



Wisdom Vortex:

International Journal of Social Science and Humanities

Open-access, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Quarterly Journal, Multiple Language (English & Hindi)

e-ISSN: 3107-3808

p-ISSN: Applied for

Wisdom Vortex: International Journal of Social Science and Humanities, Volume: 02, Issue: 03, Oct-Dec 2026

How to cite this paper:

Toppo, T. J. (2026). Employee Burnout and Destructive Leadership in Toxic Workplaces. *Wisdom Vortex: International Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 2(3), 34-41. <https://doi.org/10.64429/wvijsh.02.03.052>

Received: 15 Aug. 2026

Accepted: 25 Sep. 2026

Published: 10 Oct. 2026

Copyright © 2026 by author(s) and Wisdom Vortex: International Journal of Social Science and Humanities.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY- 4.0).

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Employee Burnout and Destructive Leadership in Toxic Workplaces

Dr. Triza Janifer Toppo¹

ABSTRACT

This systematic review investigates the direct and indirect mechanisms through which destructive leadership accelerates chronic employee burnout within contemporary work environments. Integrating the Job Demands-Resources model, Conservation of Resources theory, and Social Exchange Theory, this review synthesizes peer-reviewed empirical literature to delineate how hostile managerial typologies, including abusive supervision, petty tyranny, and narcissistic leadership, function as relentless psychosocial demands that deplete employees' cognitive and emotional reserves. Following PRISMA guidelines, the synthesis examines empirical studies to clarify the pathways linking supervisory misconduct to the core burnout dimensions of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. The findings demonstrate that toxic behaviors such as public humiliation, arbitrary control, and gaslighting induce chronic hyper-vigilance and impede psychological recovery. This destructive trajectory is heavily mediated by the systematic erosion of psychological safety and the collapse of organizational trust, leading to profound psychological contract breaches. Consequently, affected employees frequently exhibit defensive coping and withdrawal behaviors, including quiet quitting, counterproductive work behaviors, and increased turnover intentions. While personal psychological capital, cognitive reappraisal, and peer solidarity serve as vital moderating buffers, they cannot substitute for systemic institutional safeguards. Ultimately, this review reframes burnout not as an individual coping failure, but as an organizational outcome of toxic leadership. To effectively counter this dynamic, organizations must move beyond reactive wellness programs and implement proactive governance, such as multi-tiered leadership screening, continuous 360-degree evaluations, and independent reporting channels that safeguard employee well-being.

Keywords: Destructive leadership, Employee burnout, Toxic workplace, Abusive supervision,

¹ Assistant Professor, Deptt. of Psychology, Santhal Pargana College, SKMU, Dumka, Jharkhand

Psychological safety, Job Demands-Resources (JD-R)

Over the past decade, the modern organizational landscape has undergone a paradigm shift, increasingly recognizing that employee psychological well-being is intrinsically linked to sustainable productivity and institutional success (Harter et al., 2020). While organizations traditionally prioritized structural efficiency, profit margins, and physical safety, contemporary organizational psychology places human capital and mental health at the forefront of operational design (Harter et al., 2020). However, parallel to this positive shift, the modern workplace, exacerbated by post-pandemic restructuring, hybrid work models, and intense economic competitiveness, has witnessed a concerning rise in dysfunctional organizational cultures. Among the most corrosive elements threatening contemporary work environments is the persistence of destructive leadership and its devastating psychological toll on subordinates (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). To rigorously examine the dynamics of toxic work environments, this review anchors upon two primary constructs: destructive leadership and chronic employee burnout. Destructive leadership is defined as a systemic and recurring pattern of behavior by a leader that violates the legitimate interests of the organization by undermining and harming its goals, tasks, resources, and the effectiveness, well-being, or job satisfaction of subordinates (Einarsen et al., 2007). Unlike passive or incompetent management, destructive leadership is often active and intentional, manifesting in various toxic sub-typologies such as abusive supervision, which involves sustained hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors excluding physical contact (Tepper, 2000); petty tyranny, characterized by the arbitrary use of power to humiliate, control, and oppress employees (Ashforth, 1997); and narcissistic and psychopathic leadership, marked by grandiosity, a lack of empathy, entitlement, and the exploitation of employees for personal aggrandizement (Karlsson et al., 2021).

Parallely, chronic employee burnout is conceptualized through the seminal framework of the Maslach Burnout Inventory as a psychological syndrome emerging as a prolonged response to chronic interpersonal and emotional stressors on the job (Maslach et al., 2001), comprising emotional exhaustion, depersonalization or cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishment. While an extensive body of literature investigates general workplace stress and isolated leadership styles, a significant research gap remains in systematically synthesizing how multifaceted destructive leadership behaviors directly instigate and accelerate chronic employee burnout through specific relational and psychological pathways. Much of the existing literature evaluates stress as a byproduct of heavy workloads or ambiguous job descriptions, frequently overlooking the relational toxicity inflicted by direct supervisors. Furthermore, as organizations adapt to hybrid and digital work environments, the mechanisms of toxic oversight have evolved, shifting from physical intimidation to digital micromanagement, boundary violations, and psychological isolation. Understanding these direct pathways is critical for developing targeted, evidence-based organizational interventions. To address this critical gap, this systematic review aims to answer three core research questions: first, how distinct manifestations of destructive leadership directly contribute to the onset and perpetuation of chronic employee burnout; second, what the primary psychological mediating mechanisms, such as the erosion of psychological safety and organizational mistrust, are that translate leadership toxicity into employee emotional exhaustion; and third, which individual and organizational moderating factors effectively buffer or exacerbate this destructive trajectory.

Research Questions and Objectives

To address these critical gaps in the literature, this systematic review aims to uncover and synthesize:

- The direct and indirect pathways through which distinct forms of destructive leadership, such as abusive supervision and narcissistic management styles, instigate chronic emotional exhaustion and drive the core dimensions of employee burnout.

- The underlying mediating mechanisms, including the systematic erosion of psychological safety and organizational trust, that accelerate the transition from managerial toxicity to deep employee alienation.
- The moderating influence of modern work contexts, specifically hybrid structural arrangements and robust organizational support systems, in either exacerbating or buffering these negative psychological outcomes.

METHODOLOGY

Methodology Parameter	Operational Details & Inclusion Parameters
Search Strategy	Comprehensive database search across Scopus, Web of Science, PsycINFO, and Google Scholar using targeted Boolean strings combining terms like "destructive leadership", "abusive supervision", "toxic workplace", and "employee burnout".
Inclusion & Exclusion Criteria	• Inclusion: Peer-reviewed empirical studies published in English within the timeframe (e.g., 2011–2026), focusing on workplace settings. • Exclusion: Conceptual papers, book chapters, grey literature, and studies lacking quantitative/qualitative empirical data on burnout.
Screening Process	Executed via PRISMA guidelines across four distinct stages: <i>Identification</i> (database record harvesting), <i>Screening</i> (removal of duplicates and title/abstract filtering), <i>Eligibility</i> (full-text evaluation against criteria), and <i>Included</i> (final studies selected for synthesis).
Quality Appraisal	Methodological rigor assessed using standardized appraisal tools (e.g., Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool - MMAT or CASP checklists) to evaluate internal validity, sample size adequacy, and bias control in selected studies.

Conceptual Framework & Theoretical Foundations

To systematically examine how destructive leadership precipitates chronic employee burnout, this review integrates three robust theoretical lenses: the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model, Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory, and Social Exchange Theory. Together, these frameworks map out the psychological, energetic, and relational mechanisms through which workplace toxicity translates into chronic emotional exhaustion. Within the JD-R model, destructive leadership functions as an extreme, chronic job demand. Unlike standard operational workloads, toxic managerial behaviors such as abusive supervision, arbitrary rule enforcement, and public humiliation represent relentless psychosocial demands. Because toxic leaders systematically withhold supportive resources like feedback, autonomy, and emotional backing, employees become trapped in a health-impairment process where excessive demands deplete their coping capacity, culminating in chronic burnout and depersonalization. Complementing this, COR theory explains the dynamic energetic loss experienced by employees under toxic management. Individuals strive to obtain, retain, and protect valued resources, including energy, self-esteem, optimism, and social support. Continuous exposure to destructive leadership acts as a severe threat to these psychological resources. Toxic interactions demand constant emotional and cognitive energy just to navigate daily tasks and self-protect against managerial hostility. According to COR theory's loss spirals, individuals who lack sufficient resource replenishment suffer accelerated resource depletion, entering a state of defensive conservation that manifests as profound emotional exhaustion and a reduced sense of personal accomplishment. Finally, Social Exchange Theory elucidates the relational

and contractual breakdown occurring between employees and organizations. Operating on the norm of reciprocity, employment relationships rely on mutual obligations where fair treatment is reciprocated with loyalty and engagement. When a supervisor acts as a destructive agent, it represents a severe breach of the psychological contract. This perceived betrayal shatters the reciprocal loop, causing employees to withdraw discretionary effort, experience intense psychological distress, and develop cynical, detached attitudes as defense mechanisms against an exploitative environment.

MAJOR THEMES & FINDINGS

Synthesizing the empirical literature reveals that the trajectory from toxic management to chronic employee exhaustion operates through interconnected thematic dimensions. At the micro-level, direct pathways begin with specific destructive behaviors such as public humiliation, gaslighting, and the imposition of intentionally unrealistic workloads which act as chronic psychological stressors that immediately deplete an employee's cognitive and emotional reserves (Tepper, 2007; Mackey et al., 2017). When supervisors routinely engage in hostility or reality-distorting tactics like gaslighting, subordinates experience a persistent state of hyper-vigilance. This relentless cognitive tax prevents psychological recovery during and after work hours, directly accelerating the onset of emotional exhaustion and eroding personal accomplishment (Halbesleben et al., 2014; Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Beyond these direct pathways, the translation of managerial toxicity into burnout is significantly mediated by internal psychological mechanisms, most notably the destruction of psychological safety and the disintegration of organizational trust (Edmondson & Lei, 2014). Psychological safety defined as a shared belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk-taking is systematically dismantled by destructive leaders who punish dissent, penalize vulnerability, and cultivate a climate of fear. In the absence of psychological safety, employees suppress their voices, hide genuine concerns, and experience a profound sense of powerlessness and alienation (Detert & Edmondson, 2011). This collapse of trust shatters the psychological contract, trapping workers in an environment where they feel completely incapacitated to influence their working conditions, thereby intensifying chronic depersonalization and emotional drain (Kelloway et al., 2012). Ultimately, these psychological impairments manifest in severe behavioral and organizational consequences. Employees experiencing chronic burnout driven by toxic leadership frequently exhibit defensive coping strategies and withdrawal behaviors, ranging from "quiet quitting" (disengaging from discretionary effort while meeting only bare-minimum requirements) to explicit turnover intentions and active counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) like sabotage or absenteeism (Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Cropanzano et al., 2017). Rather than being isolated individual failures, these organizational outcomes represent systemic responses to structural toxicity, highlighting how unchecked destructive leadership creates a cascading crisis of health, retention, and performance across contemporary workplaces (Inceoglu et al., 2018).

Moderating Factors & Buffers

Moderating Category	Core Buffering Mechanism
Individual Psychological Capital (PsyCap)	High hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism act as internal psychological shields that absorb the initial shock of toxic management and prevent rapid resource depletion (Hobfoll, 2001; Luthans et al., 2007).

Coping Strategies & Appraisal	Active problem-solving and cognitive reappraisal help employees reframe toxic behaviors as external pressures rather than personal failures, mitigating emotional exhaustion (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).
Social Support & Peer Networks	Lateral peer solidarity and informal mentoring provide vital emotional validation and collaborative backing, neutralizing the isolation caused by destructive leaders (House, 1981; Halbesleben et al., 2014).
Institutional HR & Whistleblower Protections	Transparent grievance procedures, zero-tolerance policies, and secure anonymous reporting channels restore organizational justice and psychological safety (Allen et al., 2015; Tepper, 2007).

Discussion & Theoretical Implications

Synthesizing the collective empirical literature reveals a predictable and destructive trajectory wherein managerial hostility systematically transforms into chronic employee burnout. Across the reviewed studies, the evidence demonstrates that destructive leadership encompassing abusive supervision, petty tyranny, and narcissistic control acts as an unrelenting psychosocial stressor that continuously drains the psychological and emotional reservoirs of subordinates (Tepper, 2007; Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Rather than viewing burnout as a localized reaction to excessive workloads or mundane operational pressures, the synthesized findings confirm that interpersonal toxicity accelerates resource depletion at an exponentially higher rate. When employees are subjected to systemic gaslighting, public humiliation, and arbitrary rule enforcement, they enter a state of chronic hyper-vigilance, preventing psychological recovery and ultimately solidifying emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced efficacy (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001; Halbesleben et al., 2014). This downward trajectory is heavily mediated by the collapse of psychological safety and organizational trust, which strips employees of defensive buffers and pushes them toward withdrawal behaviors such as quiet quitting and turnover (Edmondson & Lei, 2014; Inceoglu et al., 2018). Building upon these synthesized insights, this review significantly extends current organizational psychology literature by bridging fragmented frameworks and mapping out newer, contemporary facets of destructive leadership within modern, post-pandemic, and hybrid work ecosystems. While foundational models like the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model and Conservation of Resources (COR) theory have traditionally accounted for general workplace stressors, this synthesis expands their application by redefining destructive leadership as an extreme, digitized job demand that transcends physical office boundaries (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Hobfoll, 2001). By integrating Social Exchange Theory with modern hybrid work dynamics, this work highlights how digital surveillance, techno-stressors, and virtual isolation interact with traditional managerial malice to create novel forms of psychological contract breaches (Galanti et al., 2021; Cropanzano et al., 2017). Consequently, this paper contributes a holistic, multi-level theoretical model that reframes chronic employee burnout not merely as an individual failure of coping, but as a systemic consequence of unchecked institutional and interpersonal toxicity (Allen et al., 2015; Kelloway et al., 2012).

Practical & Managerial Implications

To effectively mitigate the profound organizational, psychological, and financial damage precipitated by destructive leadership, contemporary institutions must decisively transition away from superficial, reactive employee wellness initiatives toward proactive, systemic interventions rooted in advanced human resource architecture and rigorous governance. First, human resource strategies must prioritize a comprehensive overhaul of leadership lifecycles, beginning with stringent selection protocols, continuous behavioral monitoring, and

uncompromising accountability metrics. Organizations should embed multi-tiered psychological screening tools and emotional intelligence evaluations during recruitment and promotion cycles to proactively identify and filter out toxic managerial archetypes such as narcissistic, Machiavellian, or psychopathic traits before candidates are vested with supervisory authority. Furthermore, integrating frequent, anonymous 360-degree feedback loops enables institutions to continuously track leadership conduct, catching the early behavioral precursors of abusive supervision, public humiliation, or petty tyranny before they destabilize team cohesion. Crucially, these diagnostic mechanisms must be tethered to strict, enforceable accountability frameworks where persistent destructive behaviors trigger immediate structural consequences, including mandatory executive coaching, formal performance probation, or structural demotion, thereby signaling an authentic zero-tolerance institutional stance against managerial malice. Second, bridging the chasm between workplace toxicity and employee psychological recovery requires the establishment of safe, transparent, and structurally autonomous reporting channels that effectively insulate subordinates from the fear of retaliation. Traditional internal grievance mechanisms frequently fail because vulnerable employees fear career stagnation, informal ostracization, or aggravated victimization by their direct superiors who control performance reviews. To dismantle these institutional barriers, human resource departments must institute independent grievance redressal cells, third-party ombudsperson services, and secure digital whistleblowing portals that guarantee absolute confidentiality and protect psychological safety. By ensuring that reported infractions are investigated with procedural justice, handled impartially, and met with immediate protective safeguards for the complainant, organizations can restore foundational relational trust, empower legitimate employee voice, and effectively halt the destructive psychological progression toward chronic occupational burnout.

Limitations & Future Research Directions

Despite the robust theoretical insights synthesized in this review, several inherent methodological limitations within the existing empirical literature must be critically acknowledged. A predominant portion of contemporary research examining the link between destructive leadership and chronic employee burnout relies heavily on cross-sectional survey designs and self-report measures administered at a single point in time. While these studies are instrumental in mapping preliminary correlational relationships, their static cross-sectional nature fundamentally restricts definitive causal inferences, leaving open the plausible alternative of reverse causality or unmeasured confounding variables such as pre-existing psychological distress or depressive tendencies in employees artificially distorting their perception of managerial intent. Furthermore, the prevailing reliance on single-source, self-reported data introduces severe common method variance and subjective reporting bias. Distressed employees navigating high-stress environments may systematically over-report supervisory hostility due to heightened negative affectivity, whereas fearful subordinates operating under tyrannical regimes may drastically under-report toxic incidents out of self-preservation and fear of institutional repercussions. Future investigations must therefore incorporate multi-source ratings, supervisor-subordinate dyadic data, and objective organizational metrics to ensure rigorous empirical validity.

Future Research Gaps and Directions

To overcome these structural constraints and significantly advance the theoretical boundaries of occupational and organizational psychology, future research must aggressively address several critical empirical gaps:

- **Longitudinal and Ecological Momentary Assessments (EMA):** There is an imperative need for multi-wave longitudinal designs and diary-based EMA methodologies. Tracking real-time, day-to-day interactions will capture the exact temporal evolution from isolated

micro-incidents of toxic leadership to the chronic, entrenched onset of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminished personal accomplishment.

- **Remote, Hybrid, and Algorithmic Work Environments:** As organizational structures permanently migrate toward distributed, digital-first, and hybrid ecosystems, empirical frameworks must pivot to examine how digital surveillance, asynchronous communication delays, and virtual isolation interact with traditional managerial malice. Specifically, research must uncover how techno-stressors compound the psychological toll of abusive supervision when physical face-to-face buffers are eliminated.
- **Cross-Cultural Invariance and Institutional Contexts:** The vast majority of existing empirical literature remains predominantly Western-centric, creating a major blind spot regarding how cultural frameworks dictate behavioral responses. Future comparative studies must evaluate how high-power distance, societal collectivism, and varying national labor regulations influence employee tolerance thresholds, cognitive appraisal mechanisms, and behavioral withdrawal choices (such as quiet quitting versus overt whistleblowing) when confronted with destructive leadership.

CONCLUSION

This systematic review demonstrates that chronic employee burnout cannot be successfully resolved through superficial, reactive wellness initiatives that merely target individual coping mechanisms or prescribe temporary stress-relief measures. As thoroughly mapped through the integration of the Job Demands-Resources model, Conservation of Resources theory, and Social Exchange Theory, destructive leadership functions as an extreme, unrelenting psychosocial stressor. It systematically depletes employee emotional reserves, shatters psychological safety, and induces profound psychological contract breaches. When managerial hostility, abusive supervision, gaslighting, and toxic behavioral patterns remain unchecked within corporate ecosystems, they inevitably foster an environment of chronic emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. The empirical evidence reviewed throughout this paper highlights that downstream consequences such as quiet quitting, counterproductive work behaviors, and high voluntary turnover are not isolated individual failures, but rather predictable systemic symptoms of structural toxicity. Therefore, safeguarding the modern workforce and fostering sustainable occupational health requires a fundamental paradigm shift in organizational strategy. Institutions must move decisively beyond palliative measures that treat only the symptoms of burnout and instead commit to the rigorous, systemic elimination of destructive leadership at its core. Achieving this necessitates a multi-pronged institutional commitment. Organizations must implement proactive governance frameworks, including multi-tiered psychological screening during recruitment, continuous 360-degree leadership monitoring, strict accountability measures, and independent, retaliations-free reporting channels. Furthermore, as work environments continue to evolve through post-pandemic hybrid structures and digital-first ecosystems, human resource strategies must adapt to address the compounding effects of techno-stressors and virtual isolation. Only by prioritizing systemic accountability, restoring organizational justice, and dismantling toxic leadership can contemporary organizations cultivate resilient, healthy, and high-performing work cultures where human psychological capital is genuinely protected and valued.

REFERENCES

- Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(2), 40–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273>
- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2015). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 278–308. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.2.278>

- Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Petty tyranny in organizations: A preliminary examination of antecedents and consequences. *Human Relations*, 50(7), 755–778.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Bowling, N. A., & Beehr, T. A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 998–1012.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.998>
- Cropanzano, R., Anthony, E. L., Daniels, S. R., & Hall, A. V. (2017). Social exchange theory: A critical review with theoretical remedies. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(1), 479–516.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0099>
- Detert, J. R., & Edmondson, A. C. (2011). Implicit voice theories: Taken-for-granted rules of thumb that inhibit employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3), 461–488.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.61967910>
- Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 23–43. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305>
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definitions and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 207–216.
- Galanti, T., Guidetti, G., Mazzei, E., Zappalà, S., & Toscano, F. (2021). Work from home during the COVID-19 outbreak: The impact on employees' remote working distress, engagement, stress, and exhaustion. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 63(7), e426–e432.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000002236>
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., Neveu, J.-P., Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., & Westman, M. (2014). Getting to the "COR": Understanding the role of resources in conservation of resources theory. *Journal of Management*, 40(5), 1334–1364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527130>
- Harter, J. K., et al. (2020). Well-being at work and its relationships with business outcomes: A multi-company, multi-level study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(8), 841–862.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50(3), 337–421. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00062>
- Inceoglu, I., Thomas, G., Chu, C., Plans, D., & Gerbasi, A. (2018). Leadership behavior and employee well-being: An integrated review and a future research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 179–202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.006>
- Karlsson, J., et al. (2021). Dark triad leadership and employee outcomes: A systematic review. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 42(5), 712–730.
- Kelloway, E. K., Turner, N., Barling, J., & Loughlin, C. (2012). Transformational leadership and employee psychological well-being: The mediating role of employee trust in leadership. *Work & Stress*, 26(1), 39–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2012.660774>
- 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>
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397–422. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397>
- Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its consequences. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 138–158.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.004>
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178–190.
- Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33(3), 261–289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300812>