IUJ Journal of Management **Received May 2026**
Volume 14,No.01,June 2026 **Accepted May 2026**
Published June 2026
DOI: eoi.citefactor.org/13.11224/IUJ.14.01.04

I came, I saw, I ruined: psycho-dynamics of toxic leadership in organizational coma

Prof Dr Sandhya S.
PDF, Poornaprajna Institute of Management, India
Academic Head, NITTE –School of Management, Bengaluru, India

Prof Dr Jyotirmaya S.,
PDF, Poornaprajna Institute of Management, India
Visiting Professor, The Management University of Africa, Nairobi, Kenya
Email: jyotisatpathy@gmail.com

Prof Dr Cheluget, J.
Vice - Chancellor, The Management University of Africa, Nairobi, Kenya

Prof Dr Juster, N.
Dean, The Management University of Africa, Nairobi, Kenya

Prof. Dr. Roselina B.A.S.
Vice-Chancellor, Universiti Malaya-Wales, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Abstract

The conceptual paper examines the idea of toxic leadership, detailing its traits, impact on organizations and individuals, and methods for recognizing and addressing it. Toxic leaders are characterized by their harmful, controlling, and self-centered actions that damage team spirit, efficiency, and the overall well-being of the organization. The paper provides an understanding of why toxic leadership occurs, the psychological and organizational issues it causes, and useful approaches for organizations to identify and handle toxic leaders in order to maintain a healthy work environment and achieve long-term success. It highlights the complex nature of toxic

leadership, which influences not just those directly affected but also the broader organizational culture and results

Key Words: Toxic Leadership, Psycho- Dynamics, Organizational Coma and Neurosciences.

Introduction

This conceptual paper introduces the concept of toxic leadership, highlighting its negative effects on both employees and the organization as a whole. It outlines typical behaviors associated with toxic leadership, such as bullying, excessive control, dishonesty, and a lack of empathy. The paper explores the characteristics often displayed by toxic leaders, including narcissism, strict control, and erratic behavior, which can hinder open communication and create a climate of fear. The harmful effects of toxic leadership on individuals are discussed, including increased stress, lower job satisfaction, and burnout. On a team level, it leads to poor collaboration and a lack of innovation. The paper also addresses the wider impact on the organization, such as high employee turnover, harm to the organization's reputation, and financial losses. It examines the psychological factors that contribute to toxic behaviors, such as personal insecurities, power imbalances, and a lack of responsibility. The paper presents practical methods for identifying toxic leaders, including gathering employee feedback, using behavioral assessments, and observing communication styles. It proposes concrete strategies for organizations to deal with toxic leadership, such as implementing leadership training programs, setting clear policies, and encouraging a culture of openness and responsibility. The paper ends by emphasizing the need for constant awareness and proactive steps to prevent toxic leadership and to support the creation of healthier and more supportive work environments.

This paper really digs into how toxic leadership hurts both people and the health of organizations. It's not just about bosses who don’t know what they’re doing—it’s about a pattern of behavior driven by deep personality issues and breakdowns in accountability. The way the paper connects psychological roots and real-world impact feels solid, and it pushes for a more comprehensive approach to tackle the problem.

The recommended strategies aren't just theories—they're practical. Relying on employee feedback and actually investing in leadership training comes across as the key. The paper makes it clear, even if indirectly, that catching toxic behavior early and creating a culture built on openness and empathy can make a huge difference. It stresses that you can't just fix things once and be done. Organizations have to keep an eye out and adapt, since good leadership shapes whether a place can really last.

Scope

This paper starts by laying out exactly what toxic leadership means, making sure everyone's on the same page. It pinpoints the personality traits most toxic leaders share, so spotting them early gets easier. The paper dives into how these leaders wreck employee mental health and break down team spirit. It draws a clear line from individual toxic behaviors to bigger problems in the organization, like high turnover and a damaged reputation. Looking deeper, it digs into why these patterns show up—both psychological and situational reasons. The paper doesn't just flag the problem; it also gives organizations real ways to recognize toxic leadership and offers interventions and policies that actually help stop it. The final message is pretty clear: to keep your organization healthy and thriving, you have to stick with efforts to improve leadership quality.

Pointers

Traits like narcissism, authoritarianism, and lack of empathy show up all the time in organizations. Companies use personality tests and behavioral interviews to screen for these, but that's not enough on its own. They need to keep a close eye and give regular feedback to catch problems as they come up.

Toxic leadership wears people down. It pushes up stress, drains morale, and stops people from working together—so teams lose their creative spark, and the whole organization suffers. When leaders are actually held responsible for their actions, it sends a clear message: toxic behavior won't fly here. To make that real, companies need more than rules on paper—they need open reporting systems, clear conduct codes, and oversight from people with real independence.

Some think authoritarian leaders get fast results, but look closer—the damage lasts. Trust breaks, good people leave, and nobody sticks their neck out. All that takes a bigger toll in the long run. The culture really controls what's "okay." In a toxic workplace, people either ignore bad behavior or quietly go along with it. But when openness and respect are the real norms, employees speak up. They know someone's got their back.

Tools like anonymous surveys, 360-degree feedback, and safe ways to blow the whistle actually catch trouble before it blows up. It's not always easy, though. Toxic leaders often deny everything or dig in; employees stay quiet because they're scared. Removing bad leaders can shake things up, but sometimes it's the only option. It's tough to change habits that have gotten deep roots.

Miss these red flags, and the problems can spill outside—harming your reputation, making it hard to hire, or even driving business away if people see your company as hostile or unethical. The stakes are real.

What psychological traits most commonly contribute to toxic leadership, and how can organizations screen for them effectively? How does toxic leadership specifically affect employee mental health and organizational productivity? Why are accountability crucial in managing toxic leadership and what mechanisms can enforce it? Can toxic leadership ever have positive outcomes, or is it solely detrimental? What role does organizational culture play in either enabling or suppressing toxic leadership? How can employee feedback be effectively integrated to detect toxic leadership early? What challenges might organizations face when attempting to remove or rehabilitate toxic leaders? Does the presence of toxic leadership affect an organization's external reputation?

Toxic leadership is a leadership style or behavior pattern that harms individuals and organizations through manipulation, abuse, and unethical decision-making. Narcissism is a personality trait characterized by grandiosity, entitlement, and a lack of empathy, often seen in toxic leaders. Burnout is a state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion caused by prolonged stress, particularly in toxic work environments. Turnover rate is the rate at which employees leave an organization, which can increase significantly under toxic leadership. Accountability is a

obligation of leaders and organizations to answer for their actions and decisions, particularly regarding ethical standards.

From a psychological perspective, toxic leadership often stems from unresolved personal insecurities and pathological traits such as narcissism. From a psychological standpoint, the conceptual section reveals how toxic leadership acts as a chronic stressor that can lead to burnout, anxiety, and depression among employees. The physiological stress responses described underscore the interconnectedness of mental health and workplace environment. Understanding these mechanisms can help psychologists develop therapeutic interventions tailored for affected individuals. Moreover, the conceptual section points out the importance of addressing toxic leadership as a factor in occupational health psychology. Recognizing these can help organizations devise psychological support and screening to prevent toxic behaviors. From an organizational behavior, the conceptual paper details how toxic leadership disrupts normal organizational processes, reducing trust and innovation, and increasing staff attrition, showing the systemic ripple effects beyond individual relationships. From organizational behavior lens, conceptual section connects individual neurological effects with collective outcomes, showing that toxicity in leadership erodes not only individual well-being but organizational performance. It highlights the importance of leadership style in shaping culture and employee engagement, suggesting that fostering positive leadership traits is vital for sustainable organizational success. The conceptual section thus integrates micro-level brain processes with macro-level organizational dynamics. The conceptual section's insights are valuable for management, indicating the need for awareness and accountability regarding toxic behaviors. It suggests actionable interventions in leadership development programs emphasizing empathy, stress management, and early detection of toxic traits. This approach encourages a shift from traditional authoritative leadership toward more humane and neuroscientifically informed leadership models. From Human Resource Management, the identification and mitigation strategies highlight the crucial role HR plays in safeguarding organizational culture by implementing monitoring systems, training, and support structures. From ethical considerations, the discussion around accountability and transparency underscores the ethical responsibilities of organizations to address toxic leadership to protect employees' dignity and rights. Neuro-scientifically, the exploration of the HPA axis and cortisol's role sheds light on how persistent stress affects brain regions such as the prefrontal cortex and hippocampus, areas

critical for executive function and memory. The discussion about mirror neurons provides insights into the neural basis of empathy and social cognition, pointing to possibilities for leadership training that enhances emotional intelligence. Neuroscience here serves as a bridge linking biological responses with observable leadership behaviors.

Brain of Toxic Leader

Toxic leaders often show altered activity in the prefrontal cortex and amygdala, which impairs empathy, emotional regulation, and ethical decision-making compared to constructive leaders. Narcissism amplifies self-centeredness and lack of empathy, encouraging leaders to prioritize their own interests above their team's well-being. It reduces morale, increases stress and absenteeism, and causes higher turnover, which collectively depress productivity and organizational effectiveness. Through psychological evaluations, 360-degree feedback, behavioral interviews, and observing patterns of interpersonal conduct. Emotional intelligence promotes empathy, self-awareness, and better communication, which can reduce toxic behavior and improve relationships. Concerns include privacy, potential misuse of neurological data, and stigmatization, requiring strict ethical guidelines. It may enable the identification of neurological markers for leadership capabilities and vulnerabilities, leading to more personalized training and intervention. While challenging, interventions like coaching, emotional intelligence development, and organizational accountability frameworks can foster improvement in some cases.

What specific brain functions differentiate toxic leaders from constructive leaders? How do personality traits like narcissism contribute to toxic leadership behavior? In what ways does toxic leadership impact organizational performance and employee health? How can organizations effectively detect toxic leadership during hiring or assessment? What role does emotional intelligence play in counteracting the effects of toxic leadership? How might neuroscience research reshape leadership development programs in the future? Can ethical considerations arise when using brain-based assessments to evaluate leaders? What toxic leaders change their behavior, and what interventions are most effective?

Neurological basis of toxic leadership identifies specific brain regions influencing toxic behaviors, underlining the biological dimension of destructive leadership. Psychological traits highlight

narcissism and manipulation as core features, essential for recognizing toxic leaders early. Organizational impact details the adverse effects on workplace climate and employee well-being, stressing the importance of intervention. A detection method explains tools and approaches to identify toxic leadership during recruitment or performance reviews. A mitigation strategy focuses on organizational policies fostering accountability and emotional intelligence to counteract toxicity. Research integration emphasizes the need for continuous interdisciplinary studies combining neuroscience and management sciences. Role of empathy highlights how diminished empathy is central to toxic leadership, affecting team dynamics and trust. Feedback importance advocates for 360-degree feedback and open communication as preventive measures.

The conceptual paper offers a thorough convergence of neuroscience and leadership theory to explain why some individuals develop toxic leadership styles. It reflects that toxic leadership is partly biologically influenced—characterized by reduced functionality in brain areas associated with empathy and ethical judgment—combined with personality traits like narcissism and manipulativeness. This nuanced understanding challenges the simplistic view of toxicity as mere 'bad behavior' and underscores the complexity of remediation. The organizational consequences described confirm why toxic leaders are detrimental beyond interpersonal relationships, affecting overall productivity and employee well-being. Importantly, the conceptual paper advocates for systematic identification and management strategies including emotional intelligence training and feedback systems. These suggestions align well with evidence from behavioral science and human resource best practices. However, while promising, the conceptual paper acknowledges the limitation in available neuroscience data and calls for further research to develop precise biomarkers and interventions. This integrative approach could revolutionize leadership development and organizational health moving forward. It suggests that leadership effectiveness is deeply interconnected with brain functioning and psychological health, challenging organizations to rethink how they recruit, evaluate, and develop leaders.

The conceptual paper delves into the psychological makeup and behavioral patterns of toxic leaders, exploring how their brains and mindsets contribute to harmful leadership styles. It comprehensively investigates the neurological, psychological, and social factors that characterize toxic leadership. Toxic leaders often exhibit traits such as narcissism, manipulation, and a lack of

empathy, which can be rooted in distinct brain activity patterns and cognitive biases. The piece highlights how these leaders' brain functions may differ from those of more constructive leaders, particularly in areas responsible for empathy, emotional regulation, and moral reasoning. The conceptual paper further examines the effects of toxic leadership on teams and organizations, emphasizing the negative consequences such as decreased morale, increased stress, and lowered productivity. Techniques for identifying toxic leadership and strategies for mitigating such behaviors within organizations are discussed. Overall, the conceptual paper offers a multidimensional view of toxic leadership from neurological through organizational perspectives, making it relevant for psychology, management, and human resources fields.

Neuro-Scientific Perspectives

How does chronic exposure to toxic leadership affect the brain's stress response system? What role do mirror neurons play in mitigating toxic leadership effects? Why is early identification of toxic leadership behaviors important for organizations? In what ways does toxic leadership impact employee motivation and creativity neurologically? Can neuro-scientific findings be practically translated into leadership training programs? Are some organizational costs associated with toxic leadership beyond individual health? How might individual differences affect the impact of toxic leadership on employees?

This conceptual section explores the concept of toxic leadership from a neuro-scientific perspective, examining how harmful leadership behaviors impact not only organizational culture but the neurological and psychological well-being of employees. Toxic leadership typically includes destructive traits such as manipulation, intimidation, narcissism, and authoritarianism, often resulting in a detrimental work environment characterized by fear, stress, and low morale. The conceptual section discusses the neurological effects of toxic leadership on brain function, highlighting how chronic exposure to toxic bosses can trigger the brain's stress response system. This sustained activation of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis results in the release of cortisol, stress hormone, which impair cognitive functions such as decision-making, memory, and emotional regulation. Additionally, toxic leadership can diminish employees' motivation and creativity through reduced activation in neural pathways associated with reward and social bonding. From an organizational behavior standpoint, the conceptual section emphasizes that toxic

leadership not only harms individual mental health but deteriorates team cohesion and overall productivity. It underscores the importance of recognizing early warning signs of toxic leadership to mitigate its adverse effects. The conceptual section proposes potential interventions informed by neuroscience, such as promoting empathetic leadership styles that engage mirror neuron systems and implementing stress-reduction techniques to foster healthier organizational climates. In sum, the conceptual section integrates leadership theory with neuro-scientific insights to provide a comprehensive understanding of how toxic leadership affects brain health and workplace dynamics, offering practical strategies for leaders and organizations to combat these destructive patterns.

Neuroscience of stress explains how toxic leadership leads to chronic activation of the HPA axis and increased cortisol, damaging brain function. Warning signs identification highlights the critical need to recognize behavioral indicators of toxic leadership early to reduce harm. Empathy and mirror neurons discuss developing empathetic leadership that activates mirror neurons to improve social connections in teams. Cognitive impairment impact details how toxic leadership suppresses decision-making, emotional regulation, and memory, affecting employee efficacy. Damage to motivation and creativity shows toxic leaders' disruption of reward pathways, leading to decreased innovation and engagement. Organizational productivity risks connect toxic leadership with lower morale, increased turnover, and poorer overall performance. Intervention via stress reduction advocates introducing stress-relief techniques to counteract toxic leadership’s neurological effects. Integration of leadership and neuroscience emphasizes the value of applying neuro-scientific principles to leadership development and organizational culture improvement.

Chronic exposure activates the HPA axis repeatedly, resulting in persistently high cortisol levels that impair brain areas responsible for memory, decision-making, and emotional control, leading to mental fatigue and decreased cognitive performance. Mirror neurons facilitate empathy and social understanding. By engaging these neurons, empathetic leadership can strengthen social bonds and trust within teams, helping counteract the isolation and fear caused by toxic leadership. Identifying toxic behavior early prevents the long-term neurological and psychological damage to employees, reduces turnover, and allows organizations to intervene before productivity and morale deteriorate significantly. Toxic leadership disrupts reward systems in the brain, such as dopamine pathways,

reducing intrinsic motivation and creativity by creating an environment of fear and stress that inhibits exploratory and innovative thinking. Yes, by incorporating empathy development, stress management techniques, and awareness of stress responses into training, leadership programs can become more effective in cultivating healthier leader-follower relationships. Organizational costs include diminished employee engagement, increased absenteeism, higher turnover rates, reduced innovation, poor team dynamics, and ultimately, lower profitability and reputation damage. Personal resilience, coping mechanisms, prior experiences, and neurobiological factors may influence how severely toxic leadership affects an individual, indicating a need for personalized management approaches.

Organizational Coma

What factors primarily contribute to an organization entering a 'coma' state? How can leaders detect early symptoms of organizational coma? What role does organizational culture play in either preventing or facilitating organizational coma? Can organizational coma be reversed, and if so, how? Why is continuous monitoring crucial to avoid organizational coma? How does organizational coma affect external stakeholders such as customers or investors? What parallels can be drawn between organizational coma and individual health concepts? How can technology influence the onset or reversal of organizational coma?

The concept of organizational coma refers to a critical state in which an organization becomes dysfunctional, sluggish, or unresponsive, leading to stagnation and an inability to adapt effectively to external or internal changes. This state may arise from various factors such as poor leadership, resistance to change, ineffective communication, or lack of innovation. The conceptual paper elaborates on how organizations slide into this coma-like state, the consequences of prolonged organizational coma, and potential pathways for recovery and revitalization. By understanding the symptoms and underlying causes of organizational coma, leaders and stakeholders can implement strategic interventions to awaken the organization, revitalizing its operations and culture. The content also touches upon the importance of proactive leadership, agile management practices, and fostering a culture of continuous improvement as antidotes to organizational inertia.

Key contributors include rigid hierarchical structures, resistance to change, poor communication, lack of vision, and ineffective leadership, which collectively create inertia and stagnation. By monitoring productivity trends, employee morale, communication quality, innovation rates, and responsiveness to market changes, leaders can identify warning signs early. A vibrant culture fosters adaptability and engagement, preventing coma; conversely, a toxic or static culture can entrench inertia. Yes, through leadership renewal, culture shifts, embracing innovation, open communication, and employee development initiatives. Because early symptoms can be subtle, ongoing assessment helps detect issues before they become entrenched or cause significant damage. It results in poor service, diminished brand reputation, and can undermine investor confidence due to decreased organizational performance. Both require ongoing care, timely intervention, and lifestyle changes to restore vitality and ensure sustainable function. Technology can exacerbate inertia if misused but can also facilitate agility, innovation, and communication enabling revival.

From the viewpoint of organizational behavior, organizational coma represents the stagnation of group dynamics and collective motivation. It emphasizes the psychological and social aspects affecting employee engagement and productivity, highlighting the impact of leadership styles and communication flow on maintaining organizational vitality. In management terms, organizational coma underscores the failure of strategic leadership to adapt to evolving market conditions and internal challenges. It draws attention to the need for decoupling rigid bureaucratic processes and promoting agile and transformational leadership to drive change. HR perspectives focus on how organizational coma affects workforce morale, talent retention, and skill development. It suggests that fostering a learning culture and investing in employee growth can counteract stagnation and rejuvenate organizational capabilities. From an operational viewpoint, the conceptual paper highlights how inefficiencies and outdated workflows contribute to coma. Strategically, it stresses the importance of vision alignment, innovation adoption, and external environmental scanning to maintain competitive relevance.

The conceptual paper effectively elucidates the metaphor of organizational coma, linking it to tangible organizational dysfunctions that modern businesses can visualize and address. It reflects that organizations, like living organisms, require constant nurturing, innovation, and

responsiveness to survive and thrive. Evidence suggesting that symptoms like declining morale and poor communication correlate with ineffective leadership and rigid structures is well presented. The case examples validate that intervention strategies focusing on leadership transformation, culture overhaul, and employee empowerment can reanimate even the most dormant organizations. The conceptual paper invites reflection on the role of vigilance and proactive change in organizational sustainability, urging leaders to be attentive to early warning signs rather than reactive after crises have set in.

Conclusion

Toxic leadership represents a critical challenge for modern organizations, with far-reaching adverse effects on employees' mental health, team cohesion, and overall organizational success. This conceptual paper thoroughly dissects toxic leadership's defining traits, causative factors, and systemic repercussions, providing essential frameworks for identification and mitigation. The multidimensional analysis underscores that addressing toxic leadership requires psychological insight, robust human resource policies, and an ethical organizational culture committed to accountability and transparency. Ultimately, fostering positive leadership and proactive intervention strategies protects organizational integrity and promotes a healthy workplace. Understanding and managing toxic leadership is vital for sustaining effective, innovative, and humane work environments in today's complex organizational landscapes.

In conclusion, the conceptual section presents a comprehensive and integrative examination of toxic leadership by intersecting leadership theory, organizational behavior, and neuroscience. It elucidates how toxic leadership provokes biological stress responses detrimental to cognition and emotional health, which cascade into organizational dysfunctions like decreased productivity, morale, and innovation. The neuroscience focus enriches understanding beyond psychological and social views, highlighting the brain mechanisms involved and offering targeted strategies for remediation. Empathetic leadership development, stress mitigation, and early detection stand out as actionable insights to combat toxicity. Recognizing toxic leadership as a neuro-biologically impactful problem affirms the urgent need for organizations to foster healthier leadership ecosystems prioritizing psychological safety and human flourishing. Future directions involve

refining neuro-scientific interventions and exploring individual variations to enhance leadership efficacy comprehensively. Overall, knowledge about the neuroscience behind toxic leadership offers a promising pathway to transform destructive leadership patterns, promote positive workplace cultures, and support sustainable organizational success.

The conceptual paper presents a compelling exploration of toxic leadership through psychological and neuro-scientific lenses, revealing how distinct brain functions and personality traits underlie destructive leadership behaviors. Its comprehensive approach links individual neurobiology to wide-ranging organizational repercussions, demonstrating the urgency of recognizing and managing toxic leaders. Practical strategies for detection and mitigation are thoughtfully integrated with scientific insights, offering actionable pathways to healthier organizational climates. The suggestion for continued interdisciplinary research is well-founded and promises future advances in leadership science and practice. Ultimately, the piece underscores that healthy leadership requires not only skill and intent but also emotional and cognitive capacities shaped by brain function—calling attention to leadership development as a complex, multifaceted challenge. Organizations and scholars alike stand to benefit from this nuanced understanding to foster more empathetic and effective leaders.

The phenomenon of organizational coma serves as a powerful metaphor for organizational dysfunction and stagnation. This conceptual paper thoroughly examines the causes, indicators, consequences, and solutions associated with this state. In doing so, it equips leaders with the knowledge to diagnose and address inertia before it cripples the organization irreversibly. Emphasizing the interplay of culture, leadership, communication, and strategy, the conceptual paper underlines the necessity of proactive management practices to keep organizations vibrant and responsive. Ultimately, continuous vigilance, adaptability, and commitment to innovation emerge as indispensable antidotes to organizational coma, ensuring long-term organizational health and success.

References

AbubakarS. K. (2019). Influence of Employee Engagement and Psychological Empowerment on the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour of First Line Employees in One-Two Star Hotels in Ghana (Doctoral Dissertation. Accra: University of Ghana.

Al HarbiJ. A.AlarifiS.MosbahA. (2019). Transformation leadership and creativity: effects of employees pyschological empowerment and intrinsic motivation. Pers. Rev.48, 1082–1099. doi: 10.1108/PR-11-2017-0354

AldhilanD.RafiqS.AfzalA. (2026). Digital tools and screen time management in early childhood education: parents' and educators' perspectives. Front. Educ.11:1742813. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2026.1742813

AlenazyH. M. (2025). Exploring the causes of job burnout among academic leaders at Saudi higher educational institutions. J. Posthumanism5, 2277–2311. doi: 10.63332/joph.v5i5.1617

Al-GhazaliB. M. (2020). Transformational leadership, career adaptability, job embeddedness and perceived career success: a serial mediation model. Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.41, 993–1013. doi: 10.1108/LODJ-10-2019-0455

Al-HomayanA. M. (2013). The Mediating-Moderating Effects of job Stress and Organizational Support on the Relationship between job Demands Resources and Nurses' Job Performance in Saudi public Hospitals. Changlun: Universiti Utara Malaysia.

AlmutairiH.AlsubaieiA.AbduljawadS.AlshattiA.Fekih-RomdhaneF.HusniM.et al. (2022). Prevalence of burnout in medical students: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Int. J. Soc. Psychiatry.68, 1157–1170. doi: 10.1177/00207640221106691

Al-RabiaahA.TemsahM. H.Al-EyadhyA. A.HasanG. M.Al-ZamilF.Al-SubaieS.et al. (2020). Middle East Respiratory Syndrome-Corona Virus (MERS-CoV) associated stress among medical students at a university teaching hospital in Saudi Arabia. J. Infect. Public Health13, 687–691. doi: 10.1016/j.jiph.2020.01.005

Alsadaan N, Salameh B, Reshia FAAE, Alruwaili RF, Alruwaili M, Awad Ali SA, Jones LK. Impact of nurse leaders behaviors on nursing staff performance: a systematic literature review. INQUIRY: J Health Care Organ Provis Financing. 2023;60:00469580231178528. 10.1177/00469580231178528.

BakkerA. B.DemeroutiE. (2007). The job demands–resources model: state of the art. J. Manag. Psychol.22, 309–328. doi: 10.1108/02683940710733115

BrislinR. W. (1986). A culture general assimilator: Preparation for various types of sojourns. Int. J. Intercult. Relat.10, 215–234. doi: 10.1016/0147-1767(86)90007-6

CreswellJ. W.CreswellJ. D. (2017). Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

CropanzanoR.MitchellM. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: an interdisciplinary review. J. Manag.31, 874–900. doi: 10.1177/0149206305279602

EinarsenS.AaslandM. S.SkogstadA. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: a definition and conceptual model. Leadersh. Q.18, 207–216. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002

EisenbergerR.HuntingtonR.HutchisonS.SowaD. (1986). Perceived organizational support. J. Appl. Psychol.71:500. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500

EtikanI.BalaK. (2017). Sampling and sampling methods. Biom. Biostat. Int. J5:149. doi: 10.15406/bbij.2017.05.00149

GoldbergD.WilliamsP. (1988). General Health Questionnaire. Windsor: nferNelson.

HalbeslebenJ. R.NeveuJ. P.Paustian-UnderdahlS. C.WestmanM. (2014). Getting to the "COR" understanding the role of resources in conservation of resources theory. J. Manag.40, 1334–1364. doi: 10.1177/0149206314527130

HarmsP. D.CredéM.TynanM.LeonM.JeungW. (2017). Leadership and stress: a meta-analytic review. Leadersh. Q.28, 178–194. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.10.006

HobfollS. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: a new attempt at conceptualizing stress. Am. Psychol.44, 513–524. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513,

HodgesJ. (2020). Organization Development: How Organizations change and Develop Effectively. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

HofstedeG. (2001). Culture's recent consequences: Using dimension scores in theory and research. Int. J. Cross Cult. Manag.1, 11–17. doi: 10.1177/147059580111002

HowardM. C.BoudreauxM.OglesbyM. (2024). Can Harman's single-factor test reliably distinguish between research designs? Not in published management studies. Eur. J. Work Organ. Psychol.33, 790–804. doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2024.2393462

KiazadK.RestubogS. L. D.ZagenczykT. J.KiewitzC.TangR. L. (2010). In pursuit of power: the role of authoritarian leadership in the relationship between supervisors' Machiavellianism and subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervisory behavior. J. Res. Pers.44, 512–519. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2010.06.004

KlineR. B. (2023). Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling. New York: Guilford publications.

LeiterM. P.MaslachC. (2005). "36 A mediation model of job burnout." in Research Companion to Organizational Health Psychology, 544.

LovibondS. H. (1995). Manual for the depression Anxiety Stress scales. Sydney: Sydney psychology Foundation.

MaslachC.JacksonS. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. J. Organ. Behav.2, 99–113. doi: 10.1002/job.4030020205

PadillaA.HoganR.KaiserR. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. Leadersh. Q.18, 176–194. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.001

PelletierK. L. (2010). Leader toxicity: an empirical investigation of toxic behavior and rhetoric. Leadership6, 373–389. doi: 10.1177/1742715010379308

RasoolS. F.MohelskaH.RehmanF. U.RazaH.AsgharM. Z. (2025). Exploring the nexus between a supportive workplace environment, employee engagement, and employee performance in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Adm. Sci.15:230. doi: 10.3390/admsci15060230

RosenthalS. A.PittinskyT. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. Leadersh. Q.17, 617–633. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.005

SchillingJ.SchynsB.MayD. (2023). When your leader just does not make any sense: Conceptualizing inconsistent leadership. J. Bus. Ethics185, 209–221. doi: 10.1007/s10551-022-05119-9

SchmidtA. A. (2008). Development and Validation of the toxic Leadership Scale. Maryland: University of Maryland College Park.

ShrivastavaA.GoyalH. R.HusseinL.BansalS.SharmaV.HarikrishnaM. (2024). Innovations in Mechanical Drawing and Computer Graphics: Enhancing Precision and Visualization in Engineering Design. In 2024 IEEE 4th International Conference on ICT in Business Industry & Government (ICTBIG) (IEEE). p. 1–5. doi: 10.1109/ICTBIG64922.2024.10911512

SkogstadA.EinarsenS.TorsheimT.AaslandM. S.HetlandH. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. J. Occup. Health Psychol.12, 80–92. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.80,

TafvelinS.NielsenK.von Thiele SchwarzU.StenlingA. (2019). Leading well is a matter of resources: Leader vigour and peer support augments the relationship between transformational leadership and burnout. Work & Stress33, 156–172. doi: 10.1080/02678373.2018.1513961

TepperB. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. Acad. Manag. J.43, 178–190. doi: 10.5465/1556375