

Toxic Leadership and its possible meaning and resulting in Medical Departments

Evangelia Michail Michailidou, Olivia Mavromoustaki

*ICU Director, Anaesthesiologist-Intensivist, General Hospital of Agrinio
Emergencies Department Director, Surgent, General Hospital of Thessaliniki, Hippokratio*

Date of Submission: 20-06-2023

Date of Acceptance: 29-06-2023

DEFINING TOXIC LEADERSHIP

A number of academic research and popular articles published in the press, have focused on a particular type of destructive or harmful leadership that it is called "toxic leadership" These describe the devastating effects of toxic leadership on a wide spectrum organizations, industries and organizational stakeholders. Except her of toxic leadership, the same "family" also includes "abusive" (Tepper, 2000), the "tyrannical" (Ashforth, 1994), the "destructive" (Einersen et al., 2007), "bullying" (Namie and Namie, 2000) and "liberal" leadership (laissez-faire) (Einarsen et al., 2007).

The term toxic leader first appeared in 1996 from the analysis of Dr. Marcia Lynn Whicker on the three different types of leaders in organizations: the "trustee", the "transient" and "toxic". Toxic leaders are, according to her, "maladapted", "disaffected" and often "malicious" people who they succeed by tearing others down. They fight and control others instead of uplifting their followers (Whicker, 1996, p. 66). They have a "deep but well-disguised sense of personal inadequacy, selfish values and are clever at cheating (Whicker, 1996, 12).

Toxic leadership basically refers to a process in which leaders, either because of their dysfunctional personality traits, either/or because of it destructive behavior, they can harm their followers, the organizations they participate in, but also the people they don't follow (Lipman – Blumen, 2005). However, the definition of toxic leadership is not quite clear, since the toxic leader for one person can be the "hero" at the same time of another person, given that the context we are referring to takes place important role in such situations (Lipman – Blumen, 2005). According to her (Lipman – Blumen, 2005), to be able to understand how complex the concept of toxic leadership, we should have a framework that will examine them intentions of toxic leaders, the intensity of the toxicity of their actions, its types destructive

behavior in which they engage, the types of dysfunctional personality traits they are driven to take some decisions, as well as the consequences of their decisions and actions.

Williams (2005) wanted to expand the above definition noting that toxic leadership it appears from people who do not seek it and harm those around them a little, up to and including people who are overtly evil and cause serious problems. She stated that at one end of the spectrum, dysfunctional leaders may simply be unskilled, not productive and completely oblivious to the fact that they lack the necessary talent to lead. At the other extreme, toxic leaders will find their success and glory through it destruction of others. Either psychologically or even physically, they will be satisfied with her harm they can cause to others (Williams, 2005, p. 1). Its definition Williams (2005), therefore, leads us to the conclusion that toxic leadership can be both intentional and unintentional. This, of course, depends on the behavior of each leader (Green, 2014, p.19).

Any definition of toxic leadership must take into account the characteristics of followers, as well as the characteristics of the leader. Kusy and Holloway (2009) explained that the toxic leaders can only thrive in a toxic environment. Of course, the explanation it causes them to debate about what comes first, the toxic environment or a toxic leader which creates it. Padilla and colleagues (2007), also wanting to provide a definition in toxic leadership, they talked about the "Toxic Triangle", which is an interaction of the leader, his followers, (who are either defined as his "associates", or as persons who have "complied" with him), as well as his environment, which facilitates this situation (Padilla et. al, 2007). Their definition for destructive leaders he emphasizes the "negative results for them organizations and individuals associated with and affected by destructive leaders" (p. 176). In other words, the damage done is systemic. Combining the various definitions, we

find two elements that define toxic leadership. First of all, behavior of toxic leaders harms (directly or indirectly) people within the organization. And second, their behavior leads to systemic damage to its effectiveness organization (Green, p. 19).

According to Wilson-Starks (2003), toxic leadership “is a leadership approach that it harms people – and ultimately the company – through its poisoning of excitement, creativity, autonomy and innovative expression” (2003). The Goldman (2006) approached toxic leadership from a psychological perspective and showed that the personality disorders are a source of highly toxic and dysfunctional organizational behavior. Furthermore, a toxic leader doesn't necessarily have to displays toxic behaviors in all situations. The complexity of the concept it is further enhanced by the fact that different toxic leaders display different levels and types of toxicity, and the impact of toxic decisions and their actions also vary greatly (Walton, 2007). Based on research on military organizations, Reed (2004) reported that leaders who displayed negative and destructive leadership tendencies tend to push their organizations toward destruction, while the same problem exists in the corporate sector, while he also added that the toxic leadership can be characterized as an apparent lack of concern for the welfare of the existing ones. It is a personal or interpersonal technique that negatively affects the organizational climate. Pelletier (2012) also argued that toxic leadership behaviors addressed to some members of the group will still affect the rest group, creating negative outcomes for all members.

From all of the above we can conclude that toxic leadership most of the time it is easier to describe than to define strictly, as it is quite complex sense. Toxic leadership is a leadership style in which leaders, because of the negative their behavior, they cause long-term and serious harm directly to their followers and indirectly in their organizations. The leader's interpersonal style affects the shaping organizational culture both when it is positive and when it is negative.

In conclusion, then, we can say that toxic leaders are those who deliberately or they inadvertently destroy the fabric of the institution of leadership.

Characteristics of Toxic Leaders

A first attempt to uncover the characteristics of toxic leaders carried out by Kets de Vries and Miller (1984), who adopted a strict psychodynamic approach. Using case studies, they described leaders that cause systemic damage to their bodies in terms of the various types nerves.

They explained how organizations can take on the same characteristics of one particular type of neurosis as seen in their leader. For example, they described including the paranoid leader, the depressive leader and the schizoid leader. The play by Kets de Vries and Miller (1984) was influential and drew attention to the need for further research on toxic leadership (Green, 2014).

We can say that the characteristic features of toxics are many and varied leaders. A key characteristic is intentionality in the toxic's actions leader, i.e. the intention he has to harm or do an action at the expense of someone others and this is exactly the difference between the unintentionally toxic leader and the toxic leader. An additional key characteristic of toxic leaders is scarcity integrity, while also high on this particular list are cynicism, unreliability, hypocrisy and corruption. Another characteristic, which pushes toxic leaders to put their own welfare and glory above that of their followers, is the insatiable ambition that distinguishes them. Another element of their problematic character is the arrogance, which prevents them from seeing their mistakes and weaknesses. Amoral is, also, a problematic feature – like all the above we have mentioned – which does not allow toxic leaders to distinguish right from wrong actions them (Lipman – Blumen, 2004). Avarice, greed and indifference to the consequences of of their deeds are some other elements that they possess according to Lipman – Blumen (2004). Two more characteristics, which, however, point to unintentional toxicity leadership is cowardice and the inability to understand the true nature of the problems with resulting in the inability to find solutions (Lipman – Blumen, 2004).

Whicker (1996) stated that toxic leaders are bullies, they want to impose on others and fight anywhere. They are maladjusted, ill-willed and often malicious and mischievous people, who manage to tear others down in order to achieve what they want. They want to control followers instead of elevating them and apart from all this, they also have a deep-rooted but and well-disguised sense of their personal inadequacy. Finally they are possessed out of selfishness, but also cleverness in hiding things. Reed (2004) lists three common characteristics of toxic leadership (the last 2 are not characteristics of the leader), which are the obvious lack of interest in their subordinates, the conviction of subordinates that their leader is motivated primarily by self-interest and that the personal and interpersonal dynamics of leaders negatively affect organizational climate.

According to Tepper (2000), toxic leaders are characterized by rudeness, favoritism, coercion, insult and disrespect of subordinates in front of others. Toxic leaders have a predisposition to the emotion of hatred, high levels narcissism, individualized need to demonstrate power, and negative life experiences them (Lepsius, 2006). Each element is of course necessary, but not sufficient to characterize a leader as toxic. For example, a person full of hate who does not have charisma may be driven by grandiose dreams but unable to communicate or to recruit followers and therefore not be able to achieve and maintain one leadership position (Padilla et al., 2007). Some other characteristics have been linked to toxic behaviors are aggression, abusive behaviors, selfishness, greed and the lack of integrity. Box (2012) in his study of military leaders identified three types of behaviors that describe each leader style. The three different ones Leaders who stand out, according to these behaviors, are the "Micro-manager" (Micromanager), the "Pretender" and the "Egomaniac". The "Micromanager" invades the privacy of others and has a hidden agenda, o "Pretender" rejects the opinions and ideas of others, who exhibit unethical behavior and "Egomaniac" manipulates people.

However, not all toxic leaders are completely ineffective. Many are excellent successful in the results they bring. Steele (2004) noted that toxic leaders they are not usually incompetent or ineffective leaders in achieving clear mission objectives. He said that many times they are strong leaders, who have the right things characteristics, but with the wrong intensity and with the wrong desired end state, i.e. the self promotion above all else. One does not become a toxic leader overnight.

In summary we conclude that the characteristics of toxic leaders they cover the whole range of negative characteristics that we can encounter generally to a man. Of course, there are some positive aspects of their character, but these are not enough to balance the negative effects they cause on their followers and organizations in general.

Types of Toxic Leaders – Dimensions of Toxic Leadership

In a study conducted by Schmidt (2008), a list of toxic types was created leaders. Himself using his own scale (which we also use at our research below), identified 5 types of toxic leaders. They are: a) the one who wants self-promotion, b) the one who uses abusive language - abusive supervision, c) unpredictability, d) o narcissism and

e) the authoritarian leader. Lubit (2004) classified toxic leadership into four main types: narcissistic, aggressive, stiff and weakened. According to him, the root causes of these behaviors are the negative characteristics of the leader's personality, the mood disorders and his impulsiveness.

According to Pelletier (2010), we can distinguish eight dimensions - types of toxicity leadership:

- 1) Attacks on the self-esteem of followers (humiliation / marginalization of employees).
- 2) Lack of integrity (that is, blaming others for his mistakes, going against the views and actions of the employee or to change the regulations framework to achieve its goals).
- 3) Abuse of power (threat to his professional and/or personal safety employee).
- 4) Social exclusion.
- 5) Splitting (ostracizing employees by, for example, telling an employee that not a team player).
- 6) Promoting inequality.
- 7) Threats to the safety and physical integrity of fans (use of physical aggressive acts, forcing workers to endure hardships) and
- 8) "Liberalism" - Laissez-Faire Leadership (failure to listen or act on it with employee concerns).

According to Veldsman (2016) there are 5 types of toxic leaders:

"The Goldfish" – "Cold Fish", where any decision and action is justified if it brings the desired results.

10) "Snake", where the toxic leader uses his followers in order to satisfy his greed and feel more powerful.

11) "Glory Seeker", where personal glory is sought and self-promotion at any cost, whether contributed or not.

12) "The Puppet Master" - "Puppet Master", where here the toxic leader wants to have the absolute control over everything, everyone and in all circumstance

"The Monarch" - "Monarch", where in this case the leader considers that all assets of an organization are available for its own use, as if that is, he rules a kingdom.

So the more productive these toxic leaders are in an organization, the more toxic it is it is the organization (Veldsman 2016). Kellerman (2004, 284), who states that "all categorizations are in some somewhat arbitrary, nevertheless the effort facilitates clearer thinking", he separates "bad" leader in seven categories, from incompetent to immoral.

So the categories are the following seven:

Incompetent, where he lacks the ability, the will, or both to act effectively. Reason for this type of toxic – bad leader can it is low intelligence or carelessness in his actions.

Rigid, which is essentially the unyielding type of leader who persists in his perceptions and does not accept ideas and opinions of others.

Impulsive (Intemperate), who lacks self-control and is motivated by fans who are unable to see the dangers that exist. In the category this includes toxic leaders who have behaviors and habits such as gambling, alcohol consumption, sexual indiscretion and do not take them into account effects their behavior may have on others.

Hard – Callous, where he is indifferent to feelings, needs, wishes and wants of others. Group members are not treated with attention and especially subordinates may be mistreated.

Corrupt, where here we are in the case "the purpose sanctifies the inside". Such leaders will lie and deceive. They're putting it to the test interest above the interests of others.

Narrow-minded (Insular), who essentially ignores the health and well-being of others are outside the group. As the author typically says "if not us affects something directly, we do not concern ourselves" (Kellerman, 285).

Evil, where here is the worst style of toxic - bad leadership. THE leader and some of his followers will only commit atrocities. It does abuse of power creating serious problems such as physical, mental, materials or even all three.

Behaviors of Toxic Leaders

Toxic leaders are sometimes difficult to identify and recognize.

Often protected by their followers and/or the organization or business itself. I generally very competent and efficient, but only superficially, since in the long run incur high human and economic costs. The most common set of symptoms "toxicity" is when the leader has an obvious lack of interest in subordinates' belief that their leader is primarily personally motivated interests and when personal and interpersonal dynamics negatively affect the organizational climate (Reed, 2008). Lipman-Blumen (2005) in her research states that the toxic leaders exhibit behaviors characterized by undermining, demeaning, seduction, marginalization, intimidation, frustration, discredit, inability to imprisonment, torture, terrorism and alteration of their working environment their followers. They also exhibit negative behaviors that tend to lower morale, the motivations, self-esteem of their followers and to impose an unrealistic

burden work. They are abusive, engage in workplace bullying, harassment, and the deception. They tend to be obsessed with power and abuse it, with

in order to convey to their followers the message that they should never question their decisions or actions.

Many times they also mislead their followers by deliberately lying and exaggerating or suppressing the facts, depending on their personal interests. They compete with anyone they believe has the potential to challenge the position them, including potential successors and tend to use strategies "divide and conquer" to turn people against each other (Bloom, 2006). Ashforth (1994) describes the 'bad manager' as a person who he uses his position and powers for personal interests and is abused mercilessly the policies of the organization. Such a leader blocks initiatives, fails to achieve desired goals, behaves rudely and ruthlessly to his subordinates and shows contemptuous behavior. Jowers (2015) described toxic leaders as a combination of self-centered attitudes, motivations, and behaviors that negatively affect their subordinates, the unit, and the company's results work. Toxic leadership behaviors fall on a continuum ranging from obscene gestures to physical abuse of others and from petty theft to fraud; deception and distortion of facts against the organization (Mehta & Maheshwari, 2014, p. 21).

Toxic leaders want to control using a poisonous power to complicate the organizational structure. They boost their ego and don't pay attention to nobody but themselves. They reduce working imagination and employee productivity with their harmful behaviors and attitudes.

They use scapegoats for the problems that arise and blame others when something goes wrong in the body. The abusive, illegal, harmful behaviors are assessed as toxic behaviors (Koys, 2001; Hitchcock, 2015). Pelletier (2010) emphasized that toxic behaviors are those that deprive worker's rights, ignoring their ideas, marginalizing and harassing him. He also noted that their behaviors create emotional instability, while the they themselves have a tendency to blame others for their own mistakes, to threaten her job security of employees, use lies and alienate members of the group among themselves.

Toxic leaders generally belittle, criticize and bully their colleagues.

They consider themselves very successful and try to project this image and to the others. They lack empathy, sensitivity, humanity and hope (Schmidt 2008, 2014). Common behaviors repeated

by toxic leaders are avoidance of existing, the appearance of aggressive behaviors against others, humiliation of subordinates, as well as hiding work goals from the rest club. Also common is to blame others for their own mistakes and to intimidate their followers (Steele, 2011). Of course, not all leaders are toxic themselves, as reported by Kusy and Holloway (2009) and separate toxic leadership behavior in three types: a) to the leader who embarrasses someone, b) to the one who shows passive hostility and c) to the one doing group sabotage. So, they reported how the three behaviors above are linked together to maintain toxic leadership.

However, through these types it is not clear to what extent leadership is toxic in practice (Green, 2014, p. 21).

Examples, also, of toxic behaviors according to Kellerman (2004) can be the toxic leader's constant critical attitude towards the work performance of his subordinates, the use of the latter's ideas as his own, as well as the humiliating them in front of other colleagues. Toxic leaders consciously adopt

and intentionally demeaning and unfavorable attitudes toward employees. They show off hostile attitude towards them and also, their mean-spirited behavior is fueled by the power they hold. The toxic behaviors of leaders are spreading throughout the world organization and poison the employees and the work climate. Its dominance toxic leadership style brings about the distant behavior of the employees and damages the sustainability of organizations (Gündüz & Dedekorkut, 2014; Reyhanoğlu & Akın, 2016). The toxic leaders can make a decision in a very short time and to change any decision unexpectedly and without giving a valid reason.

When making a decision, toxic leaders usually don't think about the consequences brings about and generally believe that they always do the right thing. Also, because their behaviors do not go hand in hand with the welfare of the workers, they negatively affect the whole organization and its climate (Eğinli and Bitirim, 2008).

Regardless of what various researchers identify as toxic leadership behaviors, most of them agree that these behaviors are unacceptable. The in recent years, the reason for the collapse of many well-known and famous international organizations has been attributed to toxic leadership behaviors to a large extent (Example). Hence, it has become imperative for organizations to recognize their toxic leaders and lead them to modify their behavior so that the latter to work collectively to achieve organizational goals.

Sources and causes that create Toxic Leadership

If we take a look at the past of toxic leaders we will see that they do not develop toxic ones trends overnight, but in reality their style has evolved into a longer period of time (Mehta & Maheshwari, 2014). Extremely toxic this style has become when not fought by someone superior or someone else of the same rank. When the specific leaders occupy higher-level positions in an organization, impact of their behavior is even greater (Mehta & Maheshwari, 2014).

Therefore, the more power an evil leader has, the more toxic he becomes. Leadership toxicity also stems from a perceived threat to a leader for status, power and control, which causes toxic behavior in those who are vulnerable. Small changes in an executive's power and achievements, which are generally achieved after a lot of hard work and effort, may be perceived as a threat and cause psychological insecurity and harsh defensiveness reactions. These strains become more vulnerable and sensitive and feel compromised their identity and reputation. (Mehta & Maheshwari, 2014).

Ludeman and Erlandson (2004, 58) explained that successful leaders failed to use their emotional intelligence to such an extent that "the more executive power the people acquired, the more pressure they felt and the more their faults were becoming apparent", which in turn strengthened her sense their vulnerability and generally caused toxic behavior. Organizations could, also, to become a breeding ground for toxic or dysfunctional behaviors by providing their own toxins, through counterproductive policies and practices, including of absurd goals, excessive internal competition and cultures that encourage category play (Lipman-Blumen, 2005). Another reason that can cause toxic leadership, is the fact that these leaders take advantage four basic needs and two basic fears. These are the need of power, the need for security, the need to feel special, the need to belong somewhere, the fear of it exclusion and the fear of weakness (Lipman-Blumen, 2015).

Lack of experience and confidence is another reason for toxic leadership. The promotion or the selection of personnel for a managerial position based on urgency of a specific activity for a leading person and the examination of finances constraints often leads to the selection of less qualified personnel (Wilson-Starks, 2003). This is what happens in the recent promotions in the army based on accelerated pace of combat, as well as in the selection of personnel in companies without detailed candidate study (Wilson-Starks, 2003).

Some toxic leaders have also fared poorly standards. Since they have been led by toxic leaders, they are operating under a false definition of leadership. They are often staunch advocates of "strong leadership," but they have distorted definition of power. They think they have to control everything, without they realize that excessive control produces toxic effects. It still might have unresolved psychological issues (such as fear of the unknown, fear of failure, etc.) mistrust of people, feelings of inadequacy, lack of trust or overconfidence), who cover them up by practicing toxic leadership (Wilson-Starks, 2003).

Leaders who relentlessly pursued irrational profits from quarter to quarter could, also, to be an important source of this type of leadership (Macklem, 2005). Another source of toxicity is when more weight is given to average performance than to value-based production. These types of organizational practices tend to stifle the above average artists, who feel frustrated and dissatisfied. A another reason for the emergence of toxic leadership is when the personal agendas of the leaders take precedence over the long-term welfare of the organization (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003). When the dysfunctional behavior of leaders in senior positions shaped by subordinates, then the focus is more on the individual interests rather than organizational goals, resulting in an ineffective organization.

When, too, followers avoid disagreements with leaders for fear of retaliation, there is a threat of emerging workplace toxicity (Jones, 1996). The leaders who usurp their position and power in such situations, tend to take control of the workplace and become quite rigid and unyielding in their approach, blind to new ideas or existing proposals (Macklem, 2005). The impatient and nervous leaders who are constantly on edge in the workplace, will they could also be the cause of toxicity (Macklem, 2005). Those leaders develop the habit of getting angry, yelling, making unreasonable demands, use abusive language and openly belittle employees (Macklem, 2005). When subordinates are treated as financial liabilities by superiors leadership instead of assets, then a culture is likely to be created toxicity which could lead to decay of morale and self-esteem of workers (Macklem, 2005). As toxicity occurs in leaders, the hard hardworking and honest subordinates tend to shy away from toxic atmosphere, resulting in greater employee turnover. Results – Consequences of Toxic Leadership

If we look at toxic organisms, things may seem normal externally, but unfortunately within the organization there are serious problems. Feeling

disability, reduced autonomy, lack of opportunity for participation, irregular work situation, reduced efficiency and innovation, lower labor satisfaction, mental and psychosomatic problems such as anxiety, depression, frustration and stomach problems, are all known symptoms of toxic leader behavior (Ashforth, 1994). There is ample evidence of the impact of toxic leadership, both on organizational as well as individual level. Organizational results include negative impact on organizational performance (Ashforth, 1997), counterproductive work behavior (Duffy, et al., 2002) and higher turnover intention (Tate, 2009). The counterproductive ones behaviors tend to be attributed to the injustice suffered by employees, which in turn they repay them by causing lasting and systemic damage to an organism, such as sabotage and providing inaccurate information, while also ceasing to be cooperative with their colleagues. The awareness of the presence of toxic behaviors from the outside workforce can also negatively impact an organization by attracting and other people of similar moral behavior (Sutton, 2007).

Individual-level outcomes include lack of motivation, sexual harassment (Chan, Lam, Chow & Cheung, 2008), reduced job satisfaction; (Tate, 2009). Studies have also shown that abusive leadership has a positive relationship with turnover intentions and employee stress and a negative relationship with organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Rayner and Cooper, 1997). In addition, the workers who face an attack on self-esteem show low self-confidence and reduced sense of self-efficacy, which leads to deterioration of individual performance (Kusy and Holloway, 2009). Other, also, harmful effects of toxic leadership is that it reduces motivation, creativity, satisfaction, productivity, engagement, employee performance, while increasing problems health, stress and exhaustion, as well as their intention to quit organization (Lipman-Blumen, 2005; Kellerman, 2004; Liu, Liao & Loi, 2012; Aboassin & Abood, 2013; İzgüden, Eroymak & Erdem, 2016; Burns, 2017).

The most obvious implication is that while toxic leadership is associated with reduced performance, commitment and job satisfaction of employees, the more you should strong efforts are made to reduce the likelihood of such disasters behaviors (Lipman-Blumen, 2005). Being solely focused on their own person and in their own goals, toxic leaders often make bad decisions about the team members (for example their employees), but also for the organization, since are able to sacrifice, either consciously or unconsciously, the good of

others for their own their. Such toxic leaders are not limited to business and politics, but they are found in all areas of social life (Lipman-Blumen, 2005).

According to William (2016), humans tend to choose or follow a very different kind of leader. We hire and promote psychopaths, narcissists, bullies and authoritarians, self-interested and those whose long-term impact may harm or even destroy organizations (even countries). Many people easily forgive these toxic leaders and the damage they cause because they measure their success solely by economic terms or because they provide entertainment value to the organization'. However, in the long run, such short-term benefits are undoubtedly canceled out by hidden costs and collateral damage caused to people and organizations by dysfunctional behavior of the toxic leader. Such damages are the reduced productivity due to increased absenteeism and sick leave (the negative impact on physical and mental health), the poor performance of employees due to lack of commitment and dissatisfaction at work, the reduced brand value due to damage to the organization's reputation, legal costs, etc. (Sutton, 2010, pp. 213-220, Sutton 2007, pp. 27-50). In military environments, toxic leadership is seen as even more damaging, as o impact of toxic leaders on the performance of their subordinates is greater for those who find their work meaningful and have a strong sense of commitment (Harris, Kacmar, Zivunska & Shaw, 2007). Reed (2004) stated that in a military organization, toxic leaders erode unit cohesion and reduce team spirit and at worst case scenarios, toxic leadership could even lead to mutiny or death.

Other less serious effects include loss of confidence, reduced effectiveness and commitment, misinterpretation of communication and reduced well-being followers (Ashforth, 1997). In short, toxic leadership affects mindset, loyalty and completing a soldier's mission.

Finally, toxic leadership manifested in an organization or business can have effects such as negative emotional moods and mood swings, (anger, despair, frustration, pessimism and aggression) counterproductive and meaningless work, destructive and counterproductive behavior by employees (Veldsman 2016). Other negative effects and consequences are physical and emotional disengagement or withdrawal of employees, such as absences and lack of contribution to work (Veldsman 2016). Other serious consequences for organizations are unethical or deviant behavior (theft, fraud and sabotage) and is important to report that these

particular workers have poor well-being, health and low morale, perhaps even dissatisfaction with life (Veldsman 2016). Workers' health problems are increasing with the toxic behaviors of leaders, even when their performance, job satisfaction and their organizational commitment tend to decrease (Schmindt, 2008, 2014). Alienation, lack of confidence and hopelessness are some of the psychosocial effects of bad / destructive / toxic / harmful / dark leader style in relation to employees – incumbents – followers – peers. Insomnia, weakness, discomfort, fatigue, anorexia, dermatological and ergonomic problems are also related to toxic leads behaviors (Başar, Sıgri & Basim, 2016).

REFERENCES:

- [1]. Aboyassin, N.A. & Abood, N. (2013). The effect of ineffective leadership on individual and organizational performance in Jordanian institutions, *Competitiveness Review*, 23(1), 68-84 Adams, L. & Bryan, V. (2021). Workplace harassment: The leadership factor, *Healthcare Management Forum*, 34(2), 81 - 86. Akca, M. (2017). The Impact of Toxic Leadership on Intention to Leave of Employees, *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, 1(4), 285-298.
- [2]. Astrauskaite, M., Notelaers, G., Medisauskaite, A. & Kern, M.R. (2015). Workplace harassment: Deterring role of transformational leadership and core job characteristics, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 31(1), 121 -135. Aubrey, D.W. (2012). The Effect of Toxic Leadership, *Strategy Research Project, US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA*. Basar, U., Sigri, U. & Basim, N.H (2016). Dark Leadership in the Workplace, 3(2), 65-76.
- [3]. Behery, M., Al Nasser, A.D., Jabeen, F. & El Rawas, A.S. (2018). Toxic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Mediation Effect of Followers' Trust and Commitment in The Middle East, *International Journal of Business and Society*, 19(3), 793-815.
- [4]. Berthelsen, M., Skogstad, A., Lau, B. & Einarsen, S. (2011). Do they stay or do they go? A longitudinal study of intentions to leave and exclusion from working life among targets of workplace bullying. *International Journal of Manpower*, 32(2), 178-193.

- [5]. Bhandarker, A. & Rai, S. (2019). Toxic leadership: emotional distress and coping strategy, *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 22(1), 65-78. Białowolska, W.D., Białowolski, P. & McNeely, E. (2020). The impact of workplace harassment and domestic violence on work outcomes in the developing world, *World Development*, 126. Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Hjelt-Bäck, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior*, 20(3), 173–184. 57 Branch, S. (2014). You say tomatoe and I say tomato: Can we differentiate between workplace bullying and other counterproductive behaviours?, *International journal of organizational behavior*, 13(2), 4 – 17.
- [6]. Box, J.E. (2012). Toxic Leadership in the Military Profession, Strategy Research Project US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA. Burns, W., A. (2017). A descriptive literature review of harmful leadership styles: Definitions, commonalities, measurements, negative impacts, and ways to Improve these harmful leadership styles, *Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership*, 3(1), 33-52.
- [7]. Choudhury, A. (2019). Questionnaire Method of Data Collection: Anvantages and Disadvantages. Chua, S.M. & Murray, D.W. (2015). How toxic leaders are perceived: Gender and information – processing, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 36(3), 292 – 307.
- [8]. Davis, Q.L. (2016). A Comprehensive Review of Toxic Leadership, Research Report, Air War College, Air University, Maxwell AFB. Einarsen, S. (2000). Harassment and bullying at work: A review of the Scandinavian approach. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 5(4), 379–401.
- [9]. Einarsen, S., Raknes, B., Matthiesen, B. (1994). Bullying And Harassment At Work And Their Relationships To Work Environment Quality: AN Exploratory Study. *European work and organizational psychologist* 4(4), 381-401. Einarsen, S., Hoel, H. & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, Factor Structure and psychometric properties of the negative acts questionnaire-revised, *Work & Stress*, 23(1), 24 – 44.