



Bakır, M. & Erçetin, Ş. Ş. (2024). The relationship between the toxic leadership behaviors of school principals and the organizational happiness of teachers. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 11(3), 780-796.

Received : 19.03.2024
Revised version received : 08.06.2024
Accepted : 11.06.2024

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TOXIC LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND THE ORGANIZATIONAL HAPPINESS OF TEACHERS

(Research article)

Merve Bakır  (0000-0001-8606-4117).

Hacettepe University Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Turkey
mrwbkr@hotmail.com

Şefika Şule Erçetin  (0000-0002-7686-4863).

Hacettepe University Faculty of Education, Turkey
sefikasule@gmail.com

Biodatas:

Merve Bakır is an assistant principal in a secondary school in Turkey. She has completed her master's degree at Hacettepe University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences in the field of Educational Administration. She is pursuing her PhD studies in the same field in the same university.

Şefika Şule Erçetin is a full Professor and the Dean of Faculty of Education, Hacettepe University in Ankara, Turkey. She is also the chair of the Department of Educational Sciences in the same university. Her field of study is Educational Administration.

Note: This article has been generated from the Master's thesis of the first author completed in 2022 under the supervision of the second author.

Copyright © 2014 by International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET). ISSN: 2148-225X.

Material published and so copyrighted may not be published elsewhere without written permission of IOJET.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TOXIC LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND THE ORGANIZATIONAL HAPPINESS OF TEACHERS

Merve BAKIR

mrvbkr@hotmail.com

Şefika Şule ERÇETİN

sefikasule@gmail.com

Abstract

The study aims to describe teachers' perceptions of school administrators' toxic leadership behaviours, and to examine its effect on teachers' organisational happiness. The study group of the study consists of primary and secondary school teachers working in Afyonkarahisar city centre in the 2021-2022 academic year. The participants of the study was determined by simple random sampling method, and a total of 567 teachers were included in the study. 'Toxic Leadership Scale' and 'Organisational Happiness Scale' were used as data collection tools in the study. As a result of the study, it was found that teachers did not agree that school administrators exhibited toxic leadership behaviour and their organisational happiness levels were high. In the study, it was concluded that teachers' perceptions of school administrators' toxic leadership behaviours and organisational happiness levels differed significantly according to teachers' marital status, age, professional seniority, branch and the type of school they worked in. It was determined that toxic leadership significantly predicted teachers' organisational happiness.

Keywords: Toxic leadership, organizational happiness, school principals, teachers' perception

1. Introduction

Many theories that examine the characteristics of leadership and the characteristics of leadership have been developed from the past to the present. Leadership has always created positive phrases such as leading, hosting, motivating, motivating, pioneer, and developing the organization. However, in addition to this positive perception, it is not considered that leaders may have a dark aspect (Çetinkaya, 2017). The concept of 'toxic leadership', which has the dark aspect, negative attitudes towards its employees, and defines the leadership approach, which shows a conflict and incompatible attitude, was first used by Whicker (1996) for the first time. Frost (2003) has described the toxic leadership as an approach that exhibits destructive behaviors in the organization that may lead to quitting. Lipman-Blumen (2005) has described it as a very strict and malicious, Roter (2011) has described it as leadership approach that damages the climate of organization by putting obstacles in communication.

Toxic leadership is also used to express the issues that prevent organizational happiness which is the way of thinking that enables the highest level of performance in organizations and realizes the power at the last point (Kırbaç, 2013, p.4; Pryce-Jones, 2010). Organizational happiness expresses the situation of being satisfied with the professions and lives of employees (Weserat, Sharif & Majid, 2015). Organizational Happiness is a concept that defines the fact

that employees do their professions (Bakker & Oerlemans, 2011) and that employees feel quite unhappy and tense when they are generally happy (Diener, Sandvik & Pavot, 1991). It is unlikely that organizational happiness will exist in organizations where there are toxic leaders who do not care about employees and the peace of employees (Schmidt, 2008). Toxic leader is a major obstacle to organizational happiness by causing negativities in the decrease in performance of employees, the realization of the aims of the organization and the development of the organization.

Organizational happiness plays a dominant role in achieving the aims of the person and the organization (Bulut, 2015). In order to realize organizational happiness, organization managers should be sensitive to the expectations and needs of their employees and should develop a positive organization climate (Birdoğan Gücü, 2019). Organizational managers should design and live organization in a way that creates meaning for the employees of the organization (Gavin & Mason, 2004).

Schools are the source of social relations in the triangle of teachers, principals and students. Teachers spend most of their time at school and work for many years. Peace and happiness in the school are dominant for a teacher. In this context, a school principal is expected to behave in a way that positively affect the feelings and behaviors of teachers working in the school (Birdoğan Kuvvet, 2019). The main purpose of the educational activity is to motivate teachers. This goal is realized with a good management (Sucu, 2016). In terms of school management, organizational happiness and the leadership exhibited in school administration are very important key in providing qualified education in schools. In this context, it is an important issue for school principals to lead teachers to provide organizational happiness.

The leadership behaviors exhibited by school principals, together with the changing management approach, are of great importance for all components of the school. A supportive school principal contributes to the school success with the happiness of the teachers in the school. It is thought that the existence of happy teachers will benefit from the growth of happy students and thus indirectly benefit the happiness of societies (Arslan, 2018). In this context, the organizational happiness of teachers is important. For this reason, to determine the relationship between the toxic leadership behavior levels exhibited by school principals and the organizational happiness of teachers was found to be worth researching.

1.1. Conceptual Framework

1.1.1. Toxic Leadership

Toxic leadership was a leadership approach used by Whicker (1996) for the first time. Although toxic leadership, a new approach, has been tried to be defined by many researchers, a clear definition has not been made. It is stated that toxic leaders have incompatible, dissatisfied and malicious behaviors (İlhan, 2019). Bing (1992) defines toxic leaders as narcissists, paranoid, hostile, disastrous hunter, and authoritarian (quoted Roter, 2011). These leaders can succeed, but the employees remain for a long time under the influence of the results of the negative behavior of these leaders (Dobbs, 2014).

Flynn (1999) describes toxic leaders as individuals who deteriorate their subordinates, make screaming behaviors, weak personal relationships, make false decisions, shout and make bad words. Kellerman (2004) states that it is a wide concept for the definition of toxic leadership. Toxic leadership defines enthusiasm as an approach that damages people and

organizations by eliminating enthusiasm, creativity, autonomy, and innovative behaviors. Toxic leaders rapidly spread their poisons through excessive control and define leadership as control (Wilson-Stark, 2003).

Lipman-Blumen (2005) defines toxic leaders as individuals who have serious and permanent toxic effects on their organizations, followers and even those who are not under their protection, with their destructive behavior and dysfunctional personal characteristics. These leaders consciously do their behavior.

Toxic leadership is discussed in four dimensions as unappreciation, self-interest, selfishness and negative mood (İlhan, 2019).

1.1.2. Organizational Happiness

Happiness, which is one of the most important goals for the human being, is a subjective, cannot be considered separate from environmental and social influences (Fisher, 2010). Happiness can be evaluated in many contexts and fields. One of these areas is business life. In this context, the concept of organizational happiness emerges. Pryce-Jones (2010) describes organizational happiness as “a way of thinking that will enable the realization of the power at the highest level in organizations and to maximize performance”. Organizational happiness refers to a situation where positive emotions are more and more often and suppress negative emotions (Brief & Weiss, 2002), the happiness of the organization as a single heart rather than living happiness individually (Bulut, 2015).

It is stated that organizational happiness will positively affect productivity, performance, efficiency and cooperation (Arslan & Polat, 2017). Organizational happiness is expected to affect many factors within the organization. If positive emotions are experienced in organizations and individuals feel happy in the organization they are in, they will be happy in their own way. In this context, as Pryce-Jones (2010) points out, happiness in the organization will allow individuals to collaborate, generate creative ideas, contribute to the organization and communicate effectively. Organizational happiness will also affect organizational performance. For healthy, productive and happy organizations to exist, organizations need to attach importance to positive psychology (Gavin & Mason, 2004). It is stated that negative emotions and situations within the organization will negatively affect organizational happiness (Kahveci & Köse, 2019).

A high level of organizational happiness ensures that the performance of individuals and the efficiency of the organization are also at a high level. However, in organizations where organizational happiness is high, it is stated that individuals can easily cope with all kinds of problems they will encounter in achieving their goals. In this respect, organizational happiness refers to the meeting of the goals of the individual and the organization in a common point (Bulut, 2015).

Organizational happiness is defined in three sub-dimensions: Positive affect, negative affect, and fulfillment (Warr, 2007).

For the purpose of the research, the following questions have been tried to be answered.

1. According to teachers' perceptions, what level of toxic leadership behaviors do school principals have?
2. According to teachers' perceptions, do the toxic leadership behaviors of school principals show a generally significant difference according to the gender, marital status, professional seniority, education status, type of school variables of teachers?
3. What is the level of organizational happiness of teachers?
4. Do teachers' organizational happiness levels show a significant difference based on demographic characteristics (gender, marital status, professional seniority, type of school, and educational status)?

5. Are the toxic leadership levels of school principals a predictor of the organizational happiness levels of teachers?

2. Method

2.1. Research design

The research is based on the relational screening model, as it aims to examine the relationship between the toxic leadership behavior levels of school principals and the organizational happiness of teachers. According to Karasar (2012), the relational screening model is a research model aimed at measuring the presence and degree of the relationship between two or more variables.

2.2. Sampling

The study group of the study consists of 2370 elementary and secondary school teachers working in Afyonkarahisar provincial center in 2021-2022 academic and academic year. During the sample determination phase, the number of teachers to be sampled from the universe using simple random sampling method was determined using the following formula.

$$n = \frac{Nt^2pq}{d^2(N-1) + t^2pq}$$

The meanings of the symbols in the formula are as follows:

n: Sample size

N: The size of the universe

t: A theoretical value based on the t table at a given level of

p: The frequency of the incident being examined

q: The frequency of the incident being examined

d: Sensitivity (sampling error)

To calculate the sample size, $p = q = 0.5$ can be taken if the estimate p for the universe does not exist in the 95% confidence range, with the sampling error $d = 0.05$, the theoretical t value should be taken as 1.96 (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2020). When this formula is used to calculate the sample size;

$$n = \frac{2370 \times (1,96)^2 \times 0,5 \times 0,5}{(0,05)^2 (2370 - 1) + (1,96)^2 \times 0,5 \times 0,5}$$

$$n = \frac{2276,148}{6,8829} = 330,69$$

It was concluded that the sample size should consist of a minimum of 331 people. As a result of the procedure to calculate the sample size in the study, a total of 567 teachers were included in the sample scope. Of the teachers included in the research, 235 (41%) are in elementary schools and 332 (56%) are in secondary schools. Of the teachers, 329 (58%) are women and 238 (42%) are men; 426 (75%) are married, 141 (24%) are single, 481 (84%) are undergraduate and 86 (15%) are postgraduate. 82 (14%) of teachers have 1-5 years, 154 (27%) have 6-10 years, 130 (22%) have 11-15 years, and 201 (35%) have 16 years or more professional seniority. Of the teachers, 124 (21%) are 25-30, 253 (44%) are 31-40, 145 (25%) are between the ages of 41-50 and 45 (7%) are aged 51 and over.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

The “Toxic Leadership Scale (TLS)” developed by Çelebi, Güner and Yıldız (2015) and The “Organizational Happiness scale (OHS)” developed by Paschoal and Tamayo (2008),

adapted from Portuguese to English by Demo and Paschoal (2013), and from English to Turkish by Arslan and Polat (2017), was used to determine the relationship between the toxic leadership behaviors of school principals and the organizational happiness levels of teachers. Participants were also given a 'Personal Information Form' which covers gender, age, marital status, professional seniority, type of institution and educational status.

2.3.1. "Toxic Leadership Scale"

The scale developed by Çelebi, Güner and Yıldız (2015) consists of 30 items and the four dimensions as "unappreciation (U)", "self-interest (SI)", "selfishness (S)" and "negative mood (N)". Reliability coefficients of toxic leadership scale developed by Çelebi, Güner and Yıldız (2015); unappreciation (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11) $\alpha = .92$, selfishness (12, 13, 14, 15, 16) $\alpha = .93$, self-interest (17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 24, 25) $\alpha = .94$, negative mood (26, 27, 28, 29, 30) $\alpha = .89$ and total $\alpha = .96$ was found. Accordingly, it can be said that and the reliability of the whole scale and the lower dimensions of the scale are high. According to the results of the analysis, it seems appropriate to use the scale to measure toxic leadership levels of school principals. In this study, Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients (α) were found to be unappreciation $\alpha = .96$, selfishness $\alpha = .95$, self-interest $\alpha = .97$, negative mood $\alpha = .95$, and total $\alpha = .98$. Accordingly, it was seen that the overall level of reliability and the lower dimensions of the scale were high.

2.3.2. "Organizational Happiness Scale"

Based on Warr's (2007) organizational happiness approach, Paschoal and Tamayo (2008) developed the "Organizational Happiness scale" to measure the organizational happiness level of employees in Brazil, and Demo and Paschoal (2013) adapted it from Portuguese to English, Arslan and Polat (2017) from English to Turkish. The quintuplet-likert scale consists of 29 items and three sub-dimensions, 9 of which are "positive emotions (P)", 12 of which are "negative emotions (N)" and 8 of which are "fulfillment (F)". All substances of the size of "negative emotions" are reversed. In the reliability study, Cronbach alpha coefficients (α) were calculated as $\alpha = .94$ for the positive emotions subdimension, $\alpha = .95$ for the negative emotions subdimension, $\alpha = .92$ for the fulfillment subdimension and $\alpha = .96$ for the entire scale. Accordingly, it has been shown that the internal consistency reliability of the scale is sufficient (Arslan and Polat, 2017). In this study, Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients (α) were found to be positive emotions $\alpha = .95$, negative emotions $\alpha = .96$, fulfillment $\alpha = .95$, and total $\alpha = .97$. Accordingly, it was seen that the overall level of reliability and the lower dimensions of the scale were high.

2.3.3. "Personal Information Form"

In order to determine the status of teachers according to various variables, the personal information form containing questions about age, gender, marital status, branch, seniority in the profession, type of institution and educational status was used.

2.4. Data Analysis

In order to apply the scales in the research, legal permits were obtained from Hacettepe University Ethics Commission and Afyonkarahisar Provincial Directorate of National Education. The data of the study was analyzed using the SPSS Statistics 26.0 package program. In the analysis of the research, descriptive statistics such as arithmetic mean and standard deviation were used. At the stage of deciding which statistical tests to perform in the analysis of the data, whether the variables show normal distribution was examined and normality test was performed for this purpose. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were

examined and the variables were not normally distributed ($p < 0.05$). For this reason, in the analysis to be carried out in the research, Mann Whitney-U test from non-parametric tests was applied in the analysis of the gender, marital status, institution type and education status variables of the teachers; and Kruskal Wallis-H tests were applied in the analysis of age and occupational seniority variables. It has been analyzed using regression analysis whether teachers perceive toxic leadership behaviors can explain the level of organizational happiness.

3. Finding

In accordance with the purpose of the research, it was determined that according to teacher perceptions, toxic leadership behavior levels of school principals and toxic leadership behaviors of school principals show a significant difference in terms of teachers' gender, marital status, age, professional seniority, educational status and school type variables.

Table 1. Statistical Values for Toxic Leadership Scale and Sub-dimensions

	N	\bar{X}	Ss	Participation Frequency
U		2.04	.99	I do not agree
S		2.46	1.17	I do not agree
SI	567	2.26	1.15	I do not agree
N		2.44	1.17	I do not agree
TLS		2.24	1.03	I do not agree

According to teacher perceptions, school principals exhibit unappreciation the least ($\bar{X} = 2.04$), selfishness the most ($\bar{X} = 2.46$), and negative mood ($\bar{X} = 2.44$). Toxic leadership has emerged in the frequency of "I do not agree" ($\bar{X} = 2.24$). Teachers' perceptions of toxic leadership regarding school principals differ. According to the general average, it can be said that teachers think that school principals do not exhibit toxic leadership behaviors. Although teachers' perceptions of toxic leadership behaviors of school principals are in the frequency of "I do not agree", school principals show selfishness and negative mood behaviors more than self-interest and unappreciation.

Teachers' perceptions of toxic leadership behaviors of school principals showed no significant differences in terms of gender ($U = 37283$, $p > 0.05$) and educational status ($U = 19494.50$; $p > 0.05$).

Table 2. According to Teacher Perceptions, Mann Whitney-U Test Results for Determining the Difference of Toxic Leadership Levels of School Principals According to The Marital Status Variable

	Marital Status	N	Rank Average	Rank Total	U	P
U	Married	426	274.18	116799.50	25848.500	.013
	Single	141	313.68	44228.50		
S	Married	426	273.10	116338.50	25387.500	.006
	Single	141	316.95	44689.50		
SI	Married	426	273.32	116434.00	25483.000	.007
	Single	141	316.27	44594.00		
N	Married	426	272.79	116239.00	25288.000	.005
	Single	141	317.85	44789.00		
TLS	Married	426	272.79	116210.5	25259.50	.005
	Single	141	317.85	44817.50		

Teachers’ perceptions of school principals’ toxic leadership behaviors differ significantly in marital status variable (U=25259, p<0.05). Toxic leadership perceptions of single teachers are higher than those of married teachers.

Table 3. According To Teacher Perceptions, Kruskal-Wallis Test Results For Determining The Difference of Toxic Leadership Levels of School Principals According To The Age Variable

	Age	N	Rank Average	Sd	X ²	P	F	Tamhane
U	25-30	124	309.60	3	6.911	.075	1.491	
	31-40	253	284.10					
	41-50	145	258.24					
	51+	45	295.89					
S	25-30	124	319.44	3	12.718	.005	4.016	41-50
	31-40	253	281.05					
	41-50	145	251.39					
	51+	45	308.03					
SI	25-30	124	311.63	3	10.897	.012	3.384	41-50
	31-40	253	280.08					
	41-50	145	255.06					
	51+	45	323.20					
N	25-30	124	317.23	3	11.266	.010	3.969	41-50
	31-40	253	283.39					
	41-50	145	251.79					
	51+	45	299.66					
TLS	25-30	124	316.60	3	12.604	.006	3.139	41-50
	31-40	253	282.41					
	41-50	145	249.96					
	51+	45	312.83					

Teachers' perceptions of school principals' behavior levels in the toxic leadership scale ($F=3,139$, $p<0.05$) and the subdimensions of selfishness ($F=4,016$, $p<0.05$), self-interest ($F=3,384$, $p<0.05$), and negative mood ($F=3,969$, $p<0.05$) differ significantly in terms of age variance. The Tamhane test was performed from post-hoc tests to determine which group averages the difference occurred between. It was found that the perceptions of toxic leadership perceptions of teachers aged 25-30 in the scale of the scale of toxic leadership and "selfishness", "self-interest" and "negative mood" dimensions were higher than teachers aged 41-50 years.

Table 4. According To Teacher Perceptions, Kruskal-Wallis Test Results For Determining The Difference of Toxic Leadership Levels of School Principals According To The Professional Seniority Variable

	Professional Seniority	N	Rank Average	Sd	X ²	P	F	Tamhane
U	1-5	82	299.34	3	13.126	.004	2.257	
	6-10	154	317.89					
	11-15	130	275.50					
	16+	201	257.27					
S	1-5	82	294.07	3	11.536	.003	3.049	
	6-10	154	317.77					16+
	11-15	130	273.59					
	16+	201	260.75					
SI	1-5	82	296.54	3	14.213	.009	3.781	
	6-10	154	321.88					16+
	11-15	130	265.52					
	16+	201	261.82					
N	1-5	82	309.74	3	17.392	.001	5.811	
	6-10	154	321.48					11-15
	11-15	130	263.60					16+
	16+	201	257.98					
TLS	1-5	82	301.14	3	16.711	.001	3.715	
	6-10	154	323.61					16+
	11-15	130	268.85					
	16+	201	256.46					

According to the teachers' perceptions, the school principals' behavior level regarding toxic leadership scale overall ($F=3,715$, $p<0.05$) and selfishness ($F=3,049$, $p<0.05$), self-interest ($F=3,781$, $p<0.05$) and negative mood dimension ($F=5,811$, $p<0.05$) differ significantly according to the professional seniority variable. With the help of Tamhane, it has been found that teachers with seniority between 6-10 years perceive school principals as selfish and self-interests more than those with seniority over 16 years. It has been found that teachers with seniority between 6-10 years think more that school principals have a negative mood than those with 11-15 years and 16 years and over. According to the toxic leadership scale, it is seen that

teachers with a seniority of 6-10 years are more likely to have toxic leadership perceptions of school principals than teachers with seniority of 16 years or more.

Table 5. According to Teacher Perceptions, Mann Whitney-U Test Results For Determining The Difference of Toxic Leadership Levels of School Principals According To The Type of School Variable

	Type of School	N	Rank Average	Rank Total	U	p
U	Elementary	235	263.07	61822.50	34092.500	.010
	Secondary	332	298.81	99205.50		
S	Elementary	235	269.91	63428.00	35698.000	.083
	Secondary	332	293.98	97600.00		
SI	Elementary	235	269.39	63306.00	35576.000	.073
	Secondary	332	294.34	97722.00		
N	Elementary	235	265.18	62317.00	34587.000	.021
	Secondary	332	297.32	98711.00		
TLS	Elementary	235	265.79	62459.50	34729.50	.026
	Secondary	332	296.89	98568.50		

According to teacher perceptions, school principals' behavior levels regarding the overall toxic leadership scale vary significantly according to the type of school ($U = 34729.5$; $p < 0.05$). In this case, it is seen that teachers working in secondary school have more toxic leadership perceptions about school principals than teachers working in elementary school. When the sub -dimensions of toxic leadership are examined, it is seen that the sub -dimensions of "unappreciation" and "negative mental state" are significantly differentiated according to the school type ($p < 0.05$). Teachers who work in secondary school are found to think more that school principals do not value and have a negative mood than teachers who work in elementary school.

For the research questions, the organizational happiness levels of the teachers and whether these levels differ according to demographic variables were examined.

Table 6. Statistical Values for Organizational Happiness Scale and Its Sub-dimensions

	N	\bar{X}	Ss	Participation Frequency
P	567	2.97	1.10	Sometimes
N		3.91	.97	Rarely
F		3.49	1.04	Often
OHS		3.50	.89	Often

Teachers seem to have fulfillment sub-dimension the most ($\bar{X} = 3.49$) and negative emotions the least ($\bar{X} = 3.91$). It is revealed that teachers' organizational happiness ($\bar{X} = 3.50$) is at the level of "often" and that teachers have fulfillment at the level of "often" levels, experienced positive feelings at the "sometimes" level and have negative emotions at the level of "rarely" levels (Since the substances of negative emotions are inversely scored, the value of 3.91 corresponds to a slightly level). Accordingly, when the general average is examined, it can be said that teachers' happiness levels are high.

It has been revealed that the general and all sub -dimensions of the teachers' organizational happiness scale and all sub -dimensions did not show any significant difference according to the gender variable ($U = 38513$, $p > 0.05$). This is an indication that the level of organizational happiness of male and female teachers may be at the same rate. It has been revealed that the general level of the organizational happiness scale of the teachers and all sub -dimensions do not differ significantly according to the variable of the educational status ($p > 0.05$). This situation can be considered as an indication that the organizational happiness levels of teachers with different educational status can be at the same rate.

Table 7. Mann Whitney-U Test Results for Determining the Difference of Organizational Happiness Levels of The Teachers According to The Marital Status Variable

	Marital Status	N	Rank Average	Rank Total	U	P
P	Married	426	292.46	124587.00	26430.000	.033
	Single	141	258.45	36441.00		
N	Married	426	295.92	126062.00	24955.000	.478
	Single	141	247.99	34966.00		
F	Married	426	287.86	122626.50	28390.500	.329
	Single	141	272.35	38401.50		
OHS	Married	426	293.90	125200.0	25817.00	.012
	Single	141	254.10	35828.00		

The organizational happiness levels of teachers show a significant difference according to the marital status variable ($U = 25817.00$; $p < 0.05$). When the sub -dimensions of the organizational happiness scale are examined, only “positive emotions” dimension varies according to the marital status variable ($p < 0.05$). It is seen that married teachers have more positive emotions than single teachers and their level of organizational happiness is higher than single teachers.

Table 8. Kruskal-Wallis Test Results for Determining Differences In Teachers' Organizational Happiness Levels According To The Age Variable

	Age	N	Rank Average	Sd	X ²	P	F	Tamhane
P	25-30	124	267.57	3	5.025	.170	1.686	
	31-40	253	276.56					
	41-50	145	307.84					
	51+	45	294.31					
N	25-30	124	238.60	3	14.282	.003	4.665	
	31-40	253	288.08					
	41-50	145	312.54					
	51+	45	294.21					
F	25-30	124	270.88	3	7.544	.056	2.477	
	31-40	253	272.89					
	41-50	145	298.72					
	51+	45	335.20					
OHS	25-30	124	255.61	3	8.485	.037	3.186	
	31-40	253	278.96					
	41-50	145	309.89					
	51+	45	307.14					

The organizational happiness levels of teachers show a significant difference according to age variable ($F = 3.186, p < 0.05$). When the sub -dimensions of the organizational happiness scale are examined, there is only a significant difference in the dimension of “negative emotions ($p < 0.05$). Post-HOC tests were preferred to determine which group averages of the difference. It is seen that the organizational happiness levels of teachers between the ages of 41-50 and over 51 years are higher than teachers aged 25-30 years. It was found that teachers between the ages of 41-50 and over 51 years of age experienced less negative emotions than teachers between the ages of 25-30.

Table 9. Kruskal-Wallis Test Results For Determining Differences In Teachers' Organizational Happiness Levels According To Professional Seniority Variable

	Professional Seniority	N	Rank Average	Sd	X ²	P	F	Tamhane
P	1-5	82	289.76	3	15.704	.001	5.229	
	6-10	154	243.02					
	11-15	130	285.36					
	16+	201	312.16	3				6-10
N	1-5	82	259.40		28.352	.000	7.641	
	6-10	154	232.77					
	11-15	130	320.48					6-10
	16+	201	309.69					6-10
F	1-5	82	290.41	3	16.874	.001	5.821	
	6-10	154	240.61					
	11-15	130	288.30					
	16+	201	311.85					6-10
OHS	1-5	82	279.11	3	22.926	.000	8.159	
	6-10	154	233.66					
	11-15	130	298.47					6-10
	16+	201	315.20					6-10

All sub-dimensional levels of teachers’ organizational happiness scale ($F = 8,159, p < 0.05$) and “positive emotions” ($F = 5,229, p < 0.05$), “negative emotions” ($F = 7,641, p < 0.05$) and “fulfillment” ($F = 5,821, p < 0.05$) differ significantly according to the professional seniority variable. In determining which group averages of the difference, when Tamhane is performed from the Post-HOC tests, it is seen that the organizational happiness levels of teachers with 11-15 years and 16 years of seniority are more than 6-10 seniority. it was found that teachers with 16 years and above seniority experienced more positive emotions and fulfillment more than those with seniority of 6-10 years; and teachers with seniority of 11-15 years and 16 years and above experienced fewer negative emotions than those with seniority of 6-10 years. This situation is that the perceptions of toxic leadership of the teachers who have seniority between 6-10 years are more than teachers with seniority of 16 years or more; It supports and explains the effect of toxic leadership on organizational happiness.

Table 10. Mann Whitney-U Test Results For Determining Differences In Teachers' Organizational Happiness Levels According To Type of School Variable

	Type of School	N	Rank Average	Rank Total	U	p
P	Elementary	235	316.23	74313.50	31436.500	.000
	Secondary	332	261.19	86714.50		
N	Elementary	235	313.26	73617.00	32133.000	.000
	Secondary	332	263.29	87411.00		
F	Elementary	235	315.32	74101.00	31649.000	.000
	Secondary	332	261.83	86927.00		
OHS	Elementary	235	320.67	75357.00	30393.00	.000
	Secondary	332	258.05	85671.00		

According to the results of the Mann Whitney-U Test, there is a significant difference in the overall level of organizational happiness and all sub-dimension levels of teachers according to the type of school ($U = 30393.5$; $p < 0.05$). In this case, it can be observed that the level of organizational happiness of elementary school teachers is higher than that of secondary school teachers, they experience more positive emotions and less negative emotions, and they realize their potentials more.

It has been examined whether the level of toxic leadership of school principals predicts the level of organizational happiness of teachers. Regression analysis was conducted to determine whether the level of toxic leadership behavior of school principals predicts the level of organizational happiness of teachers.

Table 11. Regression Analysis Results of Toxic Leadership Levels of School Principals Predicting Teachers' Organisational Happiness Levels

Variables	B	Standart Deviation	B	T	P
Stable	4,686	0.71		65.731	.000
U	-.282	.066	-.313	-4.285	.000
SI	-.120	.071	-.155	-1.696	.090
S	.076	.050	.099	1.527	.127
N	-.208	.054	-.273	-3.879	.000

$R = .621$; $R^2 = .386$; $F_{(43,974)} = 88.377$; $p = .000$

When the findings given in Table 11 are examined, it is observed that the linear combination of all dimensions of toxic leadership significantly predicts the level of organizational happiness of teachers ($R^2 = .386$). The independent variables explain 38% of the variance in the dependent variable, which is organizational happiness. It is seen that the dimension of unappreciation and negative mood in toxic leadership alone explains organizational happiness ($p < 0.01$). Based on these results, it can be said that variables other than toxic leadership behavior can also have an effect on explaining organizational happiness.

4. Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

In this study, the relationship between teachers' perceptions of school principals' toxic leadership behaviors and teachers' organizational happiness levels was examined in elementary and secondary schools. The relationship between the sub-dimensions of toxic leadership and

the sub-dimensions of organizational happiness was examined along with demographic data. In this respect, when the toxic leadership behavior levels of school principals are examined according to teacher perceptions, teachers have a “disagreement” level regarding the toxic leadership levels of school principals. According to the teachers' perceptions, they had a low level of agreement with the toxic leadership behaviors of the school principals. However, it can be noted that a few teachers still believed that their school principals exhibited toxic leadership behaviors. This finding emphasizes the importance of the awareness of teachers regarding toxic leadership. This result is consistent with the studies of Dobbs (2014), Demirel (2015), and Çetinkaya (2017). In contrast, Green (2014) found that school leaders exhibited high levels of toxic leadership behaviors.

The teachers' perceptions of the sub-dimensions of toxic leadership were in the "I disagree" range. It was found that the dimensions of selfishness and negative mood had a higher mean than the other dimensions. Therefore, it can be said that teachers perceived their school principals as more selfish and reflecting more negative mood than exhibiting behaviors of value depreciation and being focused on self-interest. This finding is consistent with the highest mean in the dimension of selfishness in Çetinkaya's (2017) study. The study also found no significant difference in the levels of toxic leadership behaviors exhibited by school principals between genders. This suggests that toxic leadership has the same effect on both genders, and school principals do not display gender-based discrimination while exhibiting toxic leadership behaviors. The findings of the study regarding the gender variable are similar to the studies of Dobbs (2014) and Çetinkaya (2017). According to teachers' perceptions, there is a significant difference in the level of toxic leadership behaviors exhibited by school principals and in all sub-dimensions of toxic leadership based on marital status. It can be said that the level of toxic leadership perception of unmarried teachers is higher than that of married teachers. İzgüden et al.'s (2016) study also found that unmarried teachers perceived toxic leadership more than married ones.

There is also a significant difference based on age in teachers' perceptions of school principals' toxic leadership behaviors and in the dimensions of selfishness, self-interest, and negative mood. It was found that teachers aged between 25-30 had higher levels of perception of school principals' toxic leadership behaviors than those aged between 41-50. As teachers get older, they perceive school principals' behaviors as less toxic. School principals may be displaying their toxic leadership behaviors to younger and less experienced teachers who may be more reserved. Furthermore, there is a significant difference in teachers' perceptions of school principals' toxic leadership behaviors and in the dimensions of selfishness, self-interest, and negative mood based on professional seniority. It was found that teachers with professional seniority of 6-10 years had higher levels of perception of school principals' toxic leadership behaviors than those with 16 and more years of experience. Teachers with 6-10 years of seniority perceived school principals as more selfish and self-interest focused than those with 16 or more years of professional experience. Teachers with 6-10 years of seniority also believed that school principals had a more negative mood than those with 11-15 and 16 or more years of seniority. This may be due to less experienced teachers being more exposed to toxic behaviors and therefore having higher perception levels.

According to teachers' perceptions, there is no significant difference in the level of toxic leadership behaviors exhibited by school principals and in all sub-dimensions of toxic

leadership based on education level. However, based on school type, there is a significant difference in teachers' perceptions of school principals' toxic leadership behaviors. It was found that secondary school teachers perceived school principals' toxic leadership more than elementary school teachers. The sub-dimensions of "lack of appreciation" and "negative mood" were found to be significantly different based on school type. Secondary school teachers were found to believe that school principals were more lacking in appreciation and had more negative moods than elementary school teachers. This suggests that teacher-principal communication and relationships may differ based on school level. İlhan (2019) stated that secondary school teachers believed principals had more toxic leadership qualities than high school teachers.

It was found that teachers' organizational happiness levels were "often" and their potential was "often" realized. Teachers reported experiencing positive emotions at a "quite" level and negative emotions at a "little" level. It can be said that teachers' organizational happiness levels are high. No significant difference was found in teachers' organizational happiness levels based on gender. However, there was a significant difference based on marital status. Only the sub-dimension of positive emotions was found to be different based on marital status, with married teachers experiencing more positive emotions than unmarried teachers and having higher organizational happiness levels.

According to the research, there is a significant difference in teachers' organizational happiness levels based on age. Only in the sub-dimension of negative emotions, there is a significant difference, with teachers aged 41-50 and over 51 having higher levels of organizational happiness and experiencing fewer negative emotions compared to teachers aged 25-30. Furthermore, there is a significant difference in teachers' organizational happiness levels and all sub-dimension levels based on their seniority in the profession. Teachers with 11-15 and 16+ years of experience have higher levels of organizational happiness compared to those with 6-10 years of experience. Additionally, teachers with 16+ years of experience experience more positive emotions and fulfillment more than those with 6-10 years of experience. Teachers with 11-15 and 16+ years of experience also experience fewer negative emotions than those with 6-10 years of experience. There is no significant difference in teachers' organizational happiness levels based on their education level. However, there is a significant difference in teachers' organizational happiness levels and all sub-dimension levels based on the type of school they work in. Teachers working in elementary schools have higher levels of organizational happiness and experience more positive emotions and fewer negative emotions compared to secondary school teachers. Finally, the research also found that teachers' perceptions of school principals' toxic leadership behaviors significantly predict their organizational happiness levels, especially in the sub-dimensions of "lack of appreciation" and "negative mood." This suggests that selfish and uncaring actions by school principals can lead to negative emotions and decreased organizational happiness among teachers. This affects organizational happiness. Therefore, it can be said that toxic leadership and organizational happiness are related.

Further studies using qualitative or mixed research methods could provide more in-depth insights into the relationships between toxic leadership and organizational happiness among teachers.

References

- Arslan, Y. (2018). *The relationship between teacher perceptions of diversity management perspectives and organizational happiness*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Kocaeli University, Kocaeli.
- Arslan, Y. & Polat, S. (2017). Adaptation of well-being at work scale to Turkish. *Educational Administration Theory and Practise*, 23(4), 603–622. doi: 10.14527/kuey.2017.019
- Bakker, A. B. & Oerlemans, W. (2011). Subjective well-being in organizations. K. S. Cameron ve G. M. Spreitzer (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* içinde (s. 178-189). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Birdoğan Kuvvet, A. (2019). *The relationship of school principal instructional leadership and primary school teachers' well being at work*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Brief, A. P. & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 279-307.
- Bulut, A. (2015). *Perceptions of high school teachers' organizational happiness: A norm study*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Gaziantep University, Gaziantep. doi: [10.15659/ankad.v4i2.102](https://doi.org/10.15659/ankad.v4i2.102)
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2020). *Eğitimde Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Çelebi, N., Güner, H. & Yıldız, V. (2015). Developing toxic leadership scale. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 4(1), 249-268.
- Çetinkaya, H. (2017). *The Relationship Between The Toxic Leadership Behaviours of School Principals and The Level of Burnout of Teachers*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Pamukkale University, Denizli.
- Demirel, N. (2015). *According to the teacher perceptions the relationship between toxic leadership behaviors of school principals and organizational cynicism attitudes of teachers (the sample of Gaziantep Şehitkamil District)*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Zirve University, Gaziantep.
- Demo, G. & Paschoal, T. (2013). Well-being at work scale: Exploratory and confirmatory validation in the United States comprising affective and cognitive components. *Proceeding XXXVII Encontro da ANPAD*, Rio de Janeiro.
- Diener, E., Sandvik, E. & Pavot, W. (1991). Happiness is the frequency, not the intensity, of positive versus negative affect. F. Strack, M. Argyle ve N. Schwarz (Ed.). *Subjective well-being: An interdisciplinary perspective* içinde. New York: Pergamon.
- Dobbs, J. M. (2014). *The relationship between perceived toxic leadership styles, leader effectiveness and organizational cynicism*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of San Diego, San Diego, USA.
- Fisher, C. D. (2010). Happiness at work. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(4), 384-412.
- Flynn, G. (1999). Stop toxic managers before they stop you! *Workforce*, 78 (8), 4-40.
- Frost, P. J. (2003). *Toxic emotions at work*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.
- Gavin, J. & Mason, R. (2004). The virtuous organization: The value of happiness in the workplace. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(4), 379-392.

- Green, J. E. (2014). *Toxic leadership in educational organizations*. Georgia Southern University, 18-33.
- İlhan, H. (2019). *Examination of the relationship between school principals' toxic leadership behaviors and organizational commitment of teachers*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Karabük University, Karabük.
- İzgüden, D., Eroymak, S., & Erdem, R. (2016). Leadership to be toxic behavior in health institutions: Example of a university hospital. *Balkan Journal of Social Sciences*, 262-276.
- Kahveci, G. & Köse, Ö. (2019). An analysis of the role of organizational cynicism on organizational happiness according to primary and secondary school teachers' perceptions. *Ekev Akademi Dergisi*, 23(79), 135-156.
- Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kellerman, B. (2004). *Bad leadership: What it is, how it happens, why it matters*. Boston MA, Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Kırbaç, M. (2013). *Toxic leadership in educational leadership*. (Unpublished master's thesis). İnönü University, Malatya.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). The Allure of Toxic Leaders: Why Followers Rarely Escape Their Clutches, *Ivey Business Journal*, 12(2), 10-19.
- Paschoal, T. & Tamayo, A. (2008). Construction and validation of work well-being scale. *Avaliação Psicológica*, 7(1), 11-22.
- Pryce-Jones, J. (2010). *Happiness at work: Maximizing your psychological capital for succes*. United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell Publication.
- Roter, A. B. (2011). The lived experiences of registered nurses exposed to toxic leadership behaviors. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Capella University, ABD.
- Schmidt, A. A. (2008). *Development and validation of the toxic leadership scale*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Maryland University, ABD.
- Sucu, A. (2016). *The analysis of the relationship between teachers' motivation and instructional leadership behaviors of principals..* (Unpublished master's thesis). İnönü University, Malatya.
- Warr, P. (2007). *Work, happiness and unhappiness*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wesarat, P. O., Sharif, M. Y. & Abdul Majid, A. H. (2014). A conceptual framework of happiness at the workplace. *Asian Social Science*, 11(2), 78-88.
- Whicker, M. (1996). *Toxic leaders: When organizations go bad*. ABD, Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Wilson-Starks, K. Y. (2003). *Toxic leadership*. Erişim adresi: <https://transleadership.com/wp-content/uploads/ToxicLeadership.pdf>