

# Ineffective Leaders are Unable to Carry Out Leadership Actions Successfully and Exhibit Incompatible Leadership Traits

Dr. John Motsamai Modise  
South African Police Service

**Abstract:-** The article's goal was to make readers more conscious of the detrimental consequences toxic leadership has on workers' levels of output, motivation, and satisfaction. It is necessary to deepen our understanding of the impact toxic leadership has on employee satisfaction, motivation, and output. Ineffective leaders are those who lack the abilities or act in ways that are incompatible with effective leadership. Negative Leadership has approached the topic from several different perspectives. The article provides an in-depth overview of toxic leadership, destructive leadership, abusive supervision, and unethical leadership. These concepts are then used to analyze case studies. The majority of research and thought on leadership has focused on what makes a good leader. Leaders are deemed ineffective if they lack the traits or display the actions required for effective leadership. In his extensive framework for leadership, Bass published seven distinct leadership types, each with subtypes. Toxic management, weak leadership, narcissistic leadership, leader error, and small-scale tyranny are a few of them. A damaging leadership approach, toxic leadership can hurt both people and organizations. However, there is still no agreement on how to react to the question of whether leadership practices are perceived as improper, detrimental, or toxic to enterprises, and there is no precise definition of the term in the related literature. Toxic leadership refers to a leadership style that is harmful to its subordinates and, consequently, to the company they work for. A pattern of actions that are not only detrimental but also encourage leaders to pursue their own goals and rewards at the expense of the interests of their team members is known as toxic leadership. Lower-level employees in the business can be negatively affected by the destructive behavior of leaders in the workplace.

**Keywords:-** Police leadership, police management, leadership, toxic leadership, destructive leadership, abusive supervision, unethical leadership, Workplace Deviant Behavior.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Toxic leadership has been described by academics as "a style of leadership characterized by abusive behavior used to bully or manipulate people" (Fahie, 2019: 13). This style of leadership is often known as dark leadership, destructive leadership, or just terrible leadership. Implicit behavior significantly affects people on a psychological, emotional, and financial level. It also significantly affects

the organization itself, as seen by high staff turnover, greater skepticism, decreased commitment to the company, and employees engaging in unproductive behavior at work. Fahie, (2019: 13). Toxic leaders, according to Armitage, are those who, among other things, bully, threaten, shout, and whose mood swings dictate the office atmosphere on any given workday, encouraging employees to gossip about their bosses in hallways and cubicles (Armitage, 2015; 17). Or, to put it another way, we refer to leaders as toxic when they significantly injure both people and organizations (Hadadian and Zarei, 2016; 11).

Three fundamental components of toxic leadership, according to Adem, are "lack of concern for subordinates' well-being, personality or interpersonal techniques that negatively affect organizational climate, and subordinates' belief that leaders are motivated primarily by self-interest" (Hadadian and Zarei, 2016; 11). Some behaviors are unique to the concept of toxic leadership. For instance, toxic leadership is the only type of behavior that pits members of one group against those of another, disarms colleagues, and presents a toxic agenda as a noble vision. On the other hand, behaviors that are linked to effective leadership include insulting, marginalizing, mocking, blaming others for the leader's mistakes, and humiliating others for the leader's mistakes (Yavaş, 2016: 267, Mehta, Maheshwari, 2013: 8). As a result, it might not be wholly inaccurate to assume that toxic leadership behaviors foster an environment where undesirable organizational behavior can thrive. A hostile work environment will probably make it simpler to intimidate other employees. This is because, despite being unwanted, such behavior may be subtly permitted by a poisoned environment (Kurtulmuş, 2020:1).

Employees serve as a source of bravery, innovation, future leadership, and creativity for the company (Seth, 2011). Additionally, employees serve as a conduit between the company and its stakeholders. According to research, however, cynical workers are more inclined to criticize or question their employer (David, Stanley, Meyer, and Topolnytsky, 2005: 429). According to research by Debra Meyerson, Karl, Weick, Roderick, and Kramer (2009: 31), unfavorable remarks made by employees have a detrimental impact on both the customer experience and the bottom line of the company. Consequently, it matters how an employee feels about their company. The problem of worker cynicism appears to be widespread in scope. According to surveys, more than 50% of participants identify as cynical at work (Wayne, 2004: 44). These pervasive pessimistic sentiments don't seem to be abating. Cynicism is a problem that affects

a wide range of organizations worldwide and is not just present in the workplace.

## II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Researchers' interest in negative, poisonous, and harmful leadership has only grown since the turn of the 20th century. Since then, several research has been conducted to develop the conceptual framework that provides the theoretical groundwork for framing and analyzing the less desirable behaviors that can occur in military environments. Negative effects result in inefficiency and less-than-ideal outcomes, while the impacted groups' relationships, collaboration, and cohesion suffer. As was already mentioned, the components "leader," "followers," and "context" are all included in the leadership process. Bad leadership can emerge from any one of these three things alone or a combination of them. In light of this, the toxic triangle model was developed to symbolize the detrimental effects brought about by the combined actions of harmful leaders, gullible followers, and supportive environments (Andersson and Bateman, 1997: 449).

Nearly every theoretical framework places a strong emphasis on the "leader" component. Studies have made an effort to pinpoint the potentially harmful behaviors of leaders and their corresponding effects. The literature highlights several characteristics that define damaging leaders. According to Philip, Donald, and Kanter (1992: 45), the destructiveness of leaders does not result from a singular incident but rather from a pattern of systematic and repetitive behavior in daily actions. These actions may be taken in the direction of an individual or a group (Rebecca, 2000: 269), or they may even hurt subordinates and organizations by infringing upon their legitimate interests. James and Matrecia, (2005) In addition to being viewed negatively by followers, these behaviors are made worse when it is believed that the leader is doing them on purpose (Dean, Jr., Brandes, and Dharwadkar 1998: 341).

According to Einarsen, Aasland, and Skogstad's conceptual model of destructive leadership leader's actions can have a beneficial or negative impact on both the company and its subordinates. Four different forms of leadership are created when these behaviors are blended into two dimensions. One of these categories is productive, while the other three are harmful. Tyrannical leadership negatively impacts subordinates in favor of the organization, supportive-disloyal leadership negatively impacts the organization in favor of subordinates, and derailed leadership negatively impacts both the organization and the subordinates are examples of destructive leadership styles. An organization's goals, duties, resources, and effectiveness are all affected negatively.

The traits of destructive leaders include charisma, personalized use of power, narcissism, negative life themes, and more (Douglas and Brown, 2001: 133); we, therefore, analyzed narcissistic traits in leaders, which translate into people with a heightened sense of self-importance, preoccupation with themselves, and who ignore others, and who thereby display a complete lack of empathy in interpersonal relationships. They reject advice because they

believe that people will follow them because of the quality of their ideas (Argyr, 1964: 341). Despite their insecurities, they make an effort to project a brave and self-assured image, which, while initially advantageous, ultimately backfires because they refuse to accept responsibility for their errors (Andersson, 2002: 429). The toxic leader syndrome is defined by Reed as having three main characteristics: "an apparent lack of concern for the well-being of subordinates; a personality or interpersonal technique that negatively affects the organizational climate; and a conviction by subordinates that the leader is motivated primarily by self-interest" (Andersson, 2002: 430).

A paper by Rego, Cunha, and Gomes (Arthu, Bedeian, 2007: 9), this study was based on employees from different employment sectors and revealed eight categories of leader behaviors that are despised by employees. These are listed in order of importance:

- Aggressive and impulsive bosses who are haughty and domineering, lack emotional self-control and treat subordinates with disrespect by instilling fear and issuing threats.
- Leaders who lack motivation, are disorganized and dull, have poor time-management abilities, and are unprofessional, slothful, careless, and messy.
- Leaders who are self-centered and authoritarian, who make all choices alone and tightly regulate their staff; they do not value their potential or promote their growth.
- Leaders who are unfair and/or dishonest, who are partial and/or have character laws.
- Demobilizing leaders who don't encourage performance development or properly recognize the work and effort of their subordinates.
- Leaders who lack self-confidence, are indecisive, passive, and sycophantic, dislike accepting responsibility for their actions, and/or are easily swayed by others.
- Errant leaders who fail to properly define the roles of performers or their goals, show poor planning and strategic vision skills, and leave the team in a state of confusion.
- Anti-team leaders that fail to promote harmony, assistance, and camaraderie.

In her book, "Bad Leadership: What It Is, How It Happens, Why It Matters," by Bernard Bass & Bass (1990: 627). Seven behaviors are categorized by Kellerman as being indicative of poor leadership; three of these behaviors lead to ineffective leadership and four to unethical leadership. Incompetent behavior leads to ineffective leadership. Leaders who lack the motivation or expertise to bring about constructive change, as well as dogmatic leaders who are unable or unwilling to change their ways or adopt novel concepts. Leaders that act unethically are indifferent and disregard others' needs and rights. The actions of callous leaders who ignore or disregard the needs of others, corrupt leaders who put their interests before those of others, solitary leaders who disregard the health and welfare of others, and evil leaders who use suffering as a tool of power all result in unethical leadership.

Two key characteristics of toxic leadership, according to Schaubroeck et al., (2017) are antagonism and negative affectivity. When people are hostile, they vent their irritation and rage, which harms their relationships with their subordinates. A leader's negative affectivity is their unfavorable attitude toward both herself and others. They are unable to maximize the potential of others based on positive traits since they are so focused on the bad. To put it briefly, "both traits are associated with a negative outlook, a lack of interpersonal sensitivity, and a less effective style of interacting with others" (Tepper, 2000: 178).

Regarding the actions of leaders, the autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles are at opposing ends of the spectrum; both have detrimental impacts, encouraging discontent, fear, and mistrust. In emergencies and when subordinates are inexperienced or incompetent, the autocratic style, which is characterized by centralized power and directive and controlling leadership actions, may prove to be the most effective (Ashforth and Tyranny, 1994: 755). It may even have the advantage of ensuring team psychological safety. Negative outcomes may also result from the passive and deceptive leadership behaviors that are typical of this type. Whicker (1996) states that laissez-faire leadership is characterized by a lack of communication, a reluctance to make decisions, a refusal to accept responsibility, and a disregard for offering support. Passivity, indecision, and inaction breed ambiguity over goals, roles, and responsibilities, conflict emergence and escalation, a deteriorating work environment, and decreased job satisfaction.

### III. CHARACTERISTICS OF TOXIC LEADERS

Toxic military leaders, according to Joe Doty and Jeff Fensalson (2013), are amoral, haughty, cowardly, dishonest, dissatisfied, greedy, incompetent, insecure, irresponsible, maladjusted, malfeasant, malfunctioning, malevolent, malicious, narcissistic, self-absorbed, single-minded, and untrustworthy. Toxic leaders also engage in a variety of dysfunctional behaviors such as lying and unfair punishment to achieve their goals, self-promotion at the expense of subordinates, the punishment of honest mistakes, limiting communication with subordinates, problem-solving at the surface level, and time wastage (Department of the Interior).

Some critics have categorized the personality traits, actions, and attitudes of toxic leaders rather than listing each one individually. The toxic leader syndrome has three main components, according to Reed: a lack of concern for the welfare of subordinates, personality traits and actions that undermine organizational climate, and the perception among followers that the leader's main motivation is self-interest (Reed, 2004: 67). Micromanagement, mean-spirited/aggressive, rigid/close-minded, and poor attitude/example are the four main categories that Steele said toxic leaders fell into (Steele, Antecedents, and Consequences of Toxic Leadership in the U.S. Army).

According to Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser (2007), the traits of toxic leaders include charm, personalized use of authority, narcissism, negative life themes, and an ideology of hatred. Other writers (1990) examined narcissistic traits in leaders, which are characterized by people who have an exaggerated sense of self-importance, are preoccupied with themselves, neglect others, and exhibit a complete lack of empathy in interpersonal interactions. They reject advice because they believe that people will follow them because of the quality of their thoughts (Doty and Fensalson, 2008).

Despite their insecurities, they make an effort to project a brave and self-assured image, which, while initially advantageous, ultimately backfires since they don't accept responsibility for their errors (Robert Hogan and Robert and Kaise, 2005: 169). According to Reed (2004), the three main components of the toxic leader syndrome are: "an apparent lack of concern for the well-being of subordinates; a personality or interpersonal style that negatively affects the organizational climate; and a belief by subordinates that the leader is motivated primarily by self-interest.

According to an article by Rego, Cunha, and Gomes, there are eight sorts of leadership behaviors that are unpopular with staff members. His research was based on workers from various industries. These are listed in order of importance:

ü Aggressive and impulsive bosses who are haughty and domineering, lack emotional self-control and treat subordinates with disrespect by instilling fear and issuing threats.

- Leaders who lack motivation, are disorganized and dull, have poor time-management abilities, and are unprofessional, slothful, careless, and messy.
- Leaders who are self-centered and authoritarian, who make all choices alone and tightly regulate their staff; they do not value their potential or promote their growth.
- Leaders who are unjust, partial, or have character laws, as well as unfair and/or dishonest.
- Demobilizing leaders who don't encourage performance development or properly recognize the work and effort of their subordinates.
- Leaders who lack self-confidence, are indecisive, passive, sycophantic, dislike accepting responsibility for their actions, and/or are easily swayed by others.
- Errant leaders who fail to properly define the roles of performers or their goals, show poor planning and strategic vision skills, and leave the team in a state of confusion.
- Anti-team leaders that fail to promote harmony, assistance, and camaraderie.

In her book "Bad Leadership: What It Is, How It Happens, Why It Matters," Kellerman offers a typology of seven characteristics connected to poor leadership, of which three are tied to ineffective leadership and four to unethical leadership. Inflexible leaders who are unable or unable to adapt to new ideas, temperate leaders who lack self-control, and incompetent leaders who lack the skills or capacity to effect positive change are all causes of ineffective leadership. Leaders that behave unethically are callous and

disrespect the needs and rights of others. Unethical leadership results from the activities of callous leaders who disregard or ignore the needs of others, dishonest leaders who put their interests ahead of those of others, lone leaders who disregard the health and welfare of others, and evil leaders who utilize misery as a means of power.

Hostility and negative affectivity are the two key characteristics linked to harmful leadership, according to Schaubroeck and colleagues (2017). When people are hostile, they vent their irritation and rage, which harms their relationships with their subordinates. A leader's negative affectivity is their unfavorable attitude toward both herself and others. They are unable to maximize the potential of others based on positive traits since they are so focused on the bad. Briefly stated, "Both traits are linked to a pessimistic outlook, a lack of interpersonal sensitivity, and a less effective way of interacting with others" (Schaubroeck, Walumbwa, Ganster, and Kepes, 2007: 238).

Regarding the actions of leaders, the autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles are at opposing ends of the spectrum; both have detrimental impacts, encouraging discontent, fear, and mistrust. In emergencies, as well as when subordinates are inexperienced or incompetent, the autocratic style, characterized by centralized power and directive and controlling leadership actions, may prove to be the most suitable style (Blanchard), and it may even have the advantage of ensuring team psychological safety (Annebel. De Hoogh, Greer, and Deanne, Den & Hartog, 2015: 689). According to Anders Skogstad, Stale Einarsen, Torbjorn Torsheim, Merethe Schanke Aasland, and Hilde Hetland (2007: 80), the passive and indirect behaviors typical of the laissez-faire style of leadership can also have detrimental effects

Laissez-faire leadership is characterized by a lack of communication, a reluctance to make decisions, a refusal to accept responsibility, and a disregard for offering support. Passivity, indecision, and inaction breed ambiguity over goals, roles, and responsibilities, conflict emergence and escalation, a deteriorating work environment, and decreased job satisfaction.

Returning to the topic of the toxic triangle, Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser emphasize the significance of the two remaining components—vulnerable followers and a supportive environment—in addition to destructive leaders. One can distinguish between conformers, who stay silent out of fear of retaliation, and colluders, who actively work with leaders for their benefit. Susceptible followers, who serve as catalysts for the damaging behaviors of toxic leaders, fall into both categories. The latter group of followers includes sycophants as well as people who are skilled at manipulating views to be viewed more favorably by leaders. Keep in mind that followers' perceptions of the leader's intentions and their conviction that the leader is primarily pursuing their interests have a significant role in how toxic the leader's damaging behaviors are.

Instability, perceived threats, cultural norms, and the absence of checks can all create conducive situations. The importance of cultural values may be shown in the fact that

when they are not shared, they can lead to constant conflict, schisms, instability, and uncertainty within the group, which in turn causes stress and worry. A leader's lack of self-control, recklessness, or arrogance can exacerbate the negative impacts of toxic leadership.

#### IV. DIMENSIONS OF TOXIC LEADERSHIP

To predict employee turnover intentions, work happiness, and supervisor satisfaction, Schmidt (2008) provided a scale of toxic leadership (Burns, 2017). This scale contains five components: self-promotion, authoritarian leadership, authoritarian management, and abusive supervision.

##### A. *Petty dictatorship or unsuitable leadership*

Ashforth, who coined the term "petty tyranny," was one of the first to discuss a particular poor management technique. He recognized six key traits of petty tyrants while formulating the notion of petty arbitrariness and self-aggrandizement; belittling of subordinates; lack of consideration; a forcing method of conflict resolution; discouraging initiative; and non-contingent punishment. Ashforth discovered that petty tyranny had the following negative effects on workers: lower leader endorsement; higher frustration, stress, and reactance; greater helplessness and alienation; and work-unit cohesiveness. Other researchers have discovered a link between petty tyranny and job satisfaction as well as intentions to quit (Reed and Bullis, 2013: 595).

##### B. *Destructive leadership*

The term "destructive leadership" was introduced by Einarsen, Aasland, and Skogstad. They defined it as "the systematic and repeated behavior 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 effective" (Krasikova, Green, James, and LeBreton, 2013: 1308). Because destructive leaders can have an impact on both subordinates and organizations, the term "destructive leadership" encompasses more than just petty tyranny or abusive leadership.

They contend that oppressive management and petty despotism can both be advantageous to the organization. According to Hauge, Skogstade, and Einarsen (2007), destructive leadership includes both poor leadership and leadership that is intentionally detrimental. Bullying, job unhappiness, workload, work pressures (including position ambiguity), interpersonal issues, and job instability have all been linked to destructive leadership in the workplace (Ibid., 220–242). Destructive leadership alone, according to Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser, is not the root of these issues. (Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser, 2007: 176) A toxic triangle of destructive leadership, gullible followers, and supportive environments must exist.

Thoroughgood, Tate, Katina, Sawyer, and Jacobs (2012): 230–255) have offered the idea of harmful leader behaviors as an alternative to the concept of toxic leadership. They identified three elements of harmful leader behavior: behavior directed toward suborbehavior oriented

toward the organization, and behavior directed toward sexual harassment. A self-regulatory process that draws on psychological resources and a social cognitive process that is founded on the notion of planned behavior are the two explanations for damaging leader behavior that Wang, Sinclair, and Deese identified in their dual-process model (Ajzen, 2010: 73).

Among the factors that lead to these processes are the integrity cluster (conscientiousness, agreeableness, and neuroticism in the Five-Factor Model of Personality), resilience traits (appraisal of stressors, use of resources to stressors, ability to cope, level of adverse outcomes from stressors, hardiness, sense of coherence, and self-efficacy), dark side traits (arrogance, aloofness, betrayal of others' trust, insensitivity, and selfishness (Burke, 2001: 31).

This difference between destructive leadership and destructive leader behaviors was upheld by Schyns and Schilling in their meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its effects (Schyns and Jan Schilling, 2013: 138). They discovered that unproductive leader behaviors were linked to lower levels of job satisfaction, perceived organizational fairness, self-evaluation, well-being, and higher intentions to leave the company, as well as unproductive work behavior, unpleasant emotions, and stress. Numerous models of leadership can be used to characterize poor leadership. The most well-known examples are probably harsh supervision, petty tyranny, and toxic leadership. Both active and passive types are present in the Destructive Leadership Model created by Einarsen, Aasland, and Skogstad. Their framework identifies four forms of toxic leadership.

- **Tyrannical leadership** (active). This behavior primarily targets inferiors rather than the objectives of the company. The usual behaviors of a tyrannical boss toward subordinates include humiliation, demeaning, and manipulation to "get the job done." A tyrant may behave favorably toward higher leaders and colleagues.
- **Derailed leadership** (active). The actions of a leader who has lost control are aimed at both the organization and its followers. Bullying, humiliation, deceit, fraud, and absenteeism are only a few examples of the behaviors that define them.
- **Supportive-disloyal leadership** (active). This damaging leadership style demonstrates respect for the followers but does it in a way that runs counter to the organization's legitimate interests. This involves actions like resource theft, granting exorbitant benefits, or promoting loading or misbehavior.
- **Laissez-faire leadership** (passive). The well-known term *laissez-faire* is used by the writers to describe the detrimental passive leadership style. This suggests that the leader has renounced his or her responsibilities as a leader. This style of leadership entails actions like putting off making decisions and refusing to interact with subordinates, even when it is required.
- All of the behaviors are regarded as active manifestations of destructive leadership in Tepper's abusive supervision and Ashford's Petty Tyranny. "Subordinates' perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical

contact," is how Tepper (2000: 1780), defines abusive supervision. Embarrassing subordinates, being impolite, and displaying anger toward subordinates even though the source of the anger is someone or something else are all examples of abusive supervision behaviors. The definition of petty tyranny is "a person who exercises undue power over others." His comprises actions like arbitrary decision-making, egotism, denigration, and non-contingent punishment.

### C. Narcissistic leadership

A warning story concerning the dangers of the overwhelming love of self is Narcissus from Greek mythology, who dedicated himself to continuous self-adoration (Hook, 2007: 16). According to Holtzman and Donnellan (2015), the multifaceted concept of narcissism is defined by rage, superiority, elegance, abuse, power, and the social efficacy of self-absorption.

Finding narcissistic leaders—those with high levels of narcissism who also happen to hold leadership positions—is a major challenge because their leadership styles tend to exhibit narcissistic traits. Although there are still many unanswered questions regarding the connection between narcissism and leadership, it is apparent that narcissism plays a significant role in toxic leadership (Schmidt, 2000).

At first glance, narcissistic leadership could be regarded as an ineffective form of leadership. But psychodynamic theorists such as Sigmund Freud and Heinz Kohut saw that narcissism was a normal part of development (Freud, 1971) and it was only a problem when handled improperly. There may be characteristics of narcissistic leadership associated with effective leadership and other characteristics associated with ineffective leadership. Features of narcissism associated with effective leadership include positive self-worth that gives the leaders an air of confidence, a desire for social approval, and a sense of authority. Narcissistic leaders act boldly, aggressively, and even magnanimously in promoting their vision, which inspires followers (much the same way charismatic leaders do). Features of narcissistic leadership associated with ineffective leadership include arrogance, self-absorption, amorality, a lack of sensitivity to others, hypersensitivity and anger, irrationality, inflexibility, feelings of inferiority and hostility, need for recognition and superiority, and paranoia (Judge, Ronald, Piccolo, and Kosalka, 2006: 617). Similar to the distinctions between the positive and negative aspects of narcissistic leadership, is the distinction that Lubit made between healthy and destructive narcissism. Although it is possible for a destructive narcissist to rise within an organization, a healthy narcissist will benefit the organization in the long term.

### D. Toxic leadership

Toxic Leadership is defined here as leadership behavior that poisons, is disruptive, destructive, exploitive, dysfunctional, and abusive. This covers workplace bullying and harassment in its various forms, deception, and fraudulent dealings, forced imposition of unrealistic workloads, fostering disruptive internal competition, misinformation, and misrepresentation, and aggressive

interpersonal behaviour. Whicker (1996) defined toxic leadership as a style of management that kills employees' zeal, ingenuity, independence, and innovative expression, eventually harming the business. Leaders that desire more power spread their toxins (Wilson, 2003). Reed (2004) agrees that one particular conduct does not always indicate that a person is poisonous, but the lesson is the cumulative impact of unpleasant behavior over time on cohesion, morale, and atmosphere. Three traits define a toxic leader: a flagrant disregard for the welfare of the subordinates; a temperament or interpersonal style that negatively affects the work environment; and the perception among the subordinates that the leader's main motivation is self-interest.

A manager, supervisor, or leader that consistently engages in behavior that undermines the organization's goals, tasks, resources, effectiveness, and/or the employees' motivation, well-being, or sense of purpose is said to be practicing toxic leadership. He noted (Hitchcock, 2015) that toxic leadership involves inadequate administrative procedures, intimidating, controlling, illegal behaviors, and physical and non-physical abuse that intentionally infuriates or harms individuals and groups. A connection that affects the efficient operation of the company and threatens healthy working relationships exhibits toxic leadership, which draws attention to the willful destruction and self-serving abuse of authority. Lipman-Blumen (2005a: 18) defines toxic leaders as those "who, by their destructive behaviors and their dysfunctional personal qualities or characteristics, inflict serious and enduring harm on the individuals, groups, organizations, communities, and even the nations that they lead." She also states that these leaders "are prone to engaging in a wide range of unethical, illegal, and criminal acts."

Toxic leadership, according to Indradevi, is a silent murderer because it gives leaders the sense that they are untouchable and motivates others to impede and penalize those who do so. Such toxic leadership is an expensive phenomenon that obliterates people on all levels, including the person, the group, the organization, and even the state (Indradevi, 2016). Goyer claims that toxic leaders exhibit a variety of egotistical attitudes, motivations, and actions that are harmful to their direct reports, the success of their projects, and the company as a whole (Burns, 2017). Toxic leadership, according to Webster and colleagues, is characterized by those who frequently act in a fearful, condescending, and unethical manner toward people around them. While attending several meetings, making sporadic phone calls, and only disclosing information to those who need to know, toxic leaders, on the other hand, have a self-replicating style of communication (ztokatli, 2020).

Such poisonous behavior brings to light what has been referred to as "the dark side of leadership," a side that, while always present, has frequently been left out of much of the traditional leadership training (Babiak 1995; Babiak and Hare 2006; Cavaiola and Lavender 2000). Leaders are not, by definition, always good, ethical, or right in their behavior, despite much of the 'positive' marketing of the leadership business, as has been demonstrated in recent

times by the flood of information describing toxic leadership behavior. The significance of addressing and investigating such aspects of leadership is reinforced by high-profile toxic leadership within organizations like Enron and WorldCom (Anand et al. 2004; Frost 2003; Kellerman 2004a, b).

The situation is made more difficult by the possibility that toxic leadership behaviors may have previously been justified, denied, or even encouraged due to the results obtained. This could have (i) reinforced and intensified toxic leadership behavior, (ii) dissuaded others from raising concerns about the unacceptable behaviors they had witnessed, and (iii) created a culture of groupthink and/or acceptance within that environment (Harvey 1988a; Janis 1982; Milgram 1974; Zimbardo 1969). Incompetent, rigid, intemperate, callous, corrupt, insular, and evil are the seven categories of poor leadership practices examined by Kellerman (Kellerman 2004a: 38), whereas Lipman-Blumen focuses primarily on the allure of toxic leaders and toxic follower behavior (Janis 1982; Offermann 2004b; Stein 2005).

One of the most well-known phrases used to describe bad leadership is toxic leadership, which has been around for a while. This kind of leadership has been defined by numerous experts. According to Lipman-Blumen (2006), "a global label for leaders who engage in numerous destructive behaviors and who exhibit certain dysfunctional personal characteristics," toxic leaders have three main traits:

- An apparent lack of care for subordinates' welfare.
- A personality trait or interpersonal strategy that hurts the workplace culture.
- The belief of followers that the leader is primarily driven by self-interest (Reed, 2004).

Toxic leaders are people who: ...engage in multiple damaging behaviors and who exhibit certain dysfunctional personal characteristics, according to Lipman-Blumen, one of the leading theorists on the subject. For behaviors and character traits to qualify as toxic, they must cause their followers and organizations some sort of relatively substantial and long-lasting harm. Seriously toxic leaders are distinguished from less dangerous but harmful leaders by their desire to injure others or advance themselves at the expense of others (Jean Lipman-Blumen: 2005: 8). Some crucial characteristics of the phenomena are highlighted by the US Army's doctrinal definition of toxic leadership.

A toxic leader exhibits a range of self-centered traits that are detrimental to the success of their team, the organization, and its mission. This CEO has little regard for individuals or the culture of the company, which has detrimental short- and long-term impacts. The toxic leader acts out of extreme self-interest and an inflated sense of self-worth. To get what they desire for themselves, toxic leaders frequently employ dysfunctional behaviors to trick, threaten, force, or punish others unfairly. By functioning at the bottom of the continuum of commitment, where followers depend on their leader's positional authority to fulfill requests, the negative leader fulfills urgent needs. Even if this overlooks the other leader competency areas of leads and development, it might produce outcomes in the near run.

According to the U.S. Army's 2012 "Army Doctrine Publication 6-22, Army Leadership," the use of negative leadership over an extended period to influence followers diminishes their motivation, initiative, and potential and devastates the morale of the unit.

According to Kellerman (2004), there are seven different types of toxic leadership: inept, rigid, intemperate, callous, corrupt, insular, and malevolent. Pelletier made a useful analysis of the various forms of ineffective leadership that have been highlighted in her study on leader toxicity (Kathie, Pelletier, 2010: 373). She created a Perceived Toxic Leadership Scale based on Lipman-Blumen's theory of toxic leadership. The scale has a decent level of internal consistency and comprises 18 components. Pelletier discovered that outsiders believed leaders exhibited more harmful behavior than insiders. The content analysis revealed the following themes: unprofessionalism, narcissism, authoritarianism, self-promotion, and abusive supervision. Utilizing rewritten transcript-based items as well as items from scales for authoritarianism, narcissism, and abusive supervision (Bor-Shiuan Cheng, Li-Fang Chou, Tsung-Yu Wu, and Jiing-LihFarh, 2004: 89-117).

As they work below the surface and destroy, impede, and punish individuals who raise issues for debate, toxic behaviors by leaders—and followers—have been compared to silent murderers (Beer and Eisenstat, 2000). An unhealthy "toxic triangle" is created when toxic leaders, weak and despised followers, and supportive environments come together (Padilla et al. 2005; Paulhus and Williams, 2002; Walton, 2005a, b, in press). Surprisingly, a more thorough explanation and examination of the darker aspects of leadership and the abuse of power are not at the top of the curricula for leadership studies (Dotlich and Cairo 2003; Kilburg, 2000; Schell, 1999). Such forces pose a threat to an organization's success.

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

- Attacks on the self-esteem of followers (humiliation/marginalization of employees).
- Lack of integrity (that is, blaming others for his mistakes, going against the views and actions of the employee, or changing the framework of the regulations to achieve its goals).
- Abuse of power (threat to his professional and/or personal safety employee).
- Social exclusion.
- Splitting (ostracizing employees by, for example, telling an employee that not a team player).
- Promoting inequality.
- Threats to the safety and physical integrity of fans (use of physically aggressive acts, forcing workers to endure hardships) and
- "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. "Snake", where the toxic leader uses his followers to satisfy

his greed and feel more powerful. "Glory Seeker", where personal glory is sought and self-promotion at any cost, whether contributed or not. "The Puppet Master" - "Puppet Master", where here the toxic leader wants to have absolute control over everything, everyone, and in all circumstances.

#### *E. Negative leadership*

Learning how to be an effective leader is the aim of leader development. However, we also need to teach them (through self-awareness) about the behaviors that are impeding their ability to lead effectively. The problem is that this is not a new phenomenon; in fact, Stogdill noted over 40 years ago that "there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept." (Kelly, Sigal, and Barsade, 2012). This is a dilemma because it's possible that when someone says terrible leadership, people will consider a variety of various forms of behavior. Simply said, "negative leadership" includes anything from toxic leader behaviors to leader errors. We believe it is crucial to address the main ways that poor leadership has been presented because of this. We will highlight a few of the more popular phrases that have been used to identify unfavorable leader behaviors, even though a thorough assessment of the research is outside the purview of this chapter. We shall refer to "negative leadership" generally throughout the rest of the chapter, except when discussing a particular conception of negative leadership, to avoid using specific construct definitions.

#### *F. Destructive leadership*

Negative leadership is also frequently referred to as destructive leadership. The definition of destructive leadership, according to Einarsen and colleagues, is: "The systematic and repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor, or manager that violates the legitimate interests 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 subordinates" (Einarsen, Aasland, and Skogstad, 2007: 208). Schyns and Schilling describe it with a slightly different focus as "a process in which over a longer period the activities, experiences and/or relationships of an individual or the members of a group are repeatedly influenced by their supervisor in a way that is perceived as hostile and/or obstructive." Both conceptualizations depict the leader as someone who is impeding the achievement of the objective (i.e., sabotaging, undermining, or obstructive).

According to a recent study, one-third of employees said they had personally experienced some kind of harmful leadership (Aasland et al. 2010), indicating that this appears to be a widespread problem. It is simple to understand why this would be harmful in a military setting. There are consequences for followers as well as for the organization. This seems to be a recurring topic in discussions about bad leadership, where there is contempt for both the workforce and the company's goals. Effective leaders occasionally have to choose between the mission and the people, according to research. It's not that one is necessarily more significant than the other; rather, there are occasions when both cannot be given the same priority. For instance, commanders are

unable to make decisions that will not endanger the troops when they must place them in danger.

This is so because the military's work is inherently hazardous. Effective managers will, however, weigh all of the options available to them to minimize personnel harm while still achieving mission achievement. The destructive leader fails to achieve this harmony between the mission and the people, which leads to subpar mission performance, elevated risk of mission failure, and subpar mission performance.

#### G. Toxic leadership

Leaders are typically held responsible for the prevalence of toxic leadership. Toxic leadership is present in the military due to traits of those in leadership positions or those who hold those positions. The attraction, selection, and attrition (ASA) theory is one method for explaining toxic leadership in the military (Schneider, 1987: 437). According to ASA theory, there are several ways for military commanders to become toxic. The military tends to attract individuals with poisonous personalities. People with these qualities are drawn to the military environment.

These people pass the stringent selection criteria used by the military. Once chosen, these people are more likely to remain in their roles and advance to higher levels of responsibility. Does any of this data back up any of these claims? According to Lall, Elizabeth, Holmes, Kimberly, Brinkmyer, Johnson, and Yatko (2001: 181), individuals in the reserve officer training corps and colleges tend to have higher levels of traits like ambition and the thirst for power. Many leaders micromanage and are risk-averse, even though 21st-century leadership calls for greater coherence via adaptation (Edwin Dorn, Howard Graves, Ulmer, Jr., Joseph, Collins, and Jacobs, 2000). More than half of military leaders aren't ready to lead when they get promoted, according to many surveys. However, according to the Padilla, Hogan, and Hope model (Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser, 2007), all forms of leadership are influenced by the environment, the leader, and the followers. Some leaders are likely put into situations that make them toxic even though they don't want to be and may not even be aware that they are.

#### H. Unethical leadership

The definition of ethical leadership given by Brown, Trevino, and Harrison (2005: 120) is "the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making." The opposite of ethical leadership is stated as "supervisor behaviors that violate moral standards" (Ali, Unal, Danielle, Warren, and Chen, 2012: 5).

According to these criteria, ethical transgressions involve deviating from accepted norms or standards (Hunter, 2012: 79). This implies that ethical behavior is a fluid concept rather than a fixed idea of what is right or wrong (Hunter, 2016). Leaders are faced with a problem as a result, particularly when standards change over time.

Since many renowned firms have collapsed as a result of unethical leadership behavior, ethical behavior is an issue at the moment (Monahan, 2015). As an illustration, the VW emissions scandal demonstrates how a problem with people's faith in a company has been created (Paddison, 2015). The company abused its power while complicit in risky greenwashing, hurting the organization's efforts to support climate change while acting responsibly as a company (Paddison, 2015). Understanding how to create strategies, plans, and processes that will help a business succeed both in the short and long term of doing business is a must for business management. Effective managers work to swiftly pinpoint the source of issues while also giving their subordinates wise and assured direction (Yukl, 2012). Leadership must be able to recognize the value of moral conduct. Following this, Brown and Trevino identified various preconditions for ethical leadership, including personality differences, an ethical environment, and having a role model for leadership. In their study on the causes of the ethical climate, (Schaubroeck and his associates, 2012).

#### I. Leader error

The previous explanations of bad leadership conceptions suggest that the leader was acting intentionally in some way. Nevertheless, not all poor leadership is the result of deliberate action; it is also possible that the leader made a mistake. Several things could have gone wrong, including ignorance, poor judgment, or a lack of preparation. In any instance, the consequences of a leader's error may be felt by the followers or the organization. According to Hunter and colleagues, a leader makes a mistake when they act in a way that deviates from their initial objective or the norms of the group (Hunter et al. 2011). They continue by saying that there are three different types of errors:

- Task errors include poor planning and a failure to organize an action.
- Relationship errors include losing your anger and not standing up for a subordinate.
- Acting against socially acceptable norms is a form of ethical error.

This implies, according to Lindsay et al. (in press), that "the causes of such inaccuracy are simply more than character defects and can be produced by situational circumstances, be they contextual pressure, norms, or more general elements like culture. For instance, when put in unfamiliar situations, leaders may depend on past decisions or mental models of how they believe the circumstances should be handled. As a result, they might use an incorrect heuristic and make a mistake (Hunter, 2016). The use of simplifying heuristics is considerably more reasonable in situations where there is additional time pressure. We don't want to imply that the leader is exempt from accountability for the mistake, but from the perspective of leadership development, it makes sense to take a different approach when a leader acts benevolently as opposed to unethically.

#### J. Laissez-faire

Laissez-faire leadership, according to McColl-Kennedy and Anderson (2005), is a passive style characterized by high levels of avoidance, indecision, and apathy. When a leader adopts a "hands-off" attitude, abdicates responsibility,



delays making choices, and provides no feedback to staff, it is also frequently seen as the absence of leadership. (Xirasagar (2008) No effort is made by the leader to inspire followers or meet their specific requirements. It is sometimes seen as a way to avoid taking on leadership responsibilities, which could leave the organization without direction. The *laissez-faire* leader is also seen as being passive rather than proactive and, whenever possible, puts things off. Subordinates are not given incentives or feedback, and it is up to them to manage their personal development. According to Jones and Rudd (2007), *laissez-faire* leadership is a sluggish leadership style when the leader lacks urgency or motivation. The leader makes the erroneous assumption that followers are self-motivated and ought to be left alone to complete their job.

The majority of negative leadership that we have described thus far concerns problematic leader characteristics or behaviors that run counter to the good order and discipline of the organization. Related to this idea is leader inaction. This inactivity has been referred to as *laissez-faire* leadership (Krasikova, Green, and LeBreton, 2013: 1308). *Laissez-faire* is a part of the Full Range Leadership Model, which looks at leadership concerning effectiveness and activity (Hogan, 2009: 217). This form of leadership is characterized by the leader being absent when needed, avoiding making decisions, and failing to take action.

Collins and Schmidt, (2007), it is not hard to see how this lack of support by the leader is problematic for not only followers, but the organization as a whole. For example, in a study of 241 hotel employees, Hinkin and Schriesheim found that *laissez-faire* leadership (e.g., omission of rewards) significantly predicted several outcomes, including perceptions of supervisor effectiveness, satisfaction with a supervisor, and role clarity (Vredenburg and Brender, 1989: 1337). Such effects are similar to those seen in other investigations of leader inaction. Judge and Piccolo found that leader inaction was negatively correlated with satisfaction with the leader and the leader's effectiveness. They went on to state, "the absence of leadership is nearly as important as the presence of other forms of leadership (Brown, Treviño, and Harrison, 1995:24)." In other words, leadership is about action and presence. If the leader fails to act and show interest, then negative results are predicted to occur.

In this situation, followers are given the power to decide how to customize their working environment to fit their unique requirements. *Laissez-faire* leadership gives followers the possibility for self-management, according to Cilliers et al. (2008). They see the leader's avoidance as a chance for followers to work independently and grow into leaders in their own right. According to Madlock (2008), ineffective management, such as that of a *laissez-faire* boss, may result in strained interpersonal ties and poor levels of worker satisfaction and productivity. Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory backs up this conclusion.

In conclusion, negative leadership has been conceptualized in a variety of ways. In our review, we only touched on a few of the more well-known ones. These conceptualizations are important because they each take a somewhat different approach to the behaviors—or lack thereof—of the leader. Making sense of these occasionally subtle nuanced differences is a problem for leadership scholars and practitioners. When Kellerman stated that "bad leadership has a ripple effect and also a lingering impact," she clarified why this is important. Consider the effects on multiple generations. Bad leadership is a persistent problem. It doesn't appear and then vanishes. It leaves behind a toxic legacy that remains (Bass, Bass, and Stogdill's, 1990). There is work to be done when we consider that 65% to 75% of workers in any particular business say that their immediate supervisor is the worst part of their job (Taylor, 2012).

#### *K. Authoritarian Leadership*

It consists of behaviors such as controlling how subordinates complete their tasks, invading subordinates' privacy, not allowing subordinates to reach their goals in new ways, ignoring ideas that are contrary to their own, being inflexible when it comes to organizational policies, even in special circumstances, determining whether all decisions in the unit are important.

Another definition of toxic leadership refers to a manager's behavior in which they exercise total authority over their employees and expect unwavering loyalty from them (Schmidt, 2008). An authoritarian boss asserts complete control over subordinates and demands unwavering allegiance by exacting harsh punishment. Leaders openly exercise control over the structure and take the initiative; for example, those who disobey policies and rules face harsh punishment, and these leaders use threats and intimidation to try to subdue their subordinates to further organizational goals (Guo et al., 2018).

#### *L. Self-Promotion*

It consists of behaviors such as changing his behavior to a large extent in the presence of his/her superiors, denying responsibility for mistakes made within his unit, helping only those who can help/contribute to his/her promotion, lovingly accepting successes that do not belong to him, working only for the benefit of his next promotion. In both formal and casual social settings, self-promotion occurs frequently when people connect with people of greater status. According to the self-promotion approach, the fundamental human want is to be regarded by others as morally upright, effective in interpersonal relationships, and likable (Gtalone & Rosenfeld, 2001). Self-promotion entails taking credit for other people's work, criticizing them, and placing the blame for mistakes. Additionally, it promotes achievements (Paltu1 & Brouwers, 2020).

These people, who have relatively high self-esteem, are sensitive to challenges to their self-esteem, such as criticism of their behavior or unfavorable remarks about their performance. These people are more likely to become enraged and upset, which leads them to criticize other people and behave abusively overall (Milosevic et al., 2019). People that engage in self-promotion aim to draw

attention to their strengths and abilities. It is a type of impression management that seeks to improve a person's standing and reputation and is frequently used in business settings. Self-promotion includes highlighting one's own internal rather than external accomplishments, acknowledging others' efforts, and emphasizing one's positive traits rather than flaws (Deschacht&Maes, 2017).

#### *M. Unpredictability*

It consists of behaviors such as having explosive behavior, allowing the current mood to determine the workplace climate, behaving irritably to subordinates for unknown reasons, allowing his/her mood to influence his/her tone and voice, fluctuating mood in terms of being approachable to him/her, making subordinates try to read their mood, influencing subordinates' feelings when they are overexcited.

Poor leadership is characterized by a variety of behaviors, such as frequent mood swings and irrational outbursts that affect the feelings of followers (Zaabi et al., 2018). The environment at work may be negatively impacted by a toxic leader's emotions, and they frequently act hostile toward subordinates for no apparent reason (Hinshaw, 2020). Followers don't know when or why their leaders will change how they act. Sudden outbursts and erratic everyday behavior are traits of toxic leaders. According to accounts, the current leader's poisonous attitude negatively affects the workplace when he is anxious, angry, or depressed. No one wants to approach him at those times. His tone and intensity of speech communicate this emotion. In the dimension of negative mental mood, the vassals act to the toxic leader's mood, and toxic leaders also behave in conflict and instability in this dimension (ztokatli, 2020).

### **V. ABUSIVE SUPERVISION**

The topic of supervisory leadership has been the focus of numerous research, highlighting its significance in the management literature. This study (Poon, 2011) includes a section on abusive supervisory behaviors. The relationships people have with their supervisors are arguably more significant than other personal bonds made at work (Ahmad & Omar, 2013). According to Tepper (2000), it is the degree to which a worker believes their boss consistently exhibits aggressive verbal and nonverbal behaviors while avoiding physical contact.

Tepper (2000: 178) discussed a type of leadership he dubbed abusive supervision. Workers' opinions of their supervisors' "persistent display of verbal and nonverbal hostile behaviors, excluding physical contact," according to him, constitute abusive supervision. (Ibid. 178). In contrast to petty tyranny, where antagonism may or may not be present, abusive supervision frequently includes animosity. Tepper discovered that abusive supervision increases work-family conflict and psychological discomfort while decreasing employee satisfaction and organizational commitment. According to a recent meta-analysis, abusive supervision is linked to worsening depression, emotional exhaustion, job tension, and work-family conflict as well as lower job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior,

commitment, perceived organizational support, and work performance (Jeremy, Mackey, Rachel, Frieder, Jeremy, Brees, and Mark and Martinko, 2015).

Winn and Dykes (2019: 40) made the following statement about toxic leaders: "Toxic leaders consistently use dysfunctional behaviors to deceive, intimidate, coerce, or unfairly punish others to get what they want for themselves, destroying initiative and morale". Tepper (2000) described toxic or abusive supervision as subordinates' perception of their supervisors acting in manners of sustained displays of verbal and nonverbal behaviors. These toxic behaviors can be summed up as leading out of fear, showing little concern for peers or subordinates, having a high sense of narcissism and self-interest, and possessing traits that are detrimental to the well-being of followers. Toxic leaders may look for followers they can blame for their own mistakes and to hide their failings from view at the expense of others to save face (Bell, 2017; Mehta & Maheshwari, 2013). Businesses that don't develop (and maintain) the abilities required to prevent, mitigate, or respond to this toxic leadership will pay a heavy price in the form of hidden expenses, diminished brand value, and subpar performance (Vreka et al., 2016). These difficulties obstruct change initiatives in both macro and micro environments and might erode the credibility of change management in upcoming change initiatives (Vreka et al., 2016).

### **VI. PREVENTING TOXIC LEADERSHIP**

Several ideas have been put out to stop toxic leadership. Box proposed the creation of a general-only advisory group. Future leaders might learn from these generals (Box, 2012). Constructive leadership training is a component of leadership development (Center for Army Leadership, 2011). Three levels make up Schein's proposed corporate culture model: artifacts and behaviors, professed norms and ideals, and underlying assumptions (Schein, 2010). Training in the organizational culture of the military is part of leadership development. Increased emphasis on military principles is necessary to prevent toxic leadership and bad company culture (Elle, 2010). The instruction given to followers is a complementary form of instruction. Too frequently, military personnel simply accept the circumstance or follow the toxic leader. Programs like the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program's Global Assessment Tool could arm followers with the fortitude to resist poisonous leaders.

### **VII. EFFECTS OF A TOXIC LEADER IN AN ORGANIZATION**

Leaders with toxic character have many negative effects on both their organizations and their employees. These negative effects lead to a decrease in the organizational commitment levels of the employees and an increase in their intention to leave. Given all these facts, according to the study conducted by Yalçınsoy and Işık (2018) on the relationship between toxic leadership, organizational commitment, and turnover intention, the effects of toxic leadership on the organizational commitment and turnover intention of the employees were examined.

Apart from this, the mutual interactions of the concepts of toxic leadership, organizational commitment, and turnover intention were tried to be determined. As a result of the research, a significant relationship was obtained between the sub-dimensions of toxic leadership, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. In addition, it has been observed that some dimensions of toxic leadership have significant effects on organizational commitment and intention to leave (Yalçınsoy&Işık, 2018).

It can be said that the phenomenon of toxic leadership harms the organization by poisoning the existing order, peace, creativity, self-management, and innovation in the workplace. Whicker (1996) stated that toxic leadership negatively affects organizational culture, organizational climate, and organizational productivity. Nonetheless, he states that it can increase the health expenses of the organization by negatively affecting the health of the employees, and therefore, by increasing absenteeism and leaving the job. In other words, it causes the institution to be unsuccessful and unproductive.

In their study "Does toxic leadership trigger organizational health negatively", Reyhanoğlu and Akin (2016), stated that the manager's negative leadership behaviors as an organization leader affect the health of the employees and therefore the organization negatively. In addition to these in the study, it is found that the toxic leader is a type of leader who is rude to his employees, constantly humiliates them, has narcissistic tendencies, and uses his power and position in a repressive way to make his employees accept him decreases the morale, motivation, and productivity of the employees, as a result of which has been reported to harm the organizational climate. In the research, the effects of toxic leadership characteristics on organizational health were examined mutually. According to the findings, it was concluded that the toxic leader's intimidation behaviors, and abusive, narcissistic, selfish, and authoritarian personality negatively affect the health of the organization, especially the employees (Reyhanoğlu and Akin, 2016).

Toxic leadership reduces employee motivation, creativity, satisfaction, productivity, commitment, and performance while increasing turnover intention, health problems, stress, and death (Lipman-Blumen, 2005; Kellerman, 2004). Some academic and popular articles have focused on a specific type of destructive leadership called "toxic leadership" (Ashforth, 1994; Kellerman, 2004; Padilla et al., 2007; Pelletier, 2010; 2012; Schmidt, 2014), the deleterious effects of toxic leadership. Various organizations, industries, and stakeholders (Arizal et al., 2021).

The effectiveness of the organization also depends on whether the chosen leadership approach is suitable for the particular circumstances facing the business (Kurniawan et al., 2021). Bill Gates is a prime example of someone who behaves badly (Saputra et al., 2020). Although Gates may be unkind and demanding with his staff, his management style is ideal for the kind of person who wants to work at Microsoft. When working with capable, motivated staff that

require little supervision, Gates' authoritarian leadership style can be quite effective. In a business with numerous talented and driven employees, he excels as a leader (Ramadhani et al., 2021). Individual performance and institutional performance, sometimes known as corporate performance, are closely related in this situation (Habibah et al., 2021).

Although toxic leaders are extremely talented and effective at what they do, they also help to foster a toxic environment among their colleagues and subordinates, with far-reaching effects on several people. This was one of the initial conclusions reached after conducting study on the subject (Paltu and Brouwers, 2022: 18). When a leader prioritizes their agenda over the long-term performance of the business, toxic leadership can happen for a variety of reasons (Mehta and Maheshwari, 2014: 18). Decreased employee performance as a result of a lack of dedication and job unhappiness; decreased production as a result of an increase in absenteeism and illness. Organizations also lack the expertise and capacity to mitigate the consequences of toxic leadership. The hidden expenses paid by toxic leaders' dysfunctional behavior must be covered by the impact on organizations. Reduced productivity, lower employee performance, lower employee effort, legal fees, and other costs are some of these consequences (VreKa, Balan, and Bosca 2016: 217).

In recent years, many academics have become fascinated by the problem of toxic leadership, which is becoming more and more common in the management literature (Labrague, Lorica, and Nwafor, 2021: 29). Recent research has examined the negative facets of leadership and the impact toxic leadership has on both the success of organizations and the mental health of their workforces (Gallus, Walsh, van Driel, Gouge, and Antolic, 2013: 25). It appears that toxic leadership can be defined as a leadership style in and of itself rather than only as the absence of effective leadership (Mergen and Ozbilgin, 2021: 23). We used harmful leadership constructs for the investigation's goals. A key element of shady leadership is toxic leadership, which can spread stealthily and unobserved like poison. Individuals and groups can be harmed by toxic leadership, and eventually, the entire organization can be affected (Bhandarker and Rai, 2019: 22).

#### *A. Toxic Leadership and Workplace Incivility*

Incivility has been demonstrated to have major detrimental repercussions on the targeted employees, other co-workers, and organizations as a whole (Sharp, Peng &Jex, 2019). It is one of the most prevalent forms of antisocial behavior in the workplace. Workplaces with frequent interactivity among employees are the best settings for impolite behavior. As managers or other leaders are unable to apply their knowledge in these circumstances to judge the presence and severity of incivility, the majority of hostile behavior at work is a result of poor leadership (Baig& Zaid, 2020).

Decewin (1939) asserts that environmental factors have a part in both the onset and progression of workplace rudeness, particularly when acting as situational and

individual forces. Regulations, procedures, and social conventions, for instance, are seen to be major causes of complacency and a casual work environment, which are traits linked to rudeness. Given this, managers' leadership style is an important factor that may have an impact on workplace disrespect (Tastan&Davoudi, 2015).

Leaders that don't care about their followers may cause disrespectful behavior from workers and poor interactions with other co-workers. The use of violence against others may also be unintentional rather than done with malicious intent, according to academics. When one person who may be exposed to undesirable behaviors behaves rudely toward an innocent third party, incivility may spread in the workplace (Baig& Zaid, 2020). Additionally, it's thought that narcissistic bosses have trouble controlling their emotions. As a result, anger may lead to disrespectful behavior or other antisocial behavior (Meier &Semmer, 2013).

Poor leadership, according to past studies, includes managers who do not discourage disruptive behavior and do not encourage appropriate behavior. Additionally, they avoid discussing workplace problems and defer making judgments about them (Baig& Zaid, 2020). Making no decisions, neglecting work-related problems, and failing to recognize positive behavior are examples of negative leadership attributes. Additionally, according to Harold & Holtz (2015), these supervisors are less likely to let their employees know what is expected of them.

So, it makes sense to expect a link between incivility among employees and inactive leadership. If the proper preventative measures aren't taken to deal with inappropriate behavior, the company may develop an unofficial environment that encourages rudeness. If there is a relationship between poor leadership and workplace disrespect, a person working under a lousy leader will likely experience more disrespect than his or her coworkers (Tastan&Davoudi, 2015).

## VIII. DIMENSIONS OF WORKPLACE INCIVILITY BY EMPLOYEES

The scale of organizational information systems created by Cortina and colleagues (2001) was the basis for the majority of research on incivility. Many researchers modified this scale, including Martin and Hine (2005), who modified and validated the Uncivil Behaviour Questionnaire in the Workplace, a component scale with 20 items. But the four topics that were most important to this article's study were.

### A. Hostility

According to the definition, it is a type of physical incapacity meant to incite wrath or resentment. Intimidation, bigotry, and harassment are a few manifestations of hostility (Amos, 2013). A mannerism that is nasty, alienating, and disrespectful of others is the most common type of hostility that is observed in organizations. According to Keng (2017), being hostile is a behavior that aims to destroy nature without pecuniary gain. Workplace antagonism can also include behaviors that the target feels compelled to avoid

because they could be harmful. However, workplace hostility is only defined as overt acts of hostility aimed repeatedly against a specific individual or group of individuals (Tastan&Davoudi, 2012).

### B. Privacy invasion

It is defined as restrictions on the management or access to personal data. Instances, where personal data is obtained or made public without the relevant owner's consent, are referred to as "breach of privacy" scenarios (Bree, 2005). Privacy is not at all a contested subject. Some people think that most people occasionally expect to have the same privacy rights at work as they do at home, which can make many social interactions "fraudulent" by withholding information. Others might think their personal information is safe and private because they have an Account Number and password for their software system and email.

### C. 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 am 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 toxic leaders exhibit behaviors characterized by undermining, demeaning, seduction, marginalization, intimidation, frustration, discredit, inability to imprisonment, torture, terrorism, and alteration of their working environment of their followers. They also exhibit negative behaviors that tend to lower the morale, motivation, and self-esteem of their followers and impose an unrealistic burden on work. They are abusive and engage in workplace bullying, harassment, and deception. They tend to be obsessed with power and abuse it, 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 interests. They compete with anyone they believe has the potential to challenge their position, including potential successors, and tend to use strategies of "divide and conquer" to turn people against each other (Bloom, 2006). Ashforth (1994) describes the 'bad manager' as a person who uses his position and powers for personal interests and is abused mercilessly by 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: 21).

Toxic leaders want to control using poisonous power to complicate the organizational structure. They boost their ego and don't pay attention to anybody 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, and harmful behaviors are assessed as toxic behaviors (Koys, 2001; Hitchcock, 2015). Pelletier (2010) emphasized that toxic behaviors are those that deprive worker's rights, ignore their ideas, and marginalize and harass them. He also noted that their behaviors create emotional instability, while they tend to blame others for their own mistakes, threaten the job security of employees, use lies, and alienate members of the group among themselves.

#### *D. Exclusionary (Withdrawal) Behaviour*

By harassing, avoiding, excluding, or intimidating others, Hitlan and Noel (2009) define withdrawal behavior. This behavior has been linked to several unfavorable emotional states, including sadness, loneliness, jealousy, guilt, embarrassment, and social anxiety (Barthelemy, 2020). The definition of withdrawal behavior in the workplace is the exclusion, rejection, or disregard of a person by another person or group that prevents the fostering or maintenance of positive interpersonal relationships, professional success, or a positive reputation in the workplace. Uncertainty surrounds the definition of withdrawal as a specific form of rudeness. It is also distinguished by resource deprivation in the form of social support withdrawal. The removal of social support is believed to have a detrimental impact on people's "basic need for acceptance and belonging," and this type of workplace is a treatment that lowers employees' self-esteem and productivity. In severe cases, the exclusion could be a kind of social rejection. According to Sharp, Peng, and Jex (2019), rejection can be so agonizing psychologically that it is akin to physical pain.

#### *E. Gossip*

It is defined as an informal, in-person assessment of a different organization member that frequently takes place among a small number of people without them present. The speaker, the receiver, and the unnamed third party are all participating in office gossip (Ellwardt, 2011). Talking casually and harshly about a coworker who is not an employee of the organization is known as workplace gossip. It is becoming a more important topic in the field of organizational behavior since passive office gossip is the subject of the majority of studies. Passive office gossip has been the subject of numerous research looking at individual traits (Kong, 2018).

It frequently takes the form of rumors and other informal, harmless forms of communication when gossip occurs at work, and it may even facilitate productivity. Unfortunately, gossip that is violent or hurtful can lead to arguments and damaged feelings. They might even promote harassment and bullying at work to foster a hostile environment (Advisor, 2016).

## **IX. FACTORS CAUSING TOXIC LEADERSHIP**

There are many assumptions in the literature regarding the reasons for a leader's toxic behavior. Mumford et al. (2007) stated in their studies that the most important factor that causes leadership behaviors to be positive or negatively toxic is the way the leader uses his power or position, and destructive actions, including impulsive and other aggressive behaviors, are largely due to the urge to prove the leader's power. Narcissism results from personality tendencies such as excessive authoritarianism and low competence, as well as personal factors such as ignorance, self-interest, selfishness, and negative mood. Another factor that causes the actions to be toxic and destructive is the management approach of the organization and the situation that arises from the structure of the corporate culture. Such features such as excessive centralization, exaggerated control mechanisms, injustice, perception of opponents as enemies, and humiliation affect the behavior of leaders and cause the leader to adopt toxic and destructive leadership behaviors (Mumford et al., 2007).

## **X. WHY DO PEOPLE ACCEPT TOXIC LEADERS?**

There are leaders in every organization who, by their negative traits and dysfunctional activities, seriously and permanently harm the people they are in charge of as well as the organizations they govern. Toxic leaders are typically hated and despised by the teams they oversee, yet they may be tolerated in some workplaces due to factors like increased team productivity and revenues. Their desire for power, fame, and self-promotion initially boosts organizational productivity and speeds up expansion. As a result of the increased productivity and better corporate outcomes, top management encourages these leaders to continue their leadership style—until it starts to negatively impact the business's bottom line and good employees begin to leave the company.

Even though people can often spot toxic leaders, followers nonetheless welcome, like, and sometimes even support them despite their conduct. Dynamic leaders with a lot of energy are attractive to people. Since they can easily complete challenging objectives and overcome hurdles, many toxic leaders are regarded as charismatic. The third argument for followers' adoption of toxic leaders is the internal desires of the followers, who discover toxic leaders affording them the comfort, safety, and promise to fulfill their aims and dreams. Additionally, these strong leaders have a propensity for making crucial decisions within a company, so following them satisfies the want to be in the thick of things.

A leader who promises an ordered, predictable, and controlled society would allay people's innate anxieties of unpredictability in this world of uncertainty, chaos, and crisis circumstances. When everything around you seems to be falling apart, this regulated environment can appear to be very appealing. This may be yet another factor in followers' willingness to tolerate and even support toxic leadership.

**XI. PRACTICE DEVELOPMENT**

The diverse literature offers a multitude of suggestions for choosing toxic leaders who can subsequently be fired, from engagement strategies to person-job fit screening. It is important to create an environment that is more conducive to productive outcomes since toxic leaders tend to function in settings that are most suited for their behavior. Employee longevity and retention are positively correlated with organizational cultures that place a strong emphasis on trust, wellness, leadership, and recognition (Purcell, 2014). Simply "doing engagement" by completing surveys and reporting back on findings will not result in good change, which is why organizations must support the need for on-purpose initiatives by engaging through activity (Winn & Dykes, 2019).

To raise the bar for leadership in the organization, it might be useful to present a model of good leadership. According to statistics, ethical leadership has a greater statistical impact on millennial retention rates and overall job satisfaction than other leadership philosophies (Lee et al., 2016). These ethical leaders are consistent, transparent, well-known, and recognized for their integrity (Landesz, 2018). Developing leaders involves guided self-reflection and building awareness. By requiring greater levels of experiential learning to model appropriate behavior, organizations can assist combat toxic leader modeling (Landesz, 2018; Lee et al., 2016; Winn & Dykes, 2019).

By boosting retention and reducing tolerance for toxic leadership, the perception of ethics can benefit the organization. According to Covella et al. (2017), there is a statistically significant correlation between the perceived morality of a leader's acts and their fairness. It's interesting to note that the Covella et al. (2017) study also discovered that followers' views of the existence of ethical leadership were increased, but not the leader's, in the organization. Employee retention is positively correlated with effective leadership. Employee retention is greatly influenced by organizational justice, including distributive justice and procedural fairness (Covella et al., 2017; Egorov, 2019; Irshad&Afridi, 2011). It has been demonstrated that giving employees the right amount of personal freedom for their position also improves retention. According to Mandhanya (2015), stress is decreased and a sense of belonging and motivation to stick around at work both rise when employees feel they have some degree of control over the outcomes of their work. Executives need personal security and organizational transparency to be effective in their strategic positions, according to a Yaghi (2019) study. Organizations should continually look for and evaluate innovations boosting associate retention and toxic leader avoidance as an additional weapon of engagement to counteract negative influences. In terms of how they approach solutions across demographic, geographic, and business groups, the millennial generation is acting as a pioneer, according to Landez (2018).

**XII. SUMMARY**

In conclusion, it can be said that toxic leader-style behaviors are an indicator of the development of negative emotions and low work output in employees. Therefore, within the organization, it should be monitored whether the leaders show toxic leadership behavior toward their employees and the organization's management should take appropriate measures for those who show toxic leadership behavior in as much as the leader who values and respects his superior in the organization is expected to value and respect his subordinates equally. As seen in the past and as it will be seen in the future, the only power potential that can move an organization forward is human resources. Hence, every institution, organization, manager, and leader that values their employees and supports their development will increase their success exponentially.

**REFERENCES**

- [1.] Akca M. The Impact of Toxic Leadership on Intention to Leave of Employees. *International Journal of Economics, Business, and Management Research*. 2017; 1(04):285-298.
- [2.] Paltu A, Brouwers M. Toxic Leadership: Effects on Job Satisfaction, Commitment, Turnover Intention, and Organisational Culture within the South African Manufacturing Industry. *SA j hum resour manag*. 2020;18:1-11. doi:10.4102/sajhrm.v18i0.1338
- [3.] Mergen A, Ozbilgin MF. Understanding the Followers of Toxic Leaders: Toxic Illusio and Personal Uncertainty. *International Journal of Management Reviews*. 2021;23(1):45-63. doi:10.1111/ijmr.12240
- [4.] Maheshwari G, Mehta S. Toxic Leadership: Tracing the Destructive Trail. *International Journal of Management*. 5(10):18-24.
- [5.] Vreja LO, Balan S, Bosca LC. An Evolutionary Perspective on Toxic Leadership. *Management and Economics Review*. 2016;1(2):217-228.
- [6.] Labrague LJ, Lorica J, Nwafor CE, Cummings GG. Predictors of toxic leadership behavior among nurse managers: A cross-sectional study. *J Nurse Management*. 2021;29(2):165-176. doi:10.1111/jonm.13130
- [7.] Gallus JA, Walsh BM, van Driel M, Gouge MC, Antolic E. Intolerable Cruelty: A Multilevel Examination of the Impact of Toxic Leadership on U.S. Military Units and Service Members. *Military Psychology*. 2013;25(6):588-601. doi:10.1037/mil0000022
- [8.] Bhandarker A, Rai S. Toxic Leadership: Emotional Distress and Coping Strategy. *IJOTB*. 2019;22(1):65-78. doi:10.1108/ijotb-03-2018-0027
- [9.] Saqib A, Arif M. Employee Silence as Mediator in the Relationship between Toxic Leadership Behavior and Organizational Learning. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*. 2017;10(2):294-310.
- [10.] Kurtulmu. BE. Toxic Leadership and Workplace Bullying: The Role of Followers and Possible Coping Strategies. In: *The Palgrave Handbook of Workplace*

- Well-Being; 2020:1-20. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-02470-3\_24-1.
- [11.] Yava. A. Sectoral Differences in the Perception of Toxic Leadership. In: 5th International Conference on Leadership, Technology, Innovation, and Business Management. Vol 229. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences; 2016:267-276. doi:10.1016/j.sbs.
- [12.] Fahie D. The Lived Experience of Toxic Leadership in Irish Higher Education. *IJWHM*. 2019;13(3):341-355. doi:10.1108/ijwhm-07-2019-0096
- [13.] Armitage A. The Dark Side: The Poetics of Toxic Leadership. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*. 2015;17(3):376-390. doi:10.1177/1523422315587905
- [14.] Hadadian Z, Zarei J. Relationship between Toxic Leadership and Job Stress of Knowledge Workers. *Studies in Business and Economics*. 2016;11(3):84-89. doi:10.1515/sbe-2016-0037
- [15.] Mehta S, Maheshwari GC. Consequence of Toxic Leadership on Employee Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. *NS*. 2013;8(2):1-33. <https://ezproxy.deakin.edu.au/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip.sso&db=bth&AN=94508005&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- [16.] Krasikova, Green, and LeBreton, "Destructive Leadership," 2013. 1308-1338.
- [17.] Hogan, "Moral Conduct and Moral Character," 217-232; H. G. Gough, *CPI Plus: California Psychological Inventory* (Bucuresti, Romania: Testcentral, 2009). Retrieved from <<http://romania.testcentral.ro/media/cpiplus-m-en-pdf-BUSB2V74.pdf>>.
- [19.] Collins and Schmidt, "Personality, Integrity, and White Collar Crime," 2007.295-
- [20.] Purcell, J. (2014) Disengaging from engagement. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 24(3), 241-254. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12046>
- [21.] Bell, R. M. (2020). Toxic leadership and followership typologies: A partial replication study with scale refinement. *Integral Leadership Review* <http://integralleadershipreview.com/17427-7-31-toxic-leadership-and-followership-typologies-a-partial-replication-study-with-scale-refinement/>
- [22.] Winn, G. L., & Dykes, A. C. (2019). Identifying toxic leadership & building worker resilience. *Professional Safety Journal*, March 2019, 38-45.
- [23.] Mehta, S., & Maheshwari, G. C. (2013) Consequence of toxic leadership on employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *The Journal of Contemporary Management Research*, 8(2), 1-23.
- [24.] Vreka, L. O., Bălan, S., & Bosca, L. C. (2016). An evolutionary perspective on toxic leadership. *Management and Economics Review*, 1(2), 217-228.
- [25.] Kurniawan, M. I., Subroto, P., Ulfah, Y., Shaddiq, S., & Zainul, M. (2021). The Impact of Merger Company on the Value of Case Study Stocks on Merger Gojek and Tokopedia. *Proceedings on Engineering*, 3(4), 425-432.
- [26.] Saputra, M. R. Y., Winarno, W. W., Henderi, H., & Shaddiq, S. (2020). Evaluation of Maturity Level of the Electronic-based Government System in the Department of Industry and Commerce of Banjar Regency. *Journal of Robotics and Control (JRC)*, 1(5), 156-161.
- [27.] Ramadhani, R., Suswanta, S., & Shaddiq, S. (2021). E-marketing of village tourism development strategy (Case Study in the Tourist Village PuncakSosok). *Journal of Robotics and Control (JRC)*, 2(2), 72-77.
- [28.] Habibah, M., Setiawan, A., Shaddiq, S., & Zainul, H. M. (2021). Creative Advertising Management Application Strategy on Television in Indonesia. *Jurnal Mantik*, 5(2), 800-806.
- [29.] Landes, T. (2018). Authentic leadership and Machiavellianism in young global leadership. *ISM Journal*. Vol. 2(2), 39-41.
- [30.] Yaghi, M. (2019). Toxic leadership and the organizational commitment of senior-level corporate executives. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability, and Ethics*, 16(4). <https://doi.org/10.33423/jlae.v16i4.2375>
- [31.] Mandhanya, Y. (2015). A study of the impact of working environment on retention of employees. *Global Management Review*, 9(4), 116-128.
- [32.] Bindu, H. (2016). Factors influencing employee retention – a study in select service sector organizations. *The Indian Journal of Management*, 10, 25-30.
- [33.] Egorov, M., Kalshoven, K., Verdorfer, A. P., & Peus, C. (2020) it's a match: Moralization and the effects of moral foundations congruence on ethical and unethical leadership perception. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 167, 707-723. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04178-9>
- [34.] Irshad, M., & Afridi, F. (2011). Factors affecting employee retention: Evidence from the literature. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(2), 307-339.