

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TOXIC LEADERSHIP
BEHAVIORS OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS'
ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR¹**

Gündüz Güngör²

Received/Geliş Tarihi 12.01.2026

Online Published/Elektronik Yayın: 25.05.2026

DOI: 10.48166/ejaes.1861511

ABSTRACT

This research aims to determine the relationship between administrators' toxic leadership behaviors and teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship behaviors. The population consists of 9,815 teachers working in public primary, secondary, and high schools in Mersin's city center. The sample group consists of 443 teachers. This research is a quantitative study designed using a correlational survey model. Data were collected using a personal information form, the Toxic Leadership Scale, and the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale. SPSS 25.0 was used for data analysis, and t-tests, ANOVA, correlation, and regression analyses were performed. According to the research results, there is a moderately significant and negative relationship between toxic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. Similarly, there is a moderately significant, negative relationship between the sub-dimensions of toxic leadership—unappreciativeness, utilitarianism, selfishness, and psychological dysfunction—and organizational citizenship. Furthermore, when the data were evaluated using the total toxic leadership score, it was determined that toxic leadership is a significant, negative predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. Teachers' higher perceptions of toxic leadership among their administrators are significantly associated with their lower tendency to exhibit organizational citizenship behavior.

Keywords: Toxic leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, teacher

¹ This research was presented as an oral presentation at the TRB2 International Congress on Educational Sciences 2022.

² Assistant Prof. Dr., Cappadocia University, Nevşehir, Turkey, gunduz.gungor@kapadokya.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-3630-5407

OKUL YÖNETİCİLERİNİN TOKSİK LİDERLİK DAVRANIŞI İLE ÖĞRETMENLERİN ÖRGÜTSEL VATANDAŞLIK DAVRANIŞI ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ

ÖZET

Bu araştırmanın amacı öğretmen görüşlerine göre yöneticilerin gösterdiği toksik liderlik davranışları ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesidir. Araştırmanın evrenini Mersin il merkezinde kamu ilköğretim, ortaokul ve liselerinde görev yapan 9815 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın örnekleme/çalışma grubu 443 öğretmenden oluşmaktadır. Bu araştırma ilişkisel tarama modelinde tasarlanmış nicel bir araştırmadır. Araştırmanın verileri kişisel bilgi formu, Toksik Liderlik Ölçeği ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Ölçeğiyle toplanmıştır. Verilerin analizinde SPSS 25.0 kullanılmış ve t testi, ANOVA, korelasyon ve regresyon analizleri gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre toksik liderlik ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı arasında “orta” düzeyde anlamlı ve negatif yönlü bir ilişki bulunmaktadır. Aynı şekilde, toksik liderliğin alt boyutları değerbilmezlik, çıkarıcılık, bencillik ve olumsuz ruhsal durum ile örgütsel vatandaşlık arasında “orta” düzeyde anlamlı ve negatif yönlü bir ilişki bulunmaktadır. Ayrıca elde edilen veriler toksik liderlik toplam puanı üzerinden değerlendirildiğinde, toksik liderliğin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışının anlamlı ve negatif yönlü bir yordayıcısı olduğu belirlenmiştir. Öğretmenlerin yöneticileri hakkındaki toksik liderlik algısının daha yüksek olması, öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı gösterme eğilimlerinin daha düşük olmasıyla anlamlı biçimde ilişkilidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Toksik liderlik, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı, öğretmen

1. INTRODUCTION

The positive leadership behaviors exhibited by school administrators contribute to improvements in the quality of education, increased efficiency, and, in general, a sense of belonging and greater motivation among all school staff. In this respect, positive leadership behaviors in educational organizations are crucial for improving the quality of education. In contrast, leadership types characterized by negative managerial behaviors have generally been defined in the literature as the dark side of leadership (Pelletier, 2010; Mathieu, Neumann, Hare & Babiak, 2014; Eriş & Arun, 2020). Leadership characteristics have been described as destructive, exploitative, toxic, and tyrannical. The concept of toxic leadership was first proposed by Whicker (1996). A toxic leader is ill-tempered and displays selfish traits.

Toxic leadership draws on transformational leadership theories. While this leadership style aims to increase organizational effectiveness and employee productivity, the leader's managerial inadequacies can lead to toxic behaviors that negatively impact both (Hitchcock, 2015). Toxic leadership is a destructive form of leadership consisting of leaders' long-term behaviors that lead to negative outcomes (including self-centered behaviors). The level of toxicity varies depending on the manager's bullying and the problems it causes (Başkan, 2020; Smith & Lowman, 2020).

For toxic leadership to occur, managerial behaviors must have a negative, lasting impact on the organization and its employees. (Blumen, 2005; Armitage, 2015; Bozkurt, Çoban & Çolakoğlu, 2018). For example, toxic leaders' behavior of not valuing employees and their threatening attitudes will reduce employees' loyalty to the organization and their productivity. This situation can increase

the intention to leave the job and the risk of conflict. It is stated that opportunities for conflict resolution decrease in toxic environments (Yağcınoy & Işık, 2018; Smith & Lowman, 2020). Toxic leadership has negative effects on employees. These include negative impacts on employees' physical and mental health, decreased group and team functioning, tardiness and absenteeism, decreased productivity, and resignations (Ross, Matteson & Exposito, 2014). Some toxic managerial behaviors exhibited in organizations include aggression, causing social exclusion, creating inequality, discrimination, threatening (Yaghi & Yaghi, 2021), selfishness, arrogance, neuroticism (Green, 2014), encouraging excessive competition, belittling, marginalizing, favoritism, disregarding corruption, and human rights violations (Blumen, 2005), unethical behavior, bullying subordinates, demoralizing (Pelletier, 2010), self-praise, exploitative management style, unpredictability, and narcissism (Ross, Matteson & Exposito, 2014; Burns, 2017).

It has been determined that toxic managers who engage in exploitative management practices and exhibit unpredictable behavior negatively impact employees' psychological well-being, reduce their task-contextual performance (Kılıç, 2019), and decrease their organizational commitment (Kahveci, Bahadır & Kandemir, 2019; Kılıç, 2019; Başkan, 2020; Eriş & Arun, 2020). In other words, school administrators who create a fear-based management style over employees due to their position are detrimental to the institution and its employees. This situation weakens employees' sense of belonging to the school and causes teachers to feel a sense of meaninglessness or to become detached from the school (Erçetin, Akbaşlı & Diş, 2019). Teacher commitment at school is positively associated with administrators' open communication and teachers' involvement in decision-making. Additionally, prioritizing school success and efficiency over personal interests has been emphasized as an important correlate of teacher commitment (Kahveci, Bahadır, & Kandemir, 2019). It has been found that senior managers in the central organization of the Ministry of National Education exhibit toxic leadership traits, and that organizational trust among staff is low (Bozkurt, Çoban & Çolakoğlu, 2018).

In other words, inadequate leadership practices in organizations create chaos, which is considered the toxic side of the organization. A toxic leader causes isolation within the organization, and at the same time, distrust increases in an organizational structure where toxic characteristics are visible (Ross, Matteson, & Exposito, 2014). School administrators who exhibit toxic leadership traits damage the school climate and culture. They may display negative attitudes and behaviors towards their employees, focusing on their individual interests, and may harm school development (Çelebi, Güner & Yıldız, 2015; Başkan, 2020). Toxic leadership behaviors encountered in schools reduce teachers' job satisfaction, morale, and performance while hindering career development and increasing depression, stress, burnout, and anxiety (Snow, Hickey, Blom, O'Mahony & Mannix-McNamara, 2021).

1.1. Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) are defined as behaviors in which employees

voluntarily contribute to the organization by doing more than their job descriptions require, without expecting any reward or compensation (Organ, 1988; 1997; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Altinkurt & Yılmaz, 2012; Sezgin & Kılınç, 2012). Employees intervening in work-related problems together and voluntarily through teamwork, senior employees teaching new employees their jobs (Nasra & Heilbrunn, 2016), preventing conflict, being respectful, complying with rules even without supervision (Tziner & Sharoni, 2014), helping behavior (altruism), chivalry, organizational loyalty, organizational conformity, individual initiative, civic virtue, and prioritizing personal development (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000) accelerate organizational learning and contribute to organizational effectiveness. These voluntary behaviors exhibited by employees are also considered organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997).

Teachers' OCB in schools is positively associated with a strong school culture and a favorable school climate (Koşar & Yalçınkaya, 2013). OCB have a positive impact on increasing organizational effectiveness (Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Organ, 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Dipaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Alanoğlu & Demirtaş, 2019), reducing internal conflicts (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997), gaining flexibility in the face of unforeseen circumstances (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983), facilitating employees' allocation of time and energy to organizational goals (Dipaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001), and creating a favorable school climate where employees participate in decision-making in managerial processes (Sezgin & Kılınç, 2012).

Encouraging positive attitudes and behaviors within the organization, improving managerial decisions, developing communication strategies, and creating a fair working environment (Chan & Lai, 2017) increase employees' social-emotional needs and OCB (Lim & Loosemore, 2017). Furthermore, managers' ethical leadership behaviors positively influence OCB and employees' perceptions of justice. It is emphasized that employees' voluntary behaviors within the organization depend on managers' moral and ethical behaviors and on the provision of a fair working environment (Mo & Shi, 2017; Gerpott, Quaquebeke, Schlamp & Voelpel, 2017). Furthermore, given the contributions of organizational citizenship behaviors to the organization, companies should develop methods to encourage employees to exhibit them. For example, it is emphasized that even the tone of voice managers use when communicating successes and failures to employees is important. Accordingly, it is stated that positive tones motivate employees more than negative tones (Koning & Van Kleef, 2015).

When organizational citizenship behavior is evaluated from a social-cultural perspective, a distinction is made between horizontal, individualistic cultures and vertical, collectivist cultures. Accordingly, it is stated that organizational citizenship behavior in horizontal, individualistic cultures is related to organizational justice, job satisfaction, intention to leave, and leader-member interaction. In contrast, in vertical, collectivist cultures (cultures with power differences), it has a hierarchical structure (Organ, 2018).

In defining organizational citizenship behavior, Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) explored two

aspects: general conformity and altruism. Subsequently, Organ (1988) identified five dimensions: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. In another research, Podsakoff et al. (2000) assessed OCB through helpfulness, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, conformity, individual initiative, civic virtue, and personal development. It is noted that opinions vary regarding the dimensions of OCB (Oğuz, 2011), and various classifications exist; adopting a more comprehensive approach is crucial (Yılmaz, 2009).

1.2. The Relationship Between Toxic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Leadership is considered an important precursor because it can influence organizational citizenship behavior both directly and indirectly (Sezgin, 2005; Çetin, Korkmaz & Çakmakçı, 2016). It is emphasized that when the power held by school principals is directed positively towards the benefit of the school and staff, teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors will also be positively affected. At the same time, it is stated that individual and relational empowerment of teachers will positively affect organizational citizenship behavior (Altınkurt, Anasız & Ekinçi, 2016).

It is believed that positive leadership styles can enhance organizational citizenship behavior. For instance, transformational and transactional leadership styles create opportunities for employees to engage in extra-role behaviors and positively impact the organization's culture. It is stated that transformational and transactional leaders contribute to greater employee innovation and productivity (Jiang, Zao & Ni, 2017; Khan, Ismail, Hussain & Alghazali, 2020). It is reported that support and encouragement from managers who exhibit transformational leadership characteristics lead employees to go beyond organizational role expectations (Oğuz, 2011; Nasra & Heilbrunn, 2016). Additionally, there is a positive and significant link between organizational citizenship behavior and both authentic leadership (Joo & Jo, 2017) and spiritual leadership (Kaya, 2015).

The positive behaviors exhibited by managers not only influence individual employees' behavior but also affect citizenship behaviors across the organization. In general, toxic leadership behaviors are destructive to employees' emotions and lead to emotional exhaustion in the workplace (Ullah, Salim, & Khan, 2019). Similarly, in a work environment where abusive leadership is exhibited, the likelihood of organizational citizenship behaviors being displayed is lower, and employees feel a strong desire to leave. Hostile attitudes displayed by managers can damage employees' perceptions of competence, leading them to consider leaving their jobs (Qureshi, Ramish, Ansari & Bashir, 2022). Toxic managers attempt to force work through threats and authority, undermining employees' capacity for independent action (Blumen, 2005). In this respect, toxic behavior can be seen as the exact opposite of voluntary employee behavior (organizational citizenship behavior) performed without expectation of reward.

It is stated that managers' emotional states affect employees' organizational citizenship behaviors. For example, if a manager is angry and irritable in the workplace, it reduces employees' tendency to exhibit organizational citizenship behavior and their willingness to stay after hours. In

this regard, it is noted that negative emotions, such as anger and irritability, have harmful effects on the work environment and reduce voluntary behaviors. For example, it is stated that if managers' expressions of anger trigger negative emotional responses in employees, performance will decline, and employees will also express anger. In contrast, managers' expressions of happiness are a source of pride for employees (Koning & Van Kleef, 2015).

This study aims to explore the connection between managers' toxic leadership behaviors and teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship behaviors. Accordingly, the following sub-problems have been outlined:

1. What are the levels of toxic leadership behavior exhibited by administrators and the organizational citizenship behavior of teachers?
2. Does the level of toxic leadership behavior exhibited by administrators differ significantly by school type, gender, seniority, and branch?
3. Does the level of teachers' organizational citizenship behavior differ significantly by school type, gender, seniority, and branch?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the level of toxic leadership behavior and its sub-dimensions exhibited by administrators and teachers' organizational citizenship behavior?
5. Do the toxic leadership behaviors exhibited by administrators predict organizational citizenship?

2. METHOD

2.1. Research Design

The study employed a correlational survey design, a quantitative research design. In this model, the purpose is to determine whether and to what extent two or more variables vary together (Karasar, 2011).

In this study, the dependent variable is teachers' level of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The independent variable is the level of toxic leadership behavior exhibited by school administrators, as perceived by teachers, and its sub-dimensions. In addition, school type, gender, seniority, and branch were considered as demographic/control (grouping) variables to examine whether toxic leadership and OCB levels differed across these groups. The study also tested the relationship between toxic leadership (and its sub-dimensions) and OCB, and evaluated the predictive power of toxic leadership on OCB.

2.2. Population and Sample

The population of the study consists of 9,815 teachers working in (public) elementary, middle, and high schools in the central districts of Mersin province during the 2021-2022 academic year: Akdeniz (N:2838), Mezitli (N:1583), Yenişehir (N:2382), and Toroslar (N:3012). The minimum sample size was determined to be 370 using the Cochran formula (1962; cited in Balci, 2015) for

cases where the population size is known. The sample was selected using convenience sampling, a nonprobability sampling method. In this method, the sample consists of people who are nearby, easily accessible, and who voluntarily participate in the research (Erkuş, 2013). The sample consists of 443 teachers. 56.9% of the teachers are female, and 43.1% are male. In terms of professional seniority, 28.7% of the teachers have 1-10 years of experience, 41.5% have 11-20 years of experience, and 29.8% have 21 years or more of experience.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

In the study, the Toxic Leadership Scale (n= 334), consisting of 4 dimensions and 30 items, developed by Çelebi, Güner & Yıldız (2015), and the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (n=189), developed by Dipaola & Hoy (2005) and adapted into Turkish by Taştan & Yılmaz (2008), consisting of a single dimension and 12 items, were used as data collection tools in the study. The dimensions of the toxic leadership scale are unappreciativeness (11 items; $\alpha=.93$), utilitarianism (9 items; $\alpha=.95$), selfishness (5 items; $\alpha=.91$), and psychological dysfunction (5 items; $\alpha=.87$). The reliability coefficient of the scale as a whole is $\alpha=.96$. The reliability coefficient of the organizational citizenship behavior scale is $\alpha=.87$.

In this study (n=443), reliability analyses were conducted for all scales and sub-dimensions. Accordingly, the dimensions of the toxic leadership scale are unappreciativeness (11 items; $\alpha=.95$), utilitarianism (9 items; $\alpha=.97$), selfishness (5 items; $\alpha=.95$), and psychological dysfunction (5 items; $\alpha=.91$). The reliability coefficient of the scale as a whole is $\alpha=.98$. The reliability coefficient of the organizational citizenship behavior scale is $\alpha=.83$. The Toxic Leadership scale and the Organizational Citizenship Behavior scale are 5-point Likert-type scales, scored on a scale of 1-5. Scores are as follows: 1.00-1.80 “Strongly Disagree”, 1.81-2.60 “Disagree”, 2.61-3.40 “Undecided”, 3.41-4.20 “Agree”, 4.21-5.00 “Strongly Agree”.

2.4. Data Analysis

The study's data were analyzed with SPSS 25. Prior to analysis, the normality assumption was checked using Kurtosis and Skewness values, and Levene's Test for homogeneity of variance.

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test results showed $p<.05$ for all variables and sub-dimensions. It was emphasized that "the Kolmogorov-Smirnov method determines that normally distributed data are not normally distributed, regardless of sample size, and therefore, the skewness coefficient should be considered first when determining the normality of a dataset (Uysal & Kılıç, 2022, p. 235). In other words, reporting statistics such as skewness and kurtosis is considered a more effective way to assess normality violations in a dataset and increases transparency in data analysis (Cain, Zhang & Yuan, 2017). On the other hand, it was emphasized that skewness and kurtosis values alone should not be used to test normality (Orcan, 2020, p. 262). The assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variances are complementary in statistical analyses. Furthermore, it is directly related to the distribution characteristics of the data and the sample structure, and evaluating these two assumptions together increases the accuracy of statistical analyses (Demir, Çelik & Uurlu, 2024:59). Within the framework of these evaluations in the

literature, the normality of the data set was tested with skewness coefficients and variance homogeneity test results.

Table 1. Levene's Statistics Results and Skewness-Kurtosis Coefficients (n:443)

	Levene Statistics	Skewness	Kurtosis	p
Toxic Leadership	1.05	-.17	-.74	.31
Unappreciativeness	2.05	.35	-.55	.15
Utilitarian	1.27	-.16	-1.10	.26
Selfishness	3.53	-.32	-.79	.06
Psychological Dysfunction	0.13	-.68	-.11	.72
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	0.07	-.53	1.25	.93

Upon examining Table 1 the kurtosis coefficients for the toxic leadership scale, its subscales, and the OCB scale data ranged from -1.10 to 1.25, while skewness coefficients ranged from -0.68 to 0.35. Skewness and kurtosis coefficients between -1.5 and +1.5 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2015) or a skewness coefficient significantly less than 1 (Orcan, 2020) are significant indicators of the dataset's normality. In addition, Levene's test results showed $p > .05$ for all variables and sub-dimensions. Based on these measures, the data were found to follow a normal distribution.

This study employed parametric tests, including the Independent Samples T-Test for pairwise comparisons and the One-Way ANOVA for multiple-group comparisons. When the ANOVA results were significant, LSD and Tamhane tests were used to identify specific group differences, depending on variance homogeneity. It is stated that the LSD test has greater statistical power by reducing the probability of Type II error compared to other multiple-comparison methods (Klasson, 2024, p. 9). Tamhane T2 analysis, on the other hand, is said to be a more rigorous multiple-comparison method than other alternative tests under conditions of non-homogeneous variances, and it reduces the probability of Type I error (Lee & Lee, 2018, p. 358). Additionally, correlation analysis examined the relationship between toxic leadership and organizational commitment, while regression analysis assessed the predictive relationships between toxic leadership and organizational citizenship.

Certain conditions are necessary for regression analysis to be performed. These include the variables being continuous variables with at least equal interval measurements, the data being normally distributed, a linear relationship between the variables being present, the absence of outliers, the errors being normally distributed, the variables having equal variance, and the errors being independent of each other (no autocorrelation) (George & Mallery, 2010).

When evaluating the conditions for performing regression analysis, it was determined that the data for both variables were normally distributed and had at least equally spaced measurement levels. Furthermore, to determine a linear relationship between the two variables, the scatter plot was examined,

and the equation $y=3.97-0.19x$ (regression analysis result equation) confirmed a linear relationship. For outlier detection, the Cook's distance ranged from 0.00 to 0.08. It is recommended that the Cook's distance be less than 1.00 (George & Mallery, 2010). The scatter plot was examined, and it was determined that the variables had equal variance. To determine whether there was autocorrelation between the variables, a Durbin-Watson test was performed ($D.W = 1.93$). The accepted threshold range is 1.5-2.5 (Field, 2009). Therefore, it can be stated that the errors are independent of each other; in other words, there is no autocorrelation between the variables.

3. FINDINGS

The data obtained were analyzed and explained in accordance with the study's sub-problems. Teachers' perceptions of managers' levels of toxic leadership behavior and teachers' organizational citizenship behavior are presented in Table 1.

Table 2. Teachers' Perceptions of Managers' Toxic Leadership Behavior Level and Teachers' Organizational Citizenship Behavior Level

	N	S	$\bar{X}$
Toxic Leadership	443	0.99	2.92
Unappreciativeness		0.96	2.52
Utilitarian		1.17	3.03
Selfishness		1.13	3.20
Psychological Dysfunction		1.02	3.33
Organizational Citizenship Behavior		0.52	3.42

When examining teachers' perceptions of their managers' toxic leadership behaviors, the overall average score is close to the middle of the scale ($\bar{X} = 2.92$). When examined at the sub-dimension level, teachers stated that their managers exhibited the most psychological dysfunction ($\bar{X} = 3.33$) and selfishness ($\bar{X} = 3.20$) behaviors, and the least toxic behavior in the dimension of unappreciativeness ($\bar{X} = 2.52$). In contrast, teachers' levels of organizational citizenship behavior were found to be at a medium-high level ($\bar{X} = 3.42$).

Table 3. Results of the T-test Related to Toxic Leadership and Its Subdimensions and the Gender Variable

Dimensions	Gender	N	S	$\bar{X}$	T	P
Toxic Leadership	Female	252	0.97	2.85	1.69	.09
	Male	191	1.02	3.01		
Unappreciativeness	Female	252	0.94	2.45	1.67	.09
	Male	191	0.99	2.61		
Utilitarian	Female	252	1.13	2.93	2.12	.03
	Male	191	1.21	3.17		
Selfishness	Female	252	1.09	3.13	1.46	.14
	Male	191	1.19	3.29		
Psychological Dysfunction	Female	252	1.03	3.32	.36	.72
	Male	191	1.02	3.35		

Upon examining Table 3, teachers do not perceive a significant difference in toxic leadership behavior by gender ($p>0.05$). However, there is a notable difference in perceptions of utilitarian behavior, a subdimension of toxic leadership, based on gender. Specifically, male teachers ($\bar{X}=3.17$) reported higher perceived utilitarianism than female teachers ($\bar{X}=2.93$).

Table 4. ANOVA Results Regarding Managers' Toxic Leadership Level and School Type, Seniority, and Branch Variables

		Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	P	Difference
School Type	Between Groups	8.18	2	4.09			
	Within Groups	430.24	440	.98	4.18	.016	primary-secondary ($\bar{X} = 3.06-2.76$)
	Total	438.42	442				
Seniority	Between Groups	7.35	2	3.68			
	Within Groups	431.07	440	.98	3.75	.024	1-10 years-21 years over ($\bar{X} = 3.09-2.75$)
	Total	438.42	442				
Branch	Between Groups	15.93	2	7.97			elementary-social science
	Within Groups	422.49	440	.96	8.29	.00	($\bar{X} = 2.69-3.06$)
	Total	438.42	442				elementary-natural science ($\bar{X} = 2.69-3.10$)

Table 4 shows that, there is a significant difference between the level of toxic leadership among administrators and the school type variable based on teachers' opinions ($F_{(2,440)} = 4.18$, $p<.05$).

Homogeneity of variances was examined using the Levene test. Since the Levene test was non-significant ($p > .05$), the variances were assumed homogeneous, and the LSD post hoc test was used for pairwise comparisons between groups. According to the LSD test result conducted to determine the difference between groups, secondary school administrators' toxic leadership levels ($\bar{X} = 3.06$) are higher than primary school administrators' toxic leadership levels ($\bar{X} = 2.76$) based on teachers' opinions. Similarly, according to teachers' opinions, there is a significant difference between the toxic leadership level of administrators and the seniority variable ($F_{(2,440)} = 3.75, p < .05$). According to the LSD test result conducted to determine the difference between groups, the opinions of teachers with 21 years or more of seniority regarding the toxic leadership level of their administrators ($\bar{X} = 3.09$) are higher than those of teachers with 1-10 years of seniority ($\bar{X} = 2.75$). Accordingly, higher teacher seniority is associated with higher perceptions of their managers exhibiting toxic leadership.

According to the findings, there is a significant difference in the level of toxic leadership among administrators and the branch variable ($F_{(2,440)} = 8.29, p < .05$). Homogeneity of variance was assessed using the Levene test. A significant Levene test result ($p < .05$) indicated that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not met. Therefore, the Tamhane T2 post hoc test was used, which does not require equal variances and provides a more conservative approach under heterogeneous variances. According to the Tamhane test results, which were used to determine group differences, natural sciences teachers' perceptions of their administrators' toxic leadership ($\bar{X} = 3.10$) are higher than those of elementary teachers ($\bar{X} = 2.69$). The opinions of social sciences teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.06$) are also higher than those of elementary teachers. In other words, elementary teachers assess that their administrators exhibit lower levels of toxic leadership behavior than other branch teachers.

Table 5. ANOVA Results Regarding Subdimensions of Managers' Toxic Leadership Level and School Type, Seniority, and Branch Variables

Sub-dimensions of Toxic Leadership		Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Difference
School Type	Between Groups	8.20	2	4.10		0.01	primary-secondary ($\bar{X} = 2.36$ - 2.65)
	Within Groups	405.80	440	0.92	4.44		
	Total	414.01	442				
Unappreciativeness	Between Groups	6.86	2	3.43		0.02	1-10 Years-21 Years over ($\bar{X} = 2.37$ - 2.69)
	Within Groups	407.14	440	0.92	3.70		
	Total	414.01	442				
Branch	Between Groups	14.70	2	7.35		0.00	Elementary-Social
	Within Groups						

Utilitarian		Within Groups	399.30	440	0.90	8.10	Science. ($\bar{X} = 2.29-2.66$)
		Total	414.01	442			Elementary-Natural Science ($\bar{X} = 2.29-2.68$)
	School Type	Between Groups	11.46	2	5.73		primary-secondary
		Within Groups	599.70	440	1.36	4.20	0.01 ($\bar{X} = 2.85-3.20$)
		Total	611.17	442			
	Seniority	Between Groups	12.84	2	6.42		1-10 Years-21 Years over
		Within Groups	598.32	440	1.36	4.72	0.09 ($\bar{X} = 2.79-3.24$)
		Total	611.17	442			
	Branch	Between Groups	20.57	2	10.28		Elementary-Social Science.
		Within Groups	590.59	440	1.34	7.66	0.00 ($\bar{X} = 2.77-3.17$)
		Total	611.17	442			Elementary-Natural Science ($\bar{X} = 2.77-3.28$)
Selfishness	School Type	Between Groups	9.44	2	4.72		primary-secondary
		Within Groups	562.59	440	1.27	3.69	0.02 ($\bar{X} = 3.03-3.34$)
		Total	572.03	442			
	Seniority	Between Groups	7.14	2	3.57		
		Within Groups	564.89	440	1.28	2.78	0.06 --
		Total	572.03	442			
	Branch	Between Groups	18.00	2	9.00		Elementary-Social Science.
		Within Groups	554.03	440	1.25	7.14	0.00 ($\bar{X} = 2.95-3.32$)
		Total	572.03	442			Elementary-Natural Science ($\bar{X} = 2.95-3.43$)

Psychological Dysfunction	School Type	Between Groups	3.09	2	1.54	0.23	--
		Within Groups	464.60	440	1.05		
		Total	467.69	442	1.46		
	Seniority	Between Groups	2.24	2	1.12	0.34	--
		Within Groups	465.45	440	1.05		
		Total	467.69	442	1.06		
	Branch	Between Groups	11.03	2	5.51	0.00	Elementary-Social Science ($\bar{X} = 3.14-3.48$)
		Within Groups	456.66	440	1.03		
		Total	467.69	442	5.31		

A notable difference exists in the level of unappreciativeness among administrators based on school type ($F_{(2,440)}=4.44$, $p<.05$). Homogeneity of variances was examined using the Levene test. Since the Levene test was non-significant ($p > .05$), the variances were assumed homogeneous, and the LSD post hoc test was used for pairwise comparisons between groups. The LSD test revealed that secondary school administrators ($\bar{X}=2.65$), as perceived by teachers, exhibit greater unappreciativeness than primary school administrators ($\bar{X}=2.36$).

Similarly, teachers' opinions indicate a significant difference in perceptions of administrators' unappreciativeness based on seniority ($F_{(2,440)}= 3.70$, $p<.05$). Homogeneity of variance was assessed using the Levene test. A significant Levene test result ($p < .05$) indicated that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not met. Therefore, the Tamhane T2 post hoc test was used, which does not require equal variances and provides a more conservative approach under heterogeneous variances. The Tamhane test results show that teachers with 21 or more years of seniority rate the level of unappreciativeness by their administrators higher ($\bar{X} = 2.69$) than those with 1-10 years of seniority ($\bar{X} = 2.37$). This suggests that more senior teachers perceive their managers as less appreciative.

Teachers believe there is a significant difference in the levels of unappreciation shown by administrators across different branch variables. The statistical analysis revealed $F_{(2,440)}=8.10$, $p<.05$. LSD test results indicated that managers' unappreciativeness was higher among natural science ($\bar{X}=2.68$) and social science ($\bar{X}=2.66$) teachers compared to elementary teachers ($\bar{X}=2.29$). This pattern is consistent with the school type variable, as secondary school teachers also reported higher levels of unappreciation from their administrators.

There is a notable difference in utilitarian levels among administrators when considering the school type variable ($F_{(2,440)}= 4.20$, $p<.05$). The LSD test shows that secondary school administrators

($\bar{X} = 3.20$) have higher utilitarian levels than primary school administrators ($\bar{X} = 2.85$), based on teachers' opinions. Similarly, teachers' opinions reveal a significant difference between administrators' utilitarian levels and their seniority ($F_{(2,440)} = 4.72, p < .05$). The LSD test indicates that teachers with 21 or more years of seniority ($\bar{X} = 3.24$) perceive higher utilitarian levels in administrators than those with 1-10 years of seniority ($\bar{X} = 2.79$).

Teachers believe that there is a notable difference in utilitarianism levels between administrators and the branch variable, $F_{(2,440)} = 7.66, p < .05$. The LSD test shows that administrators are perceived as more utilitarian, with natural science teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.28$) and social science teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.17$) rating them higher than elementary teachers ($\bar{X} = 2.77$). Consequently, both social and natural science teachers view their administrators as more self-serving than elementary teachers.

There is a notable difference between administrator selfishness levels and the school type variable ($F_{(2,440)} = 3.69, p < .05$). The LSD test revealed that secondary school administrators have higher selfishness scores ($\bar{X} = 3.34$) compared to primary school administrators ($\bar{X} = 3.03$), according to teachers' evaluations.

There is no significant difference in the selfishness levels between administrators and the seniority variable ($F_{(2,440)} = 2.78, p > .05$). Teachers, however, believe there is a notable difference concerning managers' selfishness levels based on branch ($F_{(2,440)} = 7.14, p < .05$). The Tamhane test results show that administrators' selfishness scores are higher among natural science ($\bar{X} = 3.43$) and social science teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.32$) compared to elementary school teachers ($\bar{X} = 2.95$).

There is no notable difference in psychological dysfunction levels between administrators and the variables of school type ($F_{(2,440)} = 1.46, p > .05$) and seniority ($F_{(2,440)} = 1.06, p > .05$). However, a significant difference exists between administrators' psychological dysfunction levels and the branch variable ($F_{(2,440)} = 5.31, p < .05$). The Tamhane test indicates that managers' psychological dysfunction levels are higher among social sciences teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.48$) compared to elementary teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.14$).

Table 6. Results of the t-test on Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Gender Variable

Gender	n	S	$\bar{X}$	t	P
Female	252	0.52	3.34	-2.80	.01
Male	191	0.52	3.48		

Table 6 indicates a significant difference in organizational citizenship behavior by gender ($t = -2.80, p < .05$). Specifically, male teachers exhibit a higher level of organizational citizenship behavior ($\bar{X} = 3.48$) than female teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.34$).

Table 7. ANOVA Results Regarding Organizational Citizenship Behavior and School Type, Seniority, and Branch Variables

		Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Difference
School Type	Between Groups	1.46	2	.73			
	Within Groups	122.57	440	.27	2.62	.07	--
	Total	124.03	442				
Seniority	Between Groups	.69	2	.34			
	Within Groups	123.34	440	.28	1.24	.28	--
	Total	124.03	442				
Branch	Between Groups	2.55	2	1.27			Elementary- Social Science ($\bar{X} = 3.51-3.38$)
	Within Groups	121.48	440	.27	4.62	.01	Elementary- Natural Science ($\bar{X} = 3.51-3.33$)
	Total	124.03	442				

Table 7 indicates that there is no significant difference in teachers' organizational citizenship behavior based on school type or seniority ($p > .05$). However, a significant difference exists concerning the branch variable, $F_{(2,440)} = 4.62$, $p < .05$. Homogeneity of variances was examined using the Levene test. Since the Levene test was non-significant ($p > .05$), the variances were assumed homogeneous, and the LSD post hoc test was used for pairwise comparisons between groups. Post-hoc LSD test results reveal that elementary teachers ($\bar{X}=3.51$) exhibit higher levels of organizational citizenship than social sciences teachers ($\bar{X}=3.38$) and natural sciences teachers ($\bar{X}=3.33$).

Table 8. Correlation Values Related to Toxic Leadership, Its Subdimensions, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Variables

	TL	UN	UT	SE	PD	OCB
Toxic Leadership	1					
Unappreciativeness	.93**	1				
Utilitarian	.97**	.87**	1			
Selfishness	.92**	.79**	.88**	1		
Psychological Dysfunction	.85**	.70**	.78**	.78**	1	
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	-.35**	-.32**	-.34**	-.31**	-.31**	1

**0.01

Table 8 indicates a “moderate” and significant negative correlation between toxic leadership

and organizational citizenship behavior ($r=-.35$; $p<.01$). A similar “moderate” and significant negative relationship is observed between the sub-dimensions of toxic leadership—unappreciativeness ($r=-.32$; $p<.01$), utilitarian ($r=-.34$; $p<.01$), selfishness ($r=-.31$; $p<.01$), and psychological dysfunction ($r=-.31$; $p<.01$)—and organizational citizenship. These findings indicate a negative association between teachers’ organizational citizenship behaviors and their perceptions of administrators’ toxic leadership across primary, secondary, and high schools.

Table 9. Simple Linear Regression Results Regarding the Prediction of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Variable	B	St. Error	β	t	p
Constant	3.97	.08	-	54.21	.00
Toxic Leadership	-.19	.02	-.35	-7.88	.00
R=0.35	R ² =0.12				
F _(1,441) =62.07	p=.00				

Upon examining Table 9, simple linear regression analysis showed that the total toxic leadership score significantly and negatively predicted teachers' organizational citizenship behavior ($R=.35$, $R^2=.12$, Adjusted $R^2=.12$, $F_{(1,441)}=62.07$, $p<.001$). An increase in the toxic leadership score was associated with a decrease in the OCB score ($B=-0.19$, $SE=0.02$, $\beta=-0.35$, $t=-7.88$, $p<.001$). Accordingly, higher levels of managers’ toxic leadership behaviors are associated with lower levels of OCB, reflecting teachers’ voluntary extra-role contributions. Collectively, the variables in the model account for about 12% of the variation in teachers' organizational citizenship scores. In summary, teachers’ perceptions of higher levels of toxic leadership from their managers are significantly associated with lower levels of organizational citizenship behavior.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to the research findings, secondary school administrators are perceived as having higher levels of unappreciativeness, utilitarianism, and selfishness than primary school administrators. It is assessed that specialization in secondary schools, the variety of course types, and concerns about LGS success (among students, teachers, parents, and school administration) may make the relationship between school administration and teachers more conflictual. Schmidt (2008) states that in such situations, teachers' expectations of fairness and support from school administration will decrease, and the administration will be perceived more negatively. On the other hand, the persistence of patterns characteristic of toxic leadership in schools can weaken teachers' voluntary contributions to the school (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000). On the other hand, negative factors affecting the school climate in middle schools include insufficient communication among staff, a weakened sense of fairness in management, and an emphasis on individualism rather than teamwork (Tofur & Balıkcı, 2018). Among these negative situations, a weakened sense of fairness towards management and insufficient

communication among staff can lay the groundwork for toxic leadership behaviors, especially in middle schools.

Elementary teachers demonstrate higher levels of organizational citizenship behavior compared to those in other disciplines. Within the scope of this research sample, this can be attributed to elementary teachers feeling a stronger connection to the school, a greater sense of belonging, and engaging more in voluntary contributions. A study involving research assistants at higher education institutions revealed a negative correlation between perceived organizational toxicity and both job satisfaction and emotional commitment (Kasalak, 2019). Another research indicated a significant positive link between toxic leadership and the intention to leave the job. Consequently, organizations should aim to prevent toxic leadership behaviors to lower turnover intentions (Akca, 2017). Overall, toxic leadership in educational settings tends to yield negative rather than positive outcomes.

A study on toxic leadership in the Irish higher education system found that toxic behaviors exhibited by managers caused dissatisfaction among participants, leading them to resort to methods such as compromising their careers and developing self-protection strategies. It was also noted that they felt distrustful of senior human resources managers, experienced tension, and felt a lack of fairness and transparency (Fahie, 2019). Managerial misuse of power has been reported to be associated with higher levels of organizational toxicity. Moreover, in a study examining faculty members' avoidance strategies in response to toxic leadership behaviors, participants reported using strategies such as limiting communication with the toxic leader, indifference, ignoring, and remaining silent (Kasalak & Aksu, 2016). A study in the United Arab Emirates revealed a negative link between toxic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. It also found that employee trust positively influences citizenship behavior. To counteract the harmful effects of toxic leadership, managers should focus on boosting employees' trust and commitment to encourage citizenship behaviors (Behery, Al-Nasser, Jabeen, & El-Rawas, 2018). Creating a perception among teachers that school administrators are fair will enable them to trust their principals and have a sense of justice (Kazak & Yaylalı, 2023). Thus, it can be stated that toxic leadership behaviors in schools may decrease. Tofur & Balıkçı (2018) suggested that school administrators should be trained to ensure fairness in management and to improve communication with all school stakeholders. Specifically, exploitative leadership behaviors are shown to diminish employees' organizational citizenship, primarily by eroding their commitment to their work and organization (Lyu, Zhu, Zhong, & Hu, 2016). As toxic leadership from school administrators rises, teachers tend to feel more alienated from the school environment. When a toxic leader is in power, desirable qualities like creativity, critical thinking, and effective communication tend to decline (Zengin, 2019). Overall, the research supports a moderate negative relationship between toxic leadership behaviors and organizational citizenship behavior, consistent with existing literature.

When selecting and appointing managers, evaluation methods that reveal toxic leaders' negative personality traits should be used. Training programs should be implemented to establish healthy manager-employee relationships (Behery, Al-Nasser, Jabeen, & El-Rawas, 2018). It is crucial for school

administrators to manage conflict processes among all employees to create a positive school climate. Karamuk & Dulay (2023), who suggest that administrators should use emotional intelligence skills in the conflict management process, emphasized that teacher performance and student success will increase when administrators lead emotional processes. In this context, it is recommended that inventories evaluating emotional intelligence, in addition to technical knowledge, be used in the recruitment of school administrators for effective school management.

To eliminate or reduce the effects of destructive leadership traits within an organization, it is necessary to be more selective in hiring and promotion processes, ensure that positive leadership behaviors are more prominent within the organization, and give careful and dedicated consideration to employees' suggestions regarding organizational values (Erickson, Shaw, Murray, & Branch, 2015). Individuals with ethical values should be prioritized in the selection and promotion of managers. Ethical leaders are believed to foster a psychologically healthy workplace environment for employees; therefore, it is recommended that training programs on ethical leadership be organized (Mo & Shi, 2017; Samreen & Rashid, 2018).

In a study on coaching-based school leadership, school administrators reported that coaching-based leadership practices fostered a positive school climate and strengthened relationships between administrators and teachers. Therefore, it is recommended that school administrators receive training in basic coaching skills, including emotional intelligence, empathy, effective communication, feedback, and problem-solving (Akyıldız & Katıtaş, 2025). It has been emphasized that coaching-based school leadership practices are beneficial for addressing problems encountered in educational activities and for improving teacher performance and supervision effectiveness (İşli & Aksu, 2023).

On the other hand, to mitigate the potential adverse implications of toxic leadership in schools, it may be beneficial to strengthen accountability mechanisms within managerial practices. Prior studies have reported that toxic leadership behaviors are associated with lower staff motivation (Tavanti, 2011; Zengin, 2019), which supports placing greater emphasis on accountability in the administrative functions of schools and other organizations (Zengin, 2019).

Organizations should enhance the work environment and develop a strategy to mitigate the negative impacts of toxic leadership. Toxic leadership is associated with lower OCB, which are crucial to the organization's overall effectiveness and efficiency (Morris, 2019). If managers' behavior toward employees is aimed at undermining them and engaging in harassing behavior, these behaviors are characterized as toxic and create a framework that intimidates employees, demeans them, and harms organizational success (Hitchcock, 2015). When evaluating research findings, activities that positively impact school climate and teacher collaboration should be organized in situations where secondary school teachers perceive higher toxicity.

Since this research uses a relational, cross-sectional design, the findings between variables should not be interpreted as causal. The results show that there are significant relationships between teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship behavior and managers' perceptions of toxic

leadership behavior; however, the direction and possible mechanisms of these relationships (e.g., mediating/moderating variables such as school climate, workload, and organizational justice) cannot be tested within the scope of this design. Therefore, researchers are advised to conduct research with larger samples in this context.

Finally, providing training to raise awareness about the causes and consequences of toxic leadership in in-service training programs within the Turkish National Education System, establishing a system that identifies behaviors that may cause toxicity in the selection and appointment of managers, and, when necessary, screens candidates according to these criteria, will contribute to improving the quality of the Turkish National Education System.

REFERENCES

- Akca, M. (2017). The impact of toxic leadership on the intention to leave of employees. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, 1(4), 285-298.
- Akyıldız, N., & Katıtaş, S. (2025). School leadership through coaching: supporting positive change in education. *Kapadokya Eğitim Dergisi*, 6(2), 217–236. <https://doi.org/10.69643/kaped.1768999>
- Alanoğlu, M., & Demirtaş, Z. (2019). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet algılarının örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı üzerindeki etkisi. *Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 49(49), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.15285/maruaeabd.525250>
- Altınkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2012). Okul yöneticilerinin kullandığı güç kaynakları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Educational Sciences Theory & Practice*, 12(3), 1833–1852.
- Altınkurt, Y., Anasız, B. T., & Ekinci, C. E. (2016). The Relationships between Structural and Psychological Empowerment of Teachers and Their Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *TED Eğitim ve Bilim*, 41(187), 79–96. <https://doi.org/10.15390/eb.2016.6437>
- Başkan, B. (2020). Toxic Leadership in Education: A Systematic Review. *International Journal of Educational Administration, Management, and Leadership*, 1(2), 97–104. <https://doi.org/10.51629/ijeamal.v1i2.11>
- Behery, M., Al-Nasser, A. D., Jabeen, F. & Rawas, A. S. E. (2018). Toxic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: A mediation effect of followers trust and commitment in the middle east. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 19(3), 793.
- Bozkurt, S., Çoban, Ö., & Çolakoğlu, M. H. (2018). Örgütsel Güven Düzeyi ve Toksik Liderlik Davranışları İlişkisinde Örgütsel Bağlılığın Aracı Etkisi. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.16986/huje.2018045608>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.17062/cjil.v3i1.53>

- Cain, M. K., Zhang, Z., & Yuan, K. (2016). Univariate and multivariate skewness and kurtosis for measuring nonnormality: Prevalence, influence and estimation. *Behavior Research Methods*, 49(5), 1716–1735. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0814-1>
- Chan, S. H. J., & Lai, H. Y. I. (2017). Understanding the link between communication satisfaction, perceived justice and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 70, 214–223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.017>
- Çelebi, N., Güner, H., & Yıldız, V. (2015). Toksik liderlik ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 4(1), 249. <https://doi.org/10.14686/buefad.2015111056>
- Çetin, Ş., Korkmaz, M., & Çakmakçı, C. (2016). Dönüşümsel ve etkileşimsel liderlik ile lider-üye etkileşiminin öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı üzerindeki etkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 1(1), 7–36. <https://doi.org/10.14527/933>
- Demir, E., Çelik, İ., & Ural, S. (2024). Araştırmalarda uygun istatistiksel tekniğin belirlenmesinde normallik ve homojenlik ihlallerinin etkisinin ilgili literatür bağlamında değerlendirilmesi. *Journal of Psychometric Research*, 2(2), 52-62. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13865423>
- DiPaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11(5), 424–447. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105268460101100503>
- DiPaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. *The High School Journal*, 88, 35-44. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2005.0002>
- Erçetin, Ş., Akbaşı, S., & Diş, O. (2019). Toxic leadership behaviors of school managers as predictors of teachers' levels of occupational alignment. *Turkish Studies-Educational Sciences*, 14(4), 1313–1328.
- Erickson, A., Shaw, B., Murray, J., & Branch, S. (2015). Destructive leadership: Causes, consequences, and countermeasures. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44(4), 266–272.
- Eriş, Y., & Arun, K. (2020). Toksik liderliğin bir çıktısı olarak örgütsel bağlılık. *Opus Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.599311>
- Fahie, D. (2019). The lived experience of toxic leadership in Irish higher education. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 13(3), 341–355. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijwhm-07-2019-0096>
- Field A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS (third edition)* Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore and Washington DC: Sage.
- George, D., Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference* (10 Ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Gerpott, F. H., Van Quaquebeke, N., Schlamp, S., & Voelpel, S. C. (2017). An Identity Perspective on Ethical Leadership to explain organizational citizenship behavior: the interplay of follower moral identity and leader group prototypicality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(4), 1063–1078. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3625-0>

- Green, J. E. (2014). Toxic leadership in educational organizations. *Education Leadership Review*, 15(1), 18–33.
- Hitchcock, M. J. (2015). The Relationship between toxic leadership, organizational citizenship, and turnover behaviors among San Diego nonprofit paid staff. University of San Diego.
- İşli Y. & Aksu, A. (2023). Öğretmen denetiminde okul müdürlerinin koçluk algıları. *Socrates Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Researches*, 9(31), 141–158. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8151169>
- Jiang, W., Zhao, X., & Ni, J. (2017). The impact of transformational leadership on employee sustainable performance: The mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior. *Sustainability*, 9(9), 1567. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9091567>
- Joo, B. K., & Jo, S. J. (2017). The effects of perceived authentic leadership and core self-evaluations on organizational citizenship behavior: The role of psychological empowerment as a partial mediator. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(3), 463–481. <https://doi.org/10.1108/loj-11-2015-0254>
- Kahveci, G., Bahadır, E., & Kandemir, İ. K. (2019). Okul yöneticilerinin toksik liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences (JFES)*, 52(1), 225–249. <https://doi.org/10.30964/auebfd.420616>
- Karamuk, E., & Dulay, S. (2023). Öğretmenlerin bakış açısından okul yöneticilerinin duygusal zekâ becerilerinin çatışma yönetimi stratejilerini yordama gücü. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 52(239), 2077–2106. <https://doi.org/10.37669/milliegitim.1149350>
- Kasalak, G., & Aksu, M. B. (2016). Örgütler nasıl zehirlenir? Öğretim elemanlarının örgütsel toksisite algıları. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31(4), 676–694. <https://doi.org/10.16986/huje.2016015696>
- Kasalak, G. (2019). Algılanan örgütsel toksisitenin iş doyumu üzerine etkisi: Duygusal bağlılığın aracılık rolü. *OPUS International Journal of Society Research*, 13(19), 1283–1309. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.537424>
- Kazak, E. & Yaylalı, E. (2023). Okul müdürlerinin okul iklimine etkisine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 14(3), 802–818.
- Kaya, A. (2015). The relationship between spiritual leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors: A research on school principals' behaviors. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 15(3), 597–606. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2015.3.1988>
- Khan, M. A., Ismail, F. B., Hussain, A., & Alghazali, B. (2020). The interplay of leadership styles, innovative work behavior, organizational culture, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Sage Open*, 10(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019898264>
- Kılıç, M. (2019). X ve Y kuşaklarındaki toksik liderlik algılarının örgütsel bağlılık, psikolojik iyi oluş ve bireysel performans üzerindeki yansımaları. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Kocaeli

Üniversitesi. Kocaeli.

- Klasson, K. T. (2024). A discussion and evaluation of statistical procedures used by JIMB authors when comparing means. *Journal of Industrial Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 51, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jimb/kuae001>
- Koning, L. F., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2015). How leaders' emotional displays shape followers' organizational citizenship behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(4), 489–501. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.03.001>
- Koşar, D., & Yalçınkaya, M. (2013). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının yordayıcıları olarak örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel güven. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 4(4), 603–627.
- Lee, S., & Lee, D. K. (2018). What is the proper way to apply the multiple comparison test?. *Korean Journal of Anesthesiology*, 71(5), 353-360. <https://doi.org/10.4097/kja.d.18.00242.e1>
- Lim, B. T., & Loosemore, M. (2017). The effect of inter-organizational justice perceptions on organizational citizenship behaviors in construction projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 35(2), 95–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.10.016>
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). The allure of toxic leaders: Why followers rarely escape their clutches. *Ivey Business Journal*, 69(3), 1–40.
- Lyu, Y., Zhu, H., Zhong, H. J., & Hu, L. (2016). Abusive supervision and customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of hostile attribution bias and work engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 53, 69–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.12.001>
- 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
- Mo, S., & Shi, J. (2017). Linking ethical leadership to employees' organizational citizenship behavior: Testing the multilevel mediation role of organizational concern. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 141, 151–162. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2734-x>
- Morris, J. A., Jr. (2019). Understanding coping strategies and behaviors of employees affected by toxic leadership [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies (No. 6359).
- Nasra, M. A., & Heilbrunn, S. (2016). Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior in the Arab educational system in Israel: The impact of trust and job satisfaction. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(3), 380–396. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214549975>
- Orcan, F. (2020). Parametric or non-parametric: skewness to test normality for mean comparison. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 7(2), 255-265. <https://doi.org/10.21449/ijate.656077>

- Oğuz, E. (2011). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ile yöneticilerin liderlik stilleri arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 3(3), 377–403.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co.
- Organ, D.W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 157-164. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.1.157>
- Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It is construct clean-up time, *Human Performance*, 10:2, 85-97. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2
- Organ, D. W. (2018). Organizational citizenship behavior: Recent trends and developments. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 80, 295-306. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104536>
- Pelletier, K. L. (2010). Leader toxicity: An empirical investigation of toxic behavior and rhetoric. *Leadership*, 6(4), 373–389. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715010379308>
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestion for future research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 133–151. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_5
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307>
- Qureshi, M. A., Ramish, M. S., Ansari, J., & Bashir, M. A. (2022). Leader's toxicity at workplace: How leaders' decadence affects employees? A Pakistani perspective. *SAGE Open*, 12(2), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221096425>
- Ross, D. B., Matteson, R., & Exposito, J. (2014). Servant Leadership to Toxic Leadership: Power of Influence Over Power of Control. Fischler College of Education: Faculty Presentations. 244. Retrieved from: https://nsuworks.nova.edu/fse_facpres/244
- Samreen, F., & Rashid, M. A. (2018). Abusive supervision and subordinates' retaliation: The mediating role of OCB. *Pacific Business Review International*, 11(5), 94–102.
- Schmidt, A. A. (2008). Development and validation of the toxic leadership scale. Master of Science Thesis. University of Maryland, College Park.
- Sezgin, F. (2005). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları: Kavramsal bir çözümleme ve okul açısından bazı çıkarımlar. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(1), 317-339.
- Sezgin, F., & Kılınç, A. Ç. (2012). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin mesleki tükenmişlik düzeyleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13(3), 103–127.
- Smith, N., & Fredricks-Lowman, I. (2020). Conflict in the workplace: A 10-year review of toxic leadership in higher education. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 23(5), 538-

551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1591512>
- Smith, C., Organ, D., & Near, J. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653–663. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653>
- Snow, N.; Hickey, N.; Blom, N.; O'Mahony, L.; Mannix-McNamara, P. (2021). An Exploration of Leadership in Post-Primary Schools: The Emergence of Toxic Leadership. *Societies*, 11, 54. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc11020054>
- Tabachnick, L. & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using Multivariate Statistics (sixth ed.). Pearson, Boston.
- Taştan, M., & Yılmaz, K. (2008). Adaptation of organizational citizenship and organizational justice scales to Turkish. *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 33(150), 87–96.
- Tavanti, M. (2011). Managing toxic leaders: Dysfunctional patterns in organizational leadership and how to deal with them. *Human Resource Management*, 6(83), 127–136.
- Tofur, S., & Balıkcı, A. (2018). Okul yöneticileri ve öğretmenlere göre okul iklimini etkileyen faktörlerin incelenmesi: Ortaokul örneği. *Turkish Studies*, 13(11), 1279–1295.
- Tziner, A., & Sharoni, G. (2014). Organizational citizenship behavior, organizational justice, job stress, and work-family conflict: Examination of their interrelationships with respondents from a non-Western culture. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 30(1), 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.5093/tr2014a5>
- Ullah, F., Salim, K., & Khan, S. (2021). Impact of toxic leadership on organizational citizenship behavior. *Elementary Education Online*, 20(3), 2405–2405.
- Uysal, İ., & Kılıç, A. F. (2022). Normal distribution dilemma. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 12(1), 220-248. <https://doi.org/10.18039/ajesi.962653>
- Whicker, M. L. (1996). Toxic Leaders: When Organizations Go Bad. Westport, Praeger Publishers.
- Yaghi, A., & Yaghi, M. (2021). Evaluating organizational hypocrisy within universities as toxic leadership behavior. *Public Integrity*, 23(4), 385-400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2021.1888536>
- Yağcısoy, A., & Işık, M. (2018). Toksik liderlik ile örgütsel bağlılık ve işten ayrılma niyeti ilişkisine yönelik bir araştırma. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 17(3), 1016-1025
- Yılmaz, K. (2009). Özel dersane öğretmenlerinin örgütsel güven düzeyleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 15(59), 471–490.
- Zengin, M. (2019). Toksik Liderlik: Kavramsal Bir Çözümleme. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8 (4), 2754–2766. <https://doi.org/10.15869/itobiad.598165>

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ TÜRKÇE ÖZET

OKUL YÖNETİCİLERİNİN TOKSİK LİDERLİK DAVRANIŞI İLE ÖĞRETMENLERİN ÖRGÜTSEL VATANDAŞLIK DAVRANIŞI ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ

GİRİŞ

Toksik liderlik teorik altyapı açısından transformasyonel liderlik teorilerinden kaynağını almaktadır. Bu liderlik tipinde örgütsel etkililik ve çalışan verimliliğini artırmak amaçlanırken, yönetici tarafından sergilenen yönetsel yetersizliklerin toksik davranışlara yol açtığı, toksik davranışların örgütsel etkililik ve verimliliği olumsuz etkilediği belirtilmektedir (Hitchcock, 2015). Toksik liderlik, liderlerin olumsuz sonuçlara yol açan uzun vadeli davranışlarından (benmerkezci davranışlar da dahil edilebilir) oluşan yıkıcı bir liderlik biçimidir. Toksikliğin düzeyi yöneticinin zorbalığına ve yol açtığı sorunlara göre farklılaşmaktadır (Başkan, 2020; Smith & Lowman, 2020). Toksik liderliğin oluşabilmesi için yönetici davranışlarının örgüte ve çalışanlara olumsuz ve kalıcı etkisinin olması gerekmektedir. (Blumen, 2005; Armitage, 2015; Bozkurt, Çoban & Çolakoğlu, 2018). Örneğin, toksik liderlerin çalışanlara değer vermeme davranışı ve tehditkâr tavırları çalışanların örgüte ilişkin sadakatlerini azaltacağı gibi verimliliklerini de düşürecektir. Bu durum işten ayrılma niyeti ve çatışma riskinin artmasına yol açabilir. Toksik ortamlarda çatışma çözümüne ilişkin fırsatların ise azaldığı belirtilmektedir (Yalçınsoy & Işık, 2018; Smith & Lowman, 2020). Toksik liderliğin çalışanlara olumsuz etkileri bulunmaktadır. Bunlar çalışanların fiziksel ve ruhsal sağlığının olumsuz etkilenmesi, grup ve takım işlevlerinin azalması, işe geç kalma ve devamsızlık, üretkenliğin azalması ve istifalar şeklinde sıralanabilir (Ross, Matteson & Exposito, 2014).

Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları, çalışanların herhangi bir ödüllendirme veya karşılık beklemeden kendi görev tanımlarından daha fazlasını yaparak örgüte gönüllü bir şekilde katkı sağladığı davranışlar olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Organ, 1988;1997; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Altınkurt & Yılmaz, 2012; Sezgin & Kılınç, 2012). Çalışanların işle ilgili sorunlara takım çalışması yaparak birlikte ve gönüllü şekilde müdahale etmesi, kıdemli çalışanların yeni çalışanlara işleri öğretmesi (Nasra & Heilbrunn, 2016), çatışmayı önleme, saygılı olma, herhangi bir denetleme olmasa bile kurallara uyma (Tziner & Sharoni, 2014), yardım etme davranışı (özgecilik), centilmenlik, örgütsel sadakat, örgütsel uyum, bireysel inisiyatif, sivil erdem ve kişisel gelişimi önceleme (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000) gibi iş ve işlemler örgütsel öğrenmeyi hızlandırarak örgütsel etkililiğe katkıda bulunur. Çalışanların gerçekleştirdikleri bu gönüllü davranışlar da örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı olarak değerlendirilmektedir (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997).

Liderlik, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışını hem doğrudan hem de dolaylı olarak etkileyebileceği için önemli bir öncül olarak değerlendirilmektedir (Sezgin, 2005; Çetin, Korkmaz & Çakmakçı, 2016). Okul müdürlerinin elindeki yetkinlik (güç) okul ve personel faydasına pozitif anlamda yöneldiğinde öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının da olumlu yönde etkileneceği vurgulanmaktadır.

Aynı zamanda öğretmenlere dair gerçekleştirilecek bireysel ve ilişkisel güçlendirmenin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışını olumlu yönde etkileyeceği belirtilmektedir (Altinkurt, Anasız & Ekinci, 2016). Bu araştırmanın amacı öğretmen görüşlerine göre yöneticilerin gösterdiği toksik liderlik davranışları ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesidir.

YÖNTEM

Araştırmada nicel araştırma modellerinden ilişkisel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın evrenini 2021-2022 eğitim-öğretim yılında Mersin ili merkezinde kamu ilkököl, ortaokul ve liselerinde görev yapan 9815 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Örneklem büyüklüğünün hesaplanmasında Cochran (1962; Akt., Balcı, 2015) tarafından önerilen evrendeki eleman sayısı bilinen örneklem formülü kullanılarak minimum örneklem büyüklüğü 370 olarak belirlenmiştir. Örneklem olasılıksız örnekleme yöntemlerinden kolaylıkla bulunabilen örnekleme yöntemiyle belirlenmiştir. Bu yöntemde örneklem yakında olan, kolay ulaşılabilen ve araştırmaya gönüllü katılan kişilerden oluşturulmaktadır (Erkuş, 2013). Örneklem 443 öğretmenden oluşmaktadır.

Araştırmada veri toplama aracı olarak kişisel bilgi formu, Çelebi, Güner & Yıldız (2015) tarafından geliştirilen 4 boyut ve 30 maddeden oluşan Toksik Liderlik Ölçeği ve Dipaola & Hoy (2005) tarafından geliştirilip Taştan & Yılmaz (2008) tarafından Türkçeye uyarlanan tek boyutlu ve 12 maddeden oluşan Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Toksik liderlik ölçeğinin boyutları değerbilmezlik ($\alpha=,93$) 11 madde, çıkarıcılık ($\alpha=,95$) 9 madde, bencillik ($\alpha=,91$) 5 madde ve olumsuz ruhsal durum ($\alpha=,87$) 5 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Ölçeğin genelini güvenirlilik katsayısı ise $\alpha=0,96$ 'dır. Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ölçeğinin güvenirlilik katsayısı ise $\alpha = 0,87$ 'dir.

SONUÇ VE ÖNERİLER

Araştırma bulgularına göre, ortaokul yöneticilerinin değerbilmezlik, çıkarıcılık ve bencillik düzeylerinin ilkököl yöneticilerine kıyasla daha yüksek algılandığı belirlenmiştir. Ortaokullarda branşlaşmanın, ders türü fazlalığının ve LGS'ye yönelik başarı kaygılarının (öğrenci, öğretmen, veli ve okul yönetimi kapsamında) okul yönetimi ile öğretmen arasındaki ilişkiyi daha çatışmalı hale getirebileceği değerlendirilmektedir. Schmidt (2008) bu ve benzeri durumlarda öğretmenlerin okul yönetiminden adalet ve destek beklentilerinin azalacağını, yönetimin daha olumsuz olarak algılanacağını belirtmektedir. Diğer yandan, okullarda toksik liderliğe özgü örüntülerin devamlılığı öğretmenlerin okula yönelik gönüllü katkılarını da zayıflatma potansiyeline sahiptir (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Sınıf öğretmenlerinin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının diğer branş öğretmenlerine kıyasla daha yüksek olduğu bulgulanmıştır. Bu durum araştırma örneklemini sınırlılığında değerlendirildiğinde sınıf öğretmenlerinin okulla kurduğu bağın, aidiyet duygusunun ve gönüllü katkı davranışlarının daha yüksek olmasıyla açıklanabilir. Yükseköğretim kurumlarında görev yapan araştırma görevlileriyle yapılan bir çalışmada algılanan örgütsel toksisite ile iş doyumu ve duygusal bağlılık arasında negatif yönlü ilişki bulunmuştur (Kasalak, 2019). Yapılan başka bir araştırmada ise toksik liderlik ile işten ayrılma niyeti arasında anlamlı ve pozitif bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Buna göre işten ayrılma niyetini

azaltabilmek için örgütlerde toksik liderlik davranışlarının önlenmesi önerilmektedir (Akca, 2017).

Yönetici seçme ve atama işlemlerinde toksik liderlerin olumsuz kişilik özelliklerini ortaya çıkaran değerlendirme yöntemlerinin kullanılması gerekir. Yönetici-çalışan ilişkisinin sağlıklı kurulması için eğitim programları uygulanmalıdır (Behery, Al-Nasser, Jabeen & El-Rawas, 2018). Toksik özellik gösteren yönetici adaylarının elenmesi, yönetici olarak çalışmaya devam eden ve toksik özellikler gösteren yöneticilerin ise hizmet içi eğitime yönlendirilmesi (Çelebi, Güner & Yıldız, 2015) önerilmektedir. Diğer yandan örgütler çalışma ortamını iyileştirmeli, toksik liderliğin olumsuz etkilerine karşı koyan bir strateji belirlemelidir. Çünkü örgütün etkililiği ve verimliliği için önemli olan örgütsel vatandaşlık özelliklerini sergileyen çalışanlar toksik liderler tarafından hedef olarak görülmektedir (Morris, 2019). Araştırma bulguları değerlendirildiğinde, ortaokul öğretmenlerinin daha yüksek toksisite algıladığı durumlarda okul iklimi ve öğretmen işbirliğini pozitif yönde etkileyecek etkinlikler düzenlenmelidir.

Genel olarak Türk Millî Eğitim Sistemi yapısı içerisinde yer alan hizmet içi eğitim uygulamalarında toksik liderliğin sebep ve sonuçlarına ilişkin farkındalık yaratacak eğitimlerin verilmesi; yönetici seçme ve atama işlemlerinde toksikliğe neden olabilecek davranışları belirleyip gerektiğinde adayları bu kriterlere göre eleyebilen bir sistemin oluşturulması Türk Millî Eğitim Sistemi'ndeki niteliğin artırılmasına katkı sağlayabilir.