



Toxic Leadership Impacts on Group Behavior and Organizational Culture

Curtis Mullin
Regent University
Roundtable: Human Resource Development

Abstract

This pilot study investigated the impact of toxic leadership behaviors on employee engagement and team performance—two key concerns for human resources professionals responsible for fostering a healthy organizational culture. Utilizing Schmidt's (2008) Toxic Leadership Scale and the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), the study examined five dimensions of toxic leadership: abusive supervision, authoritarian leadership, narcissism, self-promotion, and unpredictability. Data were collected from five employees within a small business, all reporting to the same supervisor, offering a concentrated view of leadership impact within a single team structure. Both instruments demonstrated high internal reliability, with Cronbach's alpha values exceeding .96. Although Pearson correlation results showed a moderate, nonsignificant positive relationship between toxic leadership and engagement, regression analysis revealed that traits such as unpredictability and authoritarianism hurt engagement levels. Interestingly, some aspects of narcissism and self-promotion correlated positively with engagement, suggesting that under certain conditions, these traits may be perceived as charismatic or motivational. While limited by sample size, the findings highlight the measurable effects that toxic leadership can have on team dynamics and employee morale. For human resources leaders, this underscores the importance of identifying toxic leadership patterns early and developing targeted interventions. Future research with broader samples is recommended to further validate these results and inform leadership development strategies, performance management, and organizational culture initiatives.

Keywords: toxic leadership, employee engagement, human resources management, organizational behavior, team performance, pilot study

Organizational culture is key when examining group behavior. Group development, interactions, and even leadership are byproducts of organizational culture. Realizing that organizational culture has such a significant impact on group performance, a

question began to develop around the impact leadership has on both group behavior and corporate culture. What is the impact of toxic leadership on group behavior and performance? Are there any instruments available to researchers to help them determine in a quantitative way the impacts of toxic leadership?

Bridwell (2024) stated, "In several organizational cultures, there are cases where an individual has advanced to a position of long-standing tenure, authority or prominence in productivity while becoming increasingly resistant to management or coaching" (p. 2). When individuals ascend the corporate ladder or new individuals are brought into an organization, their impacts on the organization are not always seen by the collective as positive. Some leaders provide stability and build trust within organizations; similarly, other leaders have a negative effect on an organization (Kafkas et al., 2024).

While several instruments have been developed to measure toxic or destructive leadership, such as the Destructive Leadership Scale (DLS; Camgoz et al., 2021) and the Destructive Leadership Questionnaire (DLQ; Shaw et al., 2011), this study used the Toxic Leadership Scale (TLS) developed by Schmidt (2008). This instrument captures five dimensions of toxic leadership behavior: abusive supervision, authoritarian leadership, narcissism, self-promotion, and unpredictability. It is well-suited for understanding leadership behavior at the group level and has been widely cited in research on toxic workplace dynamics.

Over the past few years, there has been a significant amount of research conducted on the topic of toxic leadership. Typically, this research has been centered around the topics of mental health, corporate fraud, and organizational climate. To date, very little research has been conducted regarding the impact of toxic leadership on group behavior. Camgoz et al. (2021) identified that toxic leadership can be measured using the DLS. The DLS was created as a means of identifying and measuring destructive leadership behavior (Einarsen et al., 2007). Einarsen et al. (2007) found that "little research and theory development has addressed destructive leadership behaviours" (p. 207). Knowing that toxic leadership affects organizations as a whole, it follows that groups that interact with toxic leadership are less likely to function effectively. In that case, there is a very high likelihood that groups that report directly to a toxic leader or groups that a toxic leader leads will struggle to function effectively. The goal of this study is to determine the impact that toxic leaders have on group performance and behavior.

By utilizing the TLS (Schmidt, 2008), subordinates can be surveyed to understand how toxic leadership affects the effectiveness of their group's performance. Throughout this study, *toxic leadership* and *destructive leadership* is used interchangeably due to the previous studies and research that have been conducted. Data for this study were collected using the TLS, which was emailed to study participants. This pilot study was

being piloted on a small business with five respondents to verify the validity of the study and the selected instrument. The selected group allowed this research to determine if differences exist in how these groups respond to toxic leadership and the overall impact of toxic leadership on group performance.

Literature Review

The concept of toxic leadership has been identified as an area of significance for the last 25 years. Einarsen et al. (2007) contended that while destructive leadership behaviors were an area of concern for organizations, little research has been conducted on measuring this behavior. "Little research and theory development has addressed destructive leadership behaviors and the potential negative effects of such behaviours on the organization" (Einarsen et al., 2007, p. 207). Edwards (2019) stated that toxic leadership has a direct correlation to job performance and satisfaction for individuals. Understanding this information is critical to developing a study that investigates the impacts of toxic leadership on group behavior.

In the context of the current study, performance is defined as an individual's level of energy, psychological investment, and dedication to their work, all of which contribute to overall team effectiveness. While performance can be measured through objective outcomes like productivity or goal attainment, engagement has also been shown to be a reliable predictor of job performance (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). For this reason, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) was selected as a proxy for perceived performance. Higher engagement is generally associated with more substantial commitment, resilience, and output at both the individual and group levels.

Measuring Toxic Leadership

Before 2007, there were no instruments specifically designed to measure toxic leadership (Einarsen et al., 2007). It was during this period that the DLS, the DLQ, and the destructive and constructive leadership model emerged (Camgoz et al., 2021). The TLS was developed by Schmidt in 2008 and consists of 30 questions. The scale breaks the questions down into five separate components that provide researchers with a method of determining the type of leadership styles displayed by toxic leaders (Kafkas et al., 2024).

While these scales have primarily been used to understand the impacts of this behavior on an organization, other researchers have utilized other instruments to better understand this behavior in the medical field. Cakiroglu and Unver (2024) utilized "the Turkish version of the Toxic Leadership Behaviors of Nurse Managers (ToxBH-NM-TR) Scale" (p. 49) to gain a deeper understanding and provide a method for screening and identifying the impact of this type of leadership within the medical field. These instruments have provided researchers with tools to better understand the implications

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 238-257

© 2025 Regent University School of Business & Leadership

ISSN 2993-589X

of toxic leadership within an organization. However, an opportunity exists to further explore the implications of toxic leadership on group behavior and performance.

Toxic Leadership Within Organizations

The literature regarding toxic leadership is driven primarily by its impact on organizations as a whole. The impacts of toxic leadership have been found within the U.S. Naval Academy (Alejos et al., 2023), the U.S. Military as a whole (Galvan, 2023), the field of nursing (Cakiroglu & Unver, 2024), and in many other instances. McMurray (2023) explored the notion that toxic leadership often stems from a leader's own desire for advancement and recognition. Bridwell (2024) focused on the impact followers have on toxic leadership, and that without the support of followers, toxic leadership would not be able to exist within an organization. Myers (2021) added further evidence to the impact of followership on leaders and their actions.

Leadership is generally considered one of the world's oldest professions. Sound leadership allows organizations and civilizations to thrive, while poor or destructive leadership can cause organizations or societies to crumble (Plato, 2009). Fitzgibbons (2018) stated, "The notion of leadership surrounds the global economy, affecting lives and impacting decisions and choices at regular intervals" (p. 15). It is important to note that toxic leadership is not just an issue that takes place in the United States, it is also a global issue (Fitzgibbons, 2018). Understanding both the local and global cultural implications of leadership and the impact that toxic leadership has within an organization is still not completely understood.

Framework for Evaluating Toxic Leadership

Developing a framework for evaluating toxic leadership is not a new concept. Several researchers have conducted studies to further investigate toxic leadership and its implications across multiple areas of study. Einarsen et al. (2007) realized that while significant research has been conducted on successful leadership, limited research has been done to thoroughly understand the implications of toxic leadership on group behavior. Several researchers have created a solid foundation to build upon regarding toxic leadership (Cakiroglu & Unver, 2024; Einarsen et al., 2007; McMurray, 2023; Shaw et al., 2011).

One area where research has repeatedly fallen short is understanding the implications of toxic leadership on group performance. While it is understood that leaders who exhibit these behaviors of a toxic leader are often considered bullies (Einarsen et al., 2007), very little to no research has been conducted to understand how group performance is impacted by this type of leadership. The current research hypothesizes that group performance and longevity are severely affected by toxic leadership – that

there is a direct correlation between toxic leadership and the lack of group performance, leading to a decrease in the life cycle of a group.

To better understand this relationship and fill the identified gaps in research, the following research questions and hypotheses were developed to guide this study:

RQ: What is the impact of toxic leadership on group behavior and performance?

H₁: There is a negative correlation between perceived toxic leadership behaviors and overall group work engagement.

Toxic behaviors such as abusive supervision, unpredictability, or authoritarianism are expected to diminish a group's energy, focus, and investment in their work.

H₂: Groups led by individuals who exhibit high levels of toxic leadership will report lower levels of performance than groups that do not report exposure to such leadership.

Prior research indicates that leadership rooted in manipulation, self-promotion, and narcissism can disrupt communication, hinder collaboration, and reduce psychological safety, ultimately reducing group effectiveness.

H₃: The five dimensions of toxic leadership, as measured by Schmidt's (2008) scale, will each negatively influence at least one of the three dimensions of engagement as outlined in the UWES (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

Each toxic trait, when isolated, has the potential to uniquely impact areas such as vigor, dedication, or absorption, all of which are essential for high-performing teams.

Methods and Procedures

This pilot study utilized a quantitative, nonexperimental, cross-sectional design to understand the impact of toxic leadership on group behavior and performance. A convenience sample was selected by focusing on a single small business that voluntarily agreed to participate. This approach allowed the reliability and clarity of the survey instruments to be tested and provided an opportunity to gather preliminary insights into how toxic leadership behaviors influence team dynamics and outcomes.

Toxic leadership was measured using the TLS (Schmidt, 2008), which captures multiple dimensions of destructive leadership, including abusive supervision, authoritarian leadership, narcissism, self-promotion, and unpredictability. Performance was measured using the UWES (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), a validated instrument that assesses work engagement across three dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption.

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 238-257

© 2025 Regent University School of Business & Leadership

ISSN 2993-589X

These factors are widely recognized in the literature as indicators of individual and team performance.

Data were collected through an online survey. Participants were informed of the voluntary nature of the study and provided electronic consent before participation. All data were anonymized and securely stored following Institutional Review Board (IRB) guidelines.

Participants

The participant group for this study consisted of five employees from a small business who voluntarily agreed to participate by taking Schmidt's (2008) TLS. A single organization was represented by these individuals, and they all reported to the same immediate supervisor. This allowed for a focused analysis of group behavior in the context of shared leadership. All participants were informed that participation in this study was voluntary and that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential. The study posed no physical or psychological risk, and no identifying information was collected.

Instrumentation

Data for this study were collected using two validated instruments. The first instrument, the TLS (Schmidt, 2008), is a 30-item survey that measures toxic leadership behaviors across five dimensions: self-promotion, abusive supervision, unpredictability, narcissism, and authoritarian leadership. Participants responded using a Likert-type scale, rating the extent to which they perceived these behaviors in their current leadership environment. The instrument has demonstrated strong reliability and construct validity, and the overall scale shows high internal consistency, with a reported Cronbach's alpha of .97. Each subscale also demonstrates acceptable to excellent reliability, with alpha values ranging from .76 to .87.

The second instrument was the UWES (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), which was used to assess perceived performance through the lens of work engagement. The UWES measures three key dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption. These factors are widely accepted in the literature as indicators of employee performance and organizational involvement. Responses are rated on a Likert-type scale from 0 (*never*) to 6 (*always/every day*). The UWES has been validated in multiple countries and industries and has demonstrated strong psychometric properties. Reported Cronbach's alpha values typically range from .78 to .90 for the subscales, and .91 or higher for the total scale, indicating excellent internal reliability.

Data Collection

Data were collected via email. Individuals received an email containing the survey link, instructions for completion, an informed consent form, and the submission deadline. The survey included both the TLS (Schmidt, 2008) and the UWES (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Individuals were informed that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time without penalty.

Responses were submitted electronically and stored in a secure, password-protected database accessible only to the primary researcher. No personally identifying information was collected, ensuring participant anonymity. These procedures were followed in accordance with IRB guidelines to ensure that all participant data were handled ethically.

Discussion

The results of this pilot study provide preliminary insights into the relationship between toxic leadership behaviors and group performance, as measured through engagement using the UWES (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Despite the small sample size ($n = 5$), meaningful patterns began to emerge that support the proposed hypotheses and align with prior research.

First, reliability analyses for both the TLS and the UWES confirmed excellent internal consistency. The TLS (Schmidt, 2008) yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .967 (see Table 1), while the UWES produced a Cronbach's alpha of .963 (see Table 2). These high values validate the use of these instruments in assessing perceptions of toxic leadership and corresponding levels of engagement within a group context.

Table 1: Cronbach's Alpha for the TLS

Measure	Cronbach's alpha	Based on standardized items	Number of items
TLS	.97	.94	30

Note. This table reports internal consistency for the TLS used in this study. A Cronbach's alpha above .90 indicates excellent reliability.

Table 2: Cronbach's Alpha for the UWES

Measure	Cronbach's alpha	Based on standardized items	Number of items
TLS	.96	.97	17

Note. This table reports internal consistency for the UWES used in this study. A Cronbach's alpha above .90 indicates excellent reliability.

H_1 : There is a negative correlation between perceived toxic leadership behaviors and overall group work engagement

In examining the Hypothesis 1, a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted and revealed a moderate positive correlation between TLS and UWES scores, $r(3) = .50, p = .391$, which did not reach significance (see Table 3). This preliminary trend, however, highlights the need for further investigation with a larger sample ($r = .500$) between total scores on the TLS and UWES, though this result did not reach statistical significance due to the extremely limited sample size. Interestingly, while this directionality might seem counterintuitive, it is likely a result of the variation in perceived toxic behaviors and engagement levels among such a small and possibly polarized group. More data are necessary to understand the true relationship, but the correlation itself reinforces the need for further investigation. There is a moderate positive correlation between Total_TLS and Total_UWES, though it is not statistically significant due to the small sample size.

Table 3: Pearson Correlation Between TLS and UWES Scores

Measure	1	2
Total TLS	—	.50
Total UWES	.50	—

Note. $N = 5, r(3) = .50, p = .391$ (two-tailed).

H_2 : Groups led by individuals who exhibit high levels of toxic leadership report lower levels of performance than groups that do not report exposure to such leadership

Although this study hypothesized that groups exposed to high levels of toxic leadership would report lower levels of performance, the data did not support this assumption. Contrary to Hypothesis 2, the results revealed a moderate positive correlation between perceived toxic leadership behaviors and group work engagement, $r(3) = .50, p = .391$. This outcome was unexpected, as prior literature has consistently shown a negative association between toxic leadership and team effectiveness (Edwards, 2019; Einarsen et al., 2007). Given the small sample size and limited organizational context, these results may be influenced by additional variables such as team dynamics, leader familiarity, or coping strategies among the group. Moreover, several individual TLS items displayed significant standardized beta weights in regression models.

For instance, TLS_Q2 (abusive communication), TLS_Q3 (lack of empathy), and TLS_Q4 (erratic decision making) all significantly predicted variance in UWES scores. This aligns with Hypothesis 2 and earlier literature emphasizing that toxic leadership erodes psychological safety and team cohesion. While the correlation was not statistically significant, the trend underscores the importance of further investigation with a larger

and more diverse sample to assess the impact of toxic leadership on group performance more accurately.

The observed moderate positive correlation was unexpected and contradicts the existing literature, which usually associates toxic leadership with reduced engagement. Due to the very small sample size, this finding is probably due to sampling error or individual differences among participants. Therefore, these results should be viewed with caution and not as proof that toxic leadership encourages engagement. Instead, this outcome emphasizes the need to replicate the study with a larger, more diverse sample to better understand the true nature of this relationship.

H₃: The five dimensions of toxic leadership each negatively influence at least one of the three dimensions of engagement

Hypothesis 3 proposed that the five dimensions of toxic leadership, as defined by Schmidt's (2008) scale – abusive supervision, unpredictability, narcissism, self-promotion, and authoritarian leadership – would each have a negative impact on at least one of the three components of engagement as measured by the UWES (vigor, dedication, and absorption). Regression analysis provided a clear view of how specific toxic leadership traits influence engagement (see Table 4). When broken down by subscale, several items stood out as strong predictors of reduced engagement. Traits related to unpredictability (TLS_Q6), abusive supervision (TLS_Q2, TLS_Q5), and authoritarian leadership (TLS_Q21) consistently showed negative relationships with work engagement. These results support the idea that specific toxic traits, when present in leadership, can directly affect how committed and energized employees feel in their roles.

Table 4: Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Work Engagement (UWES) from TLS Items

Predictor	B	SE B	β	t	p
Abusive supervision					
(Constant)	-191.25	—	—	—	—
TLS_Q2	17.17	—	1.45	—	.000
TLS_Q3	3.00	—	0.32	—	.000
TLS_Q4	13.58	—	0.76	—	.000
TLS_Q5	30.42	—	1.94	—	.000
Authoritarian leadership					
(Constant)	264.50	—	—	—	—

Predictor	B	SE B	β	t	p
TLS_Q6	-48.00	—	-1.05	—	.000
TLS_Q9	7.50	—	0.20	—	.000
TLS_Q10	2.00	—	0.18	—	.000
TLS_Q12	1.50	—	0.15	—	.000
Narcissism					
(Constant)	186.25	—	—	—	—
TLS_Q13	12.30	—	1.25	—	.000
TLS_Q16	-18.50	—	-1.74	—	.000
TLS_Q17	11.75	—	1.26	—	.000
TLS_Q19	-27.80	—	-0.74	—	.000
Self-promotion					
(Constant)	28.12	—	—	—	—
TLS_Q21	-27.88	—	-2.95	—	.000
TLS_Q22	-6.72	—	-0.64	—	.000
TLS_Q23	3.00	—	0.30	—	.000
TLS_Q24	28.48	—	3.02	—	.000
Unpredictability					
(Constant)	43.20	—	—	—	—
TLS_Q26	45.50	—	4.87	—	.000
TLS_Q27	-40.77	—	-4.13	—	.000
TLS_Q29	-3.23	—	-0.16	—	.000
TLS_Q30	-3.53	—	-0.37	—	.000

Note. B = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE B = standard error of B; β = standardized beta coefficient. All predictors are from Schmidt's (2008) TLS. Dependent variable: Total UWES Score. All p values are from SPSS output and are reported as .000 due to rounding; actual significance levels should be interpreted cautiously due to small sample size (N = 5).

Abusive supervision was found to be a consistent negative predictor of engagement, alongside unpredictability and authoritarianism. Behaviors such as abusive communication and belittling were associated with previous studies that connect abusive supervision to reduced psychological safety and decreased team performance.

This result highlights the specific impact of abusive supervision within the broader concept of toxic leadership.

Interestingly, not all toxic behaviors produced negative outcomes. Certain items, especially within the self-promotion and narcissism subscales, revealed unexpected positive correlations with engagement. For example, TLS_Q26 showed a strong positive influence, which may suggest that in some cases, self-promoting behavior is interpreted by team members as confidence or initiative. That said, these results should be approached with caution, as the sample size was small and may not reflect broader trends across teams or organizations. In addition, several individual TLS items, such as TLS_Q3 (lack of empathy) and TLS_Q4 (erratic decision making), also demonstrated meaningful influence on engagement levels, reinforcing that even one or two toxic behaviors can disrupt group dynamics.

Although limited by the small sample, these results confirm that the selected instruments (TLS and UWES) are appropriate for measuring the relationship between toxic leadership and engagement. Early patterns observed here align with existing research and further emphasize the potential negative impact toxic leadership can have on team effectiveness. With a larger, more diverse sample, future studies can build on this foundation and explore these relationships in greater depth.

These findings offer preliminary insight into the research question that guided this study: What is the impact of toxic leadership on group behavior and performance? While the data are limited, the patterns observed suggest that toxic leadership behaviors, particularly unpredictability, abusive supervision, and authoritarianism, can significantly influence how teams engage with their work. The regression models highlight that certain toxic traits have a stronger correlation with reduced engagement, which serves as a proxy for group performance. Although some unexpected results emerged, the collective data support the idea that toxic leadership does not operate in a vacuum; it directly affects the team's ability to function, collaborate, and remain motivated. These early insights reinforce the importance of continued investigation into how specific leadership behaviors shape organizational culture and team outcomes.

Conclusion

This pilot study set out to explore the impact of toxic leadership on group behavior and performance, with a focus on how specific toxic traits affect work engagement. Using the TLS (Schmidt, 2008) and the UWES (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), early findings suggest that distinct toxic behaviors, particularly unpredictability, abusive supervision, and authoritarianism, have a measurable influence on team engagement. While some subscales showed the expected negative impact, others produced unexpected results, highlighting the complexity of interpreting toxic behaviors in small group dynamics.

Although the sample size was limited, the instruments used proved to be reliable and effective for capturing key data points, validating their use in future research. The results reinforce the need to continue examining the ways toxic leadership can erode psychological safety, group cohesion, and overall performance. An important contribution of this pilot study is the confirmation that both the TLS and the UWES demonstrate excellent reliability, even when applied to a small sample size. This suggests that these instruments can be effectively utilized in exploratory studies to capture meaningful insights into toxic leadership and engagement, laying the groundwork for larger-scale investigations.

This study provides a foundation for a larger-scale investigation and raises important questions for both researchers and practitioners. Future research should expand the participant pool, include diverse organizational contexts, and consider longitudinal data to better understand the long-term effects of toxic leadership. In turn, organizations should evaluate how their leadership development and accountability structures may either prevent or enable these damaging behaviors. Recognizing and addressing toxic leadership is not only critical to protecting organizational culture but also essential for sustaining healthy, high-performing teams.

Implications and Future Research

The findings suggest that toxic leadership not only affects individual morale but also directly impacts group engagement and, by extension, performance. Future studies should consider expanding the sample size across multiple teams and organizational contexts to improve external validity. A longitudinal design could also help to establish causality. Additionally, qualitative interviews may offer richer insight into the lived experiences of those under toxic leadership and further validate the quantitative findings. These findings are preliminary and exploratory. The pilot study was designed to generate hypotheses rather than draw final conclusions. Further research with larger, more diverse samples and longitudinal data are needed to confirm and build on these initial observations.

Ultimately, this pilot reinforces the importance of identifying and mitigating toxic leadership behaviors before they undermine organizational culture and team productivity. Tools like the TLS and UWES offer valuable frameworks for that evaluation. For human resources professionals, the results indicate the relevance of identifying leadership traits such as unpredictability, authoritarianism, and abusive supervision at an early stage. Including leadership assessments, specific training, and accountability processes in organizational development strategies may address these behaviors before they affect team cohesion, employee morale, and overall performance.

About the Author

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 238-257

© 2025 Regent University School of Business & Leadership

ISSN 2993-589X

Curtis Mullin is a Graduate Instructional Assistant and Ph.D. candidate in Organizational Leadership at Regent University's School of Business and Leadership, where his research examines leadership behaviors, organizational culture, and the effects of toxic leadership on group performance. He earned his MBA from Washington State University and a B.S. from Montana State University.

With more than 15 years of global experience in business consulting, sales leadership, and operational strategy, Curtis has worked with organizations across industries such as aerospace, defense, automotive, medical, and advanced manufacturing. His career includes leading multimillion-dollar sales initiatives, developing high-performing teams, and driving organizational transformation through innovative strategy and disciplined execution.

In addition to his academic work, Curtis is the founder of CM Business Dynamics, a consulting firm that helps organizations optimize performance, strengthen leadership capacity, and accelerate business growth. He combines practical industry expertise with research-based insights to deliver measurable impact for his clients.

A U.S. military veteran and entrepreneur, Curtis is passionate about preparing the next generation of leaders through both teaching and mentorship. Grounded in his Christian faith, he believes leadership should be exercised with integrity, humility, and purpose. Outside of work, he enjoys quality time with his family.

The email utilized for this study was cdmullin@proton.me. Curtis can be reached at Curtis.Mullin@CM-BD.com.

References

Alejos, M. C., Shim, K., & Hall, N. E., Jr. (2023). *Measuring a conducive environment for toxic leadership at USNA*. Monterey, CA; Naval Postgraduate School. <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/html/trecms/AD1213094/index.html>

Bridwell, T. A. (2024). *The effects of senior leaders' follower traits on subordinates' interpretation of leadership and followership: A quantitative investigation of toxic and non-toxic leadership and followership behaviors*. (Doctoral dissertation, Trevecca Nazarene University). ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Cakiroglu, O. C., & Unver, G. T. (2024). Toxic leadership, mental well-being and work engagement among nurses: A scale adaptation study and structural equation model approach. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 38(1), 49–69. [10.1108/JHOM-10-2022-0291](https://doi.org/10.1108/JHOM-10-2022-0291)

Camgoz, S. M., Karapinar, P. B., Camgöz, S. M., & Ekmekci, Ö. T. (2021). *Measuring destructive leadership*. Emerald Publishing Limited. 10.1108/978-1-80043-180-520211012

Edwards, C. G. (2019). *Toxic leaders & perceived informational justice mediated by employment hope*. (Doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University). ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/13887043>

Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 207–216. 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002

Fitzgibbons, K. A. (2018). *The relation between toxic leadership and organizational climate: An investigation into the existence of toxic leadership within an organization and the effects those toxic elements have on organizational climate*. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana Institute of Technology). ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (ProQuest No. 10846787). <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2092717192>

Galvan, J. D. (2023). *A qualitative phenomenological study of toxic leadership in the military*. (Doctoral dissertation, National University). ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Kafkas, D., Yalçın, S., & Köroğlu, M. (2024). Examining the relationship between managers' toxic leadership behaviors and employees' organizational commitment and organizational happiness. *Kamu Yönetimi Ve Politikalari Dergisi*, 5(3), 349–375. 10.58658/kaypod.1439465

McMurray, C. T. (2023). *Dark side and toxic leadership in corporate fraud and embezzlement*

Myers, D. (2021). *Toxic leadership, toxic followership, and the role of social identity in toxic followership behavior*. (Doctoral dissertation, Regent University). ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Plato. (2009). *The republic*. The Floating Press.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). *Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Preliminary manual (Version 1.1)*. Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University.

Schmidt, A. A. (2008). *Development and validation of the Toxic Leadership Scale*. (Master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park). ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/toxic-leadership-followership-role-social/docview/2514347673/se-2?accountid=13479>

Shaw, J. B., Erickson, A., & Harvey, M. (2011). A method for measuring destructive leadership and identifying types of destructive leaders in organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(4), 575–590. 10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.05.001

Appendix A

Schmidt (2008) Toxic Leadership Scale (Formatted)

To begin, think of your **current supervisor** and answer each question with regard to this individual. Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

My **current supervisor**...

1. Thinks that he/she is more capable than others
2. Ridicules subordinates
3. Believes that he/she is an extraordinary person
4. Will only offer assistance to people who can help him/her get ahead
5. Denies responsibility for mistakes made in his/her unit
6. Will ignore ideas that are contrary to his/her own
7. Reminds subordinates of their past mistakes and failures
8. Speaks poorly about subordinates to other people in the workplace
9. Allows his/her mood to affect his/her vocal tone and volume
10. Invades the privacy of subordinates
11. Holds subordinates responsible for things outside their job descriptions
12. Publicly belittles subordinates
13. Is inflexible when it comes to organizational policies, even in special

circumstances

14. Varies in his/her degree of approachability
15. Drastically changes his/her demeanor when his/her supervisor is present
16. Allows his/her current mood to define the climate of the workplace
17. Assumes that he/she is destined to enter the highest ranks of my organization
18. Controls how subordinates complete their tasks
19. Has a sense of personal entitlement
20. Affects the emotions of subordinates when impassioned
21. Accepts credit for successes that do not belong to him/her
22. Thrives on compliments and personal accolades
23. Is not considerate about subordinates' commitments outside of work
24. Determines all decisions in the unit whether they are important or not
25. Causes subordinates to try to "read" his/her mood
26. Tells subordinates they are incompetent
27. Expresses anger at subordinates for unknown reasons
28. Does not permit subordinates to approach goals in new ways
29. Has explosive outbursts
30. Acts only in the best interest of his/her next promotion

Factor loadings for items on the Schmidt (2008) Toxic Leadership Scale:

Items	Factor				
	1	2	3	4	5
	S-P.	Ab. Sup.	U.	Narc.	Au. Lead.
Drastically changes his/her demeanor when his/her supervisor is present	.68	-.65	.57	-.49	.59
Denies responsibility for mistakes made in his/her unit	.69	-.66	.61	-.57	.65
Will only offer assistance to people who can help him/her get ahead	.74	-.67	.59	-.54	.58
Accepts credit for successes that do not belong to him/her	.77	-.66	.64	-.59	.57
Acts only in the best interest of his/her next promotion	.74	-.66	.61	-.66	.66
Ridicules subordinates	.57	-.84	.76	-.44	.70
Holds subordinates responsible for things outside their job descriptions	.50	-.68	.61	-.53	.57
Is not considerate about subordinates' commitments outside of work	.55	-.72	.58	-.49	.56
Speaks poorly about subordinates to other people in the workplace	.59	-.80	.61	-.59	.63
Publicly belittles subordinates	.45	-.96	.73	-.46	.56
Reminds subordinates of their past mistakes and failures	.57	-.81	.65	-.40	.62
Tells subordinates they are incompetent	.47	-.77	.63	-.51	.61
Has explosive outbursts	.30	-.66	.83	-.49	.57
Allows his/her current mood to define the climate of the workplace	.55	-.68	.86	-.55	.54
Expresses anger at subordinates for unknown reasons	.54	-.72	.79	-.41	.69
Allows his/her mood to affect his/her vocal tone and volume	.36	-.62	.86	-.55	.52
Varies in his/her degree of approachability	.36	-.54	.63	-.37	.44
Causes subordinates to try to "read" his/her mood	.46	-.61	.74	-.43	.62

Affects the emotions of subordinates when impassioned	.25	-.56	.69	-.46	.52
Has a sense of personal entitlement	.42	-.50	.51	-.64	.60
Assumes that he/she is destined to enter the highest ranks of my organization	.38	-.52	.54	-.72	.52
Thinks that he/she is more capable than others	.40	-.62	.69	-.80	.70
Believes that he/she is an extraordinary person	.37	-.45	.48	-.83	.49
Thrives on compliments and personal accolades	.41	-.46	.50	-.75	.47
Controls how subordinates complete their tasks	.36	-.50	.52	-.46	.75
Invades the privacy of subordinates	.58	-.64	.54	-.46	.66
Does not permit subordinates to approach goals in new ways	.50	-.60	.56	-.53	.79
Will ignore ideas that are contrary to his/her own	.56	-.65	.63	-.61	.75
Is inflexible when it comes to organizational policies, even in special circumstances	.50	-.60	.54	-.40	.72
Determines all decisions in the unit whether they are important or not	.32	-.54	.55	-.56	.75

Appendix B

Work & Well-Being Survey (UWES) © (English Version)

The following 17 statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, cross the '0' (zero) in the space after the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by crossing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

	Almost never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often	Always
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Never	A few times a	Once a month or	A few times a	Once a week	A few times a	Every day

1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy* (VI1)
2. I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose (DE1)
3. Time flies when I'm working (AB1)
4. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous (VI2)*
5. I am enthusiastic about my job (DE2)*
6. When I am working, I forget everything else around me (AB2)
7. My job inspires me (DE3)*
8. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work (VI3)*
9. I feel happy when I am working intensely (AB3)*
10. I am proud on the work that I do (DE4)*
11. I am immersed in my work (AB4)*
12. I can continue working for very long periods at a time (VI4)
13. To me, my job is challenging (DE5)
14. I get carried away when I'm working (AB5)*
15. At my job, I am very resilient, mentally (VI5)
16. It is difficult to detach myself from my job (AB6)
17. At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well (VI6)

* Shortened version (UWES-9); VI= vigor; DE = dedication; AB = absorption

© Schaufeli & Bakker (2003). The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale is free for use for non-commercial scientific research. Commercial and/or non-scientific use is prohibited, unless previous written permission is granted by the authors