IMPACT OF TOXIC LEADERSHIP ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Fahim Ullah, Ph.D Scholar, Department of Management Sciences, Qurtuba University, Dera Ismail Khan
Dr. Kashif Salim, Professor, Department of Management Sciences, Qurtuba University, Dera Ismail Khan
Saifullah Khan, PhD Scholar. Department of Management Sciences, Qurtuba University, Dera Ismail Khan

ABSTRACT- The toxic leadership has been widely recognized as significant contributor towards the various employees and organizational outcomes. The toxic leader's behavior drives the performance negatively whether it is the individual performance, mental wellness or physical health, stress or anxiety level or the collectively work environment or organizational performance. The researchers devised some strategies to mitigate the toxic leadership effects and create a sophisticated and productive environment for work. The current research develops a deep insight as how leaders select and implement specific strategies endured with behavior for the upgrading of workplace climate and brings positive social changes. This research positively contributes in bringing social change by developing practical models and suggests how to create citizenship behavior less toxic than usual. The positive behavior of leader not only affects individual behavior rather it raises the organizational citizenship behavior and conducive situation. The citizenship behavior of the employee depends upon the leader's behavior and attitude. In this connection, the nature of this study is qualitative that aimed to examine the toxic leadership role towards organizational citizenship behavior by examining the existing literature.

Keywords: toxic leadership, organizations, environment

I. INTRODUCTION

The leadership has been considered as significant factor that is contingent upon various leading parameters that are related with the diverse outcomes. In this connection, various leadership traits and styles are widely recognized as significant contributor towards the organizational values and the employees' demands. Since, these authors evaluated each item; toxic leader variable in this study has been examined through different dimensions. To ensure this was not occurring with toxic leadership behavior, commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, the association has been examined in the different contexts (Tabnachik & Fidell, 2001). Bad, toxic, abusive, destructive, incompetent, and unethical all enter the lexicon oftoxic leadership. This makes any discussion of the subject confusing and limited by the constant debate about what does and does not constitute the construct in question (Asha & Snigdha, 2019). Moreover, some toxic leadership is global and violent (e.g. genocide), while other toxicity is nonviolent and frequently experienced in organizational life (Appelbaum & Roy, 2007). Also, when assessing the variance in employee psychological distress resulting from toxic leadership, other factors must be taken into account. According to the Organizational Support Theory (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch & Rhoades, 2001; Shore & Shore, 1995), employee emotional health is ultimately caused by inadequate organizational support especially for employees' well-being (Bronston et al., 2017) in different contexts.

The toxic leadership is an important phenomenon that has been widely experienced in different organizational contexts with diverse consequences. It has been suggested by various researchers as the similar trait parallel to authoritative and abusive leadership (Goldman, 2011, Maxwell, 2015). It influences number of the administrative and organizational process, sectors and areas such as employee mental and physical health, increased dysfunctional group behaviors, absenteeism and lateness, the lesser efficiency and relocation and resignations. Moreover, toxic leaders own the characteristic such as bad or unethical behavior, self-promotion, insulting and oppressive management, descending anger towards other and the egotistical and administrative inclinations (Schmidt, 2014). Mehta and Maheshwari (2014), argued characteristic of toxic leaders encompass egoistic attitude, self-centered approach, faithfulness, aggressiveness and bad temperament. They do not bother their behavior and attitudinal impact on followers/subordinates and ultimately results in unintentional ignorance towards the guidance, mentoring, training and development of employees or subordinates.

The organizational citizenship behavior has received attention in both organizational and business research (Arthaud, Rode &Turnley, 2012). There has been a substantial amount of research during the last few decades on topic of organizational citizenship behaviors and various organizational constructs related

to it. These previous studies have addressed as many as leadership tend to play a significant role in employees' organizational citizenship behavior (Farh, Zhong& Organ, 2004). It also focuses on significance of the culture and context in which task performance occurs. Therefore, one can argue that organizational citizenship behavior is an act that is not required or demanded as part of the formal job accountability (Lai, Lam and Lam, 2013). In contrast to this, challenge-oriented organizational citizenship behavior is change oriented and contains the risk that they could harm interpersonal relationships with others because they critique the status quo (Qadeer & Jaffery, 2014), however, certain other factors are also liable to mark the relationships like the organizational politics. Toxic leadership in the banking sector has a significant link with organizational trust, organizational citizenship behavior, and group productivity.(Zaabi & Elanain, 2018). Toxic leadership behaviors are destructive to emotions, leading to emotional exhaustion and employee behavior in work setting.

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW

The current study undergone a vast scope and studies impact of toxic leadership behavioral from different dimensions relating to how worst affects not only the individual employees but also affects badly overall organizational citizenship behavior and performance. The low degree performance has been studied quantitatively to have a better and deep understanding of selection and implication of leadership strategies as well as the behavior needed to modify the workplace environment. The current study seeks the degree of resentment of workforce against the toxic behavior of leader, thus, the leaders devise the acceptable improved behavior towards employees that detoxifies the workplace environment. The literature described those toxic leaders' nuisance subordinates to impairment of work, long-term welfare and health of the people within it. Also, the study of Aboyassin and Abood (2013), Hadadian and Zarei (2016) revealed that toxic leadership attitude had positive association with employee stress and ineffective leadership had negative relations with employees and organizational performance, negative leadership enhance employee turnover and there is positive and significant relationship among the abusive leadership and intention to quit.

However, such employees who borne attack(s) on their self-esteem, have low confidence; toxic leader attitude decrease their self-efficacy (Kusy& Holloway, 2009). Toxic leadership is more damaging because it affects the performance of the subordinates (Malik, Sattar, Younas, & Nawaz, 2019). The toxic leaders boost their self-esteems and cut off their employees' work extravagance and efficiency with destructive behavior. Toxic leaders blame others if they do anything wrong at workplace which ultimately affects the citizenship behavior. The leaders are considered elemental for success or failure of an organization. As leaders, may become source of the learning, innovation and organizational success (Berson, Da'as, & Waldman, 2015) or turn out to be barrier to citizenship behavior and organizational failure by negatively influencing emotions and behaviors of individuals (Schilling & Kluge, 2009). These contradicting leadership behaviors invite the attention of researchers to understand both positive and negative aspects of leadership to fully understand the leadership phenomenon (Kaiser, LeBreton, & Hogan, 2015). Therefore, the toxic leadership provides the guiding principles to employees that how to behave in the organizations towards the assigned responsibilities.

The existing research has witnessed a number of leadership behaviors and styles that are facilitating to organizational learning (Vera & Crossan, 2004) like transformational leadership (García, Barrionuevo, & Gutiérrez, 2012), ambidexterity leadership (Nemanich & Vera, 2009), transactional leadership (Jansen, Vera & Crossan, 2009). However, toxic leadership behaviors in relationship to organizational citizenship behavior are a missing link as emphasized numerous researchers in different research studies. The toxic leadership is considered as an array of the destructive behaviors that drive the leaders to achieve personal goals and benefits by flexible interests of individuals, teams and organizations (Schmidt, 2014). Goldman (2012) explained that toxic leaders' destructive and dysfunctional behaviors have capacity to transfer to lower level of workplace, resulting in to the toxic organizational climate. The extent literature views those leadership behaviors whether constructive or destructive behaviors emerge from interaction of three factors namely leaders, followers, and the environment (Padilla, Hogan & Kaiser, 2007). From the perspective of toxic leadership these three factors negatively affect the toxic leadership behaviors; called it "toxic triangle" (Xu, Loi, & Lam, 2015). In this connection, the toxic leader is more effective in determining the employees' attitude and behavior towards the assgined tasks from different perspectives.

In explanation, leader' personality, power and ideology; followers" values, maturity and same personality and ideology like the toxic leaders; and the environmental factors instability, perceived threats, cultural

values conducive to toxicity, lack of checks and inefficient mechanisms and systems handle toxic leadership behaviors and negative outcomes. The toxic leadership has been explained in this study through different dimensions like self-promotion, dark-leadership, unpredictability and abusive supervision. The literature revealed that without request for formal rewards in return and now become quite a relatively new concept in performance analysis. Organizational citizenship behavior is an important element of employees' productivity as organizations cannot foresee the entire job scope required for the goals attainment except the contractually stated the minimum job descriptions (Rioux, & Penner, 2001). The construct of organizational citizenship behavior was introduced by drawing on concept of super role behaviors (Schlechter & Engelbrecht, 2006). Examples of employees' organizational citizenship behavior include: accepting extra duties and responsibilities at work, working overtime when needed and helping subordinates with their work (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman & Taylor, 1996). Thus, the leadership is critical in determining the values of the employees and the norms of the concerned organization in different contexts.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The argumentation process has been used to qualitatively examine the views of the various researchers on the issues like toxic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. The toxic as explored from different dimensions by researchers have been highlighted in light of existing research studies and thus analyzed through argumentation process to analyze the views of the researchers and extract the new knowledge about the existing issues to contribute the existing database of knowledge. Therefore, the various dimensions have been discussed in this study which is critical in determining the behavior of toxic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior in different perspectives. Therefore, this tool of argumentation and thematic analysis is the most significant tool used for determining the views of the respondents as well as researchers concerning the various research phenomena.

IV. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The toxic leadership has been explored through various studies with diverse outcomes relating to employees' attitude and behavior in different contexts. The leadership is critical in examining the values of the employees towards the organizational objectives thereby keeping in view the different traits of the leadership as well as the attitudinal responses of the employees (Gotsis & Kortezi, Z. (2010). Thus, employees are apprehensive in managing the demands of the leadership and the ultimate and leading behavioral outcomes related with the organizational consequences (Hadadian & Zarei, 2016). The leadership is also critical for maintaining the desired outcomes that are contingent upon the tasks and contextual behavior of the employees (Kaiser, LeBreton & Hogan, 2015). The leadership is therefore, the important phenomenon that is vital for maintaining the employees' values and organizational demands (Mehta & Maheshwari, 2014). The employees are also much concerned with the environmental issues that are vital in determining the attitude and behavior of the employees concerned (Padilla, Hogan & Kaiser, 2007). The literature showed that without request for formal rewards in return and become now fairly relatively new concept in performance analysis related with the attitude and behavior of the employees.

This study aimed at examining the influence of toxic leadership dimensions toward organizational citizenship behavior in the different contexts. The toxic leadership behaviors are destructive to emotions, leading to emotional exhaustion and employee Silence with in works setting (Ng & Feldman, 2012). Tepper (2007) and Whitman et al. (2014) based on the theory of conservation of resources explained that when subordinates face negative behavior of their supervisors. They intend to adopt avoidant or passive copping behaviors and hence try to remain away from the source of stress and exhaustion i.e., toxic leader. Based on these assumptions the study postulated that toxic leadership behaviors cause increase in the employee behavior. The literature provides evidence that employee silence behavior is a hurdle in the way to organizational citizenship behavior (Morrison, 2014). Employees silence which is viewed as an individual choice involves a decision about whether to have a voice or to remain silent in the context of an organizational politics that affects the individual employee (Lewin & Mitchell, 1992; McCabe & Lewin, 1992; Withey & Cooper, 1989). In this regard, toxic leaders are critical for determining the employees' behavior from different perspectives.

The literature revealed that leaders are concerned about only their own-self and care themselves rather very low degree of concern toward team members, followers or subordinates. In addition, toxic leaders intentionally espouse hostile behavior towards their employees because of their managerial power; this

behavior of toxic leaders created anxiety among the employees and also hurts the individual administrative success (Reyhanoğlu & Akın, 2016). The toxic leaders retain hounding attitude towards peers as they illustrate their successful image to others and this not only creates poisonous thoughts also imparts poison behavior along the teams (Gündüz & Dedekorkut, 2014). Moreover, they are deprived of empathy, sensitive and belong to hopeless school of thought that is showed in their attitude. They try to decay solidities of workgroup in organization and their festering behavior effects individual eccentricities in organization (Gallus, Walsh, Driel, Gouge & Antolic, 2013). Toxic leader performance revealed those administrators or other managerial leaders lessening organizational behaviors in for-profit employees contributes to the higher employee turnover (Rafferty & Restubog, 2011). Thus, toxic leaders are significant for determining the individuals' behaviors in the organizations concerning the various parameters that need further investigations.

V. CONCLUSION

The toxic leadership was examined as theoretical underpinning used in previous research that examined leadership behavior. In this connection, due to restricted constructs used in theoretical model related to toxic leadership to analyze the leadership phenomenon, this research appeared to analyze theoretical model with other theory such as organizational support theory related with the various phenomenon in the organizational context. Somehow by "extending theoretical model, it can strengthen explanatory ability to, recognizing the coping strategy could improve the capacity of the theoretical model to explain the toxic leadership". Also, the organizational support theory is adopted to predict psychological distress of the employees. This study implies that individual behavior is affected by how the organization cares and values their emotional needs related with the organizational citizenship behavior. The support from supervisors, without the fairness, and incentives, employees will not be able to see that organization has a strong emphasis on them that lacks in the toxic leadership traits. In this context, on the basis existing research studies findings, this study indicates that further work is required to extend the existing model (toxic leadership) so that it can provide more substantial explanatory power to analyze the toxic leadership in the different contexts. This study provides significant insight about the toxic leadership and the organizational citizenship behavior.

REFERENCES

1. Aboyassin, N. A., &Abood, N. (2013).The effect of ineffective leadership on individual and organizational performance in Jordanian institutions. Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal, 23(1), 68-84.
2. Appelbaum, S. H., & Roy, G. D. (2007). Toxins in the workplace: affect on organizations and employees. Corporate Governance, 7 (1), 17-28.
3. Arthaud, M. L., Rode, J. C., &Turnley, W. H. (2012). Direct and contextual effects of individual values on organizational citizenship behaviors in teams. Journal of Applied Psychology, 97(4), 792-807.
4. Asha, B., & Snigdha, R. (2019). Toxic leadership: emotional distress and coping strategy. International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior, 22 (1), 65-78.
5. Ashford, S. J., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Christianson, M. K. (2009). Speaking up and speaking out: The leadership dynamics of voice in organizations. In Greenberg, J., & Edwards, M. S. (Eds.). (2009). Voice and silence in organizations. Emerald Group Publishing, pp. 175-202
6. Berson, Y., Da'as, R., & Waldman, D. A. (2015). How do leaders and their teams bring about organizational learning and outcomes? Personnel Psychology, 68(1), 79-108
7. Chua, S. M. Y., & Murray, D. W. (2015). How toxic leaders are perceived: gender and information-processing. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 36 (3), 292- 307.
8. Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(1), 42-51.
9. Farh, J. L., Zhong, C. B., & Organ, D. W. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in the People's Republic of China. Organization Science, 15(2), 241-253.
10. Gallus, J. A., Walsh, B. M., Driel, M. v., Gouge, M. C., &Antolic, E. (2013). Intolerable Cruelty: A Multilevel Examination of the Impact of Toxic Leadership on U.S. Military Units and Service Members. Military Psychology,25(6), 88–601.
11. García-Morales, V. J., Jiménez-Barrionuevo, M., & Gutiérrez-Gutiérrez, L. (2012).Transformational leadership influence on organizational performance through organizational learning and innovation. Journal of Business Research, 65(7), 1040-1050.

12. Goldman, A. (2011). Demagogue to dialogue: An alternative to toxic leadership in corporate downsizings. Organizational Dynamics, 40, 235—241.
13. Goldman, E. F. (2012). Leadership practices that encourage strategic thinking. Journal of Strategy and Management, 5(1), 25-40.
14. Hadadian, Z., &Zarei, J. (2016).Relationship between Toxic Leadership and Job Stress of Knowledge Workers. Studies in Business and Economics, 11(3), 84-89.
15. Jansen, J. J., Vera, D., &Crossan, M. (2009). Strategic leadership for exploration and exploitation: The moderating role of environmental dynamism. The Leadership Quarterly, 20(1), 5-18
16. Kaiser, R., LeBreton, J., & Hogan, J. (2015).The dark side of personality and extreme leader behavior.Applied Psychology.
17. Khattak, M.N. and O'Connor, P. (2020), "The interplay between servant leadership and organizational politics", Personnel Review, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print.https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-03-2020-0131
18. Lai, J. M., Lam, L. W., & Lam, S. K. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior in work groups: A team cultural perspective. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34(7), 1039-1056.
19. Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. & Taylor, M. S. (1996). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. A*cademy of Management Journal*, 43, 738-748.
20. Maxwell, S.M. (2015). An exploration of human resource personnel and toxic leadership.(Doctoral dissertation).College of Management and Technology, Walden University.
21. Mehta, S. & Maheshwari, G.C. (2014). Toxic leadership: Tracing the destructive trail. International Journal of Management, 5(10), 18-24.
22. Nemanich, L. A., & Vera, D. (2009).Transformational leadership and ambidexterity in the context of an acquisition. The Leadership Quarterly, 20(1), 19-33.
23. Ng, T. W. H. and Feldman, D. C. (2012), Employee voice behavior: A metanalytic test of the conservation of resources framework. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33: 216–234.
24. Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007).The toxic triangle; Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. Leadership Quarterly, 18, 176- 194
25. Rafferty, A. E., &Restubog, S. L. D. (2011). The influence of abusive supervisors on follower's organizational citizenship behaviours: The hidden costs of abusive supervision. British Journal of Management, 22, 270–285.
26. Reyhanoğlu, M. & Akın, Ö. (2016). Does toxic leadership trigger organizational health negatively? Journal of the Human and Social Science Researches, 5(3), 442-459.
27. Rioux, S.M. &Penner, L.A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 1306-1314.
28. Schlechter, A.F. &Engelbrecht, A.S. (2006).The relationship between transformational leadership, meaning and organizational citizenship behavior. Management Dynamics, 15(4), 2-16.
29. Schmidt, A.A. (2014). An examination of toxic leadership, job outcomes and the impact of military deployment.(Doctoral dissertation).The Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Maryland.
30. Shore, L. M., & Shore, T. H. (1995). Perceived organizational support and organizational justice. In Cropanzano, R., & Kacmar, K. (Eds.), Organizational Politics, Justice, and Support (pp.149–164). Quorum.
31. Vera, D., &Crossan, M. (2004).Strategic leadership and organizational learning. Academy of management review, 29(2), 222-240.
32. Whitman, M.V., Halbesleben, J.R.B., & Holmes, O., IV (2014). Abusive supervision and feedback avoidance: The mediating role of emotional exhaustion. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35(1), 38–53.
33. Xu, A. J., Loi, R., & Lam, L. W. (2015). The bad boss takes it all: How abusive supervision and leader–member exchange interacts to influence employee silence. The Leadership Quarterly, 26(5), 763-774.