# STRATEGIES FOR LEADERSHIP AND WORKPLACE TOXICITY

**TITIN S. ATMADJA**

Walden University.

**Abstract**

Employee health and productivity may suffer as a result of workplace toxicity. When talking about low-toxicity work environments, there are no best practices for effective leadership techniques. This qualitative narrative case study's goal was to gain a better understanding of how managers chose and used particular leadership techniques in nontoxic work settings. Using a purposive sample method and semi-structured interviews based on Alvarado's triangular model of workplace toxicity, data were gathered from 10 participants in New Hampshire. This study's design took a narrative approach to examine how effective leaders reduced workplace toxicity in real-world settings. Experience with toxic leadership and leadership approaches to toxicity were two of the three main themes that emerged from the research. This study's findings may aid business leaders in preventing lawsuits, low productivity, and high staff turnover caused by toxic workplace factors that are neglected or improperly managed. By developing realistic examples and recommendations for fostering a less toxic workplace, the study may help bring about good social change. Healthier and happier employees contribute to greater public wellbeing and business success.

**Keywords:** Workplace toxicity, leadership strategies, approach

## I. INTRODUCTION

Research on toxic leadership is becoming increasingly popular. Researchers are interested in learning how toxic leadership affects employees and overall business success as well as in identifying the characteristics of toxic leaders so that these characteristics might be avoided or countered when choosing people for leadership positions (1). Recent studies have also examined transformational leadership and used such constructive leadership in many job settings to lessen toxic conditions (2).

Studies on workplace diversity have gained traction in recent years as a result of businesses being more dynamic and inclusive (3). By bringing attention to problems like gender-, race-, and/or sexuality-based discrimination, general society has also started to learn from the past and right its wrongs (4). Researchers have called for greater awareness of representativeness and diversity in the workplace (5). The findings of this qualitative narrative case study, which looked into workplace toxicity, added to the body of knowledge in the field of workplace diversity.

(6) Evidence that persistent negativity caused workplace toxicity. Conflict over unmet expectations may arise between employees and/or leaders, which could result in negativity (6). When various people interact and share space, as in a workplace, such breaks or disappointments are inevitable (7). Leaders can prevent toxic environments in the workplace by timely and effectively addressing such negativity (8). Employees are more likely to adopt negative attitudes, gossip, and other toxic behaviors the longer leaders take or the less effectively they handle a specific problem (9). The cycle of toxicity will then be further sustained as this negativity spreads and more people start to exhibit negative attitudes and

behaviors (9). To reduce the possibility of toxicity emerging in the workplace and negatively affecting the wellness and productivity of employees, leaders should use positive leadership styles and behaviors by establishing clear and effective problem-solving (6).

The general issue was that unfavourable bosses were adversely hurting their staff members' well-being and productivity. The wellbeing of employees may be jeopardized if harmful substances are present at work (10). (11) Came to the conclusion that 78% of workers had unfavourable effects from toxic leadership. While leadership behaviors are the precise acts leaders do to influence their subordinates to achieve goals, leadership approaches are the overall methods leaders choose to persuade their subordinates to do so (12). The issue was specifically that when bad leaders affected the office climate, it became unfavourable, which decreased productivity and led to additional issues, like low staff retention. Toxic settings at work were characterized as worrisome by (6). (13) Affirmed that, for better or worse, leadership may have an impact on workplace toxicity. According to (14), 80% of the problems with productivity among employees had to do with the setting at work where they carried out their regular tasks.

(15) Suggested that scholars investigate strategies for dealing with toxic leadership because such research would enhance working conditions. (15) Urge more study to close the knowledge gap by examining leadership and leadership techniques for nontoxic work environments. Additionally, Cotton found that there was a void in the literature discussing whether and how positive leadership could combat toxic work environments, particularly from the perspective of the leader. Furthermore, the effects of leadership strategies have not yet been described by researchers. Instead, researchers have a tendency to examine leadership's impact on trends in leadership development more broadly. In order to better understand leadership techniques that resulted in improved leadership and helped to improve the working environment, this study filled a vacuum in the literature relevant to these topics. Better workplaces may result in happier and more productive workers, which would be advantageous to both businesses and society at large (6). So, the study's research question is: What leadership strategies do successful, nontoxic leaders use to lessen toxicity? The goal of this study is to gain a deeper knowledge of how managers chose and implemented particular tactics to enhance the working environment in nontoxic workplaces.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Toxic leadership can have a detrimental impact on the productivity and well-being of employees (16). Businesses with toxic leadership may have higher levels of employee anxiety, more cases of employee illness, a poorer reputation, and reduced revenues as a result of this problem (10). Leadership that is constructive or nontoxic can reduce toxicity in the workplace, and leadership style can have a significant impact on employee satisfaction, wellbeing, and productivity (8).

Researchers must comprehend nontoxic leadership and methods that positive leadership can ameliorate toxic surroundings in order to lessen the types of drawbacks associated with toxic leadership and build better leadership practices to increase worker well-being (17). Business

leaders and employees may benefit from positive leadership since it raises productivity, employee wellbeing, and company reputations (18). Researchers have not yet looked into how particular leadership philosophies have impacted workplace toxicity from the perspectives of employees and leaders (19).

(19) Observed that under toxic leadership, employees had higher levels of anxiety and frequently chose ineffective or counterproductive strategies to deal with such leadership. (19) Highlighted that toxic leadership had been examined from the viewpoint of the worker and that additional research into how to combat toxic leadership by comprehending the perspectives of leaders was still required. This argument supported past research that showed managers could have a detrimental impact on their employees' psychological health.

There has been research on many leadership philosophies, including poisonous, transformative, transactional, and so forth (2). It was not, however, focused on how or why leaders made the choices they did, or how they felt these choices affected employees and the workplace. Regarding these gaps, I presented my observations. This qualitative narrative case study's goal was to gain a greater understanding of how managers chose and implemented particular tactics in nontoxic work environments. I selected to research nontoxic work environments since the administrators of these organizations can discuss the preventative measures they have taken and are currently taking. These leaders could share the strategies they employed to reduce situations that might have resulted in a toxic work environment. The population of leaders from two institutions—one governmental and one nongovernmental—in the state of New Hampshire was the subject of this study. They offered perceptions and illustrations of what nontoxic leadership included, so offering an alternative to toxic leader situations. The results of this study may help leaders choose the best leadership philosophies to lessen or prevent workplace toxicity.

The triangular model of workplace toxicity by (16) served as the conceptual foundation for this study. To explain the relationships between toxic work environments, toxic subordinates, and toxic leadership, Alvarado proposed this three-part model. (16) Polled 280 individuals from a single actual workspace to develop this model. For each participant to adequately respond to questions about workplace toxicity, they had to have worked in this field for at least two years.

(16) Discovered four elements through this study, including perceived danger, favouritism, bullying, and general organizational atmosphere, that related to workplace toxicity. In other words, workplace toxicity was higher when employees felt intimidated or faced other unfavourable outcomes if they made mistakes, failed in other ways, or did not fit into the corporate culture, such as when female employees felt threatened by male co-worker. Workers' perceptions of a social hierarchy or that some employees were more likely to obtain benefits and promotions while others were more likely to be ignored or intimidated led to higher levels of toxicity.

According to (16), employees who experienced bullying—either from managers or fellow employees—were also more likely to perceive their workplace as unhealthy. Finally, the culture of the company or the general atmosphere of the workplace would turn toxic if

management did not confront toxic behavior or if leaders actively participated in or promoted such behavior. Toxic characteristics in the workplace would become the norm if leaders accepted negative elements like discrimination or bullying as "just the way things are" or if workers felt that leaders did not take their complaints about these components seriously (16).

The four variables pointed to a dynamic interaction between followers and followers in the toxic workplace (16). In order to more accurately assess workplace toxicity, the author modified the original model to put a stronger emphasis on evaluating perceived danger, favouritism, bullying, and overall organizational atmosphere. This improvement allowed (16) to produce the AWEST.

The four criteria might readily account for both leader and follower conduct and toxicity, as well as the overall toxicity of the corporate culture. The AWEST could enable other studies to more precisely assess workplace toxicity by assessing all three points of the toxic triangle (16). The scale might more accurately assess how these elements interact with the toxic triangle to determine whether, where, and how problems might develop and, consequently, how they might be addressed in the future (16). For instance, if a corporation had a high follower toxicity score, it was likely due to leadership and culture, either directly or indirectly. Then, those who want to address the problem could approach its rectification from both a follower and a leadership and culture perspective, such as by teaching followers not to bully their co-worker's, and by teaching leaders how to better deal with co-worker abuses or concerns, thereby establishing a more positive culture where bullying is not tolerated.

(16) Highlighted how the difficulties that led to disastrous leadership may be explained by the triangular toxicity model. The model's identification of the interrelatedness or triangularity of workplace toxicity could also aid in demystifying why, even after taking a single action like removing an abusive leader, dismissing employees with attitude issues, or improving unfavourable aspects of company culture, toxicity may still exist in the workplace. This study determined that the AWEST was a suitable model to use since it is comprehensive and can help researchers measure workplace toxicity accurately in accordance with four parameters and across each of the three potentially toxic domains, leadership, followers, and corporate culture.

## III. METHODOLOGY

With a narrative case study approach, this study employed a qualitative methodology. This qualitative narrative case study's goal was to gain a better understanding of how managers choose and implement particular tactics in nontoxic work settings. The narrative methodology was designed to collect in-depth, first-person accounts from leaders about how leadership strategies may lessen, eliminate, or at least lessen workplace toxicity (20). Researchers that focus on narratives seek for in-depth information from those who are most impacted by or involved in a subject being investigated (21). The topic of this study was toxic leadership, the associated workplace toxicity, and how they affect the environment as a whole. Leaders used the narrative structure to elaborate on their experiences dealing with workplace toxicity by implementing constructive methods as opposed to toxic leadership methods. For a closer look, we gathered their opinions on what worked and why, what inspired them to adopt their

particular leadership style, and how they could approach similar circumstances differently in the future.

The identities of people and how they view themselves can be promoted through narrative stories (20). This study's methodology demonstrated whether, how, and why leaders might regard themselves as nontoxic and their leadership styles, as well as the potential impact their decisions for positive leadership may have had on reducing workplace toxicity. We investigated how workplace toxicity was reduced through effective leadership strategies and how all the elements of toxicity, as described by (16), interacted with one another using a narrative method.

The study's focus on stories necessitated a more extensive interviewing method (21). Each participant had three hours of interviewing, either in a single 3-hour session or three 1-hour sessions. As required for narrative research, the interviews comprised of semi-structured questions that participants were requested to relate in-depth answers to, including personal tales. According to (22) because of how time-consuming the narrative interview procedure was, qualitative researchers would need smaller study populations to obtain reliable and representative results. Researchers should speak with five to eight leaders from each study site, according to recommendation (22). In this study, we used the documentation and policies of the individual organizations for creating healthy work environments, as well as earlier academic literature defining toxic leadership, to triangulate data (21). An additional source of support for the interview and documentation data was academic studies from the past that defined toxic leadership.

The population of leaders in governmental and nongovernmental organizations in the state of New Hampshire was the primary focus of this study. Ten individuals were interviewed for data from two government and non-government organizations in the state of New Hampshire. Purposive sampling was used to sample the participants. Purposive sampling is a technique that researchers can employ to guarantee that only participants who most closely match the needs of a study are chosen (23). We identified two selection criteria for this study's purposive sampling: Participants must have (a) spent at least five years in their current leadership position at the provided company, and (b) prior experience in a toxic work environment, either as an employee working for a toxic leader or as a nontoxic leader joining and needing to improve a toxic work environment.

We entered the interview data into NVivo after all interview statements had been explained, compared to the recorded data, and any necessary edits had been made to guarantee interview data accuracy. Software called NVivo was created expressly to help qualitative researchers carry out topic analysis (24). We compared and analyzed information from all interview transcripts entered into the software to look for recurrent themes. Themes were classified in accordance with how well they addressed the research questions, and the findings from the numerous interviews were combined to create the study's final findings

## IV. RESULT & DISCUSSION

Researchers have found that managers can affect the well-being of employees and the environment at work (25). (13) Affirmed that leadership might have a beneficial or negative impact on workplace toxicity. The general issue was that unfavourable bosses were harming their staff members' well-being and productivity. The wellbeing of employees may be jeopardized in toxic work environments (10). The specific issue was that successful leadership strategies for developing low-toxicity work environments lacked best practices. (15) suggested that researchers investigate strategies for dealing with toxic leadership; this research might enhance working conditions. The author identified a vacuum in the existing literature by urging greater research into addressing toxic leadership and enhancing working conditions (15).

Given these issues, the goal of this qualitative narrative case study was to gain a greater understanding of how leaders chose and implemented particular solutions in unfavourable work situations. The population of leaders in governmental and nongovernmental organizations in the state of New Hampshire was the primary focus of this study. With the aid of semi-structured, in-depth interviews and a purposeful sample technique, data from 10 individuals in New Hampshire were gathered.

### 1. Demographics

Participants in this study were chosen because they held leadership roles across several sectors. To be eligible for this study, participants had to complete the following requirements:

Participants must meet the following requirements: (a) be leaders in their industry; (b) have been actively engaged in their current leadership role for at least three years (to have a record of their leadership choices and outcomes); and (c) have reported high levels of productivity and worker satisfaction. Using this as an inclusion criterion, I choose 10 people to represent the sample. Participants were not necessary to be connected to or involved in a hazardous working environment at the time of the study, but they were required to have had prior experience with such conditions. The backgrounds of each of these volunteers are shown in Table 1.

### Themes

The data revealed two key themes: leadership approaches to toxicity and experience with toxic leadership. There were two subthemes associated with the first theme, "previous experience with toxic leadership," including "effect on current style of leadership" and "undoing toxic leadership." Finally, the second subject of leadership responses to toxicity also contained two subthemes: dealing with toxic people and minimizing toxicity in the workplace.

### Data Analysis Procedures

We used the online transcription tool Transcribe to write up each interview after it was completed. The physical notes for the interview were written, and the audio recordings and physical notes were manually integrated into one document. After member checking, we imported the interview data into NVivo to compare and examine it for recurrent themes across all interview transcripts. To create the study's final conclusions, we combined information from

all of the interviews and classified these themes in accordance with how each response related to a particular research topic.

The study's findings are displayed here, reinforced by comments and anecdotes from the participants and illustrated by major themes and subthemes. The data revealed two main themes: prior encounters with toxic leadership and leadership strategies to combat toxicity.

## 2. Previous instances of Toxic Leadership

Previous encounters with poisonous leadership constituted the first main theme. There were two subthemes associated with this theme: influence on the current leadership style and eliminating toxic leadership.

### Impact on present leadership approach

Participants discussed how their encounters with toxic leaders had shaped their present leadership style in the first subtheme. For the majority of participants, they observed behavior modeled that they themselves would not model and actions that were the exact reverse of what the toxic leader performed.

### Removing toxic leadership

The second subtheme looked at the steps that current leaders had to take to remove any traces of previous toxic leadership. Eight out of ten participants, or 80%, discussed the need to reverse toxic leadership that had previously been in place. Each participant, in slightly different ways, explained how they did this by making it clear that the previous leadership was no longer in place and that the new leadership would approach things differently.

## 3. Leadership Approaches to Toxicity

Leadership approaches to toxicity, which examined the perspectives and attitudes leaders have toward toxic people, was the second key issue to emerge from the data. From this overarching theme, two subthemes emerged: dealing with toxic people and lowering toxicity in the workplace.

### Interacting with toxic people

The first subtheme, dealing with toxic people, looked at how leaders handled toxic employees or subordinates. The subtheme's categories are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Strategies for Dealing with Toxic People**

| Approach | Number of participants | Percentage of total participants |
|---|---|---|
| Conversation | 4 | 40% |
| Directness | 2 | 20% |
| Other strategies | 4 | 40% |

40 percent of participants, or four out of ten, stated they enjoyed talking to toxic people when they approached them.

**Reducing toxicity at work**

The second subtheme of the second major theme, "Leadership approaches to toxicity," explained how leaders go about lowering general toxicity at work. Two leaders provided multiple responses in these areas, which changed the total number of answers for each category. Similar to the preceding subtheme, four leaders, or 40% of the participants, mentioned communication as a way to lessen toxicity at work.

## IV. CONCLUSION

Researchers have found that managers can affect the well-being of employees and the environment at work (25). (11) Came to the conclusion that working under toxic leadership had adversely affected 78% of participants in some way. The general issue is that unfavourable executives are harming their staff members' wellbeing and productivity. The wellbeing of workers may be jeopardized in toxic work environments (10).

This qualitative narrative case study's goal was to gain a better understanding of how managers choose and implement particular tactics in nontoxic work settings. The population of leaders from governmental and nongovernmental organizations in the state of New Hampshire was the primary focus of this study. With the aid of semi-structured, in-depth interviews and a purposive sampling technique, I gathered data from 10 participants in New Hampshire. After reviewing the transcript and verifying the membership, I entered the interview data into NVivo to compare and examine it for recurrent patterns across all interview transcripts. I categorized these themes based on how each response related to a particular research topic, then I combined the information from all of the interviews to create the study's final findings.

The study's findings supported the existing literature in many respects, but some of them also opposed it and provided fresh insights into toxic leadership. Participants discussed how their encounters with toxic leaders had influenced their current leadership style, for instance, in relation to the first major theme. For the majority of participants, this approach entailed acting in opposition to what the toxic leader did and modeling conduct that they themselves would not exhibit. Such findings were in agreement with (26), who proposed that some personalities could counteract toxicity through their constructive acts.

The same findings posed a challenge to the literature on the impact of toxic leadership. According to (16), leaders not only set the tone for the workplace through their leadership philosophies, such as authoritarian vs transformational, but they also signal to their subordinates what is appropriate and inappropriate behavior in their divisions or the entire organization. To put it another way, if leaders engage in unethical behavior, micro aggressions, favouritism, or other similar actions or attitudes, either their followers will adopt the same characteristics and attitudes, or they will experience elevated levels of stress from having to combat the negatives (16). The findings of this investigation did not reveal such a factor.

The methods used by leaders to lessen toxic employees and the overall hazardous work environment were more consistent. The findings of this study and the body of prior work demonstrated the necessity of a leader's optimism. Because toxic or nontoxic practices trickled

down from the top, as (27) suggested, leaders should use effective leadership techniques (6). The study's participants agreed, stating that altering and overcoming toxic people requires positive.

Leaders in this study approached toxic people in a manner that was also in line with the literature. (6) Pointed out that unmet expectations may cause disagreement among employees and/or leaders and may result in negativity. Leaders could prevent toxic environments in the workplace if they dealt with such hostility quickly and efficiently (8). The majority of participants decided that confronting the toxic person—either directly or through conversation—was the best course of action. The participants avoided the poisonous work conditions caused by toxic attitudes going unresolved or rising confrontations being overlooked by dealing with these issues quickly and honestly (28). In order to address individual worker negative behaviors and attitudes as soon as possible, leaders gave their workers the chance to voice their complaints and concerns by permitting a talk, as four of the 10 participants did (29).

Additionally, we discuss suggestions for future research based on the findings of this study in the following ways:

The participants in this study were drawn from the worlds of politics, education, and law. Future studies in several fields that include employee volunteers from different businesses may be beneficial. Such research can enable a cross-analysis of the differences, if any, between toxic and nontoxic leadership in various professional contexts. The design of this study was qualitative, which constrained the number of participants. Future research may employ several designs to help overcome that design restriction. These designs may include a quantitative study with a larger sample size or a new qualitative study with more participants. The employee side of the hazardous triangle was outside the purview of this investigation. Future researchers might be interested in looking into the kinds of education, competencies, and coping strategies that nontoxic staff members can use to combat toxic leadership and work settings.

### References

1. Fischbacher-Smith, D. (2015). The enemy has passed through the gate: Insider threats, the dark triad, and the challenges around security. Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, 2(2), 134-156. doi:10.1108/JOEPP-03- 2015-0010.

2. Breevaart, K., Bakker, A., Hetland, J., Demerouti, E., Olsen, O. K., & Espevik, R. (2014). Daily transactional and transformational leadership and daily employee engagement. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 87(1), 138-157. doi:10.1111/joop.12041.

3. Bond, M. A., & Haynes, M. C. (2014). Workplace diversity: A social-ecological framework and policy implications. Social Issues and Policy Review, 8(1), 167- 201. doi:10.1111/sipr.12005.

4. Mizzi, R. C. (2017). Leadership for organizational diversity: Tackling micro-aggressions in educators' workplaces (Vol. 3). In A. B. Knox, S. C. O. Conceição, & L. G. Martin (Eds.), Mapping the field of adult and continuing education: An international compendium (pp. 48-49). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

5. Burton, L. J. (2015). Underrepresentation of women in sport leadership: A review of the research. Sport Management Review, 18(2), 155-165. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2014.02.004.

6. Field, T. (2014). Toxic work environment. In H. G. Harder, S. Wagner, & J. Rash (Eds.), Mental illness in the workplace: Psychological disability management (pp. 207- 234). New York, NY: Routledge.

7. Jain, R., & Kaur, S. (2014). Impact of work environment on job satisfaction. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 4(1), 1-8. doi:10.1.1.429.3175.

8. Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., & McKee, R. A. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. Leadership Quarterly, 25(1), 63-82. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.004.

9. Burns, W. A. (2017). A descriptive literature review of harmful leadership styles: Definitions, commonalities, measurements, negative impacts, and ways to improve these harmful leadership styles. Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership, 3(1), 33-36. doi:10.17062/cjil.v3i1.53.

10. Galupo, M. P., & Resnick, C. A. (2016). Experiences of LGBT micro-aggressions in the workplace: Implications for policy. In T. Köllen (Ed.), Sexual orientation and transgender issues in organizations (pp. 271-287). New York, NY: Springer.

11. Bell, R. M. (2017). The dysfunction junction: The impact of toxic leadership on follower effectiveness (Doctoral thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (UMI No. 10260880)

12. Cummings, G. G., MacGregor, T., Davey, M., Lee, H., Wong, C. A., Lo, E., Stafford, E. (2010). Leadership styles and outcome patterns for the nursing workforce and work environment: A systematic review. International Journal of Nursing Studies, 47(3), 363-385. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2009.08.006.

13. Tse, H. H. M., & Chiu, W. C. K. (2014). Transformational leadership and job performance: A social identity perspective. Journal of Business Research, 67(1), 2827-2835. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.07.018.

14. Anjum, A., Ming, X., Siddiqi, A. F., & Rasool, S. F. (2018). An empirical study analyzing job productivity in toxic workplace environments. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. doi:10.3390/ijerph15051035

15. Leonard, J. B. (2014). The dissolution of effective leadership: A multiple-case study analysis of destructive leadership (Master's thesis). Retrieved from University of Tennessee Honors Thesis Projects. (Order No. 1800).

16. Alvarado, C. (2016). Environmental ingredients for disaster: Developing and validating the Alvarado work environment scale of toxicity (Doctoral thesis, California State University). Retrieved from http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd/406/

17. Sun, Y., Gergen, E., Avila, M., & Green, M. (2016). Leadership and job satisfaction: Implications for leaders of accountants. American Journal of Industrial and Business Management, 6, 268-275. doi:10.4236/ajibm.2016.63024.

18. Dul, J., & Ceylan, C. (2014). The impact of a creativity-supporting work environment on a firm's product innovation performance. Journal of Product Innovation Management, 31(6), 1254-1267. doi:10.1111/jpim.12149.

19. Cotton, E. (2016, September 5). How can you maintain your sanity in a toxic workplace? LSE Business Review. Retrieved from http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/74184/

20. Taylor, S. J., Bogdan, R., & DeVault, M. (2015). Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons

21. Lewis, S. (2015). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. Health Promotion Practice, 16(4), 473-475. doi:10.1177/1524839915580941

22. Robinson, O. S. (2014). Sampling in interview-based qualitative research: A theoretical and practical guide. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 11(1), 25-41. doi:10.1080/14780887.2013.801543

23. Eiken, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5(1), 1-4. doi:10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

24. Zamawe, F. C. (2015). The implications of using NVivo software in qualitative data analysis: Evidence-based reflections. Malawi Medical Journal, 27(1), 13-13. doi:10.4314/mmj.v27i1.4

25. Mathieu, C., Neumann, C. S., Hare, R. D., & Babiak, P. (2014). A dark side of leadership: Corporate psychopathy and its influence on employee well-being and job satisfaction. Personality and Individual Differences, 59, 83-88. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2013.11.010

26. Baronce, E. (2015). From passivity to toxicity: Susceptible followers in a conducive environment (Masters' thesis, Linnæus University, Sweden). Retrieved from http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:839156/FULLTEXT01.pdf

27. Fraher, A. L. (2016). A toxic triangle of destructive leadership at Bristol Royal Infirmary: A study of organizational Munchausen syndrome by proxy. Leadership, 12(1), 34-52. doi:10.1177/1742715014544392

28. Moore, I. C., Coe, J. B., Adams, C. L., Conlon, P. D., & Sargeant, J. M. (2015). Exploring the impact of toxic attitudes and a toxic environment on the veterinary healthcare team. Frontiers in Veterinary Science, 2, 78-80. doi:10.3389/fvets.2015.00078

29. Laschinger, H. K. S., Wong, C. A., Cummings, C. G., & Grau, A. L. (2014). Reducing workplace incivility. Nursing Economic$, 32(1), 5-15. Retrieved from http://www.nursingeconomics.net/