Influence of Toxic Leadership Behaviour on Teachers' Diligence and Productivity in Lagos State Senior Secondary Schools, Nigeria

MOHAMMED Mubashir Olayiwola Babatunde (Ph.D) & ORUNBON Nurudeen Olalekan (Ph.D in view)
Faculty of Education,
Department of Educational Management,
Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos, Nigeria
+2348033344750, +2348066442494
myuniversity@yahoo.com, orunbon.nurudeeno@gmail.com

Abstract
Various studies have focused on the effective and authentic aspects of school leadership and neglected the toxic aspects of school leadership which is important to identify the behaviours of school leaders who intentionally and unknowingly inflict enduring damage on their teachers and school organisation. Thus, this study examined the influence of toxic leadership behaviour on teachers' diligence and productivity in Lagos State senior secondary schools. Two hypotheses (tested at 0.05 level of significance. Correlational and descriptive research designs were adopted; its population comprised all Principals, Vice-principals, and teachers in public senior secondary schools in Lagos State. The sample sizes were 98 Principals, 196 Vice-principals and 980 teachers after stratifying the population into Education Districts and thereafter selected through purposive sampling technique. Two main instruments were used to collect data after ensuring their validity and establishing their reliability using test-retest method. Analysis was carried out using both descriptive and inferential statistics of means, percentages, tables and graphs including Pearsons Product-Moment Correlation Analysis and Regression Analysis using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 24.0. Findings indicate that a negative and non-significant relationship exist between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' diligence at work in Lagos State senior secondary schools (r = -0.029, ρ>0.05) and the study also found that toxic leadership behaviour is negatively and non-significantly related with teachers' productivity in Lagos State senior secondary schools (r = -0.060, ρ>0.05). It is concluded that toxic leadership behaviour affected teachers' diligence and productivity in Lagos State public senior secondary schools, as evidenced in the study.

Introduction

Of all resources in any organisation, including education manpower plays an important role in the organisation's ability to grow and continuously evolve. The success of school is dependent upon the collection of individuals, including the school leaders and followers, and the amount of effort both the leaders and followers put into it. Therefore, school leadership is often regarded as the most important factor in the success and failure of school as an organisation. Leadership in education has to do with the active use of a person's ability, and talents towards influencing others in the achievement of common or preconceived educational goals. Educational leadership is important in school as an organisation, as a result of its all-embracing effects on the accomplishment of school objectives, policies, and programmes. Therefore, the

role of leadership in education is to co-ordinate the activities and aspirations of school members as followers (Orunbon, 2020).

Ideally, leadership–followership relationships in education setting should be filled with rewards, sense of belonging, freedom in job operations, showing of recognition, and competency for both parties. Despite that, for a follower, this relationship may also form the basis for maltreatment, abuse, and punishment, accompanied by follower's feelings of frustration, anxiety, uncertainty, and displeasure.

Therefore, toxic leadership is a combination of self-centred attitudes, motivations and behaviours that have adverse effects on subordinates, the organisation, and mission performance. The toxic leader lacks concern for others and the climate of the organisation, which leads to short and long term negative effects. The toxic leader operates with an inflated sense of self-worth and from acute self-interest. Toxic leaders consistently use dysfunctional behaviour to deceive, intimidate, coerce, or unfairly punish others to get what they want for themselves. The toxic leader completes short term requirements by operating at the bottom of the continuum of commitment, where followers respond to the positional power of their leader to fulfil requests. Prolonged use of toxic leadership to influence followers undermines the followers' will, initiative and potential and destroys unit morale (Reed, 2004).

However, given that followers are an essential part of the leadership equation without the required followers, becoming a befitting leader is difficult. In the popular parlance "he who thinks he leads, but has no followers, is only taking a walk". Followers impact leaders and the leadership process. Followers provide the 'horsepower' to organisational performance and productivity as they are the primary contributors to the success of any organisational outcomes. People display followership when they express, through their words or actions, respect and support for a person they view as their leader, and openness to be influenced by him or her in that capacity. One could argue that any good leader is in turn a good follower (Bennis, 2010). Teachers as Followers can thus serve as an effective process in harnessing organisational change, as effective followers impact the adaptive culture of an organisation through both challenging and supporting leaders (Chaleff, 2008). In essence, followership impacts on leadership and hence on the organisational process as well as organisational output and productivity.

The performance of a corporate organisation, which determines its survival and growth, depends to a large extent on the productivity of its workforce. Indeed, the wealth of the nation as well as socio-economic well-being of its people depends on the effectiveness and efficiency of its various subcomponents (Yesufu, 2000). Labour is generally regarded as the most dynamic of all the factors that are employed for the creation of wealth, having the potential to energize and serve as a catalyst to all the other resources (Yesufu, 2000). Productivity is thus of fundamental importance to the individual worker of whatever status, to the organisation whether commercial or not and to the national economy at large and, accordingly, therefore, to the upliftment of the welfare of the citizen and the reduction if not total eradication of mass poverty (Yesufu, 2000; Akinyele, 2010).

In senior secondary schools, teachers work hand in hand with principals. Both parties are expected to work toward accomplishing educational goals. Generally, teachers' responsibilities include the actual teaching, setting, administering and marking of students' assignments, tests papers, examination scripts, monitoring students' progress and host of other school academic engagements. In these responsibilities, teachers are usually left to function independently, carry out these duties with little or no supervision. The principals' roles are more of administrative

duties including leadership. Teachers are closer to students and are expected to produce good results. However, they need the support of school leaders to be very effective. They need the school leaders' direction and guide in order to achieve the school objectives. It is therefore necessary that school leaders are aware and understand teachers' followership in order for them to know the best approach to use in working with teachers for maximum effectiveness and productivity.

When the teachers' productivity declines, it has a correlation to the quality of education both in the short and the long term. Teachers exert a great influence on the students, and the children look up to them for guidance, support and protection. Children are supposed to learn from them informally by observing their attitude, mannerism, conduct and general behaviours and formally through their teaching in the classrooms (Adu, 2015).

School leadership role in the school system and the issue of leadership are therefore crucial to the attainment of goals, aims and objectives of the school. Thus, school leadership has become a priority in education policy agenda globally and plays a key role in improving school outcomes by influencing the motivation and productivity of teachers. Moreover, ineffective (or poor) leadership must be viewed as not merely a lack of positive behaviours, but also a display of specifically destructive behaviours (Toor & Ogunlana, 2009). It could be observed that research on required leadership behaviours has enabled leaders in public senior secondary school settings to attempt to adapt and align their behaviour to reflect frequently accepted leadership qualities. Such alignment, although influenced heavily by positive and constructive leadership research, thereby looks down upon the lessons and opportunities that may be generated by research on the side of leadership such as toxic leadership behaviour.

The term "toxic leader" first appeared in 1996 (Wicker, 1996), but as yet no standard definition of toxic leadership exists. Nevertheless, toxic leadership is an increasingly prevalent phenomenon in today's world, affecting both private and public organisations and individuals in all fields of social life, from business, education and politics to various other domains of action (Padila, Hogan & Kaiser, 2007). Therefore, term toxic leader refers to leaders who display five specific characteristics, which are: Self-promotion, Abusive supervision, Unpredictability, Narcissism and Authoritarian leadership (Schmidt, 2008).

Toxicity in the workplace particularly in education is created when followers/teachers feel bullied, harassed, or abused. The actions of the toxic leaders in schools are identified as creating situations where the followers complain about a negative atmosphere working under the leaders who suppress them, abuse them, and harass them. These leaders may use inappropriate methods of causing the followers to believe they are forced into actions that they may not normally execute.

That is, toxic leadership behaviour in education reflects the noticeable absence of effective and authentic leadership quality among school leaders which includes phenomenon like managerial incompetence and managerial misconduct.

Table 1: Toxic Leader Characteristics

Toxic Behaviour Results In Negative Impact	Dysfunctional Personality	Positive Aspects of Personality
Deceptive	Lack Of Integrity	Charming
Incompetent	Avarice	Forge quick relationships
Ignorant	Cowardice	Ability to charm supervisors
Cruel	Cynicism	Self-confidence
Evil	Narcissism	Magnetic enthusiasm
Greed	Paranoia	
Mistrust	Megalomania	
Lack of restraint	Moral Blind spots	
Manipulate people	Demanding	
Malevolent	Autocratic	
Abusive	Unrelenting	
Bad leadership	Lacks empathy	
Bullies	Personal inadequacy	
Corrosive leadership	Maladjusted	
Harassing leaders	Malcontent	
Jerks	Egotistic	
Assholes	Malfunctioning	
Tyrannical	Maladjusted	
Incompetence	Sense Of Inadequacy	
Irresponsible	Malcontent	
Avarice And Greed	Amoral	
Deception	Cowardice	
Malicious	Insatiable Ambition	
Malfeasance	Egotism	
Malevolent	Arrogance	
Failure to understand and to act competently and effectively in leadership situations.	Selfish Values	
	Lack Of Integrity	
Reckless disregard for the costs of their actions to others as well as to themselves	Insatiable Ambition prompts leaders to put their own sustained power, glory, and fortunes above followers' well-being	
	Enormous Ego that blinds leaders to the shortcomings of their own character and thus limit their capacity for self-renewal.	
	Arrogance	
	Amorality prevents acknowledging their mistakes and instead leads to blaming other.	

Source: Quincy, 2016

Diligence, according to Akpa (1998), means industriousness and earnest commitment. Teacher diligence as described by Eze (2001) is the extent to which teachers are committed, hardworking and industrious in performing their teaching roles. Jefferson (2004), described a diligent teacher as one who is willingly, committed, productive, conscientious and efficient in sound application of information and skills to the teaching process, assessment strategies, disciplinary management and control of students. A teacher that is diligent will be motivated to put in more efforts in the teaching career while a teacher that is not diligent as Eze (2001), noted, performs very lowly, is not resourceful and committed. Thus, diligent teachers are generally indispensable to Nigeria's educational development

As a teacher, this trait means a variety of things. A teacher's role in the classroom is to serve as mentor, educator, confidant and coach. A teacher who is demonstrating diligence will work tirelessly with the student who does not wish for help.

In the school system, teachers' productivity could be measured in terms of teacher's performance. Teachers' productivity is the ratio of output produced by the teachers; here the output refers to the quality of the students produced or turned out on yearly basis (Musibau & Adigun, 2010). Teachers' productivity level may also be evaluated in terms of what the teachers control and actually do in the classroom such as effective teaching, classroom management and performance (Dunkin, 1997). The major tool (indicators) of school performance is student academic performance, most especially at the external level. If the majority of student presented for WAEC/NECO examination have below five credits the performance is low, it shows the level of teachers' productivity. But if the majority has above five credits, the performance is rated high (Atanda & Waheed, 2006).

Also, Owoeye in Kennedy (2016) asserted that variables of teachers' productivity such as effective teaching, lesson note preparation, effective use of scheme of work, effective supervision, monitoring of students" work and disciplinary ability are virtues which teachers should uphold effectively in the school system. As revealed by Purcell, Kinnie, Hutchinson, Rayton and Swart (2003) evidence shows that teacher productivity depended on having the right mix of the skills, abilities, motivation and potentialities in achieving the predetermined goal of the institutions.

Teacher productivity in many studies has been associated with output or end-result of the school academic goals like end of term result, school mock examination, WAEC results or a combination of these (Osinowo & Akanbi, 1986).

Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of toxic leadership behaviour on teachers' diligence and teachers' productivity in public senior secondary schools in Lagos State. In specific and explicit terms, this study was set out to:
1. Investigate the influence of toxic leadership behaviour on teachers' diligence at work in Lagos State senior secondary schools.
2. Examine the relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' productivity in Lagos State senior secondary schools.

Research Questions
The following questions were raised to guide this study:
1. Does toxic leadership behaviour influence teachers' diligence at work in Lagos state senior secondary schools?
2. What is the relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' productivity in Lagos State senior secondary schools?

Research Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were proposed and tested in the study:

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' diligence at work in Lagos State senior secondary schools.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' productivity in Lagos State senior secondary schools.

Methodology

In the choice of a design for this study, correlational and descriptive survey research designs were considered suitable. This is because the study examined the nature of relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and followership characteristics and a description of existing situation regarding the emergence of toxic leadership behaviour in public senior secondary schools in Lagos State and its concomitant influence on followership characteristics and their productivity in Lagos State public senior secondary schools. The study also described the interplay between the variables.

The study population comprised all Lagos State owned senior secondary schools in the six Education Districts in State. There are 322 Public Senior Secondary Schools of Lagos State. The study population also consisted of all the principals, vice-principals, and teachers of these schools.

The stratified random sampling technique was used to select 30% of total number of public senior secondary schools of Lagos State. That is, for the teachers and principals, 30 percent of them were chosen after stratifying into districts.

Again, a purposive sampling technique was employed to select one principal, the two vice-principals, and ten teachers teaching and taking students through SS I to SS III to be drawn from each school.

It was purposive in that, principals, vice-principal, and teachers that have stayed or have been teaching in their various schools for five years were selected as participants in the study.

Therefore, a total of 98 principals, 196 vice-principals, and 980 teachers were used for the study. However, the selection of respondents from each Education District was on an equal basis.

Two research instruments were used for the study. They are self-structured and developed questionnaires by the researcher in conjunction with experts on the field of measurement and evaluation. They questionnaires were responded to by the school Principals, the two Vice-Principals, and teachers. These instruments were used to elicit information from respondents regarding toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' diligence and productivity.

Data collected were analysed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics used included tables, charts, figures and percentages. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested using Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation (PPMC) Analysis at 0.05 level of significance through the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24.0.

Results

Hypothesis One

This hypothesis states that 'there is no significant relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' diligence at work in Lagos State senior secondary schools'. In order to test the hypothesis, Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Analysis was conducted between toxic leadership behaviour and followership diligence at work. The scores of responses of items of toxic leadership behaviour was computed and used as a single variable to correlate the sum of scores of items of followership diligence at work. The result is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Correlation showing relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and followership diligence at work in public senior secondary schools

Variables	N	Mean	SD	R	Sig.	Remark
Toxic Leadership	279	83.04	11.293			
Followership Diligence at Work	949	18.34	1.918	-0.029	0.628	Not Significant

Source: Field Work

The result of the test performed indicates that there is a negative and non-significant relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' diligence at work in Lagos State senior secondary schools (r = -0.029, ρ>0.05). The implication of this is that there is a negative influence of toxic leadership behaviour on teachers' diligence at work. This means that higher the toxic leadership behaviour of principals and vice principals, the lower the teachers' diligence at work. Hence, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' diligence at work in Lagos State senior secondary schools is not rejected.

Hypothesis Two

This hypothesis states that 'there is no significant relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' productivity in Lagos State senior secondary schools''. To test this hypothesis, data collected on toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' productivity were subjected to Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Analysis. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Correlation showing relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and followership productivity in public senior secondary schools

Variables	N	Mean	SD	R	Sig.	Remark
Toxic Leadership	279	83.04	11.293			
Followership Productivity	949	19.13	1.780	-0.060	0.320	Not Significant

Source: Field Work (2019)

The result illustrated in Table 2 shows that toxic leadership behaviour is negatively and non-significantly related with the teachers' productivity in Lagos State senior secondary schools (r = -0.060, ρ>0.05). This implies that as the toxic leadership behaviour practices increases, there is non-significant reduction in teachers' productivity. This suggests that toxic leadership behaviour does not significantly influence teachers' productivity in Lagos State senior secondary schools. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' productivity in Lagos State senior secondary schools is hereby not rejected.

Discussion

The study showed that there is a negative influence of toxic leadership behaviour on teachers' diligence at work. That is, it was found in this study that there is a negative and non-significant relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' diligence at work in Lagos state senior secondary schools. The result is in line with the finding of Sutton (2007) who reported that toxic leadership creates counterproductive behaviours which tend to be attributed to perceived injustice by the followers who retaliate by inflicting harm and producing systematic damage in an organisation like sabotaging operations, providing inaccurate information and lack of diligence to work by the followers. Also, Elle (2012) found that toxic leadership undermines teachers' diligence to work, erode trust and create a negative organisational climate. In the same vein, Gallus, Walsh, Driel, Gouge and Antolic (2013) cited multiple studies that have shown that toxic leadership is negatively related to teachers' diligence to work within in any given organisation.

In the second hypothesis the study found out that there is a negative and non-significant relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' productivity in Lagos State senior secondary schools. This finding is consistent with the findings of earlier studies conducted by Whicker (1996) and Lipman-Bulmen (2005) which explained that toxic leadership often creates short-term boosts in productivity since subordinates are acting out of fear. Pelletier (2010) also found that toxic leadership had negative direct effects on work productivity and subordinates work commitment because toxic leaders are generally disliked as there is no scope for initiative, consideration, and self-development on the part of followers. Teachers whose school principals employ toxic leadership style remain insecure and afraid of the leadership authority which as a result reduces teachers' productivity and leads to inability of the followers to explore their potential. Mullins (2002) argued that toxic leaders in schools are more concerned with despotic influence in order to get the job accomplished rather than with the development and growth of subordinates. On the contrary, CNSnews.com (2011) opined that toxic leaders may at times by very successful, in terms of productivity within an organisation, but usually only a temporary success, and improve the organisations worth. Toxic leadership can create a decrease in workplace performance, productivity, and output, as well as its remarkable negative reflections on employees (Barbara, 2019). Toxic leadership is a phenomenon that exists in contemporary organizations resulting in an inefficient and less productive work environment (Frost, 2003; Kusy & Holloway, 2009; Lipman-Blumen, 2005; Sutton, 2010). The prevalent lack of positive leadership that leads to poor workplace climates and cultures led some researchers to assert that toxic leadership is a fact of organizational life (Frost, 2003; Kusy & Holloway, 2009). A toxic environment leads to the loss of talented faculty and a decline in productivity by those who remain and are affected emotionally, psychologically and/or physically (Klein & Lester, 2013; Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik, & Alberts, 2006). Toxic behaviours represent a problem in higher education, because they negatively impact retention, morale, productivity, and can result in a hostile work environment (Klein & Lester, 2013).

Conclusion
The significance of this study lies in its capacity to create awareness on the importance of leadership and followership as critical variables in the education industry. The findings of this study could then be used to identify the steps or yardsticks to be used in the selection or appointment of secondary schools leaders in order to avoid choosing of toxic leaders. The focus of this study therefore, is on toxic leadership behaviours specifically of school leaders. The higher the individual is in the school organisation, the more power they have at their disposal, if this power is used to enforce dysfunctional behaviours the consequences could spread through the school organisation because of the legitimate or position power which the

individual has from his/her position within the school organisation. That most obvious place to begin to examine the toxicity of schools is with school leadership. In the final analysis, it can be concluded that, toxic leadership behaviour in any school setting, undermine teachers' diligence at work, which ultimately leading to deterioration in teachers' productivity, that is the productivity of the school will be decreased in terms of students' academic performance. It is noteworthy therefore that, future researches on educational/school leadership should also be tailored toward the dark side of leadership – toxic leadership.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are hereby made.

1. Qualified consultants, that is, personnel specialists with expertise in organisational leadership should be engaged during the search and selection process of school leaders so as to detect toxic leaders in waiting.
2. Appointment or selection of teachers into school leadership positions (Principals or Vice-principals) should be based on past records of the teacher devoid of toxic trace.
3. Stakeholders in education should continue to lay more emphasis on the need for school leaders to exhibit good leadership ability in the day-to-day administration of the school, so as to create non-toxic atmosphere for teachers and thus enhance their productivity.
4. At the follower level, State Ministry of Education through the Education Districts should establish ethics ombudsperson to usually investigate allegations of leader toxicity in various schools.
5. Annual Performance Evaluation Report (APER) form for teachers should include teachers' diligence and productivity column in order to measure these dimensions.

References

Adu, E. O. (2015). Institutional personal and reward system factors as determinant of teachers' productivity in public secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria, *Journal of Social Sciences*, *45* (1): 1-2.

Akinyele, T. S. (2010). The influence of work environment on workers' productivity: A case of selected oil and gas industry in Lagos, Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4 (3); 299-307.

Akpa, O. O. (1998). Management Problems Militating against Secondary School Teachers' Effective in Calabar Metropolis. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Port Harcourt.

Atanda, A. I., & Waheed, O. L. (2006). *Fundamentals of School Organization and Classroom Management*. Ibadan: Awemark Industrial Printers.

Barbara, K. (2019). Leadership in theory and practice. University of the Cumberlands. A student handbook. Retrieved from www.academia.com

Bennis, W. (2010). Art of followership. *Leadership Excellence*, 27, 3.

Chaleff, I. (2008). Creating new ways of following. *The art of followership: how great followers create great leaders and organisations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

CNSnews.com, (2011). Obama: 'We Would Not Be a Great Country' Without Government Entitlements. Retrieved June 23, 2012, from: http://cnsnews.com/news/article/obama-we-would-not-be-great-country-without-gov-t-entitlements

Dunkin, M. J. (1997). Assessing teachers' effectiveness. *Issues in Educational Research,7* (1); 37-51.

Elle, S. A. (2012). Breaking the toxic leadership paradigm in the U.S. Army. Carlisle Barracks, VA: US Army War College.

Eze, D. (2001). Teachers and Nation Building. *Nigerian Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 10* (5); 103-107.

Frost, P.J. (2003). *Toxic emotions at work: How compassionate managers handle pain and conflict*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

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.

Kennedy, N. G. (2016). Motivational strategies and productivity: Lessons of experience from public secondary schools in Kisii County; Kenya. *IOSR Journal of Research and Method in Education (IOSR-JRME), 4* (3); 33-38.

Klein, C., & Lester, J. (2013). Moving beyond awareness and tolerance: Recommendations and implications for workplace bullying in higher education. In Lester, J. (Ed.) *Workplace bullying in higher education* (138-147). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kusy, M., & Holloway, E. (2009). *Toxic workplace: managing Toxic personalities and their systems of power.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). *The Allure of Toxic Leaders:* Why We Follow Destructive Bosses and Corrupt Politicians – and How We Can Survive Them, Oxford University Press.

Mullins, J. & Linehan, M. (2005). Leadership and followership in Public libraries: Transnational Perspectives. *The International Journal of Public sectors Management, 18* (7); 641-647.

Musibau, A. J. & Adigun, J. T. (2010). Influence of school climate change on teachers' productivity and students" achievement. *Journal of Research in National Development*, 8, 2.

Orunbon, N. O. (2020). Toxic Leadership Behaviour, Followership Characteristics and their Productivity in Lagos Senior Secondary Schools, Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Lagos State University.

Pelletier, K. L. (2010). Leader toxicity: An empirical investigation of toxic behaviour and rhetoric. *Leadership, 6* (4); 373 – 389.

Purcell, J., Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., Rayton, B. & Swart, J. (2003). Understanding the People and Performance Link Unlocking the Black Box. London: CIPD, 56.

Quincy, L. D. (2016). A Comprehensive Review of Toxic Leadership. An Unpublished Research Report, Air War College, United States of America.

Reed, G. E (2004). Toxic Leadership. *Military Review,* 48, 67-71.

Schmidt, A. A. (2008). Development and validation of the toxic leadership scale. Unpublished masters thesis, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Sutton,R.I.(2010).*The no asshole rule: Building a civilized workplace and surviving one that isn't*. New York, NY: Business Plus.

Sutton, R.I. (2007). Building the civilized workplace. *Mckinsey Quarterly, 2,* 30-39

Toor, S. R., & Ogunlana, S. (2009). Ineffective leadership: Investigating the negative attributes of leaders and organisational neutralizers. Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, 16 (3); 254-272. doi: 10.1108/09699980910951663

Tracy, S.J., Lutgen-Sandvik, P., & Alberts, J.K. (2006). Nightmares, Demons and Slaves: Exploring the Painful Metaphors of Workplace Bullying. *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*(2); 1-38.

Wicker, M. (1996). *Toxic leaders: When organisations go bad.* Westport CT: Praeger.

Yesufu T.M. (2000). *The dynamics of industrial relations: The Nigeria experience.* Ibadan: University Press Limited.