The Perceptions of Academicians on Organizational Toxicity

Akademisyenlerin Örgütsel Toksisiteye İlişkin Algıları

Seyithan DEMİRDAĞ[a]
[a]Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi, Ereğli Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Zonguldak, Türkiye

Öz

Örgütsel toksisite ya da örgütsel zehirlenme, toksik davranışlar olarak sınıflandırılan bireysel faktörlerin bir sonucu olarak ortaya çıkar. Bundan dolayı, bu çalışmanın amacı, farklı üniversitelerdeki akademisyenlerin algılarına göre algılanan örgütsel toksisite, toksisitenin algılanan etkileri ve toksisiteyle başa çıkma düzeylerini incelemektir. Çalışma için gerekli verilerin toplanması için karma araştırma yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Çalışmaya 116'sı erkek ve 90'ı kadın olmak üzere toplam 206 akademisyen seçkisiz olmayan bir yöntemle seçilmiştir. Karma yöntemlerin kullanıldığı çalışmanın nicel bölümünde betimsel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın nitel kısmı, açık uçlu sorular içeren yarı yapılandırılmış bir görüşme tekniği içermektedir. Nicel verileri analiz etmek için parametrik olmayan istatistiksel yöntemler kullanılmıştır. Nitel verilerin analiz edilmesi için ise içerik analizi yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın bulguları örgütsel toksisitenin etkisinin, yükseköğretimdeki akademisyenlerin toksisite ile başa çıkma düzeylerinden daha yüksek olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bulgular ayrıca algılanan örgütsel toksisite ile toksisitenin algılanan etkileri arasında pozitif yönde ve anlamlı bir ilişki olduğunu belirtmiştir. Bunlara ek olarak, akademisyenler, çalıştıkları bölümlerde bazı durumlarda meslektaşları tarafından kıskanıldıklarını da belirtmişlerdir.

Abstract

Organizational toxicity occurs as a result of individual factors classified as toxic behaviors. For this aim, the objective of this study is to determine the levels of perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and strategies of coping with toxicity of academicians at different universities. A mixed research method was selected for collecting adequate data for the study. A total of 206 participants including 116 males and 90 females were selected through a non-random selection. The study employed a mixed method approach. The survey model of descriptive method was used in the quantitative part of the study. The qualitative part of the study included a semi-structured interview technique involving open ended questions. Non-parametric statistical methods were employed to analyze quantitative data. In addition, content analysis method was employed to analyze qualitative data. The findings of the study showed that the effects of organizational toxicity were higher on academicians in higher education than their coping with toxicity. The findings also indicated that there were positive and significant correlations between perceived organizational toxicity and detected effects of toxicity. Furthermore, most of the academicians agreed that they have experienced toxic behaviors such as jealousy from their colleagues in their departments.

1. Introduction

Understanding organizations is essential for understanding toxic working conditions. Therefore, interpersonal and occupational conditions in the workplace need to be addressed. These are essential for organizational effectiveness and for ensuring a positive organizational climate (Lawler, Thye, & Yoon 2000). When interpersonal and occupational conditions are not properly addressed in an organization, it is likely that the organization will be ineffective, stressful, and chaotic (Clarke, 1999; Parker, 2005).

Toxicity is the difficulty of not responding to any desire or the unwanted feeling due to the negative treatments of others (Hançerlioğlu, 2000). According to Frost (2003) organizational toxicity is a situation, which reduces the morale, motivation, self-esteem, and diligence of the workers in an organization. In other words, emotional pain experienced in institutions is called toxicity (Frost, 2003). From all these definitions and opinions, organizational toxicity can be expressed as situations that cause corporal punishment or injury, harm to workers, and create distress and useless situations. Toxicity, had its origins in the field of science, was first examined in the field of organization and administration by Whicker (1996). However, it was Frost (2003), who actually defined the concept of "Organizational Toxicity" and introduced it to the field of organization and management (Carlock, 2013, Goldman, 2008, Maitlis, 2008).

The theoretical foundations of organizational toxicity include six different classifications. First one includes Fiedler's leader-member interaction. Based on this theory, the relationship between leaders and their followers determines the challenges, perceptions, and obligations within the working environments (Pellettier, 2009). Second one is Turner's self-classification. This approach suggests that self-classification is a process enabling individuals to identify their own identities and act as members of groups (Hogg and Vaughan, 2011). Third one is known as social identity which was developed by Tajfel and Turner (1979). The theory indicates that that the society is structured hierarchically and different social groups establish relations of power and status within such structure (Hogg and Vaughan, 2011). Fourth one includes Freud's psychodynamics. According to this theory, leaders in organizations tend to destroy those who have narcissistic behaviors as they may harm the organization by diminishing the motivation and being jealous of the other workers (Lubit, 2004). Fifth one includes Bandura's social learning theory. The theory suggests that when individuals are not punished due to their aggressive and unwelcoming behaviors in their organizations they may create toxicity within the environment (O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin and Glew, 1996). The last one is Maslow's hierarchy of needs. In relation with organizational toxicity, based on Maslow's theory, a person may deny the existence of toxicity in an organization to protect his own comfort zone and needs (Lipman-Blumen, 2005).

Comparing organizational toxicity with bullying, Pelletier (2009) notes that people who exhibit toxic behaviors are weaker or more subordinate to bully persons, prefer to use mental and physical force. Leaders who practice bullying tactics, demand unreasonable work requests, apply fabricated rules in an inconsistent way, threat to fire workers, insult and underestimate, ignore achievements, scream, and own someone else's work are toxic (Namie &Namie, 2000). However, the concept of toxicity also includes dysfunctional personality features such as inadequacy and immorality in addition to bullying (Pelletier, 2009). Mobbing systematically targets a specific person directly whereas toxicity is not considered to be systematic and may affect more people working in an organization for the moment (Leymann, 1992).

Organizational toxicity occurs as a result of individual factors classified as toxic behaviors (Bassman 1992) and personality traits of workers and leaders (Cox, 2000) as well as organizational factors classified as organizational changes (Hochschild, 1983), organizational policies, traumas, crises (Kapferer, 1972), and organizational interventions (Leiter & Maslach, 1988).

Toxic members of the organizations are inclined to be narcissists, unethical, strict (Lubit, 2004), and aggressive (Carlock, 2013) due to their personal characteristics, environmental conditions, or urges that they employ (Pearlin, 1989). Especially personal characteristics of the toxic member may be the reasons of the behaviors of jealousy, exclusion, prevention, and lower levels of motivation around organizations (Lambert, 1991). Narcissism, which may have some effects on both educators and students in higher education level has steadily risen over the last two decades (Bergman, Westerman, & Daly, 2010).Behaviors of narcissist individuals include being arrogant, seeing others worthless, showing lack of conscience and empathy, humiliating others' values, regarding themselves as the most important ones in the organzation being selfish, and pretentious (Lubit, 2004; Twenge Campbell, 2010). Aggressive ones show behaviors of jealousy, forcing groups of people to be labeled as parties, hoaxing, and backbiting (Lubit, 2004). Strict behaviors can also lead to organizational toxicity, which is exhibited by workers that are insulting and shattering, showing rude behaviors and disgruntled attitudes (Frost, 2003; Lipman-Blumen, 2005). Lastly, unethical behaviors may arise in the form of expecting more work outside the job description of the workers and unfairly increasing their workloads (Frost,

2003; Lubit, 2004).

The determinants of toxicity in the workplace include negative comments about genders, directing in interpersonal relationships, and weaknesses in corporate communication, rumors, and personal conflicts. However, inadequacies in relation to corporate goals and values, dangerous and abusive behaviors, verbal or physical threats, high-level of absences of the workers; promotion wars, and ignoring others create a toxic organizational climate (Appelbaum &Roy-Girard, 2007; Kusy &Holloway, 2009). When investigations are examined, it seems that organizational toxicity is evaluated in the field of health (Roter, 2011), education (Bolton, 2005; Buehler, 2009; Parish-Duehn, 2008; Peterson &Deal, 2009), defense (Aubrey, 2012; Schmidt, 2008; Steele, 2011), and non-profit organizations (Mueller, 2012).

Organizational toxicity is an annoying process that causes severe and permanent damage to the organizations and its surroundings as a result of the repeated interaction of negative emotions and actions (Frost, 2003; Lipman-Blumen, 2005, Maitlis, 2008). It is therefore important to examine the effects of organizational toxicity on the workers. About 80% of workers in negative work settings report health problems and due to toxic working conditions, one-third of workers have considered changing jobs within the last year and 14 percent have actually changed jobs in the last two years (Bassman, 1992). Cox (2000) claimed that toxic work settings also include organizational problems such as low morale, impaired judgments, absenteeism, communication breakdowns, tardiness, distrust, and turnover. Kiefer &Barclay (2012) examined the effects of organizational toxicity on the individuals in the forms of disclosure (Albrecht, 2006), repetition of negative emotions, and disassociation (Frost, 2003; 2007). Disclosure is the physical and psychological energy that negative emotions create (Kiefer &Barclay, 2012). The individuals feel stressful, anxious, regretful, nervous, exhausted, wounded, worthless, tired, alienated and without motivation (Pelletier, 2009). Negative and bitter feelings destroy the immune system by poisoning the human body (Frost, 2003). Repetition of negative emotions is a condition that brings individual burden, makes someone feel unresponsive and frightened for the possibility of repetition of an unwanted situation (Frost, 2003; Kiefer &Barclay, 2012). In this situation, it is very likely that the individual cannot get rid of his negative feelings in the working environment (Porter- O'Grady, 2009; Pelletier, 2009), is disappointed, feels despair, and frustration in case of experiencing similar negative situations (Porter- O'Grady &Malloch, 2010). Disassociation is a situation when someone becomes distant from his social circle or colleagues. Such an individual loses his willingness to interact with others, does not adapt to social conditions or want to come to work, isolates himself from the working environment and feels lonely (Kiefer &Barclay, 2012).

College professors' personal interests moving ahead of their professional ideology may lead to a toxic environment (Qian &Daniels, 2008; Ramaley, 2002). Toxic behaviors of college instructors include communication problems, disrespectful attitudes, creating groups of like-minded ones, who have negative intentions towards others, and preventing academic promotions of others (Yaman, 2007). Factors such as personal competition among the instructors, not accepting of the success of the colleagues, negative use of administrative duties, and considering negative organizational behaviors as appealing behaviors may lay the groundwork for organizational toxicity. As administrative leaders in higher education are key to how their organizations function (Amey, 2006), they may have strong impacts on creating either a toxic or a non-toxic environment. For some college professors, specialization in a specific field, receiving academic titles, and having administrative duties may facilitate the emergence of conflicts university-wide (Farrington, 2010). Negative environment in higher education can lead to the unqualification of the universities and may damage the mentality of being a college instructor (Celep &Konakli, 2013). It is highly meaningful for organizations to retain and effectively utilize the highest quality workers (Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner 1998). Therefore, it is crucial to understand what a toxic work environment is and what contributes to such settings so that effective measures may be put in place to lessen its negative effects on the individuals and the organization. For these reasons, the need to understand organizational toxicity in organizations such as higher education institutions, its perceived effects, and the strategies for dealing with it necessitate the understanding of organizational toxicity. Therefore, the aim of this research is to identify the college academicians' perceptions on organizational toxicity, the perceived effects of toxicity, and the strategies of coping with organizational toxicity, and the negative attitudes such as jealousy, discouraging other than motivating, preventing other than encouraging, and excluding other than accepting others are exhibited by academicians at higher education due to organizational toxicity.

Studies on organizational toxicity seem fairly new and limited in Turkey. Available research focus on the opinions of elementary (Akduman-Yetim, Koşar, & Ölmez-Ceylan, 2013) and middle school teachers (Çelebi, Yildiz,&Güner, 2013). There is only one study on the organizational toxicity in higher education. This qualitiative study was conducted with only 40 participants (Kasalak &Bilgin-Aksu, 2016). Therefore, it can be said that research about organizational toxicity in Turkish literature is quite new, and studies investigating the toxicity in educational administration and edu-

cational sciences are very few.

Taken together, the current literature suggests need to examine perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and levels of coping with toxicity in higher education institutions of Turkey, from a holistic perspective. As such, the present study sought to determine whether an organization's toxicity have a potential to influence preventions, exclusions, jealousy, and motivation among academicians in higher education. In so doing, it is hoped that the present effort contributes to our understanding of organizational toxicity as a complex process, consisting of inter- actions between academicians and the work environment in higher education.

The goal of this study was to determine the levels of the perceptions of academicians about perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and coping with toxicity in their universities. Therefore the study includes the following research questions for both quantitative and qualitative portions of the study:

Research questions of quantitative portion of the study:

1. Are there any relationships perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and coping with toxicity based on the levels of the perceptions of academicians?
2. Do the levels of perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and coping with toxicity show meaningful differences based on academicians':
   A.   Genders,
   B.   Academic titles,
   C.   Universities and,
   D.   Teaching experiences?

Research questions of qualitative portion of the study:

3. Why do academicians in universities tend to:
   A.   Prevent,
   B.   Be jealous,
   C.   Motivate and,
   D.   Exclude each other?

2. Method

In this study, as a design of mixed method approach, a triangulation design was employed to determine the levels of the perceptions of academicians about perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and coping with toxicity in their universities. In this design, quantitative and qualitative data are collected simultaneously. The main purpose of using triangulation design is to determine whether the data support each other based on the findings of the study (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2008). The focal point of the mixed method is to provide a better understanding of research problems using both quantitative and qualitative approaches together rather than using a single approach (Creswell & Clark, 2007).

The descriptive method was used in the quantitative part of the study. Descriptive methods are conducted on large groups to determine facts, events, and opinions about them. In such approach, the researcher tries to determine the current events in detail and give detailed information about the situation (Karakaya, 2009). As the instrument, Organizational Toxicity Scale (OTS) was used to collect data in the study. In addition, the qualitative part of the research constitutes a phenomenological approach. According to the phenomenological approach, the most important factors shaping an individual's behavior include his perceptions based on the situations related to him or the environment itself (Seggie & Bayyurt, 2015). In this context, it is aimed to define and explain the perceptions of the participants in the study (Annels, 2006). In the qualitative part of the study, it was aimed to explain the situations such as jealousy, motivation decrease, exclusion and prevention, which may cause organizational toxicity among academicians. Therefore, a phenomenological approach including semi-structured questions was adopted in order to enable academicians explain their opinions and perceptions about the phenomenon of organizational toxicity (Creswell, 2007).

Study Group

The participants of this study for both quantitative and qualitative parts included academicians from three state universities in Turkey (Table 1). The term "Academician" is used in this research to represent all faculty members in universities. Academician is a professional title given to individuals, who provide education, conduct research, and

make contribution to literature in higher education. The academicians in this study are research assistants, lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors and full professors. Although the researcher aimed to collect data from one university in each region of Turkey, he was only able to collect data from three universities, each in different region, in order to generalize the study findings. In this case, University A representing Anatolian Region with 105 (51.0%) participants, University B representing Marmara Region with 62 (30.1%) participants, and University C representing Black Sea Region with 39 (18.9%) participants were selected to conduct the study. A total of 206 participants including 116 males (56.3%) and 90 females (43.7%) were selected through non-random selection. The participant included research assistants (60.7%), lecturers (5.3%), assistant professors (22.3%), associate professor (4.9%), and professors (6.8%). In addition, the teaching experience of the participants varied as 1-5 Years (43.7%), 6-10 Years (28.6%), 11-15 Years (10.2%), 16-20 Years (6.3%), and 21 Years and more (11.2%).

Table 1. Frequency and percent distributions of various features of the academicians in the sample

Features		1	2	3	4	5	Total
		Female	Male				
Gender	n	116	90				206
	%	56,3	43,7				100
		Research Assistant	Lecturer	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor	
Academic Title	n	125	11	46	10	14	206
	%	60,7	5,3	22,3	4,9	6,8	100
		University C	University B	University A			
University	n	39	62	105			206
	%	18,9	30,1	51,0			100
		1-5 Years	6-10 Years	11-15 Years	16-20 Years	21 Years and more	
Teaching Experience	n	90	59	21	13	23	206
	%	43,7	28,6	10,2	6,3	11,2	100

Data Collection Tools

Organizational Toxicity Scale (OTS) was used in the quantitative part of the study. The five-point (Never-1 to Always-5) Likert type scale instrument was developed by Kasalak (2015). The instrument included three sub scales: Perceived Organizational Toxicity Scale (POTS) including 16 items, Detected Effects of Toxicity Scale (DETS) including 12 items, and Strategies of Coping with Toxicity Scale (SCTS) including 12 items. Questions on POTS basically determine whether toxicity exists within the organization or not. Some of the sample questions on POTS are "Abusing messages are given in the organization" and "Individuals are forced to take sides between groups". The second factor of the instrument, which is DETS includes questions about the feelings of the workers of the organization. The sample questions are "I feel that I am under stress" and "I feel that my energy is consumed". Lastly, the third factor, which is called SCTS included questions about how the workers in the organization try to overcome problems associated with organizational toxicity. The sample questions are "I try to resist and survive with resistance against toxicity" and "I try to find a way to believe that I am not helpless". The validity and reliability studies of the scale were conducted. The reliability coefficient of α was .93 for POTS, .92 for DETS, and .75 for SCTS. In addition, the researcher of this study pilot tested the instrument and found that the coefficient of α was .89 for overall instrument.

In the qualitative part of the study, the data were collected through a semi-structured interview technique. When collecting data, four open ended questions were added at the end of the quantitative instrument to collect both data simultaneously. The research question was that "Why do academicians in universities tend to prevent, exclude, be jealous and, reduce the level of motivation for each other?" Accordingly, this approach was employed to enable the qualitative data support the quantitative data obtained. The questions which were used in the qualitative dimension were prepared by the researcher. For the internal validity of the instrument, a semi-structured construct form consisting of three questions was presented to four field experts. After making changes and adjustments based on the feedbacks provided by the field experts, the final form of the construct included four questions. Then, a pilot study was conducted with a teacher other than the participants, and then the voice record of this interview was transcribed into writing. Later, an area specialist reviewed the interviews in terms of whether the questions are clear and understandable, whether they cover the topic of the study and provide the necessary information. As a result of making necessary controls over the form, no problems were found and the interview form was finalized. After all these steps were taken, then the qualitative construct was conducted on actual participants.

In order to analyze the *reliability* of the qualitative instrument, the answers provided by the researcher and an expert in the field on the construct were compared. The comparison was conducted according to the *formula* (*reliability* = same opinions / (same opinions + different opinions) proposed by *Miles and* Huberman (*1994*). As a result, the *reliability* of the qualitative instrument was calculated as 93%.

Data Analysis

The analysis of the quantitative part of the study was made in a pattern revealing the effects of organizational toxicity in higher education in terms of perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and the level of coping with toxicity. These effects were examined based on gender, teaching experience, academic title, and university of academicians in higher education. The data was analyzed using SPSS 20.00. For the analysis, first, mean scores of each subscale were determined based on the following calculations: 1.00-1.80 (never), 1.81-2.60 (rarely), 2.61-3.40 (sometimes), 3.41 to 4.20 (often), and 4.21 to 5.00 (always) (Al Fadda & Al Qasim, 2013). Because the data in the study was not normally distributed, non-parametric statistical tests were employed for data analysis. Mann Whitney U test was used to examine the differences between genders, and Kruskal Wallis test was used to detect the differences between teaching experience, academic title, and the type of university. Lastly, Spearman's correlation coefficient, rho was used to determine the association between dependent variables.

Qualitative data was analyzed using content analysis method. The basic process in content analysis is to bring together similar data within the framework of specific concepts and themes and to interpret them in a clear way (Yildirim &Simsek, 2005). Once the qualitative instrument were collected from the participants, the answer on them were organized. After identifying the meaningful data, they were encoded and then draft themes were specified. According to the determined draft themes, the codes were arranged. Then, the data was re-arranged according to the draft themes and codes.

3. Findings

Findings from Quantitative Portion of the Study

The first research question was about the relationships between perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and coping with toxicity based on the levels of the perceptions of academicians. Therefore, table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlations on perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and coping with toxicity.

Table 2. Means, standard deviations, and correlations

Variables	$\bar{X}$	SD	1	2	3
Perceived organizational toxicity	3.96	.70	1.00		
Detected effects of toxicity	3.54	.88	.51**	1.00	
Coping with toxicity	3.24	.55	-.15*	-.08	1.00

**. $p < .01$; *$p < .05$

Table 2 indicates that the participants had a mean score of $\bar{x} = 3.96$ ($SD = .70$) on perceived organizational toxicity, $\bar{x} = 3.54$ ($SD = .88$) on detected effects of toxicity, and $\bar{x} = 3.24$ ($SD = .55$) on coping with toxicity. Based on these results, one may suggest that the effects of organizational toxicity were higher on academicians in higher education than their coping with toxicity. This may mean that some of the academicians were reluctant to challenge with organizational toxicity. In terms of determining the relationships between the dependent variables of the study, Spearman's correlation coefficient, rho was used. The results showed that there were positive and significant correlations between perceived organizational toxicity and detected effects of toxicity (*rho* = .51; *p* <.01). However, there was a negative and a significant correlation between perceived organizational toxicity and coping with toxicity (*rho* = -.15; *p* <.05). These results show that when the perceptions of organizational toxicity increase, it is likely that the effects of toxicity on the participants increase as well. When the academicians' perceptions of organizational toxicity increase, it is likely that they may experience certain obstacles to come up with the strategies of coping with toxicity.

Table 3. Table of Mann Whitney U for gender

Variables	Gender	N	Mean Rank	U	z	p
Perceived organizational toxicity	Female	116	106,05	4924,50	-,69	,48
	Male	90	100,22			
Detected effects of toxicity	Female	116	99,36	4740,00	-1,13	,25
	Male	90	108,83			

Variables	Gender	N	Mean Rank	U	z	p
Coping with toxicity	Female	116	108,72	4614,00	-1,43	,15
	Male	90	96,77			

The levels of perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and coping with toxicity based on academicians' genders were analyzed using Mann Whitney U test (Table 3). The findings indicated that there were no significant differences between male and female participants on perceived organizational toxicity ($U = 4924.50$; $p = .48$; $p > .05$), detected effects of toxicity ($U = 4740.00$; $p = .25$; $p > .05$), and coping with toxicity ($U = 4614.00$; $p = .15$; $p > .05$). It may be said that the levels of perceptions of academicians on perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and coping with toxicity have similar effects on their genders.

Table 4. Table of Kruskal Wallis for academic title

Variables	Academic Title	N	Mean Rank	SD	Chi-Square	p
Perceived organizational toxicity	Research Assistant	125	107.53			
	Lecturer	11	95.41			
	Assistant Professor	46	104.59	.70	3.58	.46
	Associate Professor	10	76.80			
	Professor	14	89.39			
Detected effects of toxicity	Research Assistant	125	97.46			
	Lecturer	11	96.77			
	Assistant Professor	46	116.98	.88	8.86	.06
	Associate Professor	10	81.40			
	Professor	14	134.18			
Coping with toxicity	Research Assistant	125	102.36			
	Lecturer	11	100.41			
	Assistant Professor	46	103.39	.55	.58	.96
	Associate Professor	10	106.05			
	Professor	14	114.68			

Based on the academic title of the participants, the levels of perceptions of academicians on perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and coping with toxicity were analyzed using Kruskal Wallis test (Table 4). The results showed that there were no significant differences between them on perceived organizational toxicity ($\chi^2 = 3.58$; $p = .46$; $p > .05$), detected effects of toxicity ($\chi^2 = 8.86$; $p = .06$; $p > .05$), and coping with toxicity ($\chi^2 = .58$; $p = .96$; $p > .05$). The findings suggest that regardless of academic titles, the levels of perceptions of academicians on organizational toxicity show similar results.

Table 5. Table of Kruskal Wallis for type of university

Variables	University	N	Mean Rank	SD	Chi-Square	p
Perceived organizational toxicity	University A	39	90.22			
	University B	62	87.26	.70	12.79	.00
	University C	105	118.02			
Detected effects of toxicity	University A	39	96.54			
	University B	62	102.31	.88	.87	.64
	University C	105	106.79			
Coping with toxicity	University A	39	120.54			
	University B	62	92.00	.55	5.51	.06
	University C	105	103.96			

The levels of perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and coping with toxicity based on academicians' universities were analyzed using Kruskal Wallis test (Table 5). The findings showed that there were significant differences between them on perceived organizational toxicity ($\chi^2 = 12.79$; $p = .00$; $p < .05$), favoring University C. However there were not any significant differences between the participants on detected effects of toxicity ($\chi^2 = .87$; $p = .64$; $p > .05$) and coping with toxicity ($\chi^2 = 5.51$; $p = .06$; $p > .05$). Based on these results, one may say that among all three universities, the perceptions on organizational toxicity are the highest in University C compared to University A and University B. It seems that these perceptions are similar for both University A and University B.

Table 6. Table of Kruskal Wallis for teaching experience

Variables	Teaching Experience	N	Mean Rank	SD	Chi-Square	p
Perceived organizational toxicity	1-5 Years	90	111.10			
	6-10 Years	59	104.46			
	11-15 Years	21	82.14	.70	5.51	.23
	16-20 Years	13	84.62			
	21 Years and more	23	101.48			
Detected effects of toxicity	1-5 Years	90	106.78			
	6-10 Years	59	89.22			
	11-15 Years	21	103.31	.88	6.21	.18
	16-20 Years	13	124.38			
	21 Years and more	23	115.65			
Coping with toxicity	1-5 Years	90	98.90			
	6-10 Years	59	108.03			
	11-15 Years	21	102.52	.55	4.15	.38
	16-20 Years	13	131.19			
	21 Years and more	23	95.13			

A Kruskal Wallis test was used to also analyze the levels of perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and coping with toxicity based on academicians' teaching experience (Table 6). The results showed that there were no significant differences between them on perceived organizational toxicity ($\chi^2 = 5.51$; $p = .23$; $p > .05$), detected effects of toxicity ($\chi^2 = 6.21$; $p = .18$; $p > .05$), and coping with toxicity ($\chi^2 = 4.15$; $p = .38$; $p > .05$). Based on such results, it may be said that academicians with all types of teaching experiences had similar perceptions of organizational toxicity.

Findings from Qualitative Portion of the Study

This part of the study includes answers of four qualitative questions such as why academicians in universities tend to prevent, exclude, be jealous and, reduce the level of motivation for each other. The answers provided from academicians were coded and explained in the fashion of frequencies and percentages so that the effects of organizational toxicity on academicians may be expressed according to their importance.

The first question of qualitative portion of the study was "Why do academicians in universities tend to prevent each other?" In Table 7, the frequency values for reasons behind why academicians in the universities are being prevented are given. These reasons are examined within three dimensions: Individuals thinking that they are being prevented (f = 41), individuals thinking that they are not being prevented (f = 144), and individuals thinking that they are rarely being prevented (f = 9).

Table 7. Answers given on the question: Why do academicians in universities tend to prevent one another?

Reasons behind why employees in the organization are being prevented	f	Percentage
1. Individuals thinking that they are being prevented	41	19,9
1.1. Power related reasons		
1.1.1. Administrative power holders	5	2,4
1.1.2. Academic power holders	2	<1,0
1.2. Personal reasons		
1.2.1. Personal interests	13	6,3
1.2.2. Failures	7	3,3
1.3. Organization based reasons	7	3,3
1.4. Ideological differences	4	1,9
2. Individuals thinking that they are not being prevented	144	69,9
2.1. Same criteria for all	12	5,8
2.2. Solidarity	3	1,4
3. Individuals thinking that they are rarely being prevented	9	4,3
3.1. Personal reasons	4	1,9
3.2. Power related reasons	1	<1,0

The reasons for individuals thinking that they are being prevented are being examined in four dimensions: Power

related reasons, personal reasons, and organization based reasons (f = 7), and ideological differences (f = 4). Power related reasons included two dimensions as administrative power holders (f = 5) and academic power holders (f = 2). In addition, personal reasons included two dimensions as personal interests (f = 13) and failures (f = 7).

The reasons behind why academicians think that they were being prevented at their university were examined based on their explanations. As a category of the power related reasons, for individuals holding administrative power, a participant, AC-81 (Academician-81) said that: *"While the administrators favor their favorite people, those who have power because of their titles do their work according to their own beliefs"*. For the same reason, AC-82 asserted that: *"Administrators holding power behave unjustly and for his own desires, and don't act according to rules"*. As another category of the power related reasons, for academic power holders, AC-130 expressed that: *"My advisor wanted to use my project budget but, I didn't let this happen. Later, he became confrontational and some of his behaviors included mobbing, which caused me to experience stress and not to fight for my own rights"*. In addition, as a category of personal reasons, for personal interests, AC-134 asserted that: *"After incentives were received based on the academic performances, academicians with higher titles have begun to narrow down project applications for us";* and under the same category, AC-148 mentioned that: *"Our university professors are very selfish, as they tend to act according to their own interests. The number of professors who consider the well-being of students and research assistants is very small (10%)"*. As a category of personal reasons, for personal failures, AC-36 pointed out that: *"The feelings of intolerance, unhappy lives, and failures of academicians make them to employ some jealous behaviors towards others"*. Some of the participants also claimed that they were prevented to effectively do their work be promoted due to organization based reasons and ideological differences. Based on the reasons related to the organization, AC-152 stressed that: *"Because of the academically competitive environment, every academician tries to be visible to others by preventing their colleagues in the competition"*. Based on the reasons related to ideological differences, AC-72 explained that: *"Having a different ideology caused my exclusion by others"*.

Individuals, who were thinking they were not being prevented, were examined in two dimensions: Same criteria for all (f = 12) and solidarity (f = 3). Reasons for those who thought that academicians were not prevented were examined on two categories: Same criteria for all and solidarity. For the reasons associated with same criteria for all, AC-113 expressed that: *"Promotion criteria are clear for everyone. Regardless of negative behaviors of people surrounding you, if you own any of those criteria, then you would get promoted"*. And AC-33 emphasized that: *"According to the YOK's (Council of Higher Education) criteria of appointment, the conditions of assignments are fixed. Everyone who finishes his doctorate is assigned according to his / her waiting status and academic work done"*. In addition, based on the reasons related to solidarity, AC-100 claimed that: *"I do not think I'm excluded, especially as a division, we are in great solidarity"*.

Faculty members, who thought that they were rarely being prevented, were being examined in two dimensions: Personal reasons (f = 4) and power related reasons (f = 1). Some of the academicians suggested personal reasons and power related reasons behind why individuals thinking that they were rarely being prevented. As for personal reasons, AC-34 pointed out that: *"I have not witnessed an act of prevention in the past, but sometimes I think that they are trying to prevent me from working by verbally keeping me busy"*. And for power related reasons, AC-87 asserted that: *"In some cases, being assigned to any work by the college administration limits my ability to effectively get my own work completed"*.

Table 8. Answers given on the question: Why do academicians in universities tend to be jealous of each other?

Reasons behind why employees in the organization are being jealous of each other	f	Percentage
1. Feeling jealousy from other employees	97	47,0
1.1. Occupational requirements	15	7,2
1.2. Academic performance	12	5,8
1.3. Personal interests	46	22,3
1.4. Personal characteristics	19	9,2
1.5. Observed situations	2	<1,0
2. Not feeling jealousy from other employees	64	31,0
2.1. Criteria being the same for all	3	1,4
2.2. Everyone focusing on their own business	3	1,4
3. Rarely feeling jealousy from other employees	35	16,9
3.1. Personal characteristics	5	2,4
3.2. Organization based reasons	3	1,4

Reasons behind why employees in the organization are being jealous of each other	f	Percentage
3.3. Personal interests	2	<1,0
4. Having no idea on whether others are being jealous	1	<1,0

The second question of qualitative portion of the study was "Why do academicians in universities tend to be jealous each other?" In Table 8, the frequency values for reasons behind why academicians in the universities are being jealous of each other are given. These reasons are examined within four dimensions: Feeling jealousy from other employees (f = 97), not feeling jealousy from other employees (f = 64), rarely feeling jealousy from other employees (f = 35), and having no idea on whether others are being jealous (f = 1).

The reasons for individuals thinking that they are being jealous of each other are being examined in five dimensions: Occupational requirements (f = 15), academic performance (f = 12), personal interests (f = 46), personal characteristics (f = 19), and observed situations (f = 2). The reasons behind why academicians think that they were feeling jealousy at their university were examined based on their explanations. Participants mentioned different reasons on this topic. One of the participants, AC-122, thought that this issue was related to occupational requirements and said that: *"There is a seriously competitive and a tense environment, and everyone is in a race with one another"*. AC-34 suggested that the problem was associated with academic performance and stressed that: *"I think that others are getting jealous of my academic work"*. For the same reason AC-200 suggested that: *"There is jealousy due to academic achievements, projects, administrative and managerial positions"*. However, a participant, AC-27, claimed that the issue is because of personal interests and explained that: *"Gossip is being made to even newcomers about some college professors, and courses are distributed for the interests of individuals"*. For the same category, AC-205 asserted that: *"I did not encounter such a situation among the research staff, but I think that there is jealousy between academic staff, due to academic and personal reasons"*. Some of the academicians thought that why people are jealous of each other depends on personal characteristics. For this matter, AC-13 pointed out that: *"Some academicians working in our institution exhibit jealous behavior due to their personal characteristics"*. On the other hand, based on his observations, AC-185 suggested that *"I observed that some groups have experienced jealousy based on their academic promotion"*.

Individuals thinking that they were not being jealous of each other were being examined in two dimensions: Criteria being the same for all (f = 3) and everyone focusing on their own business (f = 3). Among those who thought that criteria were the same for all academicians and that none of them were jealous of each other, AC-26 said that: *"I do not think anybody is jealous of me because the conditions provided here are fair for everyone"*. On contrary, some of the academic staff claimed that none of them were jealous each other, and confirming this, AC-114 emphasized that: *"No, I do not think anyone is jealous of me. Everyone is focused on their own business, so the people compete with themselves and therefore, the problem is gone"*.

The reasons for individuals thinking that they were rarely being jealous of each other were being examined in three dimensions: Personal characteristics (f = 5), organization based reasons (f = 3), and personal interests (f = 2). Academicians had different ideas on why they thought that people were jealous of each other. One of the participants, AC-171, contended that the reason was due to personal characteristics and stressed that: *"In rare moments, I think people are jealous of me because of their personal characteristics or materialistic reasons"*. AC-48 suggested that the reason was associated to organization based reasons, and asserted that: *"I am not sure whether it is due to the atmosphere of this environment or not, sometimes we experience the circumstances of jealousy among the people"*. Lastly, AC-105 claimed that it was because of personal interests and said that: *"Partly because of professional ambitions and personal interests, there is jealousy among the people here"*.

Table 9. Answers given on the question: Why do academicians tend to motivate each other in their universities?

Reasons behind how employees in the university are being motivated	f	Percentage
1. Individuals thinking that they are being motivated	86	41,7
1.1. Receiving positive verbal responses	30	14,5
1.2. Academic support and incentives	26	12,6
1.3. Effective communication	8	3,8
1.4. Transfer of experiences	6	2,9
1.5. Physical adjustments	6	2,9
2. Individuals thinking that they are not being motivated	71	34,4
2.1. Inadequate support		

Reasons behind how employees in the university are being motivated	f	Percentage
2.1.1. Self-motivation	6	2,9
2.1.2. Being motivated by advisor	2	<1,0
2.2. Ignoring the work	5	2,4
2.3. Drudgery	3	1,4
2.4. Inadequate incentives	3	1,4
3. Individuals thinking that they are rarely being motivated	29	14,0
3.1. Receiving positive verbal responses	14	6,7
3.2. Same criteria for all	3	1,4
4. Having no idea on whether being motivated by others	14	6,7
4.1. Self-motivation	6	2,9

The third question of qualitative portion of the study was "Why do academicians tend to motivate each other in their universities?" In Table 9, the frequency values for reasons behind how academicians in the universities are being motivated are given. These reasons are examined within four dimensions: Individuals thinking that they are being motivated (f = 86), individuals thinking that they are not being motivated (f = 71), individuals thinking that they are rarely being motivated (f = 29), and having no idea on whether individuals are being motivated by others (f = 14).

Faculty members, who thought they were being motivated were examined in five dimensions: Receiving positive verbal responses (f = 30), academic support and incentives (f = 26), effective communication (f = 8), transfer of experiences (f = 6), and physical adjustments (f = 6). The reasons behind why academicians thought that they were being motivated at their university were examined based on their explanations. For the category of receiving positive verbal responses, a participant, AC-8 pointed out that: *"Being verbally appreciated by our administrators, such as the wishes to my success, increases my motivation"*. For the same category, AC-9 mentioned that: *"Conducting positive conversations with other academicians at my institution have a great influence on my motivation"*. Among the staff, who thought being motivated by others was originated from academic support and incentives, AC-28 explained that: *"Having my papers published in SSCI and SCI indexed journals and receiving thanks accordingly from the academic committee of my university motivate me"*. AC-106 pointed out the reasons in terms of effective communication as: *"I noticed that things developed over time for me. At the beginning, I could not even be aware of the activities or approaches that might motivate me, but as the time passed, establishing strong communication bonds with the others turned itself into a motivating form"*. And AC-62 explained that the reasons had a connection with the transfer of experiences as: *"The sharing of information and experiences by experienced professors has a motivating impact on me"*. Lastly, AC-5 suggested that physical adjustments diminished the feeling of jealousy as: *"It is extremely motivating for us when the office of the dean make time and space adjustments so that we can improve ourselves in an academic sense"*.

The reasons for individuals thinking that they are not being motivated are being examined in four dimensions: Inadequate support, ignoring the work (f = 5), drudgery (f = 3), and inadequate incentives (f = 3). In addition, Inadequate support included two dimensions as self-motivation (f = 6) and being motivated by advisor (f = 2). The reasons behind why academicians did not think that they were being motivated at their university were examined based on their explanations. As a sub-factor of inadequate support, for self-motivation, AC-27 mentioned that: *"I do not think that I am being motivated by others. My self-motivation and my work are sufficient for me as an element of motivation"*. As another sub-factor of inadequate support, for being motivated by advisor, AC-52 asserted that: *"I think that I am motivated to do something only by my academic advisor when I think of the university that I work with"*. For the category of ignoring the work, AC-58 pointed out that: *"The department that I work with does not really care about educational improvements in the world thus no one is encouraged to motivate another one"*. Another participant, AC-23 explained the reasons why people were not being motivated by others due to drudgery as: *"I do not think I'm motivated a lot. In some cases, help is needed in non-academic matters"*. Lastly, a participant, AC-16 mentioned the reasons in terms of inadequate incentives as: *"No, I often think that I have not been motivated. In addition, incentives for academic studies are inadequate both materially and spiritually"*.

Academicians at universities, who thought they were rarely being motivated, were examined in two dimensions: Receiving positive verbal responses (f = 14) and same criteria for all (f = 3). Based on the participants' explanations, the reasons behind why academicians did not rarely think that they were being motivated at their university were examined. AC-34 explained that the reasons were related to receiving positive verbal responses from others as: *"There are times when I have been motivated verbally by some academicians"*. In addition, AC-90 explained the reasons in terms of the same criteria for all as: *"I have been motivated by others very little. After all, the conditions are the same for everyone,*

I believe that our own efforts for motivation are important".

The reasons for individuals having no idea that whether they are being motivated are being examined in one dimension: Self-motivation (f = 6). One of the participants, AC-81 explained that such reasons were due to self-motivation as: *"I am not so sure whether my colleagues are motivated by others, however, I believe that I am self-motivated by my sincere determination and personality".*

Table 10. Answers given on the question: Why do academicians in universities tend to exclude each other?

Reasons behind how instructors in the university are being excluded	f	Percentage
1. Individuals thinking that they are being excluded	38	18,4
1.1. Being on a temporary contract	12	5,8
1.2. Exhibiting unethical behavior	8	3,8
1.3. Relationships	3	1,4
1.4. Personal characteristics	3	1,4
1.5. Ethnic identities	2	<1,0
2. Individuals thinking that they are not being excluded	142	68,9
2.1. Relationships	8	3,8
2.2. Having respect from everyone	3	1,4
3 Individuals thinking that they are rarely being excluded	15	7,2
3.1. Groupings	5	2,4
3.2. Having different choices	3	1,4
4. Having no idea on whether being excluded by others	2	<1,0

The fourth question of qualitative portion of the study was "Why do academicians tend to exclude each other in their universities?" In Table 10, the frequency values for reasons behind why academicians in the universities are being excluded are given. These reasons are examined within four dimensions: Individuals thinking that they are being excluded (f = 38), individuals thinking that they are not being excluded (f = 142), individuals thinking that they are rarely being excluded (f = 15), and having no idea on whether individuals are being excluded by others (f = 2).

Faculty members thinking that they are being excluded are examined in five dimensions: Being on a temporary contract (f = 12), exhibiting unethical behavior (f = 8), relationships (f = 3), personal characteristics (f = 3), and ethnic identities (f = 2). The reasons behind why academicians think that they were being excluded at their university were examined based on their explanations. AC-134 explained the reasons in terms of being on a temporary contract as: *"As OYP (Academic Staff Training Program) members, we are not seen as academic staff in our department. We work in the form of "classroom assistants" and are treated as unskilled researchers".* And AC-27 explained that the reasons had some associations with exhibiting unethical behavior as: *"As my university does not value the competence of academicians, there are examples of exclusions and unprincipled behaviors".* AC-29 pointed out that the reasons were because of relationships as: *"I think I'm excluded because of the relationships I have established in my university. When different professors see me talking to people they do not like, they have start acting cold towards me".* In addition, AC-13 mentioned the reasons in terms of personal characteristics as: *"I think that I am excluded by others because of my personal characteristics".* Another participant, AC-192 emphasized that the reasons were related to ethnic identities as: *"I get the feeling that I am not accepted because of my ethnic identity and that others are jealous of me because of my academic successes".*

The reasons for individuals thinking that they are not being excluded in two dimensions: Relationships (f = 8) and having respect from everyone (f = 3).The answers provided on the reasons behind why academicians thought that they were not being excluded at their university were examined. For the category of relationships, AC-36 pointed out that: *"I have never been excluded and always tried to express myself honestly and clearly in the relationships that I have established. I'm sincere. I invested in sincerity and friendship. When I have a problem, I receive the support of all people".* And for the category of having respect from everyone, AC-43 said that: *"Since everyone respects each other in my department, there are no examples of exclusions".*

Individuals thinking that they are rarely being excluded are being examined in two dimensions: Groupings (f = 5) and having different choices (f = 3). The answers provided on the reasons behind why academicians thought that they were rarely being excluded at their university were examined. One of the participants, AC-34 asserted that the reasons were due to groupings as: *"Because of my friendship choices, I feel like I'm being excluded by some people, and that sometimes I can see this happen".* In addition, AC-59 explained the reasons in terms of having different choices as: *"As*

I have different choices and personal characteristics, I feel that I have been ignored or excluded in some cases at my university".

4. Discussion and Conclusion

This study included a mixed method approach and aimed to determine the levels of the perceptions of academicians about perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and coping with toxicity in their universities. Based on the results, mean scores for the levels of perceived organizational toxicity and detected effects of toxicity were considered to be "often", and for coping with toxicity was "sometimes". These means that although academicians frequently feel the effects of organizational toxicity in their universities they may have fear of losing their jobs, fear of not being promoted, stress, anxiety, and being confrontational with their superiors to challenge with toxicity. The effects of toxicity may result from superiors with dysfunctional personality (Leymann, 1992; Pelletier, 2009) meaning that their toxic behaviors of superiors may create traumas, crises, and fears among workers in the organization (Carlock, 2013, Frost, 2003, Lipman-Blumen, 2005, Musacco, 2009). In addition, there were positive and significant relationship between perceived organizational toxicity and detected effects of toxicity, but there was a negative and a significant relationship between perceived organizational toxicity and coping with toxicity. These findings indicate that when the effects of organizational toxicity increase, it is likely that the academicians' may experience certain obstacles to come up with some strategies of coping with toxicity. It is likely that during the presence of organizational toxicity, academicians experience some type of drawbacks in order to cope with toxicity in higher education. The reasons for drawbacks include but are not limited to behaviors of hoaxing, backbiting, jealousy, insulting, and unfairly increased workloads by their leaders in the organization (Frost, 2003; Lipman-Blumen, 2005; Lubit, 2004).

When the perceptions of academicians on organizational toxicity were analyzed based on their genders, the findings suggested that both male and female participants had similar perceptions and that they exhibited similar behaviors of coping in such situations. Experiencing similar toxic behaviors of others in the universities does not mean that male and female academicians have organizational toxicity-free working environments. Research suggests that one of the determinants of toxicity in the workplace include negative comments about genders (Kusy & Holloway, 2009).

The perceptions of academicians on organizational toxicity were analyzed based on their academic titles and the results showed that regardless of their academic titles, their levels of perceptions were similar. In addition, they have similar reactions of coping with toxicity in their universities. It may be said that no matter what type of academic title academicians have, they all experience almost the same perceptions of organizational toxicity and that they employ similar behaviors to cope with toxicity. These findings are parallel with the findings of Farrington (2010) as receiving academic titles or having administrative duties may facilitate the emergence of conflicts resulting in a toxic environment university-wide.

The perceptions of academicians on organizational toxicity based on their universities showed that the perceptions on organizational toxicity were the highest in University C compared to other universities. These results imply that the level of toxicity may differ in different organizations due to variety of circumstances. In some organizations the numbers of members causing toxicity may be higher than the other ones. Research suggests that these members are tend to be unethical (Lubit, 2004; Schmidt, 2008), and exhibit aggressive and strict behaviors towards others (Carlock, 2013; Lubit, 2004; Riley, Hatfield, Nicely, Keller-Glaze, &Steele, 2011). Having colleagues with such behaviors would eventually create negative working conditions in higher education, damage the mentality of being an academician at the university, and lead to the unqualification of the universities (Celep & Konakli, 2013; Whitener et al., 1998).

The perceptions of academicians on organizational toxicity based on their teaching experiences were analyzed. The results indicated that teaching experience was not a definitive indicator in terms of determining the levels of perceived organizational toxicity, detected effects of toxicity, and coping with toxicity. One may suggest that every academician has a potential of experiencing organizational toxicity from colleagues or administration no matter how many years he/she has been in teaching profession in higher education. They may experience organizational toxicity in the fashion of being humiliated and seen worthless and selfish by others (Lubit, 2004; Twenge &Campbell, 2010). Supporting these findings Frost (2003) found that toxic individuals were those, who exhibit behaviors that are contrary to rules and regulations in their organizations. They are inclined to undermine the ability of their colleagues in order to optimize their personal interests (Hosmer, 2007).

The results of the qualitative part of the current study support these findings as current study's results show that most of the academicians agree that they have experienced the toxic behaviors such as jealousy from others in their depart-

ments. Parallel to these findings, research claims that toxic behaviors of individuals may be abusive (Tepper, 2000), tyrannical (Ashforth, 1994), destructive (Einarsen, Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007), bullying (Namie & Namie, 2000; Rayner & Cooper, 1997), ineffective and unethical (Kellerman, 2004), and hostile (Tepper, 2000). However, the qualitative part of the current study also show that most of the academicians are not prevented or excluded by their colleagues. In addition, they even think that they are being motivated by their colleagues and superiors. In contrast to these findings, Appelbaum and Roy-Girard (2007) and Kusy and Holloway (2009) found that behaviors of discouragement, verbal or physical threats, ignorance, and promotion wars are prevalent in organizations.

When confronted with a toxic leader or a colleague in an organization, workers may reciprocate in a negative way, such as engaging in gossiping behavior due to being intimidated, humiliated, ridiculed, or being yelled at. In the event of encountering with a toxic leader, friend, or an organization, employees not only feel less connected to their leaders and colleagues but also feel less connected to their organization and their job. They may even react to such toxic conditions by engaging in supervisor-directed or colleague-directed deviance in order to harm them. Today's leaders in higher education need to guide their institutions into the future while providing the authentic insights that come from critical reflection about and deep understanding of organizational culture and values, which may able to create a toxic-free working environment. The presence of leaders with no toxic behaviors may be available through professional development activities, collaboration.

Organizational toxicity was determined according to the perceptions of the academicians at three different state universities in this research. In the future, the numbers of the participants may be increased and research may be conducted at both state and private universities instead of just the state ones. Even though organizational toxicity may be perceived differently according to the individual's attitude, emotional state, behavior and personality, such concepts were ignored in this research. For such reasons, the relationships between variables such as organizational toxicity and personality or emotional states of individuals can be examined in future studies. In addition, the current study took the effects of toxicity into account on individual level rather than on organizational level. For that matter, conducting research on the effects of toxicity on organizational level will contribute to filling the related gap in the literature.

This research includes some limitations. First, nonparametric tests with a statistical power weaker than parametric tests were used because the data obtained in the study did not show a normal distribution. Secondly, although there were seven regions in Turkey, the data was collected from universities located in three different regions. Finally, when all types of academicians in universities were considered, the majority of the participants of this study included research assistants, which constitutes another limiting factor for research.

5. References

Akduman-Yetim, S., Koşar, D. &, Ölmez-Ceylan, Ö. (2013). İlkokul öğretmenlerinin toksik liderlik ile ilgili görüşleri. *VIII. Ulusal Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi* (s.134-135). İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi.

Albrecht, K. (2006). Sosyal zeka: Başarının yeni bilimi (*Çeviren: Selda Göktan). İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları*.

Amey, M. (2006). Resource Review: Leadership in Higher Education. *Change, 38*(6), 55-58.

Al Fadda, H., & Al Qasim, N. (2013). From call to mall: The effectiveness of podcast on EFL higher education students' listening comprehension. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(9), 30.

Appelbaum, S.H., & Roy-Girard, D. (2007). Toxins in the workplace: Effect on organizations and employees, *Corporate Governance.7* (1), 17-28.

Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. Human Relations, 47(7), 755–778.

Aubrey, D.W. (2012). The effect of toxic leadership. *Strategy Research Project*, United States Army War College. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/e%C4%9Fitim%20f/Downloads/ADA560645.pdf

Bassman, E. S. (1992). *Abuse in the workplace*. Westport, CT: Quorum.

Bergman, J., Westerman, J., & Daly, J. (2010). Narcissism in management education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 9*(1), 119-131.

Bolton, S. (2005). *Emotion management in the workplace.* Lancaster: Palgrave Macmillan.

Buehler, J. L. (2009). *Words matter: The role of discourse in creating, sustaining and changing school culture* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Michigan, ABD.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2008). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Carlock, D.H. (2013). *Beyond bullying: A holistic exploration of the organizational toxicity phenomenon* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Pepperdine University Graduate School of Education and Psychology, ABD.

Çelebi, N.,Yıldız, V., & Güner, H. (2013). İlköğretim birinci ve ikinci kademe öğretmenlerinin toksik liderlik algıları. *VIII. Ulusal Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi.* 8 (s.145-147). İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi.

Celep, C., & Konakli, T. (2013). Mobbing experiences of instructors: Causes, results, and solution suggestions. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *13*(1), 193-199.

Clarke, L. (1999). *Mission improbable: Using fantasy documents to tame disaster*. University of Chicago Press.

Cox, T. (2000). Organizational healthiness, work-related stress and employee health. Pp. 173–90 in *Coping, Health, and Organizations*, edited by P. Dewe, M. Leiter, and T. Cox. New York: Taylor and Francis.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: choosing among five approaches*. Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA.

Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2007). Designing and conducting mixed methods research. University of Nebraska.

Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behavior: A definition and conceptual model. The Leadership Quarterly, 18, 207–216.

Farrington, E. L. (2010). Bullying on campus: How to identify, prevent, resolve it. *Women in Higher Education*, *19* (3), 8-9.

Frost, P. J. (2003). Emotions in the workplace and the important role of toxin handlers, *Ivey Business Journal,* 1-6.

Goldman, A. (2008). Consultant and critics on the couch. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *17*(3), 243-249.

Hançerlioğlu, O. (2000). *Felsefe ansiklopedisi: Kavramlar ve akımlar cilt 1 (A-D)*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Hochschild, A. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hosmer, L. T. (2007). The Ethics of Management (6th Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kapferer, B. (1972). *Strategy and transaction in an African factory: African workers and Indian management in a Zambian town*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University.

Karakaya, İ. (2009). Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri (Editör: A.Tanrıöğen). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Kasalak, G. (2015). *Organizational toxicity at higher education: Its sources, effects and coping strategies* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Akdeniz University, Turkey.

Kasalak, G., & Bilgin-Aksu, M. (2016). How do organizations ıntoxicate? Faculty's perceptions on organizational toxicity at university. *Hacettepe* Üniversitesi *Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education) 31*(4), 676-694.

Kellerman, B. (2004). Bad leadership: What it is, how it happens, why it matters. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Kiefer, T., & Barclay, L.J. (2012). Understanding the mediating role of toxic emotional experiences in the relationship between negative emotions and adverse outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85, 600–625.

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

Lambert, S.J. (1991). The combined effects of job and family characteristics on the job staistaction, job ınvolvement and ıntrinsic motivation of men and women workers. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, *12* (4), 341-363.

Lawler, E. J., Thye, S. R., & Yoon, J. (2000). Emotion and group cohesion in productive exchange 1. *American Journal of Sociology*, *106*(3), 616-657.

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, . (1988). The impact of interpersonal environment on burnout and organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 9*(4), 297–308.

Leymann, H., & Gustaffson, A. (1996). Mobbing at work and the development of post traumatic stres disorders. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5*(2), 251-275.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). The allure of toxic leaders: Why followers rarely escape their clutches. *Ivey Business Journal*, *69*(3), 1-40.

Lubit, R. H. (2004). The tyranny of toxic managers: Applying emotional intelligence to deal with difficult personalities. *Ivey Business Journal*, *68*(4), 1-7.

Maitlis, S. (2008). *Organizational toxicity*. S. Clegg ve J. Bailey (Editors). International Encyclopaedia of Organization Studies, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook. *Beverly Hills: Sage Publications*.

Mueller, R. A. (2012). *Leadership in the U.S. Army: A qualitative exploratory case study of the effects toxic leadership has on the morale and welfare of soldiers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Capella Unıversıty, USA.

Musacco, S. D. (2009). *Beyond going postal: Shifting from workplace tragedies and toxic work environments to a safe and healthy organization*. Charleston, SC: Booksurge.

Namie, G., & Namie, T. (2000). *The bully at work: What you can do to stop the hurt and reclaim the dignity on the job*. Naperville: Sourcebooks, Inc.

O'Leary-Kelly, A., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. 1996. Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework. *The Academy of Management Review*, *21*(1), 225-253.

Parish-Duehn, S.L. (2008). *Purposeful cultural changes at an alternative high school: A case study.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Washington State University, USA.

Parker, M. (2005). Organizational gothic. *Culture and Organization*, *11*(3), 153-166.

Pearlin, L. I. (1989). The sociological study of stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 30*(3), 241–56.

Pelletier, K. L. (2009). *The effects of favored status and identification with victim on perceptions of and reactions to leader toxicity* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Claremont Graduate University, USA.

Peterson, K.D., & Deal, T.E. (2009). *The shaping school culture field book*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Porter-O'Grady, T., & Malloch, K. (2010). *Quantum leadership: A resource for health care innovation*. Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett.

Qian, Y., & Daniels, T.D. (2008). A communication model of employee cynicism toward organizational change. *Corporate Communication: An International Journal, 13* (3), 319-332.

Ramaley, J. A. (2002). New truths and old verities. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 119, 15-22.

Rayner, C., & Cooper, C. (1997). Workplace bullying: myth or reality—Can we afford to ignore it? *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 18*(4), 211–214.

Riley R., Hatfield, J., Nicely, K., Keller-Glaze, H., & Steele J.P. (2011). *2010 center for army leadership annual survey of army leadership (CASAL): Main findings.* ICF International Inc Fairfax VA.

Roter, A. B. (2011). *The lived experiences of registered nurses exposed to toxic leadership behaviors* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Capella Unıversıty.

Schmidt, A.A. (2008). *Development and valıdatıon of the toxıc leadershıp scale*. (Unpublished master's thesis), University of Maryland College Park, USA.

Seggie, F. N., & Bayyurt, Y. (2015). *Nitel araştırma yöntemlerine giriş. Nitel araştırma yöntem, teknik, analiz ve yaklaşımları içinde (10-22).* Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Steele, J.P. (2011). Antecedents and consequences of toxic Leadership in the U. S. Army: A two year review and recommended solutions. *Center for Army Leadership Annual Survey of Army Leadership (CASAL).* Technical Report. Retrieved from http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a545383.pdf

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, *33*(47), 74.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(2), 178–190.

Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W., K. (2010). *Asrın vebası: Narsisizm illeti*. (Çev. Ö. Korkmaz). İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları.

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

Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of management review*, *23*(3), 513-530.

Yaman, E. (2007). *Üniversitelerde bir eğitim yönetimi sorunu olarak öğretim elemanının maruz kaldığı informal cezalar: Nitel bir araştırma*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Yildirim, A., & Şimşek, H. (2005). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.