between gender role stereotypes and requisite military leadership characteristics. *Sex Roles*, 49(7-8), 365-378.
- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2015). *Business research methods*: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Chua, S. M. Y., & Murray, D. W. (2015). How toxic leaders are perceived: gender and information-processing. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 36(3), 292-307. doi:doi:10.1108/LODJ-06-2013-0076
- Cialdini, R. B., & Trost, M. R. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, conformity and compliance.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 13(1), 46-78.
- Deaux, K., & Lewis, L. L. (1983). Assessment of gender stereotypes: Methodology and components. *Psychological Documents*, 13(2).
- DeFrancisco, V. P., & Palczewski, C. H. (2007). *Communicating gender diversity: A critical approach*: Sage Publications.
- Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of management review*, 11(3), 618-634.
- Drake, I., & Solberg, A. G. (1995). *Kvinner og ledelse-gjennom glasstaket?* : Tano.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(2), 233.

- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. *The developmental social psychology of gender*, 123-174.
- Einarsen, S., & Skogstad, A. (2015). *Ledelse på godt og vondt* (2nd ed.): Fagbokforlaget.
- Einarsen, S., Skogstad, A., & Glasø, L. (2013). When leaders are bullies: Concepts, antecedents, and consequences. *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of the psychology of leadership, change, and organizational development*, 129-153.
- Einarsen, S., Skogstad, A., & Aasland, M. S. (2010). The nature, prevalence, and outcomes of destructive leadership: A behavioral and conglomerate approach. *When leadership goes wrong: Destructive leadership, mistakes, and ethical failures*, 145-171.
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 207-216.
- Erdogan, B., & Bauer, T. N. (2010). Differentiated leader–member exchanges: The buffering role of justice climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(6), 1104.
- Forsvaret. (2016). Personnell. Retrieved from <https://forsvaret.no/aarsrapport/statistikk/personell>
- Forsvaret. (2018). Førstegangstjeneste. Retrieved from <https://forsvaret.no/karriere/forstegangstjeneste>
- Forsvarsstaben. (2007). *Forsvarets fellesoperative doktrine (FFOD)*. Oslo: Forsvarsstaben.
- Forsvarsstaben. (2014). *Forsvarets fellesoperative doktrine (FFOD)*. Oslo: Forsvarsstaben Retrieved from https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/bitstream/id/317149/FFOD_2014.pdf.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues: American Psychological Association.
- Harvey, P., Stoner, J., Hochwarter, W., & Kacmar, C. (2007). Coping with abusive supervision: The neutralizing effects of ingratiation and positive affect on negative employee outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 264-280.
- Heilman, M. E. (2012). Gender stereotypes and workplace bias. *Research in organizational Behavior*, 32, 113-135.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*: Sage publications.
- Ingallhalikar, M., Smith, A., Parker, D., Satterthwaite, T. D., Elliott, M. A., Ruparel, K., . . . Verma, R. (2014). Sex differences in the structural connectome of the human brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(2), 823-828.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755.
- Kagan, J. (1964). Acquisition and significance of sex typing and sex role identity. *Review of child development research*, 1, 137-167.
- Kaufmann, G., & Kaufmann, A. (2003). *Psykologi i organisasjon og ledelse*: Fagbokforlaget.

- Kellerman, B. (2004). *Bad leadership: What it is, how it happens, why it matters*: Harvard Business Press.
- Kimura, D. (1992). Sex differences in the brain. *Scientific american*, 267(3), 118-125.
- 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. doi:10.1177/0149206312471388
- Larwood, L., & Blackmore, J. (1978). Sex discrimination in managerial selection: Testing predictions of the vertical dyad linkage model. *Sex Roles*, 4(3), 359-367.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates". *The Journal of social psychology*, 10(2), 269-299.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). Toxic leadership: When grand illusions masquerade as noble visions. *Leader to Leader*, 2005(36), 29.
- Martin, C. L., & Halverson, C. F. (1981). A Schematic Processing Model of Sex Typing and Stereotyping in Children. *Child Development*, 52(4), 1119-1134. doi:10.2307/1129498
- Martinsen, Ø. L. (2015). *Perspektiver på ledelse* (4 ed.): Gyldendal
- Meyers-Levy, J., & Loken, B. (2015). Revisiting gender differences: What we know and what lies ahead. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 25(1), 129-149. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2014.06.003>
- 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. (2012). Perceptions of and reactions to leader toxicity: Do leader-follower relationships and identification with victim matter? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(3), 412-424.
- Plant, E. A., Hyde, J. S., Keltner, D., & Devine, P. G. (2000). The gender stereotyping of emotions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24(1), 81-92.
- Putrevu, S. (2001). Exploring the origins and information processing differences between men and women: Implications for advertisers. *Academy of marketing science review*, 2001, 1.
- Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., & Broverman, D. M. (1968). Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 32(3), 287.
- Schaubroeck, J., Walumbwa, F. O., Ganster, D. C., & Kepes, S. (2007). Destructive leader traits and the neutralizing influence of an "enriched" job. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 236-251. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.006>
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (Vol. 2): John Wiley & Sons.
- Schein, V. E. (1973). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(2), 95.
- Schein, V. E. (1978). Sex role stereotyping, ability and performance: Prior research and new directions. *Personnel Psychology*, 31(2), 259-268.
- Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 138-158.

- Seo, J., Nahrgang, J., Carter, M., & Hom, P. (2017). Not All Differentiation is the Same: Examining the Moderating Effects of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Configurations. *The Journal of applied psychology*.
- Singh, N., Dev, S., & Sengupta, S. (2017). Perceived toxicity in leaders: Through the demographic lens of subordinates. *Procedia Computer Science*, 122, 114-121. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.11.349>
- Skogstad, A. (2000). Psykososiale faktorer i arbeidet. *Det gode arbeidsmiljø. Krav og utfordringer*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Skowronski, J. J., & Carlston, D. E. (1989). Negativity and extremity biases in impression formation: A review of explanations. *Psychological bulletin*, 105(1), 131.
- Springer, S. P., & Deutsch, G. (1998). *Left brain, right brain: Perspectives from cognitive neuroscience*: WH Freeman/Times Books/Henry Holt & Co.
- Tannen, D. (1991). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*: Virago London.
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of management journal*, 43(2), 178-190.
- Thoroughgood, C., Padilla, A., Hunter, S., & Tate, B. (2012). *The susceptible circle: A taxonomy of followers associated with destructive leadership* (Vol. 23).
- Varma, A., & Stroh, L. K. (2001). Different perspectives on selection for international assignments: The impact of LMX and gender. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 8(3/4), 85-97.
- Wayne, S. J., Liden, R. C., & Sparrowe, R. T. (1994). Developing leader-member exchanges: The influence of gender and ingratiation. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 37(5), 697-714.
- Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). *Measuring sex stereotypes: A multinational study*, Rev: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Wong, S. I., & Giessner, S. R. (2015). The thin line between empowering and laissez-faire leadership: An expectancy-match perspective. *Journal of Management*, 0149206315574597.
- Wu, T.-Y., & Hu, C. (2009). Abusive supervision and employee emotional exhaustion: Dispositional antecedents and boundaries. *Group & Organization Management*, 34(2), 143-169.
- Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in organization* (8th ed.): Pearson.
- Aasland, M. (2012). Destructive leadership: Conceptualisation, measurement, prevalence and outcomes. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation*). University of Bergen, Norway.