The Interpersonal Pollution and its Effect on Group Members’ Well-Being, and on Culture of Unity in Organizational Context

ABSTRACT

The new concept of “interpersonal pollution” and its antecedents and effects, i.e. on organizational members’ health and well-being and on organizational outcomes are investigated. Building upon this work this presentation proposes a model and tentative definition of a broader construct, i.e. “organizational pollution”, and identifies its potential antecedents and explores its impact on humans’ health and well-being and organizational outcomes. In particular our model explores the roles played by leaders’ and members’ dark personalities and lack of environmental concern, by unethical leadership, by both the characteristics of the community and the organization, including the latter’s physical and ethical environment, and finally their link to organizational pollution. This new model implications for organizational and environmental psychology are discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

The effect of environmental pollution is often delayed and thus distant in time and space from the decision makers. As corporate decision makers are not usually directly and immediately affected
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by the consequences of their decisions causing environmental pollution, this delay in effect creates difficulties for corporate decision makers to adequately grasp the cause and effect relationship of their activities and pollution in the environment. Hence this delayed effect creates cognitive distortions in decision makers’ moral evaluations. According to Biela (1984) and Pietrulewicz (1984) many corporate decision makers lack a moral awareness of their actions in causing environmental pollution and they are lax in taking moral responsibility for their actions.

We also proposed some situational and environmental factors that might cause this delayed effect. For instance when environmental pollution problems arise, industrial and environmental activists seem to concern themselves mainly with problems in the process and, except when used as examples, only rarely do they seem be concerned with the individuals who are affected by the polluted environment. This can contribute to creating that delayed effect too. It is interesting to note that whilst he was considering his thesis. Finally Pietrulewicz (1984) also supported his claims of situational and environmental factors’ effect on pollution by referring to Urie Bronfenbrenner’s ecological systems theory (1979).

Bronfenbrenner, a Moscow born and American educated developmental psychologist, drew Pietrulewicz’s attention to the large number of environmental and societal factors influencing child development. In his Vygotsky-like ecological system’s theory, Bronfenbrenner (1979) suggests that an individual’s development is reflective of five environmental systems each containing roles, norms and rules shaping psychological development. First the «microsystem» refers to the institutions and groups that most immediately and directly impact the child’s development including: family, school, religious institutions, neighborhood, and peers. The person’s own biology may also be considered part of the microsystem; thus the theory has been recalled “Bio-Ecological Systems Theory.” Meanwhile the «mesosystem» represents the interconnections between the microsystems, for example the
interactions between the family and teachers. The «exosystem» involves links between a social setting in which the individual does not have an active role and the individual’s immediate context. For example, a parent’s or child’s experience at home may be influenced by the parent’s other experiences at work. Then the «macrosystem» describes the cultures and subcultures that impact one’s attitudes and evolves over time. Because each successive generation may change this macrosystem, this can lead to the development of a new and unique macrosystem. Finally Bronfenbrenner’s «chronosystem» includes the events that impact the child’s life, for example a divorce or the increase in opportunities for women to pursue a career. Since its publication in 1979, Bronfenbrenner’s theory has greatly influenced the way many psychologists approach the study of human beings and their environment.

ENVIRONMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANIZATIONAL POLLUTION

Environmental psychology is a science which studies the relationship between human behavior and the environment (Evans, 1982; Stokols, Altman, 1987; Lévy-Leboyer, 1988; Lévy-Leboyer, Duron, 1991; Lévy-Leboyer, Bonnes, Chase, Ferreira-Marques, Pawlit, 1996; Gifford, 2007; 2014; Zarola, Santos, 2010). According to Paradis et al. (2014) environmental psychology should be looking at both the natural and built environments, physical and social environments, and both real and virtual environments, as well as both studying more specific environments such as home, school, public parks, inner city and certainly the various work environments, indeed as suggested by Gifford (2014). Bronfenbrenner, who ten years after his death is still prominent in the field of human development, had suggested that human beings create
the environments that, in turn, shape their own development (Bronfenbrenner, 2005). Influenced by these person-environment perspectives, Paradis et al. (2014) focused on the organizational environment and more particularly on pollution in the workplace. Although not alone, Paradis et al. (2014) suggested that one can think of two broad kinds of pollution: physical pollution and human pollution (see Turk, Turk, Wittes, 1972). In brief physical pollution can arise from physical aspects such as harmful substances found in the air, in the water or in the building itself (e.g. rodents, mould, bacteria, chemical pollutants and radioactivity). Additionally, there are other physical aspects as excessive noise, poor lightning, spatial crowding, inappropriate temperature and certain odors which can be perceived as pollutants.

Meanwhile the authors also discussed another source of pollution that can be found in the workplace and which can also be detrimental to employees and ultimately to the organization, i.e. interpersonal pollution (Paradis et al. (2014). These authors define interpersonal pollution as being «a broader more global concept» that includes various types of both blatant and subtle organizational maltreatments. These interpersonal pollutants may range from the darker forms of leadership behavior on through to harassment, be it sexual, physical or psychological (Carroll, 2006) and can include psychological harassment’s predecessors: incivility (Cortina, Magley, Williams, Langhout, 2001; Dion, 2009) and blatant antisocial behavior (Babiak, Hare, 2007). Paradis et al (2014) went on to conclude that interpersonal pollution includes all those social attitudes and behaviors that can contaminate a workplace environment and which can have a crucial negative impact on the employee’s performance and well-being. Note some authors such as Sarine (2012) and Cammalleri (2012) had alluded to a similar concept, something they called social pollution. However Sarine’s concept of social pollution refers more specifically to discrimination caused by any implicit biases towards a worker,
whilst Cammalleri’s concept refers more specifically to undeclared work being imposed on the worker.

Next we need to turn our attention to those variables that potentially contribute to this interpersonal pollution including the characteristics of both leaders and followers, of the job itself and of the work environment. The first of these, leaders’ traits and behaviours and more specifically at dark supervision and leadership behaviours, are addressed in the following section.

DARK SUPERVISION AND LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOURS

Although millions of employees are subjected to unethical behaviours perpetrated by their supervisors (Andersson, Pearson, 1999; Tepper et al., 2006; Tepper, Henle, 2011; ECR, 2014), the research in this area has traditionally focused on its counterpart: ethical supervisory behavior and ethical leadership. Only recently researchers have started to pay attention to so-called dark supervision and in leaders’ behaviours per se (see Ünal et al., 2012; Hershcovis, 2011; Tepper, Henle, 2011; Brown, Mitchell, 2010; Tepper, 2007), i.e. when exploring the causes and effects of these supervisory and leadership behaviours. Some of these researchers have studied overt and physical types of dark supervisory behaviours such as sexual harassment, physical violence and overt hostility (Tepper, 2007). Still other researchers, often having implied that the more common manifestations of destructive supervisor behaviour involve non-physical actions, have studied behaviours such as angry outbursts, public ridiculing, scapegoating subordinates and the taking credit for a subordinate’s work (see Keashly, Trott, MacLean, 1994). Indeed Tepper (2007) went on to point out that, whilst many of these latter researchers use labels such as «petty tyranny» (Ashforth, 1994), «supervisor aggression» (Schat, Desmarais, Kelloway, 2006), and a supervisor’s «undermining» attitudes and behaviours (Duffy, Ganster, Pagon,
2002), most of the work conducted to date use the term «abusive supervision» (Tepper, 2000; Tepper, Duffy, Henle, Lambert, 2006). However, still other criteria have arisen in this literature. For instance, Einarsen, Aasland and Skogstad (2007) looked at what they deemed to be destructive leadership. They defined the concept of destructive leadership as the systematic and repeated behaviour by a leader, supervisor or manager that violates the legitimate interest of the organization by undermining and/or sabotaging the organization’s goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and/or the motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of his/her subordinates (Einarsen, Aasland, Skogstad, 2007).

Recently Ali Ünal at Rutgers University has reiterated a critique of this «dark» supervisory behavior literature, i.e. its lack of grounding in universal ethical theories (Ciulla, 1995; Ünal et al., 2012). It is interesting to note that Biela (1984) and Pietrulewicz (1986) had in fact grounded his own thinking in Kant’s philosophy of morality whereas most of the later scholars looking into unethical supervision, have implicitly used more intuitive, lay-type ethical criteria when proposing their models and defining and measuring their constructs (Ciulla, 1995). Unfortunately the practice of using intuitive, a-theoretical criteria, seems to have contributed to the emergence of a more fragmented and poorly integrated concepts and measures in this literature (see Tepper, 2007, for a review). Meanwhile Ünal et al. (2012) also noted that ethical leadership research, even though growing rapidly, lacks an explicit consideration of «normative» foundations. Drawing on four major normative theories commonly applied to ethical dilemmas found in the business world, i.e. justice, rights, utilitarianism and virtue ethics, Ünal et al. (2012) sought to derive new standards for analyzing the constructs and measures of unethical supervision. They categorized the various definitions underlying unethical supervisory constructs and scale items, and then went on to identify the dimensions of unethical supervision found in these four theories. Their analysis suggest that some behaviours
are currently understudied or completely missed in the existing literature. In particular they note that the emphasis has been on the violation of rights to dignity and autonomy (ex Behnke, 2005) as well as on distributive and procedural justice type problems (ex McFarlin, Sweeney, 1992; Usamani, Jamal, 2013).

Ünal et al. (2012) also note, as did Brown and Mitchell (2010), that ethical and unethical leadership have formed two separate streams, with the former focusing on exemplary ethical leader behaviour and the latter on supervisory behavior literature to unethical leadership, Brown and Mitchell (2010) suggest that all of these darker supervisory behaviours are unethical (Brown, Mitchell, 2010) and thus fit under the broader umbrella of unethical leadership. They also point out that unethical leadership is more than just the behavior of a leader but that unethical leaders can also encourage the deviant behavior in their followers (Brown, Mitchell, 2010). Thus, they define unethical leadership as the behavior of organizational leaders that violate moral or legal standards, and promote such acts in their followers. Meanwhile, grounded in the four normative theories discussed above, Ünal et al. (2012) also propose a definition of unethical supervision. They define unethical supervision as supervisory behavior that violates normative standards as opposed to the absence of exemplary ethical behavior. Their definition assumes a hierarchical relationship in which the supervisor has the formal authority over the subordinates and involves the use of power and authority in an inappropriate manner or for an improper purpose. When comparing the Ünal et al. (2012) definition, with the definition of unethical leadership proposed by Brown and Mitchell (2010), one can start seeing some similarities between these two definitions. A related issue underlined by Ünal et al. (2012) is the misunderstanding of the relationship between unethical and ethical leadership. The question is if are they independent constructs each varying from low to high or, are they the opposite ends of one continuum varying from unethical to ethical? Note that in
their article, Ünal et al. (2012) assume that these are independent constructs because according to them, the commission of unethical behavior (e.g., per Tepper 2007, on abusive supervision) is not usually synonymous with the omission of ethical behavior (e.g., per Brown, Treviño, 2006, on ethical leadership) antisocial and negative supervisory behavior, in comparing the dark side.

AN INTERACTIVE MODEL TO EXPLORE ANTECEDENTS OF UNETHICAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOURS

In his 1957 presidential address, Lee Cronbach called on psychologists to adopt a new paradigm: the coordination of both individual differences and environmental effects. (Cronbach, 1957; see Hunt, 1975). Since then the preferred approach in applied psychology is to measure those individual differences or personal dispositions in terms of personality traits (Raja, Johns, 2010; Stumpp, Muck, Hulsheger, Judge, Maier, 2010), in particular those based on the various five factor models (FFM; see Goldberg, 1980; Costa, McRae, 1985). Goldberg’s model of personality (1992), and his readily available open source measures and data, is popular among researchers (Plaisant et al., 2010; Martel, 2010). In one version people have only to describe themselves on a series of bipolar adjectives measuring the five key traits known under the acronym “OCEAN” (Tivendell et al., 2013). Although their use is still relatively scarce, we are now also seeing a growing interest in traits that describe the darker side of the personality (Hogan, Hogan, 2001; Paulhus, Williams, 2002; Lebel, 2015). Kaiser, LeBreton, Hogan (2015) define the darker side of personality as the way we behave when we feel stressed, tired and less alert, and by the way we are being perceived by others. According to some this research area falls within the DSM-V’s classification of personality troubles, but the symptoms are less acute (Schyns, 2015). So far a number of different traits can be found in the
measures of the darker side of personality, including Narcissism, Hubris, Social Dominance and Machiavellianism (see Judge, Piccolo, Kosalka, 2009). For their part, Paulhus and Williams (2002) use a three trait taxonomy of these socially undesirable traits, which they call the dark triad, and now the majority of research uses these three: Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and Psychopathy (Paulhus, Williams, 2002; Furnham, Richards, Paulhus, 2013; Paulhus, 2014).

Paulus’s approach for identifying dark traits was focused on those pathologies that are characterized by motives to elevate the self and to harm others (Paulhus, Williams, 2002), whereas Hogans’ approach was to focus on the dark side as negative characteristics that emerge when individuals let down their guard (Hogan, Hogan, 2001). For Paulhus and Williams (2002) the first of these three traits is **Machiavellianism**, which is described by referring to Machiavelli’s The Prince (Machiavelli, 1513), a ruler known for his cold nature and manipulative acts. The second is the subclinical trait of **Narcissism** which, it is argued, seems to be increasingly present in our society (Raskin, Hall, 1979; Raskin, Terry, 1988). People with a Narcissist personality tend to want to dominate others by most any means, to see themselves as superior, to impose their presence, to constantly vie for a higher status and to always be the center of attention (Paulhus, Williams, 2002). Finally the third is **Psychopathy**, a trait often measured using an adaptation of Robert Hare’s scale (Hare, 2003; Hare, Neumann, 2008), that researchers use to differentiate clinical from subclinical psychopaths. (Note that recently Paulhus (2014) has added a fourth trait, the everyday sadistic personality, but its usefulness as well as its reliability and validity are still being tested).

Next, we need to explore the research using these dark personality traits and studying their effect on both leadership in general and on organizational outcomes.
LEADERS’ DARK PERSONALITY, ITS EFFECT ON LEADERSHIP
AND ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOMES

Personality traits and leadership have a long history, but recently a number of studies have pointed towards dark personality as a possible culprit in the ongoing problems with failed leadership in organizations (Bentz, 1967; 1985a; 1985b; 1990; Burke, 2006; Dotlich, Cairo, 2003; Hogan, 1994; Hogan, Hogan, 2001; Kets de Vries, Miller, 1984; Leslie, Van Velsor, 1996; Lombardo, Ruderman, McCauley, 1988; McCall, Lombardo, 1983). For example rather consistent reasons for executives’ derailment have been postulated, some of which overlap strongly with dark personality, especially those problems involving interpersonal relationships (Spain, Harms, Lebreton, 2013). These include a description of the leader as being insensitive, manipulative, demanding, authoritarian, self-isolating, aloofness, critical, arrogance, melodrama, volatility, excessive caution, habitual distrust, mischievousness, eccentricity, passive resistance, perfectionism, and eagerness to please (Van Velsor, Leslie, 1995; Lombardo, McCauley, 1994; Dotlich, Cairo, 2003). However, in a recent meta-analysis, Gaddis and Foster (2015) seemed to have also found a significant and negative relationship between leader dark side personality and leadership behaviours that are critical for success, and indeed this effect could be found across several countries! Evidently more research must be done.

Meanwhile Hogan and colleagues (Arneson, Milliken-Davies, Hogan, 1993; Hogan, Hogan, 2001; Hogan, Raskin, Fazzini, 1990) and others (Benson, Campbell, 2007; Torregianete, 2005), found negative relations between dark side personality measures (HDS) and leader performance and it seem that this effect goes above and beyond the usual FFM measures’ effect. Other studies find complex nonlinear relationships where low to moderate scores on dark-side measures are unrelated to managerial performance but high scores are associated with lower performance (Benson,
Campbell, 2007). However Hogan postulated that these complex relationships could be explained in part by the work context. It seems that the context is an important determinant of whether dark personality traits will play a positive or a negative role in determining leadership effectiveness outcomes (Padilla, Hogan, Kaiser, 2007). Much of the above research, but not all, involved looking at a leader’s Machiavellian or Narcissistic trait (ex Deluga, 2001; Chatterjee, A., Hambrick, D.C. (2007), and some of the negative consequences of his or her leadership.

However to date, these traits’ influences on leader behaviours and outcomes, remains unclear (Campbell, Hoffman, Campbell, Marchisio, 2011; Judge et al., 2009). Several researchers had found that leader narcissism was negatively related to integrity and ratings of interpersonal performance (Blair, Hoffman, Helland, 2008; Helland, Blair, 2005; Kets de Vries, Miller, 1985; Mumford, Connelly, Helton, Strange, Osburn, 2001). Meanwhile Van Dijk and De Cremer (2006) found that narcissistic managers were more self-serving than their counterparts, with an inclination to allocate scarce organizational resources to themselves, and even to the extent as being linked to white-collar crime (Blickle, Schlegel, Fassbender, Klein, 2006). Moreover Judge, LePine and Rich (2006) suggest that narcissistic leaders may be prone to enhance self-ratings of leadership attractiveness and influence, and that these same leaders are generally viewed negatively by others, which then results in lower job performance and fewer examples of organizational citizenship among subordinates. Narcissism has also sometimes been found to relate to counterproductive work behaviors (Judge et al., 2006; Penney, 2002; Penney, Spector, 2002), which share similarities with unethical leader behaviors.

On the other hand, some research indicates that narcissistic leaders may be effective at least as it appears superficially. For example, Deluga (1997) found that narcissistic American presidents were deemed more charismatic and their performance was rated higher than non-narcissistic presidents. Grijalva, Harms,
Newman, Gaddis, and Fraley (in press; cited in Schyns, 2015) conducted a meta-analysis of narcissism that suggests that there is a relationship between narcissism and leadership emergence, but not with leadership effectiveness. This appears to be consistent with the bright and dark side of narcissism: for instance at first, narcissists seem confident but in the longer run, this turns into entitlement (Campbell, Hoffman, Campbell, Marchisio, 2011). Nevertheless, O’Reilly, Doerr, Caldwell, and Chatman (2014) found that narcissistic CEOs receive better compensation and their compensation was more discrepant with their members’ than non-narcissistic CEOs. Lastly, we should note that still other research has found no link between narcissism and leader effectiveness (Chatterjee, Hambrick, 2007; Judge et al., 2006; Resick, Whitman, Weingarden, Hiller, 2009).

Recently, Hoffman et al. (2013) investigated the link between leader narcissism and follower perceptions of ethical leadership and leader effectiveness, including the potential moderating role of ethical context. They found no significant associations between leaders’ narcissism and follower perceptions of both ethical and effective leadership. But, in this study, Hoffman et al. (2013) did find ethical context to be a moderator of the influence of narcissism on follower perceptions of leadership. Results indicate that the negative effect of narcissism on followers’ ratings of leadership increases as the organization’s climate becomes more ethical. That is, when the organizational climate demands ethical behavior, narcissists are perceived as less ethical and less effective. In contrast, in less ethical contexts, the adverse consequences of leader narcissism on follower perceptions of leadership were reduced. Specifically, in less ethical contexts, narcissism manifested a positive but no significant relationship with follower ratings of ethical and effective leadership. Thus, Hoffman et al. (2013) point to the importance of reinforcing an ethical context and to the importance of leader selection.
Meanwhile some studies show that Machiavellian leaders can be proficient at forming political alliances and cultivating a charismatic image (Deluga, 2001; Judge et al., 2009). In a study of 39 U.S. presidents, ratings of Machiavellianism were positively associated with not only charisma but also rated performance (Deluga, 2001). Machiavellian leaders also tended to serve more years in elected office and have a greater number of legislative achievements (Simonton, 1986). On a less positive note Judge et al. (2009) describe Machiavellian leaders as seeking control over followers, they cite McHoskey (1999) as saying they use tactics of impression management, and they cite Becker and O’Hair (2007) of avoiding motives of organizational concern and prosocial values. Judge et al. (2009) also suggest that these leaders have a natural talent for influencing people, for being able to talk others into doing things for the leader’s personal benefit, for sometimes clearly abusing their power in an organization and for being less willing to adhere to formal procedures or to ethical and moral standards, but instead for being concerned with maximizing opportunities to craft their own personal power. Machiavellian leaders seem also to be rated as more abusive by their subordinates than low Machiavellians (Kiazid et al., 2010). More recently, Den Hartog and Belschak (2012) suggest that Machiavellians leaders may authentically display ethical leader behaviors if they perceive this is a useful way to reach their goals even though they privately hold less moral beliefs. Thus, they argue that the positive impact of ethical leadership on engagement will be reduced for those leaders for who private identity and expressed identity are not in line as followers are likely to pick up on inauthentic displays (see too Zapf 2002). Thus support for a moderated or mediation model of this trait has been found. The effect of ethical leader behaviours on engagement was less strong when ethical leaders were high as opposed to low on Machiavellianism.

Finally we should look into the third dark trait, what the famous forensic psychologist Robert Hare called «psychopathy»
In 2006, Babiak and Hare published their book entitled «Snakes in suits: When psychopaths go to work», in which they suggested that one could observe a presence of “darkness” among those in management positions. Keeping in mind that we are mainly talking about subclinical levels of psychopathy, according to Hare and his colleagues about 3 percent in higher level positions in organizations are psychopaths (Babiak, Hare, 2007; Babiak, Neumann, Hare, 2010). Others note that this subclinical form of psychopathy is associated with positive outcomes such as communication skills, and with negative outcomes such as poor management skills and hard manipulation tactics (Smith, Lilienfeld, 2013). While we need more research into psychopathy in the workplace, preliminary evidence suggests that individuals with this subclinical form of psychopathy are likely to be attracted to positions of influence and thus might be slightly over-represented in leadership positions and appear to be mainly toxic for an organization.

Reflecting on these inconsistent and sometimes counterintuitive findings, Harms et al. (2011) noted that the nature of the dark side personality appears “far more complex than originally thought” and suggested that “there is a great deal of research to be done” (p. 508) to understand how it affects leadership. In their article, Kaiser, Lebreton, Hogan (2015) offer some theoretical explanations for these inconsistencies. They suggested that the effectiveness of leader behaviour is typically conceptualized in a linear way where, for instance, more consideration or initiation is assumed to be “better”. However, Kaiser et al. (2015) explain that this ignores a key finding in the early derailment research that strengths can become weaknesses through overuse (McCall, Lombardo, 1983; see also McCall, 2009). According to Kaiser et al. (2015), although the concept of strengths overused is acknowledged, it is seldom applied in the measurement of leader behaviour as the standard method relies on Likert-type rating scales where higher scores indicate more frequent or more
effective behaviour. According to Kaiser et al. (2015), this method confounds doing a lot with doing too much; it also blurs the distinction between deficiency and excess as two distinct sources of ineffectiveness (Kaiser, Kaplan, 2005). Thus, Kaiser et al. (2015) proposed that this may be one reason why leadership research on dark side traits has produced inconsistent findings. In their study, Kaiser et al. (2015) used a measurement methodology that allowed raters to distinguish when managers do too little or too much of specific leader behaviours. Their results demonstrated that scores near the normative mean on the dark-side traits were associated with optimal levels of the leader behaviours, translating into strengths, whereas both high scores and, unexpectedly, low scores were associated with extreme, ineffective leader behaviours, translated into weaknesses. Support for a moderating effect for Emotional Stability was also found.

In general it thus seems that a leader’s dark personality may, in the short term, be associated with what may appears to be a positive relationship with good leadership and both employees and organizational positive outcomes. However, what appears appealing in the short term may, in the long term, evolve into very toxic and unethical leadership behaviours which in turn will contribute to a more polluted organizational environment. Moreover some researchers have found that an ethical context and a bright personality dimension such as emotional stability, can moderate the relations between leaders’ dark personality and leadership and outcomes (Hoffman et al., 2013; Kaiser et al., 2015. Thus, much as Hoffman et al. (2013) have suggested, reinforcing an ethical context and having an efficient leader seems to be necessary to avoid having to deal with the devastating consequences of unethical leadership and polluted organizations.
Today academics and professionals have come to recognize that leadership is a process that includes not only leaders, but also followers and the context (Hollander, 1992; Kellerman, 2004; Lord, Brown, 2004; Uhl-Bien, 2006; Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, Carsten, 2014; Padilla, Hogan, Kaiser, 2007). Although the role of the followers has been studied less than that of the leaders, their role in the leadership process is now obviously important (Baker, 2007; Boccialetti, 1995; Carsten et al., 2010; Carsten, Uhl-Bien, 2013; then Cornelis, 2012 and Camps et al., 2012, as cited in Crossman, Crossman, 2011; Den Hartog, Koopman, 2005; Hollander, 1992; Hollander, Offermann, 1990; Keller, 1999; Lord, Brown, 2004; Meindl, 1995; Nye, 2005; Offerman et al., 1994; Sy, 2010; Uhl-Bien, 2005; Uhl-Bien, Carsten, 2007; and Yukl, 2005). Following a review of the literature on “followership”, Baker (2007) suggests that the definitions of “followership” are better seen as relational roles, a perspective shared by Kelley (1998, cited in Crossman, Crossman 2011). Based on this perspective Crossman and Crossman (2011) define “followership” as a complementary factor to leadership and they endorse the idea put forth by Carsten, Uhl-Bien, West, Patera, and McGregor (2010), suggesting that the concept of “followership” represents leadership ascending (upward) or, more specifically, a relational role in which “followers” have the ability to influence leaders, to contribute to the improvement of the group and to its achieving of the organization’s goals. That is followers can have a direct upward impact on the behaviour of their leaders.

According to Hollander (1995) and Perreault (1997), researchers interested in studying organizational ethics must also explore the influence of subordinates on maintaining ethics in their organization. The Hinrichs’ (2007) study on “followers” crimes of obedience, that is of blind acceptance of directives or the collusion
of “followers” against a leader’s directives, is an example of why research should now also focus on the ethical or unethical behaviours of “followers”. Meanwhile Uhl-Bien and Carsten (2007) attempt to explain the psychological processes involved when an employee must deal with unethical behaviours of a manager. According to them, having to face such a situation engenders a sense of moral distress, that is an ability to recognize the morally appropriate way to behave but at the same time a sense of restriction in relation to one’s ability to taking an appropriate action. Moreover this sense of moral distress can further «enhance» by personal characteristics (lack of courage, helplessness, lack of control) and/or situational characteristics (climate or unethical culture) resulting in anxiety, regret and in extreme cases, physical and mental disorders. Indeed according to Uhl-Bien and Carsten (2007), either active or passive reactions are possible in this situation. Active reactions are defined by actions to maintain ethical standards when leaders’ ethical behaviour can be questionable. In contrast passive reactions represent acceptance, compliance or ignorance vis-a-vis such unethical situations. From this perspective it is possible to see that the “followers”, by their reaction to a manager’s unethical behaviour, can contribute or not to maintaining the current ethics of their organization. A number of researchers have already suggested that various personal characteristics such as the shifting of responsibility (Carsten, Uhl-Bien, 2013; Blass, 2009; Burger, 2009, Milgram, 1965; 1974; Wood, Bandura, 1989; Modigliani, Rochat, 1995) and a level of moral disengagement (Bandura, 1991; 1999), and also various situational characteristics such as communication flow and work climate (Miller et al., 1995; Carsten, Uhl-Bien, 2012), can indeed influence the follower’s decision to obey or resist a leader unethical request.

Note that in their model of what is destructive leadership, which they called the toxic triangle, Padilla et al. (2007) also highlighted the influence of interactive factors to explain leaders’ destructiveness that is the leader, the follower and the environ-
ment. This model first highlights five individual characteristics of destructive leaders: charisma, personalized use of power, narcissism, negative life themes, and an ideology of hate. Next the model refers to two types of susceptible followers, namely the colluders and the conformers. According to Padilla et al. (2007), while colluders actively contribute to destructive leadership, conformers can also contribute to the destructive leadership process by their obedience. Finally Art Padilla suggests four environmental factors that also seem to be important for destructive leadership to occur, respectively: instability, perceived threat, cultural values, the absence of checks and balances, and institutionalization (Padilla et al., 2007). Building on this work Thoroughgood et al. (2012) would further divide Padilla’s conformers, i.e. into lost souls, authoritarians, and bystanders, and divide Padilla’s colluders, i.e. into acolytes and opportunists. According to Thoroughgood et al. (2012), these types of susceptible followers are a response to different triggers. Meanwhile the role of followers in the process of destructive leadership has been further outlined in recent two theoretical articles. For example May, Wesche, Heinitz, and Kerschreiter (2014) outline how followers’ coping strategies for dealing with abusive supervisors can actually increase a leaders’ abusive supervision when the leader interprets a followers’ coping behaviour as being either aggressive or submissive. Another example can be found in Pundt’s (2014) observation that, for example, a followers’ refusal to «accept» a leader’s charisma can often lead to abusive behaviours by this leader due to his or her feelings of frustration. This line of thinking is similar to Barbara Kellerman’s when she talked about undue influence being given to a leader due to the followership’s actions or lack of action (Kellerman, 2008).

Some more recent studies bring still a different perspective on the role of followers in this leadership processes. For example, Grijalva and Harms (2014) attempt to show which followers could work most effectively with narcissistic leaders. This is also in line
with Jonason, Wee, and Li (2014) who call for finding “niche” (p. 119) for individuals who score high on one of the dark triad personality traits, i.e. in order to make use of their personality in a positive way. In another recent study, Lebel et al. (2015) explored the effect of followers’ bright and dark personality traits as well as their perception of their work, of their organization’s culture and a subset of this latter, the organization’s ethical culture, and finally of their evaluation of their supervisor’s ethical and unethical leadership, as these contribute to their level of stress at work. The result of this latter study demonstrated that employees’ bright and dark personality and certain environmental factors, each had unique relationships with ethical and unethical leadership and with their level of stress at work (Lebel et al., 2015).

Overall, the research outlined above highlights one important aspect, that unethical leadership behaviour is the product of not only the leaders’ individual characteristics but also of the context as well as of the followers (employees) reactions to leaders’ unethical behaviours. These reactions in turn are also influenced by followers own individual characteristics and by environmental or situational characteristics. Next we take a look at some of these organizational environmental characteristics.

ORGANIZATIONAL ENVIRONMENT, ITS EFFECTS ON UNETHICAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL POLLUTION

The organizational context is now a frequently cited significant consideration when studying, evaluating or planning for a work outcome (ex Harvey, Jas, Walshe, 2014). Meanwhile this organizational context has been define in terms of its structure (Campion, Medsker, Higgs, 1993; Mintzberg, 1993), its procedures (Tivendell, Doucette, 1998; Guilliland, 1993), its climate (Denison, 1996) and its culture (Schein, 1996; Denison, 1996; Muchinsky, 2000). For example there is a long scientific tradition of studying the orga-
nization’s culture or climate in order to explain and predict the behaviour of managers and employees (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Denison, 1996; Hofstede, 1991; Schein, 1985). Similarly many studies have demonstrated that organizational culture has a significant influence on employees’ attitudes and behaviors and on the organization’s productivity and effectiveness (Danna, Griffin, 1999; Hartnell, Ou, Kinicki, 2011; Dextras-Gauthier et al., 2012; Dion, 2009; Levesque, 2006; Martel, 2010; Smith et al., 2012; Zheng, Yang, McLean, 2009). Indeed a recent albeit untested model suggests that an organization’s climate or culture may explain, much of the variance in individual and organizational outcomes, previously thought to be contributed by its structure and its procedures (see Levesque, 2006; Martel, 2010).

In the business ethics literature, attention to the context initially did focus largely on ethical climate. For example Victor and Cullen (1987, 1988) were among the first to develop a model of the informal ethical context in organizations. Their definition of ethical climate – «those aspects of work climate that determine what constitutes ethical behaviour at work» (Victor, Cullen, 1988, p. 101) – is much cited and their model and its corresponding questionnaire have often been used since to study the influence of ethical climate on unethical behavior (e.g. Kish-Gephart et al., 2010; Martin, Cullen, 2006; Peterson, 2002a; 2002b; Schminke, Ambrose, Neubaum, 2005; Treviño et al., 1998; Vardi, 2001; Wimbush, Shepard, Markham, 1997a; 1997b). Recently, Grijalva and Harms (2014) found that the ethical climate of an organization has an effect on a narcissistic leader’s behaviour. However, we should note that this approach has not been without critics (Brown, Treviño, 2006; Kaptein, 2008; 2011; Debode et al., 2013).

As a subset of organizational culture, the ethical culture of an organization is regarded as an important component of the organizational context in order to account for unethical behavior. (see Casey, Davidson, Schwartz, 2001; Key, 1999; Ford, Richardson, 1994; Fritzsche, 1991; Sims, Brinkmann, 2003). Ethical organiza-
tional culture here can represent various formal and informal systems of behavioral control, or at least of influence, that are capable of promoting either ethical or unethical behavior (Brown, Treviño, 2006; Debode et al., 2013; Kaptein, 2008; 2011; Treviño. Youngblood, 1990; Treviño et al., 1998). These may include policies (e.g., codes of ethics), leadership, authority structures, reward systems, training programs and peer behavior and the implementation of certain ethical norms. Some measure ethical organizational culture using a unidimensional questionnaire (ex Treviño et al., 1998) whereas others assess it using a multiple dimensions questionnaire (ex Debode et al., 2013; Kaptein, 2008; 2011). The literature also provides evidence that an ethical organizational culture can positively influence several employee attitudes, behaviours and even their health (Debode et al., 2013; ERC, 2010; Huhtala et al., 2011; Kaptein, 2011; Ruiz-Palomino, Martinez-Canas, 2014; Treviño et al., 1998) organizational effectiveness (Kish-Gephart et al., 2010; Riivari, 2012) and even ethical leadership (Toor, Ofori, 2009; Schaubroeck et al., 2012).

CONCLUSION: UNETHICAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL POLLUTION, SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY.

In this latter we suggest that employees’ bright and dark personality traits, work characteristics and organizational characteristics have unique relationships with ethical and unethical leadership as well as with employees general health and stress.

At this time our understanding of the relationship between bright and dark personality traits, job and organizational characteristics, and their link to ethical and unethical leadership and to organizational pollution, is still very limited (Paradis et al., 2014; Lebel et al., 2015). This article may be a first attempt to enhance our understanding of these relationships. It also presents a model,
if not a plan, for subsequent research to expand our knowledge of
the relation between organizational pollution and environmental
pollution. However, more studies are needed. This is also very
much in line with the recommendations put forth in Ünal et al.
(2012), in Ruiz-Palomino and Martínez-Canas (2014) and even in
Besio and Pronzini (2014) which includes exploring the role that
corporate morality, ethics, and values plays in the public debate
on environmental issues such as climate change.
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