The mediating role of organizational trust in the effect of toxic leadership on job satisfaction

Nurgul Erdal ^{(a)*}, Olkan Budak ^(b)

^(a) PhD., Istanbul University, Hospital of School of Medicine, Cerrahpaşa Medical School, Fatih, 34098, Istanbul, Turkey

^(b) PhD., Beykent University, Maslak Campus, Ayazaga, Hadim Koryolu Cd. No:19, Sariyer, 34398, Istanbul, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 08 April 2021

Received in rev. form 28 April 2021

Accepted 29 April 2021

Keywords:

Health employee, Job Satisfaction,
Organizational Trust, Toxic
Leadership

JEL Classification:
O15, P36

ABSTRACT

Toxic leadership refers to the sum of the negative aspects of leaders within their leadership traits. Narcissistic leadership is a multidimensional structure that includes charismatic leadership and authoritarian leadership types. Toxic leaders can harm the organization, employees and society in which they work. This research aims to determine the toxic characteristics of leaders working in public universities and to extract the attribute of organizational trust in job satisfaction. Turkey's Istanbul made the data collected through face to face survey research methods in 470 people working in the public university hospital in the province were analyzed by analysis methods used in social sciences. As a result of the analysis, a negative significant relationship between toxic leadership and organizational trust, a negative significant relationship between toxic leadership and job satisfaction and its sub-dimensions, and a positive significant relationship between organizational trust and job satisfaction and its sub-dimensions were found. Toxic leadership affects managerial job satisfaction and company policy-based job satisfaction through the full set of organizational trust. In addition, toxic leadership has also been found to be effective on job satisfaction arising from employees through partial organizational trust.

© 2021 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Introduction

Businesses that want to provide sustainable competitive advantage have to give importance to organizational values. Many scientists have studied the concept of value and sustainable competitive advantage (Bowman & Ambrosini, 2000). Today, high competition environment, uncertain environment, behavior of the leader and / or manager, economic difficulties, fear of losing their job, psychological, behavioral and health problems. Various adversities can reduce the effectiveness and efficiency of organizations. In this context, there is a need for healthy, strong and talented leaders, managers and employees who attach importance to organizational values, who trust the organization, the manager and their colleagues, in order to maintain their effectiveness and efficiency. Members of the organization, who spend most of their time in the workplace, constantly question themselves in their work and try to attribute meaning. All employees; They want to work in organizations where they are happy in their work, they are useful, they feel they are part of a whole, and have feelings, common values, loyalty, team spirit, trust, unity and solidarity in the management process (Kesken & Ayyıldız, 2008).

Today, in order for businesses to compete and gain competitive advantage, change depends on the harmonious work of the organization, leader and employee trio in the intensity of the transformation cycle. Leadership is among the most popular topics in academic writing. There are researchers who examine how leaders develop their organizations and how they increase the effectiveness and success of their followers (Pelletier, 2010), There has been increasing interest in studies focusing on the dark side of leadership in recent years (Burton et al., 2014; Tepper, 2007). Although leadership often has a positive connotation.

* Corresponding author. ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2961-3906

© 2021 by the authors. Hosting by SSBFNET. Peer review under responsibility of Center for Strategic Studies in Business and Finance.

<https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v10i3.1144>

Leaders who engage in harmful behavior are common in real life organizations. (Tavanti, 2011). Restriction and excessive control come to the fore in these organizations. The sanction is based on intimidation, and toxic leaders' selfishness, selfishness, negative mood and depravity behaviors are common addition, these leaders are constantly concerned and see success as ego gratification. Toxic leaders displaying a rude and bully personality structure negatively affect both the mental and physiological health of employees (Demir, 2019).

Organizational trust of organization members who are negatively affected by toxic leaders is also affected and job satisfaction becomes difficult. Trust plays a key role in many processes at micro and macro levels, such as interpersonal relationships, group behavior, managerial efficiency, economic changes, social and political stability, and understanding different cultures, and it is necessary even in the most routine work (Kalemci Tüzün, 2007). Thanks to organizational trust, conflicts, complexities and uncertainties are reduced, information exchange increases, the efficiency and productivity of the organization reach the maximum level (Erdal, 2020). Job satisfaction is a personal evaluation of the job conditions (the job itself, the attitude of the management) or the results obtained from the job (wage, job security) and consists of the internal reactions that the individual develops against the perceptions of the job and job conditions through the system of norms, values and expectations (Çekmelioglu, 2005). In order to achieve maximum benefit in organizations, it is necessary to value the expectations, needs, feelings and thoughts of the employees and to create a safe working environment. Managers' behaviors are very important for job satisfaction and organizational trust. Toxic Leadership behaviors cause organizational insecurity and job dissatisfaction. With this study, the relationship between variables was tested through the data obtained from the health sector. Due to the scarcity of previous studies within the framework of this purpose, it is thought that it will make an original contribution to both literature and business life. It is aimed to reveal the harmful consequences of the negative interaction between the leader and employee resulting from toxic leadership, to contribute to the measures to be taken to prevent these damages and to offer solutions.

The mediating effect of organizational trust, which is not included in the studies explained by the research, has been tried to be clarified within the scope of the following questions:

Does organizational trust have a mediating role in the effect of toxic leadership on different dimensions of job satisfaction?

If the mediating role of organizational trust is determined, in what dimensions of job satisfaction does it occur?

If the mediating role of organizational trust emerges, what could be the managerial suggestions in terms of toxic leadership and job satisfaction dimensions?

The main objectives of this study are to reveal the negative effect of toxic leadership on job satisfaction dimensions, as well as to test the mediating role of organizational trust in this effect. For this purpose, pre-tests were carried out by validating the research questions as included in the details described in the method section. Later, data were collected through questionnaires from 470 employees working in different state hospitals. This research is critical in revealing the mediating role of organizational trust in the effect of toxic leadership on job satisfaction. The managerial suggestions developed in this way give an idea to the practitioners in terms of ensuring the job satisfaction of the employees.

Literature Review

Theoretical and Conceptual Background

Toxic Leadership

In addition to the positive aspects of leadership, there is also a dark side. This dark side; It includes dark leadership types such as petty tyranny, abusive leadership, destructive leadership, toxic leadership, workplace bullying, and narcissistic leadership (Kılıç, 2019). Toxic leadership was revealed for the first time in Whicker (1996) and defined them as vindictive, malicious, restless and complaining personality traits (Whicker, 1996).

Toxic leadership is the least researched type of leadership among the types of leadership (Çelebi et al., 2015). Toxic leaders can damage the functioning of the organization, complicate the work, reduce the energy of the employees and decrease the motivation and determination to work, complicate the work in the organization, prevent the careers of the employees, job satisfaction, It can destroy organizational trust and impair the physiological and psychological health of employees (Lubit, 2004). Toxic leadership, which is called "destructive", "bully", "cruel" and "toxic" (Goldman, 2011), includes these types of leadership because it also includes other negative leadership behaviors (such as bullying, rude, destructive leadership) in the workplace. (Smith & Lowman, 2020; Yavaş, 2016).

Toxic leadership is examined in four sub-dimensions as selfish, selfish, self-interested, invaluable, and negative mental state (Demir, 2020). The self-interested toxic leader uses his subordinates and business resources for their own purpose and benefit and does what they want by creating fear. (Appelbaum & Roy-Girard 2007). The selfish toxic leader humiliates his followers and constantly humiliates them and bullies their requests (Reed 2004). The invaluable toxic leader, on the other hand, makes his presence felt in every success, he does not give the real success to the righteous one. The toxic leader, who exhibits a negative mood, always poisons the environment, which is very malicious (Demir, 2020).

The concept of leadership has found a wide place in management literature. While leadership theories tend to increase the positive aspects of their members, there are also leaders who engage in harmful behavior (Reyhanoğlu & Akın, 2016). There are studies that reveal the negative outcomes of the leader. These are; (Coccia, 1998; Frost, 2004; Wilson-Starks, 2003; Reed, 2004; Williams, 2005; Goldman, 2006; Walton, 2007; Allum, 2011; Tavanti, 2011; Pelletier, 2010; Pelletier, 2012; Kasalak & Aksu, 2016; Kırbaç, 2013; Reyhanoğlu & Akın, 2016; Yavaş, 2016; Zagross & Jamileh, 2016, Demir 2019, Tepe 2020). Adversely affects their commitment and job satisfaction (Curry, 1999). The common feature of studies conducted with toxic leadership is that they have negative characteristics for employees and organizations (Schmidt, 2008).

Organizational Trust (OT)

Trust; It is a person having a positive expectation towards another person or persons and feeling a psychological sensitivity to the result of this expectation, and it also includes emotional sensitivity (Wech, 2002). Trust, which is the most important element of social capital, determines the relationships within the organization, it does not occur in a short time, and when it is shaken, it is very difficult to regain (Örücü & Kambur, 2017). Trust is accepted as the essence of relationships, it is a social factor that holds people together, and is seen as a component of common values, culture, morals and social networks in organizations (Chowdhury, 2012). Organizational trust is an employee's belief in the support given by his or her organization. It is more often revealed when rulers are just, telling the truth, and being behind their word. It plays a key role in determining both horizontal and vertical relationships (Gün & Söyük, 2017). In organizations where organizational trust has not developed, it is not possible for individuals to proceed towards the same goal. Employees in organizations with a low degree of trust express their anger and reactions by not obeying the rules of the management or by distorting the targets. Employees show more performance when they trust their managers and the institution (Erdal & Altındağ, 2020). Organizations with a high level of trust can adapt to changes more easily, they can be more successful and innovate (Batmantaş & Örücü, 2018).

Organizational trust is examined in three dimensions as trust in the organization, trust in the manager and trust in colleagues, even if these dimensions are perceived differently, they are interrelated. However, in some cases, there may be no link between these dimensions. For example, an employee of the organization may not trust the organization while trusting his manager, or on the contrary, he may not trust his manager while trusting his organization. Such situations may occur when employees' contribution to the organization is not considered and fair rewarding, favoritism, management such trust is not taken into account or the employee is not rewarded (Pars Şener, 2017).

Job Satisfaction (JS)

The concept of job satisfaction was first discussed in Hoppock's (1935) "Job Satisfaction" book. In the work, job satisfaction was evaluated as the level of satisfaction of the employee regarding the physical and psychological work environment (Cited in: You et al., 2013).

Job satisfaction is defined as the satisfaction or discontent felt by individuals in their job. In other words, job satisfaction occurs when the qualifications of the job and the expectations of the employees are compatible with each other (Davis 1984). In this sense, the reaction of the individual to the working environment is called job satisfaction, and it is the expression of how much emotional satisfaction the employee has achieved in the experience of the job and the work he / she is engaged in (Yorulmaz et al., 2017).

Job satisfaction has many benefits, the individual who has job satisfaction becomes healthy and happy in his / her work life and carries this happiness to almost every part of his / her life (Özdem Sezer, 2019). Job satisfaction reduces the organizational commitment and burnout of the employees and enables them to stay in the institution for a long time. The most important issue in job satisfaction is the harmony between employee and company. When adaptation increases, job satisfaction increases (Babadağ & Arlı, 2018). Physical and psycho-social factors related to working conditions and individual differences affect the perception of job satisfaction (Kalleberg, 1977). In this context, job satisfaction is considered in two dimensions as internal and external (Büyükyılmaz et al., 2018). External satisfaction is mainly related to factors that are not related to the job but originated from the work environment. These are; organizational and human characteristics related to employee, manager relations, colleagues, recognition, title, compensation and promotion. Internal satisfaction is satisfaction related to the content of the work done. Job structure, job requirements, duties required by the job affect the formation of internal satisfaction (O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1980).

Empirical Review and Hypothesis Development

Toxic Leadership and Organizational Trust Relationship

Toxic leadership behaviors deeply affect both organizations and employees and can lead to negative outcomes (Schmidt, 2008). By damaging intra-organizational communication, it decreases organizational trust and commitment to the organization, decreases productivity, causes rumors, poisons the organizational climate and leads to quitting (Walton, 2007). Negative behaviors of toxic leaders affect the organizational trust levels of employees. In addition, the commitment of employees to the organization affects organizational trust (Curry, 1999). In this context; Toxic leadership behaviors of managers directly affect organizational trust and decrease organizational trust by decreasing commitment. It directly affects the organizational trust of the staff, on the other hand, it decreases the organizational trust level by decreasing the organizational commitment (Bozkurt et al., 2020). In the study conducted by Bozkurt et al., It was shown that there is a negative moderate relationship between toxic leadership and organizational trust, a low

negative relationship between toxic leadership and organizational commitment, and a moderate positive relationship between organizational commitment and organizational trust (Bozkurt et al., 2020). Based on the stated studies, the following hypotheses have been developed:

H₁: Toxic leadership has a negative impact on organizational trust.

Trust is very important for organizations, it facilitates market change, contributes to economic and social development, reduces strikes and facilitates the management of the business. It sees trust as an international barometer in many countries (Morena et al., 2009).

Toxic Leadership and Job Satisfaction Relationship

Toxic leadership causes many adverse situations, including low job satisfaction. (Ghosh et al., 2011). It negatively affects the sociological, physical and psychological health of employees, and adverse effects on well-being (Too & Harwey, 2012). Studies on this subject have revealed that managers who exhibit toxic leader behavior cause irritability and focus problems in employees, reduce their workplace performance, cause stress, anxiety and depression at work, and as a result, conflict and aggressive behaviors are observed in the individual (Appelbaum & Roy-Girard, 2007; Goldman, 2006; Frost, 2003). They are toxic leaders who approach employees negatively within the organization and reduce the overall performance of the organization (Reyhanoğlu & Akin, 2016). Toxic leaders negatively affect legal, emotional, and positive outcomes (Hoffman & Segio, 2020). Toxic leaders are people who permanently harm their followers, the organization and their relatives.

Loke (2001) also revealed that there is a significant correlation between leadership behavior and job satisfaction, explaining job satisfaction 29%. Skinner (1969) found a positive relationship between leadership behavior and job satisfaction. The more toxic behavior employees perceive, the more work stresses increase (Zagross, H. & Jamileh, 2016). In toxic leadership, turnover and psychological distress have been found to be positively proportional and negatively proportional to job and life satisfaction (Rayner & Cooper, 1997; Tepper, 2000). When leaders constantly harass employees, insecurity, low self-esteem, decrease in job satisfaction, performance and motivation losses occur (Kusy & Holloway, 2009; Frost, 2003). Erkutlu & Chafra (2006) found that poor leadership and low organizational performance and job satisfaction. In his thesis on bank employees, Eriş (2019) found a significant negative relationship between the dimensions of toxic leadership and both scales of job satisfaction, the level of toxic leadership perceived by employees decreases their job satisfaction levels. Eriş & Arun (2020) reduce the level of toxic leadership perceived by bank employees and their job satisfaction, there is a negative relationship between them. In the study, a negative significant relationship was found between toxic leadership and job satisfaction. A leader with toxic leadership characteristics usually feeds on uncertainties, problems and negativities and creates an appropriate order for himself (Çetinkaya, 2017). It has been determined to have a negative effect (Zengin, 2019). According to the findings of the research, a significant negative correlation was found between abusive management and job satisfaction, life satisfaction and satisfaction with the organization. It has been concluded that the job satisfaction, life satisfaction and satisfaction levels of the employees from the lower levels are lower than the white-collar employees, and the level of job satisfaction, life satisfaction and satisfaction with the organization is higher. The research findings have been analyzed in detail in the discussion section (Serdar, 2019). In line with the studies described, the following hypotheses have been developed:

H₂: Toxic leadership has a negative impact on managerial based job satisfaction.

H₃: Toxic leadership has a negative impact on company policy based job satisfaction. Toxic leadership has a negative impact on colleagues based job satisfaction.

When businesses that want to increase organizational performance and gain competitive advantage, especially when they see passive and opposite behavior due to toxic leadership behavior, taking measures to eliminate this and reduce its effects is effective in providing sustainable performance and competitive advantage (Akça & Tuzcuoğlu, 2020).

Organizational Trust and Job Satisfaction Relationship

Trust is a fragile emotion that occurs at the end of a long and difficult process and is difficult to regenerate when broken, and it is accepted as the essence of all relationships. Trust keeps people together and gives them a sense of security (Gilbert & Tang, 1998). is necessary for job satisfaction and long-term activities of businesses. If the understanding of mutual trust develops between the employees in the business, it becomes one of the high-performance organizations (Çiçek & Şahin Macit, 2016).

There is a wide range of studies on organizational trust and job satisfaction in the literature (Yorulmaz & Karabacak, (2020), in their study, revealed the partial moderator effect of both job satisfaction and organizational commitment on the relationship between organizational trust perception and job performance. Inan & Çelik (2018) In the study they conducted with bank employees, a significant difference was found on the organizational trust and job satisfaction scales of the employees in the public and private institutions. The age status, total working hours and wages were found to affect organizational trust and job satisfaction, and those who chose their job voluntarily were higher than the non-voters. Erdal & Altındağ (2020) found no relationship between trust in manager and seniority and salary in their studies, but they found a positive relationship between trust in manager and job satisfaction with the institution. They found a positive relationship between trust in the organization, seniority and salary job satisfaction and job

satisfaction with the organization. Yazıcıoğlu (2009) determined that there is a significant relationship between trust in the organization, job satisfaction and intention to quit. In line with the studies described, the following hypotheses have been developed:

H₅: Organizational trust has a positive impact on managerial based job satisfaction.

H₆: Organizational trust has a positive impact on company policy based job satisfaction.

H₇: Organizational trust has a positive impact on colleagues welded job satisfaction.

Toxic Leadership, The Mediating Role of Organizational Trust in Job Satisfaction Relationship

Today, the news about toxic leadership in the press and the public is increasing day by day. Therefore, studies on toxic leadership and organizational outcomes have increased. Hanges (2014) tested the mediating effect of toxicity on group cohesion and work outcome variables. As a result of the research, toxic leadership; Leadership, unpredictability, narcissism, and authoritarian leadership, including self-promotion, abusive control dimensions, were found to have a direct negative impact on group-level job satisfaction, group productivity, group-level organizational trust, and group-level organizational commitment. In their study, Koç & Yazıcıoğlu (2011) determined that there is a positive relationship between the sense of trust in the manager (leader) and the sense of satisfaction that employees gain from their jobs. In the study conducted by Uysal 2019, a significant relationship was found between job stress and job satisfaction. They also found toxic leadership as a partial moderator variable in job satisfaction and job stress. In previous studies, the mediating effect of organizational power on the effect of toxic leadership on job satisfaction has not been investigated. We aim to make this work a role model. Within the scope of the mentioned studies, the following hypotheses were assumed:

H₈: Toxic leadership significantly affects managerial based job satisfaction through organizational trust.

H₉: Toxic leadership significantly affects company policy based job satisfaction through organizational trust.

H₁₀: Toxic leadership significantly affects colleagues welded job satisfaction through organizational trust.

In this section, the hypotheses formed for the variables in the research model and the studies that formed the basis of the previous research hypotheses are explained. The research model in Figure 1 was created in line with the hypotheses created in line with the studies dealing with the subject in terms of toxic leadership, organizational trust and job satisfaction:

Figure 1: Conceptual model

Research and Methodology

Purpose and Importance of Research

The main purpose of this study is to reveal the effect of toxic leadership and organizational trust on job satisfaction. The healthcare sector is a very comprehensive, unique workflow, and the most intense teamwork is experienced. Especially university hospitals are managed with a matrix structure and there are too many managers. When choosing a manager, it is left to the initiative of the senior management, and people who are inexperienced, uninformed and do not have the title of manager can be managers and this affects the employees negatively. The important point here is to reveal the toxic characteristics of leaders and to ensure the achievement of job satisfaction by reinforcing the organizational trust by minimizing the influence of the followers from them. With this study, revealing the negativities in the interactions of leaders and followers, identifying the underlying causes of the toxic leaders' behaviours and It aims to improve, create an atmosphere of high organizational trust, and reach the job satisfaction of the employees. This information aims to enable managers to determine their own management styles, and to plan resource planning in the most efficient way by preventing toxic leaders from harming employees and the organization.

Content and Limits of Research

The scope and limitations of this research constitutes the results of surveys on the scale of the public university hospital employees operating in the provinces of Istanbul in Turkey. The research explains how toxic leadership and organizational trust have an effect on job satisfaction. The applied method also imposes some restrictions. Example of Turkey's leading university hospitals it is made 470 runs and this number is appropriate sampling. The acceptability of the findings as a role model for many healthcare businesses across the country can be considered an important factor. The research population reached 600 people by random method between 30 August 2019 and 30 November 2019, and 470 of them were considered valid

Research Method and Research Scales

Face-to-face survey method was used as a data collection method within the scope of the research. The questionnaire used in data collection was prepared as a 7-point Likert scale. It was conducted as a result of interviews with 11 hospital staff for the validation of the research questions. After the validation of the research questions, a pretest was made from 27 hospital staff. Afterwards, data were collected through questionnaires from 470 employees working in different hospitals in the Istanbul region. The collected data were subjected to frequency distribution, validity, reliability, and correlation and regression analysis with statistical package programs used in social sciences. The questionnaire consists of four parts. The first section contains brief information about scale measurement tools that show demographic and demographic information about institutions and employees. In the second part, "Toxic (Toxic) Leadership Scale" developed by Çelebi, Güner & Yıldız (2015) was used to determine toxic leadership perceptions. The scale, consisting of 30 items, examines four sub-dimensions of toxic leadership. These sub-dimensions and the number of items are as follows: Deprecation 11 items, • Selfishness 5 items, Selfishness 9 items, Negative mood 5 items. In the third part, organizational trust scale developed by Nyhan & Marlowe (1997) and adapted into Turkish by Demircan (2003) was used to determine the organizational trust perceptions of healthcare professionals. It is a 12-point measurement tool that consists of two sub-dimensions: trust in the manager and trust in the organization, and evaluates organizational trust as emotional, cognitive and planned behavior. The sub-dimension of trust in the manager consists of eight items (ie, items 1-8). The sub-dimension of trust in organization consists of four items (ie, items 9-12). The fourth part is the 20-question job satisfaction scale developed by Schwepter (2001) (Churchill et al., 1974; Comer et al., 1989); The structure of the work will be evaluated with questions 2, 13, 17, 18; promotion questions 4, 8, 15; wage questions 5, 9; executive questions 1,6; 12, company policy questions 3, 7, 14; customers' questions 11, 19, 20; and colleagues' questions are questions numbered 10, 16 and 4.

Findings and Discussion

70% of the participants are women and 30% are men. 64.9% of them are married and 35.1% are single. When the occupational distribution of the participants is examined, 14.7% are technicians and administrative workers, 5.1% are doctors, 9.1% are nurses, 3.2% are technical services and 9.1% are nurses. Considering the distribution of the caretakers according to the departments they work in, 35.1% were in the service, 19.4% in the administrative department, 16.0% in the operating room, 11.9% in the intensive care, 17.4% in the polyclinic, 0.2% of them were found to work in other departments. In addition, the majority of the participants (34.9%) are university graduates, while the rate of high school graduates is 24.3%, high school graduates are 18.3%, Master's graduates are 15.5% and PhD graduates are 5.1%. realized as. The age range is 19-60, the average age is 37.18. The age range is between 19-60 years old, and the average age is 37.18. In addition, factor analysis results are presented in detail at Appendix 1.

Validity and reliability analysis was applied to each scale set and the resulting Cronbach Alpha coefficients concluded that the scales collected by the data were safe for the study. It was tested with Correlation Analysis to measure the linear relationships between existing variables. Later, in addition to other hypothesis tests, regression analysis was applied to analyze mediation. Then, regression analysis hypothesis test was applied to analyze the mediation relationship for the hypothesis test. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient is used to calculate the internal consistency of the obtained factors. This value shows the total reliability of the questions that take factors. This coefficient is the one that best reflects the reliability value of the scale. Academic coefficient value is expected to be 0.70 and above. A Cronbach Alpha score between 0.60 - 0.80 indicates that it is at a reliable level and that it is between 0.80 -1.00 indicates that it is at a high reliability level in the table1(Cortina 1993).

Table 1: Degree of Reliability of Scale Variables and Sub-Components

Variables and Sub-Components	Number	Coranbach Alpha
Toxic Leadership	30	0,996
Organizational Trust	12	0,984
Job Satisfaction	20	0,937
Managerial Based Job Satisfaction	8	0,948
Company Policy Based Job Satisfaction	9	0,948
Colleagues Welded job Satisfaction	3	0,854

As a result of the general reliability analysis measured for the job satisfaction dependent variable, which includes 20 questions, it was found to be 0.937. The sub-dimensions of job satisfaction that make up the research scale are represented with reliability values between 0.948 and 0.854. The Cronbach Alpha value of the organizational trust independent variable was calculated as 0.984 and the Cronbach Alpha value of the toxic leadership independent variable as 0.996. In addition, the general reliability analysis result for 62 questions of the scales was found to be 0.937. In order to test the suitability of variables to factor analysis, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was conducted. It can be argued that the validity is excellent, as the limit value for sample adequacy is 0.976 as seen in Table 2.

Table 2: Toxic Leadership and Organizational Trust (Independent Variable) KMO and Bartlett's Test

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0,976
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	43284,447
	Df	861
	Sig	0,000

When the reliability analysis of the scales belonging to the model variables and the results of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity were examined, it was seen that the scales belonging to the model variables and subcomponents were reliable. At the same time, as one of the normality assumptions, it is seen in table 3 that the results of the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity are significant at <0.05 .

Table 3: Job Satisfaction (Dependent Variable) KMO and Bartlett's Test

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0,942
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	10116,961
	Df	190
	Sig	0,000

Since the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) values were greater than 0.70 and the p value of the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity results was less than 0.05, it was decided that the data set was suitable for factor analysis, and explanatory factor analysis was applied to test the validity of the variables and scales. The distribution of independent and dependent variables is shown in detail at Appendix 1. Considering the distribution of independent variables, it is seen that toxic leadership and organizational trust are gathered under one factor. Job satisfaction, which is included in the model as the dependent variable, was distributed to three factors: managerial based job satisfaction, company policy-based job satisfaction and colleagues welded job satisfaction. Correlation analysis was applied to determine policy-based on and strength of the relationship between the variables.

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that the correlations between toxic leadership, which is an independent variable in the research model, and organizational trust and job satisfaction sub-dimensions are negative and significant. In addition, it was determined that the correlations between organizational trust and job satisfaction sub-dimensions are positive and significant. When the correlation coefficients are evaluated, it can be said that there is no multiple linear connection problem since the tolerance values calculated for all variables do not take a value below 0.10 and VIF values above 10 (Pallant, 2005). Regression analyzes were applied to test the research hypotheses. Table 5 shows the results of regression analysis showing the relationship between toxic leadership, organizational trust and job satisfaction.

Regression analysis was applied to test the effects of toxic leadership on organizational trust. According to the determination coefficient, toxic leadership explains the organizational trust variable at a rate of 24.8% (adjusted $R^2 = 0.248$). The model 1 in Table 5, it is seen that the negative effect of toxic leadership on organizational trust is significant ($p > 0.05$). Since toxic leadership was found to negatively affect organizational trust ($\beta: -0.499$, $p < 0.01$), the H_1 hypothesis that "Toxic leadership has a negative impact on organizational trust" was accepted.

Regression analysis was used to test the effect on managerial based job satisfaction induced toxic leadership model 1 in Table 5. According to the determination coefficient, toxic leadership explains the managerial based job satisfaction variable at a rate of 10.7% (adjusted $R^2 = 0.107$). The model 2 in table 5, it is seen that the negative effect of toxic leadership on managerial based job satisfaction is significant ($p > 0.05$). Because toxic leadership's managerial based job satisfaction negative impact is detected ($\beta: -0.331$, $p < 0.01$) "Toxic leadership has a negative impact on managerial based job satisfaction" H_2 hypothesis that has been adopted.

Regression analysis was applied to test the effects of toxic leadership on company policy based job satisfaction. According to the coefficient of determination, toxic leadership explains 3.2% of company policy based job satisfaction (adjusted $R^2 = 0.032$). The model 3 in table 5, it is seen that the negative effect of toxic leadership on company policy based job satisfaction is significant

($p > 0.05$). Since toxic leadership was found to negatively affect on company policy based job satisfaction (β : -0.184, $p < 0.01$), the H_3 hypothesis that "toxic leadership has a negative impact on company policy based job satisfaction" was accepted.

Table 4: Descriptive statistics and inter-correlations

Questions			Toxic Leadership	Organizational Trust	Managerial Based Job Satisfaction	Company Policy Based Job Satisfaction	Colleagues Welded Job Satisfaction
Toxic Leadership	Pearson		1				
	Correlation						
	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	469				
Organizational Trust	Pearson		-,499**	1			
	Correlation		,000				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	469	469			
Managerial Based Job Satisfaction	Pearson		-,330**	,689**	1		
	Correlation		,000	,000			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	469	469	469		
Company Policy Based Job Satisfaction	Pearson		-,184**	,592**	,577**	1	
	Correlation		,000	,000	,000		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	469	469	469	469	
Colleagues Welded Job Satisfaction	Pearson		-,490**	,660**	,583**	,510**	1
	Correlation		,000	,000	,000	,000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	469	469	469	469	469

** Correlation significant is meaningful at the level of the 0.01 (2-tailed).
 * Correlation significant meaningful at the level of the 0.05 (2-tailed).

Regression analysis was applied to test the effects of toxic leadership on company policy based job satisfaction. According to the coefficient of determination, toxic leadership explains 3.2% of company policy based job satisfaction (adjusted $R^2 = 0.032$). The model 3 in table 5, it is seen that the negative effect of toxic leadership on company policy based job satisfaction is significant ($p > 0.05$). Since toxic leadership was found to negatively affect on company policy based job satisfaction (β : -0.184, $p < 0.01$), the H_3 hypothesis that "toxic leadership has a negative impact on company policy based job satisfaction" was accepted.

With the regression analysis, it was tried to determine the effect of toxic leadership on job satisfaction arising from colleagues. According to the coefficient of determination, toxic leadership explains the job satisfaction variable arising from colleagues at a rate of 23.9% (adjusted $R^2 = 0.239$). The model 4 in table 5, it is seen that the negative effect of toxic leadership on colleagues welded job satisfaction is significant ($p > 0.05$). Since toxic leadership was found to negatively affect on colleagues welded job satisfaction (β : -0.490, $p < 0.01$), the H_4 hypothesis that "toxic leadership has a negative impact on colleagues welded job satisfaction" was accepted.

Regression analysis was applied to test the effects of organizational trust on managerial based job satisfaction. According to the determination coefficient, organizational trust explains the managerial based job satisfaction variable at a rate of 47.4% (adjusted $R^2 = 0.474$). The model 5 in table 5, it is seen that organizational trust has a significant positive effect on managerial based job satisfaction ($p > 0.05$). Since it was determined that organizational trust positively affects managerial based job satisfaction (β : 0.689, $p < 0.01$), the H_5 hypothesis that "organizational trust has a positive impact on managerial based job satisfaction" was accepted.

Regression analysis was applied to test the effects of organizational trust on job satisfaction stemming from firm policies. According to the coefficient of determination, organizational trust accounts for 34.9% of company policy based job satisfaction (adjusted $R^2 = 0.349$). The model 6 in table 5, it is seen that organizational trust has a significant positive effect on company policy based job satisfaction ($p > 0.05$). Since it was determined that organizational trust positively affects on company policy based job satisfaction (β : 0.592, $p < 0.01$), the H_6 hypothesis that "organizational trust has a positive impact on company policy based job satisfaction" was accepted.

With the regression analysis, the effect of organizational trust on company policy based job satisfaction was tried to be determined. According to the coefficient of determination, organizational trust explains 43.5% of the company policy based job satisfaction (corrected $R^2 = 0.435$). The model 7 in table 5, it is seen that organizational trust has a significant positive effect on company policy based job satisfaction ($p > 0.05$). As it was determined that organizational trust positively affects on company policy based job

satisfaction (β : 0.660, $p < 0.01$), the H_7 hypothesis that "organizational trust has a positive impact on company policy based job satisfaction" was accepted.

Table 5: Regression Table (Toxic Leadership, Organizational Trust & Job Satisfaction Relationship)

Model	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Beta (Standardize)	t	Sig.	Adjusted R Square	F
1	Toxic Leadership	Organizational Trust	-0,499	-12,452	0,000	0,248	155,062***
2	Toxic Leadership	Managerial Based Job Satisfaction	-0,331	-7,564	0,000	0,107	57,219***
3	Toxic Leadership	Company Policy Based Job Satisfaction	-0,184	-4,035	0,000	0,032	16,283***
4	Toxic Leadership	Colleagues Welded Job Satisfaction	-0,49	-12,157	0,000	0,239	147,788***
5	Organizational Trust	Managerial Based Job Satisfaction	0,689	20,554	0,000	0,474	422,480***
6	Organizational Trust	Company Policy Based Job Satisfaction	0,592	15,858	0,000	0,349	251,485***
7	Organizational Trust	Colleagues Welded Job Satisfaction	0,66	18,996	0,000	0,435	360,832***
8	Toxic Leadership	Managerial Based Job Satisfaction	0,018	0,472	0,000	0,473	211,000***
	Organizational Trust		0,698	18,031	0,000		
9	Toxic Leadership	Company Policy Based Job Satisfaction	0,149	3,501	0,000	0,364	134,902***
	Organizational Trust		0,666	15,653	0,000		
10	Toxic Leadership	Colleagues Welded Job Satisfaction	-0,214	-5,500	0,000	0,468	206,841***
	Organizational Trust		0,553	14,220	0,000		
*p<0,05, **p<0,01, ***p<0,001							

In order to prove the role of mediator variable with the regression analysis; The effect of the independent variable on the mediator variable and the dependent variable, and the influence of the mediator variable on the dependent variable should be shown. In addition, when the mediator variable and the independent variable are analyzed together, it should give results that the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable disappears or decreases (Baron & Kenny, 1986). In case the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable disappears completely, it can be referred to as "full mediation" and, in case of a decrease, "partial mediation" effect (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

In table 6, which shows the mediating effect of organizational trust, it is seen that toxic leadership affects managerial based job satisfaction through organizational trust. In the first and second regressions, it is seen that toxic leadership has a significant negative effect on managerial based job satisfaction ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = -0.331$) and organizational trust ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = -0.499$). In the third regression, when organizational trust was included in the analysis together with toxic leadership as an independent variable, it was found that the negative effect of toxic leadership disappeared completely and showed a positive significant effect on managerial based job satisfaction ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = 0.018$). The rate of explaining the relationship between toxic leadership and managerial based job satisfaction through organizational trust was found to be 47.3% ($p < 0.001$). In this case, the H_8 hypothesis developed as "toxic leadership affects job satisfaction significantly through organizational trust" was accepted because it provides full mediation effect.

Table 6: The Effect of Toxic Leadership on Managerial Based Job Satisfaction through the Mediation of Organizational Trust

Regression	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Beta (Standardize)	t	Sig.	Adjusted R Square	F
1	Toxic Leadership	Managerial Based Job Satisfaction	-0,331	-7,564	0,000	0,107	57,219***
2	Toxic Leadership	Organizational Trust	-0,499	-12,452	0,000	0,248	155,062***
3	Toxic Leadership	Managerial Based Job Satisfaction	0,018	0,472	0,000	0,473	211,000***
	Organizational Trust		0,698	18,031	0,000		

In Table 7, which shows the mediating effect of organizational trust, it is seen that toxic leadership affects company policy based job satisfaction through organizational trust. In the first and second regressions in table 7, it is seen that toxic leadership has a significant negative effect on company policy based job satisfaction ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = -0.184$) and organizational trust ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = -0.499$). In the third regression, when organizational trust was included in the analysis together with toxic leadership as an independent variable, it was found that the negative effect of toxic leadership disappeared completely and had a positive significant effect on company policy based job satisfaction ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = 0.149$). The rate of explaining the relationship between toxic leadership and company policy based job satisfaction through organizational trust was found to be 36.4% ($p < 0.001$). In this case, the H_9 hypothesis developed as "toxic leadership significantly affects company policy based job satisfaction through organizational trust" has been accepted because it provides full mediation effect.

Table 7: The Effect of Toxic Leadership on Company Policy Based Job Satisfaction through the Mediation of Organizational Trust

Regression	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Beta (Standardize)	t	Sig.	Adjusted R Square	F
1	Toxic Leadership	Company Policy Based Job Satisfaction	-0,184	-4,035	0,000	0,032	16,283***
2	Toxic Leadership	Organizational Trust	-0,499	-12,452	0,000	0,248	155,062***
3	Toxic Leadership	Company Policy Based Job Satisfaction	0,149	3,501	0,000	0,364	134,902***
	Organizational Trust	Company Policy Based Job Satisfaction	0,666	15,653	0,000		

* $p < 0,05$, ** $p < 0,01$, *** $p < 0,001$

Table 8 shows the mediating effect of organizational trust and toxic leadership affects colleagues welded job satisfaction through organizational trust. In the first and second regressions in Table 4, it is seen that toxic leadership has a significant negative effect on colleagues welded job satisfaction ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = -0.490$) and organizational trust ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = -0.499$). In the third regression, when organizational trust was included in the analysis together with toxic leadership as an independent variable, it was found that the negative effect of toxic leadership decreased ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = -0.214$). The rate of explaining the relationship between toxic leadership and colleagues welded job satisfaction through organizational trust was found to be 46.8% ($p < 0.001$). In this case, the H_{10} hypothesis developed as "toxic leadership significantly affects colleagues welded job satisfaction through organizational trust" was accepted because it provides a partial mediating effect.

Table 8: The Effect of Toxic Leadership on Colleagues Welded Job Satisfaction through the Mediation of Organizational Trust

Model	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Beta (Standardize)	t	Sig.	Adjusted R Square	F
1	Toxic Leadership	Colleagues Welded Job Satisfaction	-0,490	-12,157	0,000	0,239	147,788***
2	Toxic Leadership	Organizational Trust	-0,499	-12,452	0,000	0,248	155,062***
3	Toxic Leadership	Colleagues Welded Job Satisfaction	-0,214	-5,500	0,000	0,468	206,841***
	Organizational Trust	Colleagues Welded Job Satisfaction	0,553	14,220	0,000		

* $p < 0,05$, ** $p < 0,01$, *** $p < 0,001$

With this study conducted with hospital staff working in different departments, it was tried to reveal the effects of toxic leadership on organizational trust and job satisfaction dimensions. One of the important results of the study is that the negative effect of toxic leadership on organizational trust ($\beta: -0.499$, $p < 0.01$) is stronger than the sub-dimensions of managerial and firm-based job satisfaction, and it is gathered under one factor as a result of the analysis. Toxic leadership also has a negative effect on job satisfaction resulting from employees ($\beta: -0.490$, $p < 0.01$). This result indicates that the toxic leadership characteristics of the managers working in the hospital have negative effects on organizational trust as well as negatively affecting the relationship between the employees and thus reducing job satisfaction.

The most important result of the study is to demonstrate that toxic leadership affects job satisfaction sub-dimensions through full or partial organizational trust. Toxic leadership alone has a negative effect ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = -0.331$) on managerial-induced job satisfaction, when tested through organizational trust, it positively affects managerial-induced job satisfaction as the dependent variable ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = 0.018$). This result shows that the hospital staff's trust towards their institution positively affects the job satisfaction resulting from the senior management, even if they work with a manager with toxic leadership characteristics. Because, due to the strict hierarchical structure, they can only communicate with the lower or middle level managers they are affiliated with.

For this reason, the toxic leadership characteristics revealed here represent more lower and middle-level managers, who are more in number than upper-level managers.

The full mediating effect of toxic leadership on job satisfaction resulting from corporate policies through organizational trust has been identified. While toxic leadership alone has a negative effect on job satisfaction arising from corporate policies ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = -0.184$), it shows a positive effect on job satisfaction resulting from corporate policies when tested together with organizational trust ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = 0.149$). In light of this result, considering that institutional policies in hospitals also support organizational trust, it can be thought that the effects of the toxic leadership characteristics of lower and middle-level managers on job satisfaction arising from institutional policies on hospital staff will remain limited. For this reason, the importance of the policies determined by the senior management in hospital institutions for employees is increasing.

It is seen that toxic leadership has an effect on job satisfaction arising from employees, partially through organizational trust. Although toxic leadership alone has a negative effect on job satisfaction resulting from employees ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = -0.490$), when tested together with organizational trust, the negative effect on job satisfaction resulting from employees decreases. In line with this result, it can be predicted that while organizational trust provided in hospital institutions is supportive of job satisfaction provided by communication between employees, managers with toxic leadership characteristics may also negatively affect job satisfaction by causing problems among employees ($p = 0.000$, $\beta = -0.214$).

In summary, as can be seen in table 9, while the leadership characteristics of the hospital managers have effects on organizational trust and job satisfaction, the positive perception levels of the employees in terms of organizational trust affect the job satisfaction positively. Therefore, the importance of organizational trust becomes more prominent. Improving corporate policies towards employees may also have positive effects on job satisfaction of employees.

Table 9: Research Hypotheses and Results

No	Hypothesis	Result
H ₁	Toxic leadership has a negative impact on organizational trust.	Supported.
H ₂	Toxic leadership has a negative impact on managerial based job satisfaction.	Supported.
H ₃	Toxic leadership has a negative impact on company policy based job satisfaction.	Supported.
H ₄	Toxic leadership has a negative impact on colleagues welded job satisfaction.	Supported.
H ₅	Organizational trust has a positive impact on managerial based job satisfaction.	Supported.
H ₆	Organizational trust has a positive impact on company policy based job satisfaction.	Supported.
H ₇	Organizational trust has a positive impact on colleagues welded job satisfaction.	Supported.
H ₈	Toxic leadership significantly affects managerial based job satisfaction through organizational trust.	Supported.
H ₉	Toxic leadership significantly affects company policy based job satisfaction through organizational trust.	Supported.
H ₁₀	Toxic leadership significantly affects colleagues welded job satisfaction through organizational trust.	Supported.

Conclusions

The main purpose of this study was to explain the mediating role of organizational trust in the impact of toxic leadership on job satisfaction dimensions. Our results, consistent with the literature, show that toxic leadership negatively affects job satisfaction dimensions. In addition, it was found that organizational trust has a positive effect on the sub-dimensions of job satisfaction.

One of the important results of the study is that toxic leadership has significantly negative effect on organizational trust. This situation may be suggestive in terms of the senior management to introduce different managerial measures for employees with toxic leadership characteristics. In other words, improvement programs can be applied to employees who show leadership characteristics not only in terms of employee satisfaction but also threatening organizational trust.

One of the striking implications of the study is that while toxic leadership alone has a negative effect on managerial and company policy based job satisfaction, it positively affects managerial and company policy based job satisfaction through organizational trust. This result highlights the hospital staff's trust in the institution. Even if they work with a manager whose toxic leadership feature is

dominant, their trust in their organizations still provides a managerial and company policy based job satisfaction. Based on this inference, it can be suggested that employees identify and strengthen the tools that will increase their corporate trust.

This research indicates that leaders with toxic leadership characteristics negatively affect employees' communication with each other. At this point, organizational trust is supportive of the job satisfaction subcomponent arising from the employees' colleagues. For this reason, developing actions and activities that support employee communication and including employees in them will support organizational trust on the one hand and job satisfaction of employees on the other.

Thanks to this research, improvement of policies that will support organizational trust and improvement programs to be applied to employees who show toxic leadership characteristics can be listed as general recommendations. Variables that have moderator effect on existing variables can be investigated with studies with larger sample sizes for future research.

Reference

- Akça, İ. & Tuzcuoğlu, F. (2020). Toksik liderliğin üretkenlik karşısı iş davranışları ve işten ayrılma niyeti üzerindeki etkisine yönelik bir model önerisi, *Journal of Life Economics*, 7(3), 257-268 E - ISSN: 2148-4139 URL: <https://www.journals.gen.tr/jlecon> <https://doi.org/10.15637/jlecon.7.019>
- Allum, F. (2011). Silvio Berlusconi and his 'toxic' touch. *Representation*, 47(3), 281- 294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00344893.2011.596434>
- Appelbaum H. S., & Girard. D.R. (2007). Toxins in the workplace: effect on organizations and employees corporate governance. *The International Journal of Business in Society*, 7(1), 17-28. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/14720700710727087/full/htm>
- Babadag, M., & Arli, O.E. (2018). Duygusal tükenme ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkide iş tatmininin aracı rolü , *Uluslararası İdari ve İktisadi Bilimler Dergisi*, (17.UİKÖzel sayısı), 167-182, ISSN 1307-9832. <https://doi.org/10.18092/ulikidince.432875>
- Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual. Strategic and Statistical Considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (6), 1173-1182 <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.15.6.1173>
- Batmantaş, H., & Örü, E. (2018). Örgütsel güven ile sizim arasındaki ilişki: bir uygulama, *Sosyal Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi* ,18(36),198-214, <https://doi.org/10.30976/susead.399087>
- Bowman, C., & Ambrosini, V. (2000). Value creation versus value capture: towards a coherent definition of value in strategy. *British Journal of Management*, 11(1),1-15, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00147>
- Bozkurt, S., Çoban, Ö., & Çolakoğlu, M. H. (2020). Örgütsel güven düzeyi ve toksik liderlik davranışları ilişkisinde örgütsel bağlılığın aracı etkisi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 35(3), 704-719. <https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2018045608>
- Burton, J.B., Taylor, S.G., & Barber, L.K. (2014). Understanding internal, external, and relational attributions for abusive supervision. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35, 871-891, https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/job.1939?casa_token
- Büyükyılmaz, O., Karakulle, İ., & Karataş, İ. (2018). Örgütsel kariyer yönetiminin duygusal bağlılık üzerindeki etkisinde iş tatmininin aracılık rolü. *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 8(1), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.18074/ckuiibfd.310160>
- Chowdhury, P.P. (2012). Antecedents and consequences of trust and commitment in b2b relationship: A Review of Literature. *Perspective*, 4(2), 49-63 file:///C:/Users/nurgu/Downloads/Antecedents-and-Consequences-of-Trust-and-Commitment%20(6).pdf
- Churchill, G., Ford, N. M., & Walker, O. C. (1974). Measuring the job satisfaction of industrial salesmen. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 1(3), 254-260, , <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224377401100303>
- Coccia, C. (1998), Avoiding a toxic organization. *Nursing Management*, 29(5), 32-33 <https://europepmc.org/article/med/9807410>, file:///C:/Users/nurgu/Downloads/Avoiding_a_Toxic_Organization.8.pdf ,6700ab3ab3491c154bd3fc4
- Cortina Lilia M. & Vizki J. Magley. (2003). Raising voice, risking retaliation: events following interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8(4), 247-265 doi: 10.1037 / 1076-8998.8.4.247 <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.518.3744&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Comer, J.M., Machleit, K.A., & Lagece ,R.A.(1989). Psychometric assessment of a reduced version of indsales. *Journal of Business Research*, 18, (4), 291-302, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(89\)90023-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(89)90023-4)
- Currian, D. B. (1999). The causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in models of employee turnover. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(4), 495 – 524 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(99\)00031-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(99)00031-5)
- Çankaya, M. (2019). Sağlık çalışanlarında toksik liderlik algısı. *Sosyal, Beşeri ve İdari Bilimler Alanında Akademik Çalışmalar-3* (s. 265-281) , https://www.gecekitapligi.com/Webkontrol/uploads/Fck/sosyal3_3.pdf https://www.gecekitapligi.com/Webkontrol/uploads/Fck/sosyal3_3.pdf <https://hdl.handle.net/11491/5790>
- Çelebi, N., Güner, H., & Yıldız, G. (2015). Toksik liderlik ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* ,4(1), 249 - 268, <https://doi.org/10.14686/BUEFAD.2015111056>, <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/43673>

- Çetinkaya, H. (2017). Okul yöneticilerinin toksik (zehirli) liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin tükenmişlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki, *Pamukkale Üniversitesi*, yüksek lisans tezi, Denizli
- Dellasega, C. & Volpe, R. L. (2013). Toxic nursing: managing bullying, bad attitudes, and total turmoil. Indianapolis, IN: *Sigma Theta Tau* <https://books.google.com.tr/books> ISBN:9781937554422
- Demir, B. (2019). Toksik liderlik algısının örgütsel sessizlik, duygusal bağlılık ile görev performansı arasındaki ilişki. *Beykent Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı İşletme Yönetimi Bilim Dalı*, Doktora Tezi, İstanbul
- Demir, B. (2020). Örgütlerde toksik lider ve toksik ilişkiler, *Balkan ve Yakın Doğu Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 06(Special Issue), 31-35, http://www.ibaness.org/bnejss/2020_06_special_issue/05_Demir.pdf
- Demircan, N. A. (2003). Örgütsel güvenin bir ara değişken olarak örgütsel bağlılık üzerindeki etkisi: Eğitim sektöründe bir uygulama, *Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji, Sosyal bilimler Enstitüsü*. doktora tezi Gebze.
- Erdal N. (2020). Sağlık çalışanlarında örgütsel güven ve örgütsel vatandaşlığın iş tatmini üzerindeki etkilerinin incelenmesi: bir üniversite hastanesi örneği *Beykent Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı İşletme Yönetimi Bilim Dalı, Doktora Tezi*, İstanbul
- Erdal, N., & Altındag, E. (2020). Research on the effects of job satisfaction on organizational trust and organizational citizenship in health workers: a case study of university hospitals. *Journal of Management, Marketing and Logistics (JMML)*, 7(3), 124-142. Permanent link to this document: <http://doi.org/10.17261/Pressacademia.2020.1285>
- Eriş, Y., (2019). Toksik liderliğin örgütsel bağlılığa ve iş tatminine etkisi : Bir kamu bankası Örneği, *Tekirdağ Namık Kemal Üniversitesi, Sosyal bilimler enstitüsü, işletme anabilim dalı* Yüksek lisans tezi
- Eriş, Y., & Arun, K. (2020). Liderin karanlık yüzü: toksik liderlik davranışlarının çalışanların iş tatminine etkisi, *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 12 (2), 1861-1877, <https://doi.org/10.20491/isarder.2020.949>
- Erkutlu, H.V. & Chafra, J. 2006. Relationship between leadership power bases and job stress of subordinates: example from boutique hotels. *Management Research News*, 29(5), 285-297 <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/01409170610674419/full/pdf?>
- Erkutlu, H., & Chafra, J. (2017). Leaders' narcissism and organizational cynicism in healthcare organizations. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 10(5), 346–363. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJWHM-12-2016-0090>
- Filiz, M., & Bardakçı, S. (2020). Sağlık çalışanlarının örgütsel iklim algıları ve örgütsel güven düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: Artvin ili örneği, *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 19(73), 436-449, DOI: 10.17755/esosder.587613
- Frost, P.J. (2003). Emotions in the workplace and the important role of toxin handlers, *Ivey Business Journal*, 68(2), 1-6. <https://iveybusinessjournal.com/publication/emotions-in-the-workplace-and-the-important-role-of-toxin-handlers/>
- Frost, P. J. (2004). Handling toxic emotions: New challenges for leaders and their organization. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(2), 111-127. <http://home.mycybernet.net/~taylors/Publish/toxic%20emotions.pdf>
- Gilbert, J. A., & Tang, T. L.-P. (1998). An Examination of Organizational Thrust Antecedents. *Public Personnel Management*, 27 (3), 321-338 <https://doi.org/10.1177/009102609802700303>
- Ghosh, R., Jacobs, J. L., & Reio, T. G. (2011). The Toxic Continuum From Incivility to Violence: What Can HRD Do?. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(1), 3-9 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422311410641>
- Green, J. E. (2014). Toxic leadership in educational organizations, *Education Leadership Review*, 15(1), 18-33. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1105504>, ERIC Numarası: EJ1105504
- Goldman, A. (2006). High toxicity leadership borderline personality disorder and the dysfunctional organization. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 733-746. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940610713262>
- Goldman, A. (2011). Demagogue to dialogue: An alternative to toxic leadership in corporate downsizings. *Organizational Dynamics*, 40(3), 235—241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2011.04.011>
- Gül, H., & Ağıröz, A. (2011). Mobbing ve örgütsel sinizm arasındaki ilişkiler: hemşireler üzerine bir uygulama. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 8 (2), 27-47. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/18914>
- Gün, İ., & Söyük, S., (2017). Sağlık kuruluşlarında örgüt iklimi ve örgütsel güven arasındaki ilişki. *Acıbadem Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 8 (1), 40-48. ile: http://C:/Users/nurgu/Downloads/Saglik_Kuruluslarinda_Orgut_Iklimi_ve_Or.pdf
- Davis, K. (Çev. Kemal Tosun ve diğerleri), *İşletmede İnsan Davranış- Örgütsel Davranış*, (İ.Ü. İşletme Fakültesi Ya., Ya. No: 136, İstanbul: 1984), s.6.
- Hadadian, Z., & Sayadpour, Z. (2018). Relationship between toxic leadership and job related affective well-being: The mediating role of job stress. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences: Proceedings*, 7(1), 137–145, ISSN 1805-3602 https://european-science.com/eojnss_proc/article/view/5398
- Hanges, P.J. (2014). An examination of toxic leadership, job outcomes, and the impact of military deployment. *Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy*
- Hoffman, E. P., & Sergio, R. P. (2020). Understanding the effects of toxic leadership on expatriates' readiness for innovation: An Uzbekistan case the effects of toxic leadership on expatriates' readiness for innovation: An *Uzbekistan case IEECA*. doi:10.15549/jeecar.v7i1.360
- Hyson, C. M. (2016). Relationship between destructive leadership behaviors and employee turnover. *Walden University (Dissertation)*. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/2830>

- İnan, İ. E., & Çelik, E. (2018). Algılanan örgütsel güven ve iş tatmini: Kastamonu İli özel ve kamu bankalarında bir uygulama. *INJOSOS AL-Farabi Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2 (3), 23-52, <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/528482>
- İzgüden, D., Eroymak, S., & Erdem, R. (2016). sağlık kurumlarında görülen toksik liderlik davranışları: bir üniversite hastanesi örneği. *Balkan Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2016 Özel Sayı, 262-276. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/bsbd/issue/43860/539476>
- Kalemci Tüzün, İ. (2007). Güven, örgütsel güven ve örgütsel güven modelleri. *Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi Sosyal Ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2007(2), 93-118. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/kmusekad/issue/10223/125677>
- Kasalak, G. & Aksu, M. B. (2016). Örgütler nasıl zehirlenir? öğretim elemanlarının örgütsel toksisite algıları. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31(4), 676-694, doi: 10.16986/HUJE.2016015696
- Kalleberg, A. L. (1977). Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, 42(1), 124-143. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2117735>
- Kesken, J., & Ayyıldız, N. A. (2008). Liderlik Yaklaşımlarında Yeni Perspektifler: Pozitif ve Otantik Liderlik, *Ege Academic Review, Ege University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 8(2), 729-754. <https://ideas.repec.org/a/ege/journal/v8y2008i2p729-754.html>
- Kılıç, M. (2019). X ve Y Kuşaklarındaki Toksik Liderlik Algılarının Örgütsel Bağlılık, Psikolojik İyi Oluş ve Bireysel Performans Üzerindeki Yansımaları. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme Anabilim Dalı, Yönetim ve Organizasyon Bilim Dalı*, yayımlanmış Doktora Tezi
- Kılıç, M., & Günsel, A. (2019). *The dark side of the leadership: The effects of toxic leaders on employees. European Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(2), 51–56. <https://doi.org/10.26417/ejss-2019.v2i2-64>
- Kırbaç, M. (2013). Eğitim örgütlerinde toksik liderlik. *İnönü Üniversitesi*, yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi *Malatya*
- Koç, H., & Yazıcıoğlu, İ. (2011). Yöneticiye duyulan güven ile iş tatmini arasındaki ilişki: kamu ve özel sektör karşılaştırması. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 12 (1), 46-57 <https://openaccess.dogus.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11376/247/koc.pdf?sequence>
- Kusy, M., & Holloway, E. (2009). Toxic workplace: Managing toxic personalities and their systems of power. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. <https://books.google.com.tr/books?hl>
- Labrague, L. J., Nwafor, C. E., & Tsaras, K. (2020). Influence of toxic and transformational leadership practices on nurses' job satisfaction, job stress, absenteeism and turnover intention: A cross-sectional study. *Journal Nursing Management*. 2020;28:1104–1113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.1305>
- Too, L., & Harwey, M. (2012). “TOXIC” workplaces: the negative interface between the physical and social environments. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 14(3), 171–181 <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/14630011211285834/full/html?utm>
- Lubit, R. (2004). The tyranny of toxic Managers: An emotional intelligence approach to dealing with difficult personalities, *Ivey Business Journal*, 14-34. https://www.csueastbay.edu/diversity/files/docs/ombuds-resource-articles/the-tyranny-of-toxic-managers_-an-emotional-intelligence-approach-to-dealing-with-difficult-personalities-.pdf
- Loke, J. C. F. (2001). Leadership behaviours: effects on job satisfaction, productivity and organizational commitment, *Journal of Nursing Management*, 9, 191-204, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1046/j.1365-2834.2001.00231.x>
- Nyhan, R. C., & Marlowe, H. A. (1997). Development and psychometric properties of the organizational trust inventory, *Evaluation Review*, 21 (5), 614-635, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X9702100505>
- O'reilly, C. A., & Caldwell, D. F. (1980). Job Choice: The Impact of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors On Subsequent Satisfaction and Commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65(5), 559-565. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.65.5.559>
- Örgev, C., & Demir, H. (2019). Toxic leadership in a public university hospital. *Journal of International Health Sciences and Management*. 5(8), 48-63 <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/704975>
- Örücü, E., & Kambur, E. (2017). Otel çalışanlarında örgütsel sessizlik ve örgütsel güven ilişkisi: *Bandırma. Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 10(52), 1109-1123, Doi Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17719/jisr.2017.1964>
- Özdem, G., & Sezer, S. (2019). The relationship between solution –focused school leadership and organizational cynicism, Organizational Commitment and Teachers Job Satisfaction, *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 15(1), 167-183, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2019.184.11>
- Pallant, J. (2005). SPSS survival manual a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows (Version 12). Allen & Unwin, Sydney 1-318.
- Pars Şener, M. (2017). Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç kaynakları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel güven düzeyleri, *On Dokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi*, yüksek lisans tezi, Samsun
- Pelletier, L. K. (2010). Leader toxicity: an empirical investigation of toxic behavior and rhetoric, *Leadership*, 6(4), 373-389. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1742715010379308>
- Pelletier, K. L. (2012). Perceptions of and reactions to leader toxicity: Do leader–follower relationships and identification with victim matter?. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(3), 412–424. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.09.011>
- 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 <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/01437739710182313/full/html?casa>

- Reed, G. E. (2004). Toxic leadership. *Military Review*, 84(4), 67-71
https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/35208258/Toxic_Leadership.pdf?1413826270
- Reyhanoğlu, M., & Akın, Ö. (2016). Toksik liderlik örgütsel sağlığı olumsuz yönde tetikler mi? *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(3), 442-459. <http://www.itobiad.com/en/download/article-file/206370>
- Schweper, J. C. H. (2001). Ethical climate's relationship to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention in the Salesforce. *Journal of Business Research*, 54, 39– 52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(00\)00125-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(00)00125-9)
- Schmidt, A. A. (2008). Development and Validation of The Toxic Leadership Scale. *Master of Science, University of Maryland, College Park, USA* <https://drum.lib.umd.edu/bitstream/handle/1903/8176/umi?sequence>
- Serdar, E. (2019). İstismarçı yönetimin iş tatmini, yaşam tatmini ve örgütten memnuniyet ile ilişkisi, *Sakarya Üniversitesi İşletme Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans Tezi*,
- Skinner, E. W. (1969). Relationship between leadership behavior patterns and organizational situational variables. *Personnel Psychology*, 22(4), 489-94. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1969.tb00350.x>
- Smith, N., & Lowman, I. F. (2020). Conflict in the workplace: a 10-year review of toxic leadership in higher education, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 23(5), 538-551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1591512>
- Shouksmith, G. (1994). Variables related to organizational commitment in health professionals. *Psychology Report*, 74(3), 707-711, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.2466/pr0.1994.74.3.707>
- Starratt, A., & Grandy, G. (2010). Young workers' experiences of abusive leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 31(2), 136-158 [https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/01437731011024394/full/pdf?casa_token=Tavanti,M_127-136%20\(1\).pdf](https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/01437731011024394/full/pdf?casa_token=Tavanti,M_127-136%20(1).pdf)
- Tavanti, M. (2011). Managing toxic leaders: dysfunctional patterns in organizational leadership and how to deal with them. *Human Resource Management (HRM)*, 6, 127-136. [https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/35395611/2011_Toxic_Leaders.pdf?ile:///C:/Users/nurgu/Downloads/HRM\(ZZL\)_6-2011_Tavanti-M_127-136%20\(1\).pdf](https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/35395611/2011_Toxic_Leaders.pdf?ile:///C:/Users/nurgu/Downloads/HRM(ZZL)_6-2011_Tavanti-M_127-136%20(1).pdf)
- Tepe, N., & Yılmaz, G. (2020). Öğretmenlerin okul iklimi algılarının yordayıcısı olarak okul yöneticilerinin toksik liderlik davranışları. *OPUS-Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 15(25), 3360-3381, <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.667320>
<https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1083200>
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178-190. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1556375>
- Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33(3), 261-289 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300812>
- Walton, M. (2007). Leadership toxicity - An inevitable affliction of organizations? *Organizations & People*, 14(1), 19–27
<http://business-school.exeter.ac.uk/documents/papers/leadership/94.pdf>
- Webster, V., Brough, P., & Daly, K. (2016). Fight, flight or freeze: Common responses for follower coping with toxic leadership. *Stress and Health*, 32(4), 346–354. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2626>
- Wech, B. A. (2002). Trust context: Effect on organizational citizenship behavior, supervisory fairness, and job satisfaction beyond the influence of leader-member exchange. *Business & Society*, 41(3), 353-360,
https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0007650302041003006?casa_token=UHgP0HHXzrBHAQjKjEegQIBRAB
- Williams, D. F. (2005). Toxic leadership in the U.S. army (Unpublished master thesis). *U.S. Army War College, ABD*.
<http://ndl.ethernet.edu.et/bitstream/123456789/67599/1/493%202018.pdf>
- Wilson-Starks, K. Y. (2003). Toxic leadership. *Transleadership, Inc. Retrieved from*
<http://www.transleadership.com/ToxicLeadership.pdf>
- Whicker, M. (1996). Toxic leaders: When Organizations Go Bad, *Quorum Books, New York, NY: Doubleday*
- Yavaş, A. (2016). Sectoral differences in the perception of toxic leadership. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 229, 267–276. <https://pdf.sciencedirectassets.com/277811/1-s2.0-S1877042816X00158/1-s2.0-S1877042816310722>
- Yazıcıoğlu, İ. (2009). Konaklama işletmelerinde işgörenlerin örgütsel güven duyguları ile iş tatmini ve işten ayrılma niyetleri üzerine bir alan araştırması, *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(30), (235-249)
<https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/70150>
- Yorulmaz, M., & Karaböcek, A. (2020). Liman çalışanlarında örgütsel güven ile iş performansı arasındaki ilişki: iş tatmini ve örgütsel bağlılığın rolü, *Balkan ve Yakın Doğu Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 06(2), 121-130
- You, C. S., Huang, C. C., Wang, H. B., Liu, K. N., Un, C. H., & Tseng, J. S. (2013). The Relationship between corporate social responsibility, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation (Online)*, 5(4), 65-77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.11.040>
- Zagross, H. & Jamileh, Z. (2016). Relationship between toxic leadership and job stress of knowledge workers. *Studies in Business and Economics*, 11(3), 84- 89 <http://eccsf.ulbsibiu.ro/RePEc/blg/journal/11307hadadian&zarei.pdf> DOI 10.1515/sbe-2016-0037
- Zengin, Y. (2019). Karanlık liderliğin örgütsel seslilik ve iş tatmini üzerindeki etkisi. *KAÜİİBFD*, 10(19), 310-337.
<https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/749546>

Publisher's Note: SSBFNET stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

© 2021 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478) by SSBFNET is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Appendix 1: Exploratory Factor Analysis

No	Toxic leadership	Organizational Trust	Managerial Based Job Satisfaction	Company Policy Based Job Satisfaction	Colleagues Welded job Satisfaction
TL18	,955				
TL29	,955				
TL20	,954				
TL28	,954				
TL17	,954				
TL30	,953				
TL13	,953				
TL4	,951				
TL14	,951				
TL23	,951				
TL11	,950				
TL16	,950				
TL21	,949				
TL5	,948				
TL2	,948				
TL19	,948				
TL12	,948				
TL3	,947				
TL25	,947				
TL10	,946				
TL15	,946				
TL6	,945				
TL24	,945				
TL26	,941				
TL7	,939				
TL1	,938				
TL27	,936				
TL8	,934				
TL9	,931				
TL22	,928				
OT4		,953			
OT8		,945			
OT5		,940			
OT7		,935			
OT2		,934			
OT6		,929			
OT1		,928			
OT10		,922			
OT9		,920			
OT3		,895			
OT12		,893			
OG11		,887			
JS4			,910		
JS8			,882		

Table		
Cont'd		
JS7	,881	
JS3	,855	
JS6	,830	
JS5	,824	
JS9	,803	
JS1	,774	
JS20		,909
JS19		,908
JS14		,801
JS18		,800
JS17		,789
JS16		,781
JS11		,774
JS15		,763
JS13		,737
JS2		,886
JS10		,807
JS12		,772

ExtractionMethod:PrincipalComponentAnalysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization