

GLOBAL BUSINESS AND  
TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATION

TWENTIETH ANNUAL  
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

READINGS BOOK

ISBN: 1-932917-11-X

ISSN: 2471-6006

SHAPING THE NEXT WAVE OF GLOBALIZATION:  
USING CURRENT TRENDS TO RECONNECT  
WITH MARKETS AND CREATE VALUE

Editors:

N. Delener, Ph.D. Christina  
Schweikert, Ph.D.

BANGKOK, THAILAND  
July 3rd\_7th, 2018

**PUBLISHED BY THE  
GLOBAL BUSINESS AND TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATION  
P.O. BOX 20277 | HUNTINGTON STATION, NY 11746 | U.S.A.**

**ISBN: 1-932917-11-X**

**ISSN: 2471-6006**

The materials published in this Readings Book may be reproduced for instructional and noncommercial use. Any use for commercial purposes must have the prior approval of the President of the Global Business and Technology Association.

All full papers submitted to the Global Business and Technology Association Conferences are subject to a peer reviewing process, using subject specialists selected for their expert knowledge in the areas.

The Global Business and Technology Association (GBATA) is listed with EBSCO and ProQuest. This allows researchers from throughout the world to access articles from the Readings Book.

Published in the United States of America, 2018

# FEMALE LEADERS' EXPERIENCE OF TOXIC LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA

Tessie H H Herbst

Tshwane University of Technology, Pretoria, South Africa

M.S. Mukhola

Tshwane University of Technology, Pretoria, South Africa

## ABSTRACT

*There is limited literature available on the negative aspects of leadership and very few empirical studies exist on toxic leadership. Toxic leadership causes, either abruptly or gradually, systemic harm to the health of both individual employees and the organization, impairing organisational performance. This study explores the phenomenon of toxic leadership in higher education institutions in South Africa. In particular, the investigation explored the experiences of female leaders of toxic leadership by means of the Schmidt Toxic Leadership Scale to observe the prevalence of specific toxic leadership behaviours. The results of the study confirmed that toxic leadership is indeed, a prevalent phenomenon with all participants reporting various degrees of previous or current experience with toxic leaders.*

**Keywords:** toxic leadership, higher education, abusive supervision; gender, leadership development, leadership selection.

## INTRODUCTION

The traits and behaviours that make leaders effective and how good leaders influence and motivate their subordinates to achieve organizational goals has been a focal point of scholarly research for decades (Northouse, 2007). Although in-depth insight into effective leadership and the attributes and behaviours of good leaders is imperative for developing managers, it is just as important to identify the behaviours of leaders who either unintentionally or deliberately inflict enduring harm on their subordinates and consequently, the organisation (Mehta & Maheshwari, 2014). However, only a few studies have been conducted that have directly attempted to understand the nature and consequences of dysfunctional leadership (Ashforth, 1994; Kellennan, 2004; Padilla, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2007; Schmidt, 2007, 2014). As a result there is limited literature available on the negative aspects of leadership and very few empirical studies exist on the dark side of leadership (Pelletier, 2010). Some of the theories of effective or good leadership seem to equate dysfunctional leadership simply to the absence or opposite of effective leadership (Hunter, Bedell-Avers, & Mumford, 2007). However, various authors (Goldman, 2006; Kellerman, 2004; Lipman-Blumen, 2005a; Lipman-Blumen, 2005b; Lipman-Blumen, 2005c) have suggested that there is a distinctive, more insidious type of dysfunctional leadership. According to Lipman-Blumen (2005a), toxic leaders show dysfunctional personal characteristics and act in a wide range of destructive behaviours. This unique blend of negative behaviours and attributes is called "toxic leadership" because of the particularly negative consequences of this leadership style for both individual subordinates and organizations. This type of leader is captured in a statement by Kets de Vries when he explained that 'some leaders go far beyond the abnormal ways of functioning...they go off the deep end' (Kets de Vries, 1999), p. 217). However, it is only recently that the phenomenon of toxic leadership has become a focal interest for many organizations in an attempt to understand the leadership behaviours which are harmful to employees as well as for the organization (Mehta & Maheshwari, 2013).

On an organisational level, Reed (2004), states that leaders who use their position power to display negative and destructive leadership tendencies tend to propel their organizations towards destruction. In the same line Lipman-Blumen (2005a) asserts that toxic leadership cause the fragmentation of the organization and risks the values and the norms of the organization (Aubrey, 2012). This is confirmed by Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) who provides evidence that reporting to a toxic manager leads to an increase in workplace deviance by subordinates which can be attributed to negative reciprocity. Organizational outcomes include negative effect on organizational performance (Ashforth, 1997) by invoking dysfunctional group behaviour (Wilson-Starks, 2003). A study by Schmidt (2014) found that toxic leadership had negative direct effects on four job outcomes: job satisfaction, work group productivity, organizational trust, and organizational commitment.

On an individual level, it creates a seriously effectual pressure on the personality of the employee (Lipman-Blumen, 2005a). This leads to higher levels of anxiety, burnout, depression, and work-family conflict in subordinates as well as diminished self-efficacy that could lead to deteriorations in performance and morale (Kusy and Holloway, 2009). In addition, it results in low staff morale, sexual harassment, decrease in job satisfaction, high turnover and low productivity and performance (Mehta and Maheshwari, 2014; Schmidt, 2008). Research by Zagross and Jamileh (2016) provides evidence of the relationship between toxic leadership and job stress of knowledge workers. Toxic leadership therefore creates an environment wherein employees are rewarded for agreeing with the leader and reprimanded for challenging his/her authority. Lipman-Blumen (2005a) described this as 'stifling constructive criticism and teaching supporters (sometimes by threats and authoritarianism) to comply with, rather than to question, the leader's judgment and actions' (p. 20). Wilson-Starks (2003) concurs and states that in a toxic leadership environment, 'yes' people are rewarded and promoted to leadership roles, while people who more fully engage their mental resources, critical thinking, and questioning skills are shut out from decision-making and positions of influence" (p. 2). As a result employees' enthusiasm, creativity, autonomy, and innovativeness- all important characteristics for university staff- are curtailed due to the fact that the leader's self-interest assumes prime importance. Similarly, participants with toxic leaders reported feeling less trustful of the organization and less committed to it blaming their organization for condoning the leadership behaviours that were so distressing (Schmidt, 2014). This is in line with earlier findings (Bowling & Michel, 2011; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001) that subordinates associate destructive leadership with negative organizational cultures and blame their organizations for tolerating or even encouraging and rewarding these behaviours. These negative effects on both an individual and institutional level demonstrate the importance of understanding and curtailing toxic leadership. While Reed (2004) investigated toxic and destructive leadership existing in the military, this issue was found to exist in the corporate sector as well (Pelletier, 2010). Toxic leadership has recently emerged in organisations as a silent killer and the evidence is mounting on the impact of toxic leadership both at organizational and individual levels. However, there is a paucity of research on the prevalence of toxic leadership in higher education institutions worldwide.

This study explores the phenomenon of toxic leadership – leadership that causes, either abruptly or gradually, systemic harm to the health of an organization, hampering the organization from achieving its objectives. In particular, the investigation focused on toxic leadership in higher education institutions in South Africa - the prevalence thereof, as well as the characteristics and behaviour of toxic leaders. The study employed the *Schmidt Toxic Leadership Scale* (2008), which is a 30 item questionnaire designed to observe the prevalence of specific toxic leadership behaviours. The survey measures the following five dimensions of toxic leadership: *self-promotion; abusive supervision; unpredictability; narcissism; and authoritarian leadership*. Respondents to the survey were all female leaders in higher education institutions in South Africa attending the HERS-SA academy. The HERS-SA ACADEMY is a week-long interactive professional development opportunity for women employed in higher education both in South Africa and internationally.

The results of the study confirmed that toxic leadership is, indeed, a prevalent phenomenon with all participants reporting various degrees of previous or current experience with toxic leaders. Thus, toxic leadership occurs with high frequency in higher education institutions, just as it does in other types of organizations. Furthermore, the evidence shows that the behaviours of toxic leaders are concrete. In the open-ended responses participants described toxic leadership in terms of what toxic leaders did, especially how they influenced and interacted with others. However, given the small sample (N = 48), this study can be viewed merely as exploratory. Due to the emotionally charged nature of the questions some delegates could have been discouraged from

participating. Even so, the data portray a bleak reality that toxic leadership is prevalent in higher education institutions and that it conforms to observable patterns of behaviour.

## EXPLORING TOXIC LEADERSHIP

Although the term "toxic leader" first appeared in 1996 (Whicker, 1996), as yet no standard definition of toxic leadership exists. Indeed, a variety of terms like destructive, incompetent, bullying, toxic, and abusive are used interchangeably but describe the same phenomenon: leaders who are engaged in gravely destructive behaviours and who exhibits dysfunctional personal qualities inflicting severe physical and psychological damage to followers and undermine the best interest of the organization. However, "toxic leadership" increasingly is becoming the preferred label for leadership that harms an organization or the individuals reporting to such a leader.

Schmidt (2008) added to the extant literature by showing that toxic leadership includes a broader spectrum of behaviours than had been studied previously. He describes toxic leaders as 'narcissistic, self-promoters who engage in an unpredictable pattern of abusive and authoritarian supervision' (Schmidt, 2014: 57). This view is confirmed by Pelletier (2010) and Dobbs, (2014) that toxic leadership is a multi-dimensional structure that contains flawed leadership components such as narcissism, authoritarianism, self-promotion and unpredictability. Willcker (1996) defines toxic leadership as a leader who is incompatible, anxious and malevolent. They are 'maladjusted, malcontent, and often malevolent and malicious people' who succeed by tearing others down and 'glory in turf protection, fighting, and controlling others rather than uplifting followers' (Whicker, 1996: 66). The common behaviours demonstrated by toxic leaders can include the leader criticizing employees' performance, taking the credit for employee's ideas and humiliating employees in front of their colleagues (Kellerman, 2004). Wilson-Stark (2003) defines the characteristics of a toxic leader in three ways. First of all, toxic leaders suppress the creativity of staff through their need to be in control. Secondly, they increase distrust by isolating people and withholding information from people. Thirdly, they prevent the development of productive relationships and produce polarisation and division. For example, Pelletier (2010) wrote that toxic leaders '...promote divisiveness between work groups or individuals' (p. 373), suggesting that toxic leadership would erode work group cohesion and team work. According to Reed (2004) toxic leaders have an evident lack of concern for the welfare of subordinates and a personality that negatively affects the organizational culture. This results in a belief by subordinates that their superior's actions were driven primarily by selfish motives and self-interest. Organisational cultures can also be toxic and lead to the emergence of toxic leadership when the personal agendas of individual leaders take precedence over the long-term well-being of the organization resulting in an ineffective organization (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003).

It is evident that providing a single definition of 'toxic leadership' remains an exasperating task primarily due to differences in perceptions about how leadership is viewed. What might be perceived as toxic leadership by one employee might be viewed by another as good leadership (Lipman-Blumen, 2005). To add to the complexity, a toxic leader does not necessarily display toxic behaviours in all situations and varying degrees and types of toxicity are demonstrated by different toxic leaders. However, all toxic leaders have a 'deep-seated but well-disguised sense of personal inadequacy, selfish values, and cleverness at concealing deceit' (Whicker, 1996: 12). They usually exploit four basic needs and two main fears, i.e., the need of authority, safety, feeling oneself special and the need of belonging; and the fear of exclusion and the fear of weakness (Lipman-Blumen, 2015a). Goldman, (2009) defines toxic leadership as 'being destructive, disturbing, and dysfunctional acts of supervision that spread among members of the workforce'. In a similar line, Lipman-Blumen (2005b: 30) describes toxic leaders as 'those individuals who, by virtue of their destructive behaviors and their dysfunctional personal qualities or characteristics, inflict serious and enduring harm on the individuals, groups, organizations, communities and even the nations that they lead'. It is important to note that toxic leaders are good impression managers and are often viewed as competent, charming and influential leaders by their superiors and organisation (Reed, 2004). This makes it even more difficult for their subordinates to complain about their toxic behaviour. Whicker (1996) and Lipman-Blumen (2005a) explain how toxic leadership often creates short-term boosts in productivity as a result of subordinates acting out of fear. But these bursts of productivity quickly result in burnout, withdrawal, and attrition, which are ultimately very costly to the university.

The brief discussion above can be summarised with this following statement by Reed (2004: 71) that 'a toxic leader is poison to the unit – an insidious, slow-acting poison that complicates diagnosis and the application of an anecdote (2004, p. 71). When these leaders are placed in senior positions in the organization, the impact of their behaviour is even more devastating (Kets de Vries, 2014).

## METHOD

### Participants

Data were collected from a group of female leaders (N=82) employed at 18 different higher education institutions in South Africa using the Schmidt Toxic Leadership Scale (2008). Respondents to the survey were all female leaders in higher education institutions in South Africa attending the HERS-SA academy. The HERS-SA ACADEMY is a week-long interactive professional development opportunity for women employed in higher education institutions both in South Africa and internationally. This programme is aimed at those women in, or aspiring to hold, senior leadership positions and typically attracts on average 80 women. The instrument was distributed electronically by the HERS-SA administrative office to all delegates attending the academy in 2017 (N=82). A total of 48 participants responded to the survey indicating a response rate of 58%. Due to the small sample size and to protect the identity of the participants no biographical data, apart from their job level, was collected. Of the 48 participants, 2 (4.17%) were a member of the executive management committee (EMC), 3 (6.25%) were executive deans, 6 (12.5%) were heads of academic departments, 16 (33.33%) were heads of support departments, 11 (22.92%) indicated that they are in non-management positions (other), and 10 (20.83%) were lecturers. All participants signed an informed consent ensuring them that their responses would be dealt with extreme confidentiality and that their anonymity would be safeguarded at all times.

### Measuring Instrument

The study employed the *Schmidt Toxic Leadership Scale* (2008), which is a 30 item questionnaire designed to observe the prevalence of specific toxic leadership behaviours. The survey measures the following five dimensions of toxic leadership: *self-promotion*; *abusive supervision*; *unpredictability*; *narcissism*; and *authoritarian leadership*. The scale measures the prevalence of each of the 30 toxic leadership behaviours on a 6-point Likert scale response format, with answers ranging between 1 = "Strongly Disagree" to 6 = "Strongly Agree." All items begin with the phrase "My current supervisor...". In addition, a series of open-ended questions were included that asked participants to use their own words to describe their experiences with toxic leaders, with attention given to their personal description of toxic leadership behaviours and incidents that typified toxic leadership. This paper however only reports on the quantitative data obtained. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient ( $\alpha$ ) conducted on the instrument have confirmed the reliability of the instrument. All five toxic leadership dimensions are reliably testing their respective latent constructs since their respective Cronbach's alpha values are greater than 0.7. The Cronbach's alpha values for each of the five toxic leadership dimensions were as follows: Self-promotion (0.7371); Abusive supervision (0.8301); Unpredictability (0.8808); Narcissism (0.7186), and Authoritarian leadership (0.8435).

## RESULTS

The STATA statistical software package was used to analyse the data.

**Table 1: Summary statistics per toxic leadership dimension**

TOXIC LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS	Rank mean	Median	Chi-Squared	DF	p-value	Multiple Comparison
1. Abusive supervision	672.74	6				1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5*
2. Unpredictability	722.92	6	22.8	9	0.001	1-2 1-3 1-4 1-5
3. Self-promotion	722.2	6				1-2 1-3 1-4 1-5
4. Narcissism	822.42	6				1-2 1-3 1-4 1-5
5. Authoritarian leadership	677.73	6				1-2 1-3 1-4 1-5

\*significant difference between dimensions

The high rank mean for each of the five dimensions indicate that the majority of the participants either "agreed" (5) or "strongly agreed" (6) that their line manager demonstrated the 30 toxic leadership behaviours measured by the instrument. The median for each of the 30 questions ranged between 5 and 6 with a median of 6 for each of the five dimensions of toxic leadership.

**Table 2: Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test- Comparison between management and non-management staff for each of the toxic leadership dimensions**

TOXIC LEADERSHIP DIMENSION	Median		Rank Mean		z-score	p-value
	Management	Non-Management	Management	Non-Management		
1. Abusive supervision	6	5	184.3201	148.1599	-3.695	0.0002*
2. Unpredictability	6	6	173.5053	162.0646	-1.180	0.2382
3. Self-promotion	6	6	121.0815	119.7524	-0.175	0.8608
4. Narcissism	6	6	117.8333	123.9286		0.3996
5. Authoritarian leadership	6	5	158.1883	126.9008	-3.478	0.0005*

p<0.001\*

The Two-sample Wilcoxon rank-sum test was performed to compare the management and non-management participant ratings on the toxic leadership scale. As illustrated in Table 2, the results indicate that position has no significant effect on the toxic leadership ratings of *Unpredictability*, *Self-promotion* and *Narcissism*. The rating for these three dimensions does not differ between the two groups. However, rating with regards to *abusive supervision* differs significantly between the two groups ( $p<0.001$ ,  $z=-3.695$ ) as well as the rating for *authoritarian leadership* ( $p<0.001$ ,  $z=-3.478$ ). In particular, the score for managers is higher than the score for non-management staff for these two dimensions of toxic leadership. The rank mean of 148.1599 and 184.3201 for non-management and management respectively indicate that the *abusive supervision* score for managers is significantly higher than the one for non-management staff. The same applies for *authoritarian leadership* with rank means of 158.1883 for management and 126.9008 for non-management staff.

## DISCUSSION

The results of this study confirm that toxic leadership is indeed a prevalent phenomenon in universities in South Africa. The high rank mean for each of the five dimensions indicate that the majority of the participants either "agreed" (5) or "strongly agreed" (6) that their line manager demonstrated the 30 toxic leadership behaviours measured by the instrument. The extremely high ratings might be attributed to the fact that the sample included only females. Chau and Murray (2015) state that due to inherent differences in how men and women process information (i.e. the selectivity hypothesis by Putrevu, (2001) posits that women are more elaborate processors as opposed to men who are heuristic processors of information) the perception and interpretation of a message from a toxic leader will be influenced by gender. This elaborate processing typical to women leads to greater imagery creation, making the source or the person conveying the message as important as the information itself. Furthermore, women more than men, are highly attuned to inconsistencies in information presented and as a result they are more accurate in identifying deceitful or false cues in a situation involving a toxic leader that are subtly inconsistent with the message (Meyers-Levy & Maheswaran, 1991). Research by Chau and Murray (2015) confirmed that women perceive the toxic leader more negatively than men, elaborating more on negative message connotations, while men emphasized positives. From both an individual as well as an institutional health perspective, the findings of this study is problematic. The advancement of women to senior positions is currently high on the transformation agenda in higher education institutions in South Africa (CHE, 2016) and elsewhere (Shepherd, 2017). Various reasons for women's continued underrepresentation at senior leadership levels in HE are mentioned in the literature (cited in Moody & Toni, 2017). Further research is needed to determine whether toxic leadership and institutional cultures within higher education institutions might be added to the list of barriers to women's advancement.

The high rank mean for all five toxic leadership dimensions is concerning since researchers are beginning to show how such behaviours cascade throughout organizations and create toxic organisational cultures and impact the performance of the organisation. For example, Mawritz, Mayer, Hoobler, Wayne, and Marinova (2012) showed that abusive supervision among senior managers was positively related to this same leadership style among front-line supervisors, which in turn was positively related to interpersonal deviance among employees. This 'trickle-down' model of abusive supervision explains how negative leadership behaviours can be replicated downward throughout the organization, creating a highly destructive leadership climate and a toxic organisational culture. For organizations like universities with hierarchical structures these findings are especially pertinent. Lian, Ferris, and Douglas (2012) found that subordinates within such organisations were more likely to tolerate and emulate abusive supervision. This necessitates proactive interventions to identify and correct destructive leadership before it becomes a pervasive part of the university culture.

As indicated in Table 1, the two dimensions with the highest rank mean are *Narcissism* and *Self-promotion*. This is alarming since Schmidts (2008) definition of the narcissism includes a lack of skill of developing empathy with others and underestimating other's abilities. The majority of findings (cited in Braun, 2017) regarding narcissism in leaders point to its negative effects (e.g. undermining perceived innovative behaviour, eliciting counterproductive work behaviour directed against the leader. In addition research by Schmidt (2014) revealed that *self-promotion* was the most predictive of the five dimensions of the toxic leadership survey. Tal-Or (2010) states that people who self-promote often induce resentment and jealousy in those around them. It makes sense that leaders who self-promote would incite such feelings in their subordinates, particularly when taking credit for their or the team's success. Leaders who engage in self-promotion reduce potential resources (recognition, rewards, and feelings of accomplishment/competence) from their subordinates. In fact, item 3 of the self-promotion scale, 'My leader accepts credit for successes that do not belong to him/her,' is an action that directly reduces the beneficial outcomes that subordinates have earned. Although all five toxic leadership dimensions results in reduced psychological and emotional resources, *self-promotion* has a unique potential to directly reduce more tangible resources (e.g., financial bonuses, promotions, etc.).

Furthermore, Schmidt (2014) is of the opinion that due to the direct and hostile nature of *abusive supervision*, it exhausts employee resources the most. Because the behaviours associated with abusive supervision are more individually-focused than behaviours in the authoritarianism, narcissism, and self-promotion dimensions of toxic leadership, they most probably require more resources to process. Supervisors who engage in abusive behaviours micromanage their employees and use public humiliation, repeated reminders of employees' past



mistakes, and hostile language (e.g., calling people "stupid") to verbally and emotionally assault their victims (Tepper, 2000; 2007). In the same line, Schmidt (2014) argues that *unpredictability* - implying unexpected behavioural changes displayed by toxic leaders - would require subordinates to be on constant alert expending more resources. Employees can never let down their guard and need to be ready to cope with volatility at any moment. As revealed in research by Schmidt (2008) employees would rather have a supervisor who was predictably abusive than one who was sometimes positive and sometimes negative.

The findings as indicated in Table 2 that management staff experienced a higher degree of toxic leadership than non-management staff in four of the five toxic leadership dimensions confirms the finding by Frost (2003) that managers embedded within a department or organization led by toxic leaders serve the unfortunate role of being 'toxin filters'. It is evident from the results of this study that toxic leadership in universities could hamper the progress of transformation in higher education institutions in South Africa especially addressing the current gender disparity at senior levels. This is a challenge facing higher education institutions world-wide, including universities in developed countries (Shepherd, 2017; Manfredi, 2017). Female leaders who resign due to toxic leadership not only drain the university of valuable institutional knowledge, they also leave vacancies that can take significant amounts of time and money to fill. Therefore, as universities seek to attract, engage, and retain top female academic leaders they should proactively think about how to prevent toxic leadership in their universities.

## Implications for practice

The most obvious implication of the findings of this study is that because toxic leadership is related to decreased employee morale and performance, commitment, and job satisfaction (Lipman-Blumen, 2005a; Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007; Schmidt, 2014; Tepper, 2000, 2007), universities should make every effort to reduce the likelihood of the occurrence of these harmful behaviours. Leadership is a paradox and the same attributes that describe effective leaders can corrode into qualities that we associate with toxic leadership. For example, 'arrogance,' one of the trademarks of toxic leadership can easily be misinterpreted as 'self-confidence,' which is a trait shared by all good leaders. However, while the self-confidence of an effective leader inspires trust, the arrogance of a toxic leader is offensive to subordinates. Therefore, the results of this study argue on behalf of better training given to faculty and other administrators who assist in the screening of candidates for senior leadership positions. Likewise, they need to be made aware of research on toxic leadership. Indeed, there is even a case for the involvement of specialised staff (i.e., personnel specialists or psychologists with expertise in organizational leadership) during the selection process. By advancing knowledge of toxic leadership, there may be increased opportunity to decrease its prevalence and reduce its destructive impact.

Furthermore, in line with the recommendation by Chau and MwTay (2016) it is important from a management standpoint to understand that men and women process information differently. Therefore, leadership development programmes could focus on gender-specific communications to counterbalance perceptions of toxicity toward leaders. Training leaders to tailor their communication could potentially minimize misinterpretation of communication as toxic. In addition universities also need to formulate checks and controls for early identification of toxic leadership behaviours within the university. This will allow the university the opportunity to intervene and assist in re-educating aberrant leaders by means of coaching or mentoring. Early identification also decreases the possibility of fostering strong toxic behaviours. Once toxic leadership behaviours have been exposed, recognized and appropriate action taken within the university, the growth of toxic leadership may be curbed. Furthermore, performance management systems should not only reward managers who get the best results, but it is also important to understand and assess how these results were achieved. The behaviours of leaders need to be monitored and assessed to ensure that their interactions with followers results in a healthy work environment. In this regard 360-degree assessments can be helpful. In line with the recommendation by Pelletier (2010) universities should also consider establishing an ethics ombudsperson who, in addition to investigating institutional corruption, could also investigate allegations of leader toxicity.

Finally, since this investigation was intended to be exploratory in nature, there are certain limitations with regard to the issue of the generalisation of the results of this study to all sector employees. Sampling of the study comprises only females and it is suggested that future studies may bring forth more effective results with larger and

more diverse sampling. The will shed more light in terms of gender differences regarding toxic leadership. The findings do, however, support the need for more research into the area.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study was an opportunity to explore the prevalence of toxic leadership and obtain empirical evidence regarding the prevalence of toxic leadership in higher education institutions in South Africa. The findings of the study are of interest to human resource and leadership development practitioners in higher education institutions to enable them to develop policies and leadership development processes to recruit, retain and develop talented and ethical staff for management positions. The study offers recommendations that include raising the awareness and the training of staff who participate in the recruitment and selection process for management staff in universities. This will better equip them to assess not only leadership potential, but also the potential for toxic leadership. Furthermore, the findings of this study will contribute to the literature on leadership and extend the literature about the effect of toxic leadership in higher education institutions. Finally, although this investigation was intended to be exploratory in nature the findings do however support the need for more future research into the area.

## **Acknowledgements**

The authors wish to thank Princess Ramokolo for the statistical analysis, the TUT management for their support, and the respondents for taking part in the research. We also wish to thank the two anonymous reviewers for taking the time to make extremely helpful suggestions, which have contributed to the current paper in a meaningful way.

## REFERENCES

- Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Petty tyranny in organizations: A preliminary examination of antecedents and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 14, 126-140.
- Bowling, N. A. & Michel, J. S. (2011). Why do you treat me badly? The role of attributions regarding the cause of abuse in subordinates' responses to abusive supervision. *Work & Stress*, 25, 309-320.
- Braun, S. (2017). Leader narcissism and outcomes in organizations: A review at multiple levels of analysis and implications for future research. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 8:773. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00773
- Chua, S. M. Y. & Murray, D. V. (2015). How toxic leaders are perceived: gender and information-processing. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 36(3), 292-307. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-06-2013-0076>
- Council on Higher Education (CHE) (2016). *South African higher education reviewed: Two decades of democracy*. CHE: Pretoria.
- Dobbs, J. M. (2014). *The Relationship between perceived toxic leadership styles, leader effectiveness, and organizational cynicism*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of San Diego.
- Folger, R. & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Folger, R. & Cropanzano, R. (2001). Fairness theory: Justice as accountability. In: *Advances in organization justice*. Greenberg, J. & Cropanzano, R. (Ed.): Stanford University Press.
- Hunter, S. T., Bedell-Avers, K. E., & Mumford, M. D. (2007). The typical leadership study: Assumptions, implications, and potential remedies. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 435-446.
- Frost, P. J. (2003). *Toxic Emotions at Work*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Goldman, A. (2006). High toxicity leadership: Borderline personality disorder and the dysfunctional organization. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 733-746.
- Kellerman, B. (2004), *Bad Leadership: What It Is, How it Happens, Why It Matters*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Kets de Vries, M. (1995), *Life and Death in the Executive Fast Lane*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Kets de Vries, M. (2012). The Psychopath in the C Suite: Redefining the SOB. *JNSEAD working paper*, [https://flora.insead.edu/fichiersti\\_wp/inseadwp2012/2012-119.pdf](https://flora.insead.edu/fichiersti_wp/inseadwp2012/2012-119.pdf). Accessed on 15 May 2018.
- Kusy, M. & Holloway, E. (2009). *Toxic workplace: Managing toxic personalities and their systems of power*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lian, H., Ferris, D. L., & Douglas, J. B. (2012). Does power distance exacerbate or mitigate the effects of abusive supervision? It depends on the outcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 107-123.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005a). *The allure of toxic leaders: Why we follow destructive bosses and corrupt politicians – and how we can survive them*. Oxford, England, Oxford University Press.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005b). The allure of toxic leaders: Why followers rarely escape their clutches. *Ivey business Journal*, January/February, 1-8.

- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005c). Toxic leadership: When grand illusions masquerade as noble visions. *Leader to Leader*, Spring 2005, 29-36.
- Manfredi, S. (2017). Increasing Gender Diversity in Senior Roles in HE: Who Is Afraid of Positive Action? *Administrative Sciences*, 7(19). doi:10.3390/admsci7020019.
- Mawritz, M. B., Mayer, D. M., Hoobler, J. M., Wayne, S. J., & Marinova, S. V. (2012). A trickle-down model of abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 65, 325–357.
- Mehta, S. & Maheshwari, G. C. (2014). Toxic leadership: tracing the destructive trail. *International Journal of Management*, 5(10), pp. 18-24.
- Meyers-Levy, J. and Maheswaran, D. (1991). Exploring differences in males' and females' processing strategies. *Journal of Consumer Research Inc.*, 18(1), 63-70.
- Mitchell, M.S. & Ambrose, M. L. (2007) Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4): 1159–1168.
- Moodly, A. L. & Toni, N. M. (2017). Gender Equity in South African Higher Education Leadership: Where Are We Twenty Years After Democracy? *South African Journal of Higher Education*. 31(3), pp. 138-153. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20853/31-3-917>.
- Northouse, P.G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice* (4th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA
- Reed, George. E. (2004). Toxic leadership. *Military Review*, (July-August 2004), 84, 67-71.
- Padilla, A., Hogan, R. & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conductive environments, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 176-194.
- Pelletier, K. L. (2010). Leader toxicity: An empirical investigation of toxic behavior and rhetoric. *Leadership*, 6(4), 373–389.
- Putrevu, S. (2001). Exploring the cognitions and information processing differences between men and women: implications for advertisers, *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 5(3), 1-14.
- Schmidt, A.A. (2008). *Development and validation of the toxic leadership scale*. Unpublished Master's dissertation. University of Maryland.
- Schmidt, A. A. (2014). *An examination of toxic leadership, job outcomes, and the impact of military deployment*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Maryland .
- Shepherd, S. (2017). Why are there so few female leaders in higher education: A case of structure or agency? *Management in Education*, 31(2), pp. 82–87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020617696631>
- Tal-Or, N. (2010). Direct and indirect self-promotion in the eyes of the perceivers. *Social Influence*, 5, 87-100.
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 178-190.
- Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33, 261-289.
- Wilson-Starks, K. Y. (2003). Toxic leadership. *Transleadership, Inc.* <http://www.transleadership.com>. Accessed 25 May 2018.

Whicker, M. L. (1996). *Toxic leaders: When organizations go bad*. Westport, CT. Quorum Books.

Zagross, H. & Jamileh, Z. (2016). Relationship between toxic leadership and job stress of knowledge workers. *Studies in Business and Economics*, 11(3), 84-89.