

Toxic Leadership and Employee's Turnover Intention in Hotel in South East, Nigeria

¹Egwim-Chukwuezi A. I. and ²Ukabuilu E. N.

¹Department of Hospitality Management Technology,
School of Sciences, Imo State Polytechnics Omuma.

²Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management,
Imo State University, Owerri

Abstract

The study examines the relationship between toxic leadership and hotel employees' turnover intention. The main objective was to investigate how toxic leadership affects hotel employees' turnover intention. Four specific objectives and four hypotheses were formulated to guide the study. The researchers made use of structured questionnaire to collect primary data from employees of selected hotels. Descriptive statistics were used for the univariate analysis (mean and standard deviation). Pearson product moment correlation co-efficient analysis was used to test the hypotheses ($P = 0.05$). The findings show that each of the toxic leadership dimension studied has significant and positive relationship with turnover intention. It was observed that toxic leaders exist in all the organizations investigated but the extent of their existence is low; toxic leadership has impact on employee turnover intention, as some employees in the hotels studied have the intention to quit. It was recommended that organizations should develop strategies that would promote culture of fairness, respect, humanized workplace, also the culture and climate of an organization must be a positive one and it will start with ethical and superior leadership.

Introduction

The term toxicity was first used in 1880 to mean the state of being poisonous, Online Etymology Dictionary, (2014). The concept is defined as something that acts poisonously or has poisonous effect, Lipman-Blumen (2005) assumed to be derived from French word, *toxique* and Latin *toxicum*. Whicker (1996) was the first to link it to leadership. He offered that toxic leaders are bullies, enforcers, street fighters and malicious people, who succeed by tearing others down and glory in turf protection, fighting, and controlling others rather than uplifting followers, that have deep seated but well disguised sense of personal inadequacy, selfish values and cleverness at concealing deceit. Frater (2014) said that leaders can be defined with same commonalities in characteristics that they possess. Some of the leaders can manage their subordinates very well and offer advantageous opportunities that can be useful for the group, while some others have "toxic"

characteristics which are already defined as toxic leaders in the literature, Lipman-Bluman (2006). Toxic leadership is classified as leaders who employ unproductive and potentially abusive, dysfunctional and self-serving and personality traits, such as intimidation, bullying, manipulation or overt or subversive aggression, to force employees to follow the leaders' wishes. Work place toxicity is the level to which bad behaviour such as discrimination, bullying, co-worker incivility are experienced in a work environment that can lead to increased levels of work-related stress and anxiety, Laschinger, Wong, Cummings, & Grau (2014).

Toxicity in the workplace appears to come from toxins within the organization which renders it as a toxic organization. This observation had led, to the use of terms such as toxic leader, toxic manager and toxic culture, which are currently appearing with increasing frequency in business leadership, management and psychology literature to describe the toxins that create these toxic organizations. Beed, (2004). Baronce (2015) argued that an environment in which employees feel unvalued and not respected will become toxic workplace which in turn will lower employee retention and productivity or performance, raise stress, increase hotel care cost and lower workplace safety. Though, many hotel staff have potentials to withstand the frustration and confusion of working in an extremely difficult work environment that threatens their occupational lives, leadership behaviours affect turnover intention indirectly through enhancing or decreasing job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Employee turn-over intention is defined as an employee's thoughts or plan to exit an organization, Chang, Wang & Huang, (2013) reported in Hoston-Okae (2017). High employee turnover rate often leads to business failure, an unmotivated workforce and lack of attractiveness to skilled workers in the hospitality industry. High turnover may harm an industry's productivity when skilled workers leave and the employee population consist of a high percentage of novice workers. Hoston-Okae, (2014). Costs associated with recruiting, selecting and training new employees often exceeds 100% of the annual salary for the vacated positions.

Tse and Chiu (2014) state that effective leaders are those who could earn the respect of their followers. Leaders remain effective in influencing the retention of their employee if they can inspire employees to be motivated. Wang, Tsai and Bai (2014) also described an effective leader as one who can achieve financial growth by fostering team cooperation and effective performance of their employees, Wang, Tsai and Tsai, (2014). Effective leaders improve retention rate of employees by building lasting relationships with them. Employees who believe their supervisors and work closely with them tend to perform better. Leaders can make employees want to stay and be committed to the organization's goal and objective. High employee

turnover may imply that employees are dissatisfied, unengaged, distracted or unproductive, Holloway and Kusy, (2010) therefore, high employee turnover could result in damage to an organization's reputation and its customers' satisfaction levels. Toxic leaders exhibit an underlying neglect for the well-being of their subordinates which in turn will result to employees' turnover intention.

Toxic leadership behaviour is detrimental to employees performance in the hotel industry; Baronce (2005) posit that toxic workplace or toxic leadership can lower self-esteem, raise organizational cost, subsequently leading to organizational losses, high turnover, ill-repute in terms of positive company image, low employees morale, conflict between work and life, high absenteeism, lower employee performance and loss of organizational productivity.

Padilla, Hogan & Kaiser (2007) proposed a toxic triangle that creates a destructive environment with fatal consequences. The triangle within the workplace consists of toxic leaders, facilitative toxic work environment and susceptible toxic followers. Fraher, (2016), Leonard (2014), Padilla Hogan and Kaiser (2007) have noted that each factor within the triangle can cause or perpetuate toxicity in all three aspects. In other words, if a leader in a workplace demonstrates toxic leadership behaviour and styles, their toxicity can translate to unhappy or toxic workers thereby leading to a toxic work environment where workers and leaders are unhappy, anxious and less productive. Toxic leaders are the first factor involved when discussing workplace toxicity. This is due to leadership role and responsibility in modeling desired behaviour to followers as well as establishing the kind of culture the business wishes to maintain. As Padilla, Hogan and Kaiser (2007) argued, if a leader portrays toxic behaviour such as being unethical in their dealing or showing favoritism to some employees while bullying others, highly susceptible followers will begin to portray similar behaviour. Baronce (2015), for example, noted that workers unwilling to behave unethically, may then face marginalization, victimization from leaders promoting the said behaviour or they will begin to withdraw from participating in the company.

Toxic leaders are classified according to their traits and behaviours as follows:

- (i) Machiavellian leaders are those that like to manipulate others in order to achieve their aim. Leadership with this characteristic, feel the necessity to exert control over others and abuse their power. They give little or no importance to moral and pre-social values in their acts. Becker and O'Hair (2007). Paulhus and Williams (2002), state that Machiavellian leaders often aspire to reach high position in companies, but their traits can become a source of destruction due to their

individual ambition that can compromise the longevity of the company.

- (ii) Abusive leaderships, according to Tepper (2000), are characterized by their injurious actions that include public ridicule, angry tantrums, rudeness, favoritism, and non-contingent punishment. Tepper also defines abusive leadership as subordinates' subjective assessment of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviours, excluding physical contact. Their primary concern is that they want to gain and maintain control through the methods that create fear and intimidation.
- (iii) Narcissistic leaderships, according to Egan (2004) reported in Orunbon (2020), are those who portray themselves as possessing self-importance, causing others to perceive them as acting superiors and self-domineering. Egan claimed that such behaviours made the leader to manipulate and exploit others to move ahead and attain ideal fantasies.
- (iv) Authoritarian leadership is defined as leadership behaviour that asserts absolute authority and control over subordinates and demands unquestionable obedience from them, Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang and Farh (2004). The Authoritarian leadership construct and the scale to measure it were both created in China as part of a large examination of paternalistic leadership, even though the authors of this scale did not conceptualize authoritarianism as being necessarily toxic or destructive. Authoritarian leadership does, however, capture some important element of toxic leadership such as task micromanagement and acting in a commandeering fashion.
- (v) Bullying is a harmful leadership that uses mental and physical strength against someone who is likely to be in a weaker or subordinate position to the person who is engaging in bullying.

Sofield and Salmond (2003) described the observed experience of verbal abuse in a large, multi-hospital system and determined the relationship of verbal abuse with turnover intention. Their sample included 1000 nurses with a response rate of 46% using mailed questionnaires. Over 90% of the respondents reported experiencing verbal abuse in the last month from physicians, patients, patients' families, peers, supervisors and subordinates. The amount of abuse and the intent to leave were significantly related. Verbal abuse was directly related to decreased morale, increased job dissatisfaction and higher turnover in the health care environment. Verbal abuse affects intention, and attitude toward patient care, reduces team-work, reduces efficiency and leads to decreased accuracy, frequent confrontations and general unease on the job resulting from concerns about safety and outcomes

of care. This level of frustration leads to burnout, turnover and decreased retention of experienced staff. The findings are further corroborated by the studies of Tripp, Bies and Aquino (2001) and Tripp *et al.*, (2002) in which instances of retaliatory actions are considered reciprocal to perceived forms of maltreatment and injustice at the workplace. Subordinates, as suggested by the findings, would most likely opt for counterproductive actions as self-gratification alternatives when confronted with toxic behaviour as expressed by managers or supervisors. Implications are that; although such actions may not be confrontational; they would purposively aim at inflicting losses, damage and waste. Most importantly, innocent patients and their relatives bear the brunt of these counterproductive work behaviours because affected workers often would transfer their frustration on them. The researchers finally stated that supervisors' toxicity at the workplace is often times reciprocated through counterproductive behaviour which are adopted as a means of payback for treatments deemed abusive, degrading or insulting. Subordinates are prone to transferring aggression to either peers or identified properties and assets of the hospital accompanied by actions ranging from outright sabotage to destruction of hospital property, theft, and withdrawal.

Anjum, Ming, Siddigi and Rasool (2018) examined how narcissistic leadership can impact on subordinates' job-related outcome. Data were collected from 310 banking professionals using likert scale survey questionnaire and analyzed through SEM using Amos. Result showed that narcissistic leadership has a negative impact on subordinates' job satisfaction and well-being, resulting in a significant desire to quit.

Sutton (2010) made the business case against "nasty and demeaning people" who make it difficult to recruit and retain the best employees, clients and investors, citing a quantitative study of 700 participants, 27% of whom reported experiencing mistreatment by someone at work. A 2003 study of 461 participants working in the healthcare field indicated that 91% experienced verbal abuse. Sutton states that the total cost of jerks, must include the cost of overtime, turnover costs for assistants to those individuals, potential legal costs, and anger management training, all on top of salary and benefits. According to the study participants, organizational bureaucracy at the target organization is high, but organizational chaos is also high and there is a lack of organizational transparency. This leads to an atmosphere in which bullying and verbal/psychological abuses continue without rebounding badly on the actors. Limited behavioural accountability reinforces an atmosphere of relational powerlessness. This supports the literature on the impact of toxic managers Appelbaum & Roy-Girard, (2007); and the demonstrated effects of job stressors, organizational constraints, and interpersonal constraints on job satisfaction and other outcomes Penney & Spector, (2005). The incidents these participants described represented AWBs for that culture and caused frustration due to the interruptions in the

workflow they created. The frequency and intensity of rudeness, discourtesy, and disrespect do seem to be getting worse in the workplace, as suggested in the literature Pearson, Andersson, & Porath, (2000). Participants in this study described managers who destroy morale (as when a participant felt humiliated in a staff meeting by the manager jeering at someone else for “trying to be like” him), take credit for departmental successes (or their subordinates’ work product, as with a participant) and act in ways that are disrespectful to staff members and colleagues. This supports Appelbaum and Roy-Girard’s (2007) construct of toxic leaders as people who blame others, cover up their own mistakes, and avoid any unpleasant situational realities. Lipman-Bluemán (2005) notes the multi-dimensional framework of leader toxicity. She suggests that a leader may be toxic in some situations but effective in others and recognizes that one person’s toxic leader might be another person’s hero. As Walton (2007) suggests, the reason followers might be attracted to toxic leaders is the leader’s high level of intensity and enthusiasm for his or her own objectives. The views of Lipman Blueman and Walton (2007) by extension, suggest that behaviours tagged as toxic in another culture may not be regarded as toxic in another culture.

All the studies on toxic leadership and its impact on workers’ turnover and turnover intention and overall performance were conducted outside Nigeria in cultures where toxic behaviours may be less tolerated. To the best of the knowledge of the researchers, no such studies have been conducted to determine the prevalence or otherwise of toxic leadership on both the employees and hotel organizations in South-East Nigeria. The occurrence of toxic leadership and its impact may be more wide-spread than any of us can imagine. It is against this background that the researchers embarked on this study. The study intends to draw the attention of management and researchers to the various forms of toxic leadership and potential effects related to the loss of productivity and high level of employees’ job turnover. Toxic leadership was the independent variable while employees work behaviour was the dependent variable. Independent variable was measured in terms of abusive, narcissistic, Machiavellian and authoritarian behaviours, and the dependent variable was measured using turnover intention.

The main objective of the study was to investigate how toxic leadership impacts on employees’ turnover intention in selected hotels in South-East Nigeria. To achieve the main objective, the following specific objectives were pursued to: (1) examine the extent to which abusive leadership behaviour affects turn-over intention of hotel employees in selected hotels in South-East Nigeria, (2) investigate the extent to which narcissistic leadership behaviour affects turn-over intention on employees of selected hotels, (3) examine the extent to which Machiavellian leadership behaviour affects turnover intention of hotel employees, and (4) investigate the extent to which

Toxic Leadership and Employee's Turnover

authoritarian leadership behaviour affects turn-over intention of hotel employees.

The following hypotheses were formulated as guide and were tested in the course of the study:

- H0₁: There is no significant relationship between abusive leadership behaviour and turn-over intention among employees in the selected hotels.
- H0₂: There is no significant relationship between narcissistic leadership behaviour and employees' turn-over intention in the selected hotels.
- H0₃: There is no significant relationship between Machiavellian leadership behaviour and employees' turn-over intention in the selected hotels.
- H0₄: There is no significant relationship between authoritarian leadership behaviour and turn-over intention of employees in the selected hotels.

The content scopes of the study are toxic leadership (abusive, narcissistic, Machiavellian and authoritarian leadership behaviours) and hotel employees' turn-over intention. The geographical scope covers twenty (20) selected hotels in South-East Nigeria (Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo states), four hotels from each state. The researchers used random sampling method to select the 20 hotels. The level or unit of analysis comprised employees of the selected hotels.

Theoretical Anchor

The theories upon which this study is anchored are:

- i. Theory of Work Adjustment (TWA)
- ii. Aggressive Frustration Theory (AGT)

Theory of Work Adjustment

The theory of work adjustment, as Dawes (1994) describes it, is the relationship of the individual to his or her work environment. The theory of work adjustment had it that work is conceptualized as an interaction between an individual and a work environment. The work environment requires that contain task is to be performed and the individual brings skills to perform the task. In exchange, the individual required compensation for work performance and certain preferred conditions, such as a safe and comfortable place of work. The environment and the individual must meet each other's requirement for the interaction to be maintained. The degree to which the

requirements of both are met is called correspondence. The work adjustment is a process of achieving and maintaining correspondence.

Work Adjustment is indicated by the satisfaction of the individual with the work environment and by the satisfaction of work environment with the individual. When the employee is not satisfied with the work environment either because of toxic leadership or poor incentive, the individual may quit leading to high turnover intention.

Aggressive-Frustration Theory

Aggressive-Frustration Theory also called aggression-frustration hypotheses proposed in 1939 by John Dollard and Colleagues argues that frustration always produces an aggressive urge and aggression is always the result of prior frustration. Berkowitz, (1974) later noted that frustration can lead to several kinds of action but maintained that the urge to aggression will become more dominant. The theory, therefore, posits that individuals become frustrated when goal attainment is prohibited or interrupted following frustrating event, and will respond with aggressive behaviours as a form of retaliation against agents of the frustrating event.

In some cases, aggression naturally take the form of retaliation against the initial source of frustration, in other cases situational constraints can prevent a person from being able to react against the actual source of frustration, such as when the frustration was caused by a very powerful person or group. In still other cases, such as natural disasters there may be no one to blame, but the frustration can still produce aggressive inclinations.

According to Berkowitz, 1974, frustration is a psychologically aversive state that can create a predisposition to behave aggressively. He argues that frustration will lead to aggression to the extent that it elicits negative emotions. The basic ideas of organizational frustration are two-folds: one is that there are organization situational factors associated with constraint that contribute to an individual's frustration with the organization and two, that individual reaction to frustration can take the form of withdrawal behavior, ie quitting the organization, leading to turnover intention, altered task performance and abandonment of goal. Employee frustration with the work organization stems from situational factors in the immediate work environment associated with constraint and the blockage of goals or performance.

Methods

Research Design

According to Hair (2000), research design is the master plan of the methods and procedures to be adopted in collecting and analyzing data needed by the decision maker. In this study, correlational research approach was used to

Toxic Leadership and Employee's Turnover

determine the extent to which toxic leadership (independent variable) can influence hotel employee turnover intention. However, descriptive survey method was used.

Sample and Sampling Technique

The research used discretion to select the establishments for the study. Stratified sampling was used to determine individual hotel establishment's sample size with regards to the targeted respondents. Stratified sampling is the process of selecting sample in such a way that identified subgroup in the population is represented in the sample in the proportion they exist in the population Gay, (1996). The researchers visited the selected hotels in the South-East Nigeria namely, Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo and collected data relating to the 911 employees in the hotels. For this purpose, Taro-Yamen's method was employed to determine sample size.

Table1: Individual Hotels Sample Size

Hotels	Number of staff	Questionnaire distributed	Returned Questionnaire
Hotel A	220	67	62
Hotel B	70	21	21
Hotel C	30	9	8
Hotel D	19	7	7
Hotel E	60	18	18
Hotel F	50	15	15
Hotel G	30	9	9
Hotel H	30	9	9
Hotel J	40	12	12
Hotel K	30	9	9
Hotel L	15	5	5
Hotel M	12	4	4
Hotel N	80	24	24
Hotel O	70	21	20
Hotel P	30	9	9
Hotel Q	20	6	6
Hotel R	35	11	9
Hotel S	30	9	9
Hotel T	30	9	8
Hotel U	10	4	4
Total	911	278	270

Data Collection and Instrument Design

The major instrument for this study was the questionnaire (rating scale). The research instrument was designed in a four point likert type rating scale. This

implies that each response is associated with a point value and individual score was determined by summing up the point values. To this effect, each point value was rated as 4, 3, 2, and 1 for Strongly Agreed (SA), Agreed (A) Disagreed (D) and Strongly Disagreed (SD), respectively.

Administration of Research Instrument

The researchers first sought for permission and co-operation of management of the selected hotels for the study. Random sampling method was used in selecting respondents. One of the researchers personally administered some of the questionnaire copies. Some respondents were reached through the personnel or front desk employees and managers in the selected hotels. Respondents were not allowed to go home with the questionnaire in order to prevent them from having the opportunity to discuss issues raised with their colleagues. Instructions were communicated to the respondents to ensure that all have clear understanding of what they were expected to do.

Data Analysis

The analysis were done in two levels, the univariate and bivariate analysis. Univariate analysis involves descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation and the outputs are presented in tables, showing measures of central tendency and variability, while the bivariate analysis employed Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient to test the earlier stated hypotheses.

Decision Rule: if the calculated Pearson's Correlation Coefficient is greater than the critical value, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

The data were derived from various opinions expressed by the respondents in their reaction to questions posed to them through the instrument of questionnaire administered to them by the researchers. The descriptive statistics, mean and standard deviation for the study variables for each hotel studied are presented in table 2.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of study variables

S/N	Variables of the study	Mean \bar{x}	Standard deviation	Remarks
1	Abusive leadership behaviour	2.36**	0.40	Satisfactory
2	Narcissistic leadership behavior	2.35**	0.19	Satisfactory
3	Authoritarian leadership behavior	2.34	0.21	Satisfactory
4	Machiavellian leadership behavior	2.82	0.07	Unsatisfactory
5	Turn-over intention	2.24**	0.59	Satisfactory
6	Organizational toxicity level	2.63	0.83	Unsatisfactory

Source: Survey 2023

Key: Cut-off (expected) mean 2.5

The means marked asterisks are significantly lower than 2.5 (cut-off mean), $p = 0.05$.

Leadership behaviour with mean equal or significantly greater than 2.5 shows that managers exhibit that behaviour.

Results from items 4 & 6 in the Table above, show that their means are above the cut-off mean of 2.5. This indicates that there are leaders who exhibit such toxic leadership behaviours in the hotel organizations studied. These behaviours culminate in organizational toxic environment. The mean score for organizational toxicity level was 2.63, indicating that the hotel organizations are rated to be toxic. The frequencies from which the overall mean score was determined revealed that in over 30% of the organizations studied, toxicity level is high. The overall mean and standard deviation for turn-over intention are 2.24 and 0.60 or (0.59), respectively. This result indicates that very few employees are nursing the intention of leaving their organizations. The frequencies from which the overall mean score was determined revealed that less than 50% of the workers have the intention to quit from the organization. Item 1, 2, 3 and 5 are rated satisfactory because

any negative question below 2.5 is satisfactory while above 2.5 is high and unsatisfactory.

Table 3: Relationship between organizational toxicity and leadership behaviours

S/N	Leadership behavior	Pearson (r)	Relationship strength
1	Abusive and organizational toxicity level	.369**	Moderate, positive
2	Narcissistic behavioural and organizational toxicity level	.584**	Strong, positive
3	Authoritarian leadership and organizational toxicity level	.637**	Strong, positive
4	Machiavellian behaviour and organizational toxicity level	.569**	Strong, positive

Source: Survey 2023

The correlation coefficient marked asterisks are significant, P = 0.05, N-2df = 268

For each of the toxic leadership behaviours, the calculated r was greater than the critical value ($r = .113891$), indicating that each has positive and significant relationship with organizational toxicity. Therefore, the hypotheses were rejected. The table indicates that each of the leadership behaviours would have positive impact on the level of organizational toxicity; any increase in each of them increases organizational toxicity. This finding implies that the presence of such leadership behaviours produces toxic work environment. Thus, correlational analysis of the relationship between organizational toxic environment and employee work behavior, using Pearson's Product Moment revealed positive and significant relationship.

Pearson r of 0.70 was obtained from correlational analysis on relationship between organizational toxicity and employee turnover intention. This result indicates positive and significant relationship between organizational toxicity and employee turnover intention.

Table 4: Relationship between toxic leadership behaviours and turnover intention.

S/N	Leadership behavior	Pearson (r)	Remarks
1	H0 ₁ Abusive behaviour and turnover intention	0.48**	Reject H0 ₁
2	H0 ₂ Narcissistic behavioural and turnover intention	0.55**	Reject H0 ₂
3	H0 ₃ Authoritarian leadership and turnover intention	0.66**	Reject H0 ₃
4	H0 ₄ Machiavellian behaviour and turnover intention	0.60**	Reject H0 ₄

Source: Survey of 2023

Key: The correlation coefficient marked asterisks are significant. $P = 0.05$, $N - 2df = 268$

Pearson (r) critical value is 0.1121, hence any r value below .1121 is not significant.

Hypotheses H0₁, H0₂, H0₃ and H0₄ were tested using Pearson Product Moment. As presented in the Table above, each of the correlation coefficient calculated was greater than the critical value $r = .1121$, hence, H0₁, H0₂, H0₃ and H0₄ were rejected. The analysis indicated that each of the toxic leadership characteristics studied has significant and positive relationship with turnover intention. Each of the toxic characteristics has positive impact on turnover intention, implying that the presence of any of the toxic leadership behaviours induces intention to quit behaviour in the employees. By the above result, H0₁, H0₂, H0₃ and H0₄ were rejected. Also the strength of relationship between the toxic behaviours and turnover intention is strong.

Discussion

Results of the data analysis revealed that there are toxic leaders in the organizations studied. In any organization where there are toxic leaders, the work environment inadvertently becomes toxic, Seeger (2005), Appelbaum & Roy-Girard, (2007). The implication of this finding is that the environments of organizations studied are toxic, though to varying degrees. Toxic leaders create negative environment, resulting in increased turnover, high absenteeism and low productivity, Fraher (2016). Given the presence and activities of leaders who exhibit toxic leadership characteristic, the workers may as well become toxic themselves, Mathew, Neumann, Hare and Babiak (2014) Paddila *et al* (2007).

The relationship of abusive leadership behaviour and turnover intention is positive; implying that abusive behaviour is likely to induce high turnover intention among employees, Harvey Stoner, Hochwarter and Kacmar, (2007). Harvey *et al* (2007) found that verbal abuse was directly related to decreased morale, increased job dissatisfaction, emotional exhaustion and higher turnover. Reed (2004), Tepper (2000), Surji (2013) in Hoston-Okae (2015) reported that high employee turnover rates often lead to business failure, an unmotivated workforce and lack of attractiveness to skilled workers in the hospitality industry. Results of the study by Hamidizaden, Matin and Zafari (2017) on the effect of toxic type of leadership style and dysfunctional behaviours of leaders on the occupational outcomes and attitudes of employees of government agencies in QOM showed that toxic leadership has a positive and significant effect on employees' occupational behaviour and turnover intentions.

The present study also found that narcissistic leadership behaviour has positive and significant relationship with turnover intention. This finding corroborates the results of the study by Tiwari and Iha (2021) in India, which revealed that organizational deviance is highly influenced by narcissism, which in turn raises the toxic work culture and abusive supervision. According to Asya-W-Haq and Anwr (2020), studies have shown that narcissistic leadership has a negative impact on subordinates' job satisfaction and well being, as well as a positive relationship with stress and intentions to quit.

Furthermore, authoritarian leadership behaviour was found to have positive and significant relationship with turnover intention. This finding corroborates with the findings of Schaubroeck *et al* (2017), and Shen *et al* (2019), cited in Wang, Liu and Liu (2019) who studied the relationship between authoritarian leadership and task performance. Their results revealed that authoritarian leadership negatively affected subordinates' task performance via leader-member exchange (LMX). Also Chan *et al* (2013), Schaubroeck *et al* (2017), cited in Wang *et al* (2019) reported that authoritarian leadership is negatively associated with employee performance. Schaubroeck *et al* (2017) and Shen *et al*, (2019) also cited in Wang *et al* (2019) reported that authoritarian leadership affect follower's organizational and relational identity which often times enhances their intention to quit and negative team performance.

This study also revealed that Machiavellian leadership behaviour has positive and significant relationship with turnover intention as seen in the tested hypothesis. Gkorezis, Potridon and Krouklidou (2015), posit that numerous empirical studies on predictors of emotional exhaustion showed that Machiavellian leaders have detrimental impacts on employees' and contribute to cynicism and emotional exhaustion. This outcome has negative

Toxic Leadership and Employee's Turnover

effects on core attitudinal and behavioural outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intention to quit and job performance.

Each of the four dimensions of toxic leadership studied has significant and positive relationship with turn-over intention. However, the extent of turnover intention is low or satisfactory even though they contributed to organizational toxicity. The theory of Work Adjustment (TWA) reported in Dawes (1994), which describes the relationship of the individual to his or her work environment comes handy in this respect. The work adjustment theory holds that work is conceptualized as an interaction between an individual and a work environment. Work adjustment is the dynamic process by which the person and work environment seek to achieve and maintain correspondence with each other. The TWA identifies the likely outcomes of where an individual and a work environment are not correspondent (i.e. discordant) as follows: the individual could leave the work environment voluntarily (i.e. quit) or involuntarily (i.e. be terminated) or could attempt to increase correspondence with the work environment.

Conclusion

Data analysis revealed that significant relationship exists between toxic leadership and employee's work behaviour. Toxic leadership (TL) negatively affects employee turnover intention. Each of the toxic leadership dimensions investigated, namely abusive, narcissistic, authoritarian and Machiavellian behaviour was found in varying degrees in all the organizations investigated. The organizations are perceived to be moderately toxic given how they were rated by the employees. Indeed, the four dimensions of toxic leadership studied have significant and positive relationship with turnover intention, but to a low or satisfactory extent. Each of toxic leadership dimensions studied contributes to organization's toxicity. Some employees in the hotels studied, have the intention to quit.

The consequences of toxic leadership on the employees and the organizations have also been established and are widely known. The awareness of the presence of toxic leadership in the organizations by external workforce can also negatively affect an organization's image and ability to attract potentially qualified, talented and ethical candidates. As evident in the results, a toxic work environment significantly impacts on the productivity of an organization. Employees who work under toxic leaders suffer stress and burnout, Anjum, Ming, Siddiqi and Rasool (2018) which is capable of making them engage in retaliatory behaviours to inflict damages, wastes, and sabotage their efforts. Such behaviours in turn may reduce the organization's ability to render quality services and compete effectively. Indeed, toxic leadership has been described as a silent killer Walton, (2007) cited in Baloyi (2020), its occurrence in an organization can be detrimental to the bottom-

line, and thus, toxic leadership has enormous economic and human resource implications.

This study has implication not only for organizations and their leaders, but the followers as well. One of the most obvious implications is that harmful leadership is related to decreased employee performance, commitment and job satisfaction Libman-Bluemin, (2005), Mitchell and Ambrose, (2007), Tepper, (2000). Therefore, strong effort should be made to reduce the likelihood of the occurrence of such destructive behaviours. Organizations should develop strategies that would promote culture of fairness, respect and humanized workplace. The culture and climate of an organization must be a positive one and it starts with ethical and superior leaders. Organizations should address and teach their supervisors the implications of toxic leadership at all levels. Also, the finding of Bello and Bello (2022) find a significant correlation between employees turnover intention and job performance in the hotel industry in Lagos State. The managerial implication of this study are managers and hotel owners should create effective work relationship with their staff, formulate policies to promote an organizational culture geared towards helping staff effective solution to their problems.

References

- Akinyele S. T. (2010). The influence of work environment on workers' productivity: A case study of selected oil and gas industry in Lagos, Nigeria. *African Journal on Business Management*, 4(3), 299-307.
- Anjum, A., Ming, X., Siddiqi, A. F., & Rasool, S. F. (2018). An empirical study analyzing job productivity in toxic workplace environments. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*.
- Appelbaum, S. H., & Roy-Girard, D. (2007). Toxins in the workplace: affect on organizations and employees. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 7(1), pp.17-28.
- Asrar-ul-Haq, M. & Anwr, S. (2018). The many face of Leadership: Proposing Research Agenda Through a review of Literature: *Future Business Journal* 4 (2) 199-188
- Asrar-ul-Haq, M. and Anjum, T. (2020). Impact of narcissistic leadership on employee work outcomes in banking sector of Pakistan. *Future Business Journal*, DOI:10.1186/s43093-020-00040-x
- Baloyi, G. T. (2020). Toxicity of leadership and its impact on employees: *Exploring the dynamics of leadership in academic setting. Herv. Theological Studies*; Vol.76, 2.

- Baronce, E. (2005). From passivity to toxicity: Susceptible followers in a conducive environment (Masters' thesis, Linnæus University, Sweden). Retrieved from <http://www.diva.portal.org/smash/get/diva2:839156/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Baronce, E. (2015). From Passivity to Toxicity: Susceptible follows in a Conducive Environment (Master's thesis, Linuss University, Sweden).
- Becker, J., & O'Hair, H. (2007). Machiavellians motives in organizational citizenship behviour. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 35 (3)246-267.
- Bello M.B & Bello Y.O. (2022). Employees' turnover intention and job performance of hotel industry in Lagos State. *Journal of Tourism and Heritage Studies*. DOI: <https://doing.org/10.33281/JTHS20129.2023.1.1>.
- Berkowitz, L. (1974). "Some determinants of impulsive aggression: role of mediated associations with reinforcements for aggression." *Psych. Rev.* 81: 165-176.
- Briner, R. B. (2002). Relationships between work environments, psychological environments and psychological well-being: in-depth review. *Occup. Med.* 50 (5), 299-303. Retrieved from <http://occm.oxfordjournals.org/content/50/5/299.full.pdf>.
- 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; Vol. 3*(1).
- Cheng, B. Chou, L., Wu, T. Huang, M. & Farh, J. (2004). Paternalistic Leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a Leadership Model in China Originations. *Asian Journal of social Psychology*, 7, 89-117.
- Conger, J. A. (1990). The dark side of Leadership. *Organizational Dynamics'*, 19 (2) 44-55.
- Craig, S.B., & Kaiser R.B. (2013). Destructive leadership. In M. G. Rumsey (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Leadership* (pp. 439-454). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dawes, R.V. (1994). The theory of work adjustment as convergent theory. In Savikas, M.L. & Lent, R.W. (eds) *Convergence in Career Development Theories: Implications for Science and Practice*. Palo Alto: CPP Books, pp. 33-43.

- Finkelstein, S. (2003) *Why smart executives fail*, Portfolio. Penguin Books. New York.
- Fraher, A. L. (2016). A toxic triangle of destructive leadership at Bristol Royal Infirmary: A study of organizational Munchausen syndrome by proxy. *Leadership*, 12(1), 34-52.
- Frost P.J. (2004). *Handling Toxic Emotions, New Challenges for Leaders and their Organizations*. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33, 111-127.
- Frost, P. J. (2003). *Toxic emotions at work: How compassionate managers handle pain and conflict*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Gay, L. R., (1996). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Ohio, USA, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Incorporated.
- Gerald, K. (2008). "Career experiences, perceptions of employment practices, and psychological commitment to the organization." *Human Relations*. 42:975-991.
- Gkorezis, P., Petridou, E., Krouklidou, T. (2015). The Detrimental Effect of Machiavellian Leadership on Employees' Emotional Exhaustion: Organizational Cynicism as a Mediator. *Euro Journal of Psychology*, 11(4): 619-631. Published online 2015 Nov 27.
- Goldman, A. (2006). High toxicity leadership: Borderline personality disorder and the dysfunctional organization. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 733-746.
- Hair, N. T. (2000). *Research Methodology and Statistics*. London: News-line Publications.
- Hamidizadeh, A., Matin, H.Z. and Zafari, H. (2017). Investigating the effect of toxic leadership style and dysfunctional behaviors on employees' outcomes and job attitudes. *Organizational Behaviour Studies Quarterly* 2017
- Harvey, P., Stoner, J., Hochwarter, W., & Kacmar, C. (2007). Coping with abusive supervision: The neutralizing effects of ingratiation and positive affect on negative employee outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 264-280
- Hornstein, H. A. (1996). *Brutal Bosses and their Prey*. Riverhead Books, New York.

Toxic Leadership and Employee's Turnover

- Hoston-Okae, M. (2017). Workplace Incivility: State of the Science. *Journal of Royal society for the promotion of health* 121 (4) 230-235.
- Koehn, D. (2007). Facing the phenomenon of evil. *International Management Review*, 3, 38-59.
- Kusy, M., & Holloway, E. (2009). *Toxic workplace: Managing toxic personalities and their systems of power*. San Francisco, C.A.: John Wiley & Sons
- Kyko O.C. (2005) *Instrumentation: Know Yourself and Others*. New York: Longman
- Laschinger, H. K. S., Wong, C. A., Cummings, C. G., & Grau, A. L. (2014). Reducing workplace incivility. *Nursing Economic*, 32(1), 5-15. Retrieved from <http://www.nursingconomics.net/>
- Lemmergaard, J. & Muhr, S.L. (2013). Broadening the critical leadership repertoire: Emotions, toxicity and dysfunctionality. In J. Lemmergaard & S. L. Muhr, *Critical perspectives on leadership: Emotion, toxicity and dysfunction* (pp.3-26). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Leonard, J. B. (2014). *The dissolution of effective leadership: A multiple-case study analysis of destructive leadership* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from University of Tennessee Honors Thesis Projects. (Order No. 1800)
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). Toxic Leadership: When Grand Illusions Masquerade as Noble Visions. *Leader to Leader* 2005, 36, 20-35.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2006). *The allure of toxic leadership: Why we follow destructive bosses and corrupt politicians – and how we can survive them*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nunnally, C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nzeneri, I. S. (2010). *An Introduction to Research Methods and Statistics*. Uyo: Abigab Associates Ltd.
- Olalekan, O. N. (2020). The Menace of Toxic Leadership in School Organization, Coping Strategies. *Euro-Afro Studies International Journal* Volume 1(4).
- Online Etymology Dictionary (2014). Toxicity. Retrieved from http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=toxicity&searchmode=none.

- Ortega, A., Hogh, A., Pejtersen, J.H., & Olsen, O. (2009). Prevalence of workplace bullying and risk groups: A representative population study. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health* 82, 417-426.
- Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 176-194.
- Paulhus, D., & Williams, K. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36(6), 556-563.
- Reed, G. (2004). "Toxic leadership". *Military Review*, July-August, pp. 67-71.
- Rehman, U., Shahnawaz, M. G. (2018). Machiavellianism, Job Autonomy, and Counterproductive Work Behaviour among Indian Managers. Department of Psychology, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, India
- Rosenthal, S. A. & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 617-633.
- Seeger, F. A. (2005). Toxic human factor of crisis situations within the Russian organizations. *7th International Days of Statistics and Economics, Conference Proceedings, Prague, Czech Republic, September 19-21*, pp. 388-397.
- Sofield and Salmond (2003). Described the observed experience of verbal abuse in a large, multi hospital system, relationship of verbal with turnover intention. Pg 130.
- Sofield, L., & Salmond, S. W. (2003). Workplace violence: A focus on verbal abuse and intent to leave the organization. *Orthopedic Nursing*, 22(4).
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178-190.
- Tiwari, M. and Jha, R. (2021), "Narcissism, toxic work culture and abusive supervision: a double-edged sword escalating organizational deviance", *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-05-2020-2187>.
- Tripp, T. M; Bies R. J. & Aquino, K. (2002). Poetic justice or petty jealousy? Aesthetics of revenge. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes* processes, 89(1):966-984.

Toxic Leadership and Employee's Turnover

- Tse, H. H. M., & Chiu, W. C. K. (2014). Transformational leadership and job performance: A social identity perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(1), 2827-2835.
- Walton, M. (2007). Leadership Toxicity An inevitable affliction of Organisations? *Organisations and People*, 14(1), pp.19-27
- Wang, Z. Zaman, S. Rasool, S.F. Zaman, Q.U. and Amin, A. (2019). Exploring the relationships between a toxic workplace environment, workplace stress, and project success with the moderating effect of organizational support: empirical evidence from Pakistan. *Risk Management and Health Policy*
- Wang, Liu, and Liu, S. (2019). Authoritarian Leadership and Task Performance: the effects of leader-member exchange and dependence on leader frontiers of business research in China, volume, 13(19).
- Whicker, M. L. (1996). Toxic leaders: When organizations go bad. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Xu, J., Wang, X. and Yan, L. (2021).The moderating effect of abusive supervision on information security policy compliance: Evidence from the hospitality industry. *Computers & Security*, Volume 111.
- Yusuf, N. & Metiboba S. (2012). Work environment and job attitude among employees in a Nigerian work organization. *Journal of Sustainable Society*, 1(2), 36-43.