

Principals' Toxic Leadership Behaviour and Teachers' Workplace Incivility in Public Senior Secondary Schools, Lagos State, Nigeria

Nurudeen Olalekan Orunbon* & Ganiyu Abiona Ibikunle

Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, Lagos State University, Ojo, Nigeria

Abstract

This paper examines the connection between toxic leadership and workplace incivility among teachers in the selected public senior secondary schools in Lagos, Nigeria. Using the stratified sampling technique, 1,274 respondents consisting of 98 principals, 196 vice-principals, and 980 teachers were selected from a total population of 20,243. A structured questionnaire was used to collect quantitative data. The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 24.0 was used to analyse quantitative data, and the Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was used to test the hypotheses with the results shows that toxic leadership behaviour had a negative and non-significant correlation with teachers' hostility in Lagos State senior secondary ($r = -0.029, >0.05$), and toxic leadership behaviour showed no significant correlation with teachers' withdrawal behaviour ($r = 0.025, >0.05$). The paper concludes that toxic leadership accounts for the derogatory treatment meted on teachers at work on Lagos State's public senior secondary schools; and recommend the need for the Lagos State Education Districts to replace toxic leaders in schools with contemporary leadership styles that encourage team work and collaboration among teachers and allow participation in the process of decision-making.

Keywords: Senior secondary, toxic leadership, workplace incivility.

1. Introduction

The success or failure of any organisation, including schools is significantly influenced by the leadership. Within the organisation, workers cooperate with one another to accomplish the objectives that organisations aim to accomplish via leaders' guidance. This interaction between the leader and workers aims to produce outcomes that are satisfying. In order to establish collaboration in businesses generally and educational institutions specifically, it is crucial for managers to possess leadership characteristics since these traits have a significant influence on workers' creativity, growth, and personality.

With the shifting requirements and expectations of managers and workers, it has been found that emotional states like sadness, rage, and anxiety rise in the workplace. Teachers and school administrators react to the rude conduct they see in various ways. Incivility at work has a detrimental impact on people's devotion to their jobs and to their institutions, and it may cause people to leave their jobs, have health issues, or even have bad impacts on their families.

It was never considered that bad outcomes brought on by abusive executives may also affect the organisation. On the other side, we may see various leadership styles that negatively affect workers and the workplace, particularly toxic leadership, which is a prevalent reality that one can discover in many businesses today. Researchers have used a variety of words to characterize this, including destructive, dictatorial, abusive, dark, and poisonous. Although the term is different, it refers to the same phenomenon that happens in certain companies, which may consume physical and psychological resources to follow and therefore impact followers' perceptions, attitudes, and actions and even prompt them to engage in abusive conduct. Even if it is the least detrimental kind of conduct, it may nevertheless result in conflict and aggressive or negative attitudes, which in turn cause people to feel emotionally, exhausted and stressed, which limits their ability to be motivated and productive. Therefore, failing to address such behaviours

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: orunbon.no@gmail.com

might result in significant harm, which would ultimately result in costs and repercussions that would touch every component of the organisation.

It is on this premise that, the researcher wants to explore the current research to determine the level of availability of any of the research variables and investigate the nature of the relationship between toxic leadership and Workplace incivility by applying it to one of the Education District in Lagos State, Nigeria.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The school setting observed the presence of a climate full of demands and difficulties that may push towards the practice of a range of undesirable behaviours that may influence the participants in the educational process. The growth of a style of leadership known as toxic leadership is perhaps the most obvious of these bad habits. The majority of researches have verified the detrimental impacts of this style of leadership and how it affects the workplace. The results of the organisation's conduct and attitude are badly affected by this influence (e.g. commitment, job satisfaction, performance, productivity). On the other hand, toxic leadership has a negative effect on some behaviours and attitudes in the workplace because it leads to a number of negative behaviours that are the focus of this paper, including bullying, workplace aggression, organisational sarcasm, a lack of cooperation with others, tardiness from work, psychological withdrawal, and workplace incivility.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Toxic Leadership

Marcia Wicker's 1996 (Wicker) (Green, 2014) research of three distinct leadership styles in organisations—trusted (green light), transitional (yellow light), and (toxic) poisonous (red light)—led to the creation of the phrase "toxic leader" (Tavanti, 2011).

Toxic leadership is a leadership style that kills people's excitement, creativity, independence, and inventive expression, eventually harming the business, according to Whicker (1996). Leaders who abuse their power spread their poisons (Wilson, 2003). However, Reed (2004) recognizes that one particular conduct does not always indicate that a person is toxic, and the lesson is the cumulative impact of annoying behaviour over time on cohesion, morale, and atmosphere. A toxic leader has three characteristics: a blatant lack of regard for the well-being of the subordinates; a temperament or interpersonal style that has a detrimental impact on the workplace environment; and the subordinates' opinion that the leader's primary motivation is self-interest.

Toxic leadership is defined as recurrent, systematic conduct by a manager, supervisor, or leader that compromises and/or sabotages the organisation's objectives, tasks, resources, effectiveness, and/or the motivation, well-being, or work satisfaction of subordinates. He observed (Hitchcock, 2015) that toxic leadership includes ineffective administrative practices, intimidating, controlling, unlawful acts, and physical and non-physical abuse that purposefully enrages or hurts people and groups.

Indradevi thinks toxic leadership is a silent murderer because it makes leaders seem untouchable and encourages others to impede and penalize those who do so.

A expensive phenomena, toxic leadership such as this kills people, communities, organisations, and even States (Indradevi, 2016) Toxic leaders, according to Goyer, exhibit a variety of self-centered attitudes, motives, and actions that harm subordinates, task performance, and the company as a whole (Burns,2017)

Finally, Webster and colleagues offered a basic description of toxic leadership, noting that it refers to those with a propensity to act in a scared, haughty, and immoral way toward others around them on a regular basis. Toxic leaders, on the other hand, have a self-replicating style of communication, sharing their information only with those who need to know, attending plenty of meetings, and engaging in random phone calls (ztokatli, 2020).

2.2. Dimensions of Toxic Leadership

Schmidt (2008) presented a scale of toxic leadership that contributed significantly to predicting employee turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and supervisor satisfaction (Burns, 2017). This scale has five dimensions: abusive supervision, narcissism, authoritarian leadership, unpredictability, and Self- promotion:

a) Abusive Supervision

Numerous studies have been conducted on the subject of supervisory leadership, demonstrating its importance in the management literature. One area of this study focuses on abusive supervisory practices (Poon, 2011). If more important than other personal ties formed at work are the connections that individuals have with their managers (Ahmad & Omar, 2013). Tepper (2000) described it as the amount to which an employee perceives their boss constantly using aggressive verbal and nonverbal actions, with the absence of physical contact.

b) Narcissism

Greek mythology's Narcissus, who committed himself to unrelenting self-adoration, serves as a cautionary tale about the perils of excessive self-love (Hook, 2007: 16). Arrogance, aggressiveness, a feeling of entitlement, showmanship, exploitation, power, and the social effectiveness of self-absorption are all characteristics of the complex concept known as narcissism (Holtzman & Donnellan, 2015). While some academics considered narcissistic leadership to be a separate leadership style, others believed that it interfered with other traditional leadership frameworks like charismatic leadership. Narcissistic leadership is a particular leadership style characterized by narcissistic traits, so the main challenge is to distinguish between narcissistic leaders (people with a high level of narcissism who happen to be in leadership positions). However, despite the many unresolved issues surrounding the relationship between narcissism and leadership, it seems clear that narcissism is an important component of toxic leadership (Schmidt, 2000).

c) Authoritarian Leadership

As another concept pertains to toxic leadership, it is described as a conduct of a boss who exerts complete authority and control over subordinates and demands unquestioning allegiance from them (Schmidt, 2008). A leader who exercises ultimate authority, controls followers, and demands complete compliance by enforcing severe discipline is said to be acting in an authoritarian manner. The structure is openly controlled and initiated by leaders who exhibit authoritarian behaviours; for instance, followers who do not follow policies and rules are severely punished, and these leaders use threats and intimidation to try to subdue their subordinates in order to further organisational objectives (Guo et al., 2018).

d) Self-Promotion

Self-promotion happens in a variety of official and informal social situations and is more common when people interact with higher status persons. The underlying human goal, according to the self-promotion approach, is to be seen by others as morally upright, effective in interpersonal interactions, and likeable (Gtcalone & Rosenfeld, 2001). Self-promotion involves claiming credit for the labor of others, pointing the finger at them, and assigning blame for faults. It also serves to advertise successes (Paltu1 & Brouwers, 2020).

More precisely, these people are sensitive to challenges to their self-esteem, such as criticizing their behaviour or providing less favorable comments about their performance, and they have relatively high self-esteem. These people are more inclined to get angry and frustrated, which makes them criticize other people and act abusively in general (Milosevic et al., 2019).

Self-promotion is a behaviour in which people seek to highlight their qualities and skills. It is a kind of impression management that tries to enhance a person's reputation and standing and is often utilized in competitive situations. Examples of self-promotion include stressing one's own internal rather than external accomplishments, appreciating their efforts, and focusing on the good rather than the bad elements of oneself (Deschacht & Maes, 2017).

e) Unpredictability

It is a quality of poor leaders that involves a range of actions including regular mood swings and explosive outbursts that have an impact on the sentiments of subordinates (Zaabi et al., 2018). A toxic leader's emotions may affect their voice and the atmosphere at work, and they often display hostility against subordinates for no apparent cause (Hinshaw, 2020). It is unknown to followers when and why their leaders will alter their conduct. Toxic leaders are characterized by abrupt outbursts and inconsistent daily conduct. No one likes to approach the present leader when he is furious and agitated or in a melancholy mood, according to reports that the poisonous mood of the leader influences the workplace following a poor mental state. His voice's tone and intensity convey this feeling. The vassals behave in accordance with the toxic leader's mood in the dimension of negative mental mood, and there is conflict and instability in the conduct of toxic leaders in this dimension as well (ztokatli, 2020).

2.3. Workplace Incivility

As disrespectful conduct that undercuts the dignity and self-worth of employees and causes unneeded pain, incivility has been characterized. Behaviours that are impolite show a disregard for others' needs and go against how people expect to be treated (Zauderer, 2002). Employees' disdain for one another costs organisations money in subtle and obvious ways. Although unruly conduct is frequent, many businesses are unable to identify it, few are aware of its negative impacts, and the majority of managers and executives are unable to deal with it (Pearson & Porath, 2005).

Authoritarian work settings, challenging working circumstances, and an anxious workplace are some factors that may contribute to the feeling of emptiness. In addition to the existence of challenging working circumstances and a hostile work environment, the supervisor is the sole person with power and may create an atmosphere that fosters incivility in the workplace inside the business (Bartlett et al., 2008). As a result, Anderson and Pearson's (1999) definition of workplace incivility served as the foundation for almost all of the research analyzed and is, as a result, the term that is most often used in those studies. Incivility at work is defined by Anderson and Pearson (1999) as low-intensity deviant conduct with a hazy intention to hurt and a breach of the mutual respect standards of the workplace. He continued by saying that impoliteness and incivility are traits of uncivilized conduct, which shows disregard for other people. Many scholars have often utilized this precise term (Bartlett et al., 2008).

Every organisation has its own standards and expectations for what constitutes appropriate interpersonal interaction among workers, regardless of how differently each one functions. Acts of incitement compromise this understanding and jeopardize the wellbeing of the organisation and its employees (Tarraf, 2012). And in three ways (Anderson, 2013), these traits theoretically set uncivilized conduct apart from other types of interpersonal abuse including bullying, victimization, abusive supervision, violence, etc. First, rudeness refers to actions that are aimed at other people, not towards groups or institutions. Second, despite the fact that being impolite is against the law, deviation is restricted to straightforward behaviours like avoiding or insulting a coworker. Thirdly, rude conduct is not meant to cause damage (Estes & Wang, 2013).

Ambiguous aim denotes a hidden desire to do damage. There are other possible explanations for the person's behaviour, such as ignorance. Low intensity suggests low uncivilized conduct levels (Bayne, 2015). Therefore, the term "violation of norms" refers to actions that go against respect for one another at work (Bayne, 2015).

In the quest for unfavourable workplace behaviours, Andersson and Pearson (1999) developed the notion of workplace incivility as a new field and a specific kind of interpersonal abuse (Schilpzand et al., 2015). They presented rudeness at work as a subset of unproductive conduct at work, an umbrella term for actions that are detrimental to both businesses and their constituents. Negative work behaviours often vary along a number of dimensions, such as the kind of violation, the degree of the action, and the offender's intent to hurt (Lim & Lee, 2011). According to its three characteristics—violation of norms, ambiguous purpose, and low intensity—workplace incivility varies from other types of unfavourable workplace behaviours (Taştan & Davoudi, 2015).

A number of factors, including organisational and managerial factors (such as organisational type and structure, organisational change, communication system, work design, organisational policies, abusive supervision, etc.), individual factors (such as personality traits, demographics, stress, psychosocial factors, etc.), and situational factors such as reward system, organisation justice, organisational culture and climate, etc. (Taştan & Davoudi, 2015).

Incivility can also be part of an organisation's culture, resulting in an unfriendly, rude, nervous and stressful work environment, reducing cooperation and mutual understanding, and increasing feelings of isolation and Incivility The principal responsible for preventing uncivil behaviour and uncivilized organisational culture is the leader, and when the leader fails to intervene in uncivilized behaviour, the cycle of incivility may begin (Keçeci & Turgut, 2018).

Some researchers, such as Casa and Curtin (2007), have distinguished two different types of Incivility: top-down Incivility and side Incivility. Top-down Incivility refers to unkempt behaviour from supervisors or other people of higher status. While lateral Incivility refers to uncivilized behaviour from colleagues or peers i.e. Incivility can have multiple sources within the work environment, including co-workers, leaders or supervisors (Jiménez et al., 2018) where Workplace incivility behaviour refers to a concept is a general term for socio-psychological behaviour that lacks prudence, good manners and civility, and entails rudeness, lack of respect, sabotage through negative behaviour (Gupta & Kumari, 2020).

2.4. Dimensions of Workplace Incivility

The majority of research on incivility used the scale of organisational information systems developed by Cortina and colleagues (2001), and many researchers modified this scale, including Martin and Hine (2005), who modified and validated the Uncivil Behaviour Questionnaire in the workplace, which is a component scale of 20 items.

Respondents are asked to report on how frequently they experience certain behaviours (from an unspecified source) such as loud noises, stress, interruption, and exclusion (Schilpzand *et al.*, 2016). The study has adopted this scale to study the following dimensions:

a) Hostility

It is described as a form of physical incompetence intended to cause harm, rage, or hatred. Examples of hostility include intimidation, bias, and harassment (Amos, 2013).

The most prevalent form of hostility seen in organisations is a mannerism characterized by rudeness, alienation, and disrespect for others. Hostility is a behaviour that seeks to cause immaterial harm in nature (Keng, 2017). Workplace hostility includes actions that the target is motivated to avoid because they could harm them. But only clear-cut instances of hostility that are repeatedly directed at a person or group of people are considered workplace hostility (Tastan & Davoudi, 2012).

b) Privacy invasion

It is described as limitations on access to or management of personal data. The term "breach of privacy" refers to situations in which personal information is gathered or made public without the relevant owner's consent (Bree, 2005). The topic of privacy is by no means contentious. Many social interactions can be made "fraudulent" by withholding information, and some believe that most people sometimes expect to have the same privacy rights at work as they do at home. Others might believe that because they have an Account Number and password for their email and software system, their personal information is safe and secure (r, 2006).

c) Exclusionary (Withdrawal) Behaviour

According to Hitlan and Noel (2009), withdrawal behaviour includes harassing, avoiding, excluding, or intimidating behaviours directed at others and is linked to a variety of negative emotional states, such as sadness, loneliness, jealousy, guilt, embarrassment, and social anxiety (Barthelemy, 2020). The definition of withdrawal behaviour in the workplace is the exclusion, rejection, or disregard of an individual (or group) by another individual (or group), which hinders the development or maintenance of positive interpersonal connections, professional success, or a positive reputation in the workplace. The definition of withdrawal as a particular type of incivility is ambiguous, and it is also characterized by resource deprivation in the form of social support withdrawal. Withholding social support is thought to negatively affect people's "basic need for acceptance and belonging," and this kind of workplace is a remedy that harms employees' self-esteem and productivity. Exclusion may be a type of social rejection under extreme circumstances. Rejection may be so painful psychologically that it is comparable to physical agony (Sharp, Peng & Jex, 2019).

d) Gossip

It is described as a casual, in-person evaluation of another organisation member that often occurs amongst a small group of people when they are not present. Three parties are involved in workplace gossip: the speaker, the receiver, and the missing third person (Ellwardt, 2011).

Workplace gossip is the casual, judgmental conversation about a coworker who is not a part of the company. The majority of research focuses on passive workplace gossip, making it an increasingly important topic in the area of organisational behaviour. Several studies have examined passive workplace gossip as individual characteristics (Kong, 2018).

When gossip happens at work, it often takes the shape of rumors and some of what are considered informal, innocuous ways of communicating and may even help with work. Unfortunately, gossip may cause conflict and hurt sentiments when it is vicious or damaging. They may even encourage bullying and harassment at work to create a hostile atmosphere (Advisor, 2016).

3. Toxic Leadership and Workplace Incivility

One of the most common types of antisocial behaviour in the workplace is incivility, which has been shown to have significant negative effects on the targeted employees, other coworkers, and organisations as a whole (Sharp, Peng & Jex, 2019). The most appropriate environments for incivility behaviour are workplaces where employees regularly interact with one another. And that the majority of hostile conduct at work is a consequence of bad leadership, as

managers or other leaders are unable to use their expertise in these situations to assess the existence and severity of incivility (Baig & Zaid, 2020).

According to Decewin (1939), contextual circumstances have a role in both the beginning and escalation of workplace rudeness especially when functioning as behaviour-drivers are situational and personal Forces. For instance, regulations, processes, and social norms are seen to be key contributors to complacency and a casual work atmosphere, which are behaviours associated with incivility. In light of this, managers' leadership style is a crucial funny aspect that may affect uncivility at work (Tastan & Davoudi, 2015).

The disrespectful conduct of employees and poor interactions with other coworkers may result from leaders who do not show care for their subordinates. Additionally, scholars have claimed that someone's violent behaviour against others may be inadvertent rather than done with deliberate malice. Incivility may spread in the workplace when one individual who may be exposed to unfavorable behaviours reacts in an unkind manner against an innocent third party (Baig & Zaid, 2020). It is also believed that narcissistic leaders struggle with emotional regulation. As a result, anger might result in antisocial conduct like rudeness (Meier & Semmer, 2013).

According to earlier research, poor leadership comprises supervisors who fail to dissuade unruly conduct and do not promote proper behaviour. They also fail to address workplace issues and postpone making judgments about them (Baig & Zaid, 2020). Negative leadership traits include things like refusing to make choices, ignoring work-related issues, and failing to reward good conduct. Additionally, these managers are less likely to communicate expectations to their staff members (Harold & Holtz, 2015).

Therefore, one would anticipate a positive correlation between passive leadership and employee incivility. Failure to take the appropriate preventative actions to manage bad conduct may foster informal environmental circumstances in the workplace, leading to the flourishing of incivility. A person who works under a bad leader would often encounter higher incivility than his coworkers if there is a positive association between poor leadership and disrespect at work (Tastan & Davoudi, 2015).

4. Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested in this study:

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between toxic leadership and teachers' hostility.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between toxic leadership and teachers' withdrawal behaviour.

5. Methodology

The research designs for this study were correlational and descriptive. The research looked at the relationship between toxic leadership, and teachers' workplace incivility in Lagos State Senior secondary schools. Furthermore, the survey examined the existing situation in public senior secondary schools in Lagos State in terms of toxic leadership, and workplace incivility among teachers.

The study population consisted of all the principals, vice-principals and teachers of Public Senior Secondary Schools in Lagos State.

Thirty percent of the total numbers of public senior secondary schools in Lagos State were selected using the stratified random sampling method. That is, for the teachers and principals, 30 percent of them were chosen after stratifying into districts.

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

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

As a result, the study included 980 teachers, 196 vice-principals and 98 principals. However, the selection of respondents from each Education District was on an equal basis.

The researcher designed a 26-item questionnaire to obtain answers from educators on toxic leadership and teachers' workplace incivility. The questions in the questionnaire used a four-point Likert scale answer format, with responses ranging from 4 = Strongly agree to 1 = Strongly disagree.

The questionnaire items were derived from the sources provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Source of the questionnaire items

Measures	
Construct	Source
Toxic Leadership	Schmidt (2008)
Workplace Incivility	Martin and Hine (2005)

To determine the validity and reliability of the questionnaire, a precise and rigorous technique was used. Toxic leadership and workplace incivility all had reliability coefficients (Cronbach Alpha) of 0.822 and 0.92, respectively. As a result, the surveys were determined to be very dependable.

The data was analyzed using inferential statistics of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient to test the hypotheses since it is said to forecast the relationship between the variables.

6. Results

6.1. General Characteristics of the Respondents

It was essential for this study to gather data on principals, vice-principals and teachers' background. Teachers' background in terms of sex, teaching experience, age, and highest educational qualification besides principals and vice principals' gender, leadership experience, age, and higher qualification were captured. These, directly or indirectly would have an influence on workplace incivility in Lagos State senior secondary schools. The teacher, vice-principals, and principals' demographic data are presented in Table 2 and discussed accordingly.

According to Table 2, the demographic characteristics of respondents showed that male respondents for teachers and school leaders were 37.5% and 41.6% respectively. Whereas, in terms of females, teachers had more representation (62.5%) than school leaders (58.4%). The profile for respondents in leadership cadre was such that more principals (67.4%) compared to 32.6% vice principals participated in the study.

Regarding the respondents' teaching experience, 18.6% of instructors and 39.1% of instructional leaders reported having 5 years or less of experience, while 40.7% of teachers and 43.1% of leaders reported having 6-10 years of experience. While 12.4% of teacher respondents and 2.2% of leaders had work experience between 21 and 25 years, 10.9% of teacher respondents and 5.4% of leaders had work experience between 11 and 15 years, 9.2% of teachers and 1.1% of leaders had work experience between 16 and 20, and 12.4% of teacher respondents and 2.2% of leaders had work experience between 21 and 25 years. Additionally, the results showed that 6.4% of instructors and 8.6% of leaders had 26–30 years of experience. 5.8% of teachers and 4.7% of leaders, respectively, in both categories of the survey samples, had professional experience of at least 31 years in the teaching field. This chart makes it clear that, at most, 36.7% of teachers and 39.1% of school administrators had tenures of more than ten years. This further suggests that the educators selected for this research are well-versed in the intricacies of the Socratic vocation and may have had the opportunity to work for two or more different school leaders, making them qualified to provide an unbiased evaluation. Furthermore, findings suggest that vice principals and principals have a lot of experience in their present school to share knowledge on teachers behaviours.

Also, 4.6% of teachers and none of the school leaders who responded to the age question were between 26 and 30 years old. None of the leaders who responded and another 17.6% of teachers are between the ages of 31 and 35. 29.8% of respondents who were school teachers and 0.7% of respondents who were leaders in this age range. Additionally, among those who responded, 16.2% of educators and 2.9% of leaders were between the ages of 41 and 45, 10.9% of educators and 18.3% of leaders were between the ages of 46 and 50, and 13% of educators and 54.8% of leaders were between the ages of 51 and 55. The remaining 7.9% of teachers and 23.3% of school leaders who responded to the survey were in their 56th to 60th year. The findings show that the instructors' ages were reasonably skewed to those between 26 and 30. People who are responsive to their surroundings may thus provide fair assessments. According to observation, the majority of the school leaders (principals and vice-principals) who

responded were between the ages of 51 and 55, indicating that most persons are given the opportunity to manage a school after many years of service.

Table 2. Demographic Structure of Respondents

S/N	Variables	Categories of Variables	Teachers		School Leaders	
			No.	%	No.	%
1.	Sex	Male	356	37.5	116	41.6
		Female	593	62.5	163	58.4
2.	Leadership Cadre	Principal	0	0	91	32.6
		Vice-principal	0	0	188	67.4
3.	Work Experience/Years of leadership in current schools	1-5 years	176	18.6	109	39.1
		6-10 years	348	36.7	109	39.1
		11-15 years	103	10.9	15	5.4
		16-20 years	87	9.2	3	1.1
		21-25 years	118	12.4	6	2.2
		26-30 years	61	6.4	24	8.6
4.	Age	31 and above	55	5.8	13	4.7
		26-30 years	44	4.6	0	0.0
		31-35 years	167	17.6	0	0.0
		36-40 years	283	29.8	2	0.7
		41-45 years	154	16.2	8	2.9
		46-50 years	103	10.9	51	18.3
5.	Higher Qualification	51-55 years	123	13.0	153	54.8
		56-60 years	75	7.9	65	23.3
		NCE	31	3.3	1	0.4
		HND+PGDE	22	2.3	2	0.7
		B.A/B.Sc. + PC	154	16.2	30	10.8
		B.Ed, B.Sc. (Ed), B.A. (Ed)	588	62.0	170	60.9
	M.A, M.Sc, M.Ed	151	15.9	76	27.2	
	Ph.D	2	0.2	0	0.0	

Source: Researcher's Field Survey Results (2021)

Key: (School Leaders includes: Principals and vice-principals)

Regarding educational background, 2.3% of teachers and 0.4% of principals reported having an NCE, 3.3% of teachers and 0.4% of principals reported having an HND+PGDE, 16.2% of teachers and 10.8% of leaders reported having a first degree in B.A., B.Sc. + PGDE, and 62% of teachers and 60.9% of leaders reported having a first degree in B.ED, B.SC (Ed), B.A., respectively (Ed). Table 7 also reveals that 15.9% of respondents who were teachers in schools and 27.2% of respondents who were leaders had other degrees in addition to their M.A., M.Sc., and M.Ed. The lowest category of respondents, teachers, had a Ph.D. qualification rate of 0.2%. None of the principal and vice principal responses who are leaders has a Ph.D. From the data presentation, it can be observed that most of the respondents possess first degree which is in tandem with the present entry level for teachers in secondary school.

H01: *There is no significant relationship between Toxic Leadership and Teachers' hostility.*

Variables	N	Mean	SD	R	Sig.	Remark
Toxic Leadership	279	83.04	11.293			
Teachers' Hostility	949	18.34	1.918	-0.029	0.628	Not Significant

Source: Field Work

The result of the test performed indicates that there is a negative and non-significant relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' hostility in Lagos State senior secondary schools ($r = -0.029$, $p > 0.05$). The implication of this is that there is a negative influence of toxic leadership behaviour on teachers' hostility. This means that higher the toxic leadership behaviour of principals and vice principals, the lower the teachers' hostility. Thus, the

null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' hostility in Lagos State senior secondary schools is not rejected.

H01: *There is no significant relationship between Toxic Leadership and Teachers' Withdrawal Behaviour*

Variables	N	Mean	SD	R	Sig.	Remark
Toxic Leadership	279	83.04	11.293			
Teachers' Withdrawal Behaviour	949	18.60	2.513	0.025	0.680	Not Significant

Source: Field Work

The table shows that there is a positive and non-significant relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' withdrawal behaviour in Lagos State senior secondary schools ($r = 0.025$, $p > 0.05$). This implies that toxic leadership behaviour does not significantly influence teachers' withdrawal behaviour in Lagos State senior secondary schools. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between toxic leadership behaviour and teachers' withdrawal behaviour in Lagos state senior secondary schools is hereby not rejected.

7. Discussion of Findings

According to hypothesis one, there is a negative and insignificant correlation between toxic leadership behavior and teachers' hostility in senior secondary schools in Lagos State. As a result, instructors decide to quit the school system or put less effort into carrying out their duties. In conclusion, the desire of instructors to leave the structure of the school and effort reduction might result in less productive behaviors including silence (Lam & Xu, 2019), knowledge concealment (Pradhan et al., 2019; Shah & Saeed Hashmi, 2019), and work withdrawal (Wei & Si, 2013b). Teachers who interact with toxic school leaders may become hostile while doing their regular jobs, and their desire to quit the school organisation may grow. Even if they were treated unfairly, the mistreated teachers can still be employed by the school system. It's crucial to remember that their plan to leave might raise animosity against their leaders or perhaps the institution.

When working with toxic leaders, withdrawal was characterized by a sense of helplessness, irritability, and disengagement from tasks, as well as depression. Last but not least, being upset involves experiencing negative conduct from toxic leaders that makes you furious, embarrassed, wounded, and frustrated. In addition, other studies (Kayani & Alasan, 2021) came to the same conclusion that toxic leadership had a large and advantageous impact on unproductive work practices among nurses in Pakistan's public hospitals. In reaction to treatment that is deemed abusive, humiliating, or demeaning, unproductive actions are often shown by toxic leaders. Subordinates often behave aggressively against their coworkers, corporate property, and assets, engaging in theft, sabotage, and other illegal activities. On the other hand, treating workers with compassion would motivate them to exhibit good behaviors at work since they would feel appreciated, trusted, and crucial to the organisation.

8. Conclusion

It is significant to emphasize that the primary cause of teachers' hostility and withdrawal behaviour has, more often than not, been the poisonous leadership in the school organisation. As a result, toxic behaviours are a very effective predictor of negative workplace attitudes about job stress, job satisfaction, chance of quitting, and capacity to fulfill work obligations. The study's conclusions have important ramifications at a time when debates about teacher retention and effectiveness are intensifying. Without taking into account the potential influence of a leader on a teacher's choice to remain or go, additional incentives may not have the intended effect.

9. Recommendations

Based on the result, we recommendate:

- To assist develop a suitable working environment in the schools, the Lagos State Education Districts should replace the school toxic leaders and embrace contemporary leadership models that encourage collaboration among people and give them a voice in decision-making.

- b) School settings need to pay proper attention to such actions by using contemporary administrative techniques in order to prevent workplace incivility.
- c) Work to lessen the stimuli and triggers of workplace incivility with the intention of addressing the causes and reducing employee frustration as well as spreading an attitude of optimism and enhancing the perception that each person's goals are a part of the organisation's larger goals. This will motivate employees to face the challenges of their jobs and strive for success.

References

- Ahmad, A., & Omar, Z. (2013). Abusive supervision and deviant workplace behaviour: The mediating role of work-family conflict. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 9(2), 124.
- Amos, K. S. (2013). *Nursing faculty members' perspectives of faculty-to-faculty workplace incivility among nursing faculty members* (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University).
- Baig, J., & Zaid, A. A. (2020). Behavioural Incivility and Leadership Styles: Assessing The Mediation of Job Strain, Employment Insecurity and Relational Injustice: A Conceptual Model. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 9 (3), 687, 693.
- Barthelemy, R. S. (2020). LGBT + physicists qualitative experiences of exclusionary behaviour and harassment. *European Journal of Physics*, 41(6), 065703.
- Bartlett, J. E. (2008). Workplace Incivility: Worker and Organisational Antecedents and Outcomes. *Online Submission*.
- Brey, P. A. (2005). The importance of privacy in the workplace. *Privacy in the workplace*
- Brouwers, M., & Paltu, A. (2020). Toxic leadership: Effects on job satisfaction, commitment, turnover intention and organisational culture within the South African manufacturing industry. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(1), 1-11.
- Burns Jr, W. A. (2017). A Descriptive Literature Review of Harmful Leadership Styles: Definitions, Commonalities, Measurements, Negative Impacts, and Ways to Improve These Harmful Leadership Styles. *Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership*, 3(1), 33-52.
- Estes, B., & Wang, J. (2008). Integrative literature review: Workplace incivility: Impacts on individual and organisational performance. *Human Resource Development Review*, 7(2), 218-240.
- Giacalone, R. A., & Rosenfeld, P. (2001). Self-presentation and self-promotion in an organisational setting. *The Journal of social psychology*, 126(3), 321-326.
- Green, J. E. (2014). Toxic Leadership in Educational Organisations. *Education Leadership Review*, 15(1), 18-33.
- Guo, L., Decoster, S., Babalola, M. T., De Schutter, L., Garba, O. A., & Riisla, K. (2018). Authoritarian leadership and employee creativity: The moderating role of psychological capital and the mediating role of fear and defensive silence. *Journal of Business Research*, 92, 219-230.
- Harold, C. M., & Holtz, B. C. (2015). The effects of passive leadership on workplace incivility. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 36 (1), 16-38.
- Hinshaw, S. (2020). *The Long-Term Influences of Toxic Leaders on Their Followers: A Qualitative Descriptive Study* (Doctoral dissertation, Creighton University).
- Hitchcock, M. J. (2015). *The Relationship between toxic leadership, organisational citizenship, and turnover behaviours among San Diego nonprofit paid staff*. University of San Diego
- Hitlan, R. T., & Noel, J. (2009). The influence of workplace exclusion and personality on counterproductive work behaviours: An interactionist perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 18(4), 477-502.

- Hitlan, R. T., Clifton, R. J., & DeSoto, M. C. (2006). Perceived exclusion in the workplace: The moderating effects of gender on work-related attitudes and psychological health. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 8 (2), 217-236.
- Holtzman, N. S., & Donnellan, M. B. (2015). The roots of Narcissus: Old and new models of the evolution of narcissism. In *Evolutionary perspectives on social psychology* (pp. 479-489). Springer, Cham.
- Indradevi, R. (2016). Toxic leadership over the years—A review. *PURUSHARTHA- A Journal of Management, Ethics and Spirituality*, 9 (1), 106-110.
- Introna, L. D. (2000). Workplace surveillance, privacy and distributive justice. *Acm Sigcas Computers and Society*, 30 (4), 33-39.
- Kayani, M. B., & Alasan, I. I. (2021). Impact of Toxic Leadership on Counterproductive Work Behavior with the Mediating role of Psychological Contract Breach and Moderating role of Proactive Personality. *Studies Applied Economics*, 39(4), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.25115/eea.v39i4.4879>
- Kong, M. (2018). Effect of perceived negative workplace gossip on employees' behaviours. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 1112.
- Lam, L.W. and Xu, A.J. (2019). Power imbalance and employee silence: the role of abusive leadership, power distance orientation, and perceived organisational politics. *Applied Psychology*, 68(3) 513-546, doi: 10.1111/apps.12170.
- Leet, E. (2011). The impact toxic or severe dysfunctional leadership has on the effectiveness of an organisation (Doctoral dissertation, Murdoch University).
- Martin, R. J., & Hine, D. W. (2005). Development and validation of the uncivil workplace behaviour questionnaire. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 10(4), 477.
- Nord, G. D., McCubbins, T. F., & Nord, J. H. (2006). E-monitoring in the workplace: privacy, legislation, and surveillance software. *Communications of the ACM*, 49 (8), 72-77.
- Pearson, C. M., & Porath, C. L. (2005). On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for “nice”? Think again. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 19 (1), 7-18.
- Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organisational dynamics*, 29 (2), 123-137.
- Pelletier, K. L. (2010). Leader toxicity: An empirical investigation of toxic behaviour and rhetoric. *Leadership*, 6 (4), 373-389.
- Pradhan, S., Srivastava, A. & Jena, L.K. (2019). Abusive supervision and intention to quit: exploring multi-mediational approaches. *Personnel Review*, 49(6), 1269-1286, doi: 10.1108/PR-12-2018-0496.
- Reed, G. E. (2004). Toxic leadership. *Military review*, 84(4), 67-71.
- Roth, P. (1994). Privacy in the Workplace. *Labour, Employment and Work in New Zealand*.
- Schilpzand, P., De Pater, I. E., & Erez, A. (2016). Workplace incivility: A review of the literature and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organisational behaviour*, 37, S57-S88.
- Schmidt, A. A. (2008). Development and validation of the toxic leadership scale. University of Maryland, College Park.
- Selden, M. P., & Downey, R. G. (2012). Workplace hostility: Defining and measuring the occurrence of hostility in the workforce. *Work*, 42 (1), 93-105
- Shah, M. & Saeed Hashmi, M. (2019). Relationship between organisational culture and knowledge hiding in software industry: mediating role of workplace ostracism and workplace incivility. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Science*, 13(4), 934-952, available at: <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/214259>.
- Sharp, O. L., Peng, Y., & Jex, S. M. (2019). Exclusion in the workplace: a multi-level investigation. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*
- Tarraf, R. C. (2012). Taking a closer look at workplace incivility: Dimensionality and source effects.

- Taştan, S. B., & Davoudi, S. M. M. (2015). An empirical research on the examination of the relationship between perceived workplace incivility and job involvement: the moderating role of collaborative 2- 20- climate. *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion*, 7 (1), 35-62.
- Tavanti, M. (2011). Managing toxic leaders: Dysfunctional patterns in organisational leadership and how to deal with them. *Human Resource Management*, 2011, 127-136.
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of management journal*, 43 (2),178-190.
- Wei, F., & Si, S. (2013a). Psychological contract breach, negative reciprocity, and abusive supervision: the mediated effect of organisational identification. *Management and Organisation Review*, 9(3), 541-561, doi: 10.1111/more.12029.
- Zauderer, D. G. (2002). Workplace incivility and the management of human capital. *PublicManager*, 31(1), 36-42.