The Relationship between Toxic Leadership and Staff Nurse's Deviant Behaviors

Eman Osman Elsaid Elsabagh (1), Reem Mabrouk Abd El Rahman (2), Mayada Hassan Saad Elzohairy (3)

- (1) Demonstrator in Nursing Administration, Faculty of Nursing, Damnhour University, Egypt
- (2) Professor in Nursing Administration, Faculty of Nursing, Damnhour University, Egypt
- (3) Assistant Professor in Nursing Administration, Faculty of Nursing, Damnhour University, Egypt Correspondence Email: eman.osman@nur.dmu.edu.eg

Abstract

Background: Toxic leadership is ineffective conduct that embodies the bad or dark side of leadership and can negatively affect not only the followers but also the whole organization. Aim: Investigate the relationship between toxic leadership and staff nurse's deviant behaviors at Itay El Baroud General Hospital. Design: A descriptive, correlational research design was used to conduct this study. Setting: The study was carried out in all inpatient units (medical and surgical) and Intensive Care Units (ICUs) (n=16), namely: (1) medical units (n=8), namely: general medical (Male and Female), obstetric, pediatric, poison, orthopedic, neurosurgical, and dialysis units; (2) Surgical units (n=4), as follows: general surgical (Male and Female), and operation units; (3) ICUs (n=5), as: general, neonatal, pediatric, coronary care, and emergency unit at Itay El Baroud General Hospital. Subjects: Two groups of subjects were included; (a) All head nurses and their assistants (n=32), (b) All staff nurses (n=300). Tools: Two tools were used for data collection; toxic leadership scale and deviant workplace behaviors scale. Results: There was no statistical significant difference between head nurses and staff nurses regarding total toxic leadership and it's all dimensions and less than half of studied subjects, got moderate mean percent scores of total toxic leadership. There was statistical significant difference between head nurses and staff nurses regarding organizational deviance and above one third of studied subjects, got moderate mean percent scores of total deviant workplace behaviors. Conclusion: Highly positive statistical significant correlations between total toxic leadership and its dimensions and between total workplace deviant behaviors and its dimensions. Recommendations: The study recommended establishing leadership training programs to provide health care supervisors with the skills they need to build a collaborative and participatory management organization, thus reducing deviant workplace behaviors of staff nurses.

Keywords: Toxic Leadership, Deviant Workplace Behaviors, Staff nurses.

Introduction

Leadership is considered an important factor in achieving health care organization coordinating nurses, directing the hospital's resources to improve efficiency and performance (Karatepe & Türkmen, 2023). Effective leaders provide clarity of purpose, motivates, and guides the hospital to realize its mission (Thompson, 2021). Effective leadership practices based on the values of respect, trust, and open communication are critical not only in providing safe and highquality care, but also in creating a quality work environment in which nurses are respected and valued, which helps to keep them motivated to

work, satisfied, and committed to the organization (Field & Brown, 2019).

However, the reality is that there are undesirable leadership samples behaviors organizations. nonproductive in These kinds of leadership are samples of nonproductive and ineffective behaviors in organizations (Labrague, 2021). Toxic leadership had been examined among these ineffective behaviors that reflect leadership's negative/dark side (Taha, Ahmed & Abd Allah, 2024). Toxic leadership negatively affects nurses' quality of work, productivity, and job satisfaction, manipulating and influencing the workforce's behavior (Abdallah & Mostafa, 2021), their attitude, needs, behavior, and

nurses having toxic leaders are less satisfied, less committed, more absent, and are more deviant in behaviors in their workplace. Bhandarker, & Rai, (2019) defined toxic behaviors which leadership as divisiveness, laissez-faire, promoting inequity, social exclusion and threatening followers' security and self-esteem". Labrague. Nwafor & Tsaras, (2020) defined toxic leadership as: "a form of supervision, where a leader employ organized. systematic and persistent destructive behaviors that may harm the entire organization".

Toxic leadership is classified by Schmidt, (2008) into five dimensions: (1) Abusive supervision; (2) narcissism; (3) authoritarianism; (4) self-promotion, finally, (5) unpredictability.

Toxic leaders exhibit deviant workplace behavior consisting of voluntary actions that violate established norms, and which have an adverse effect on either or both an organization and its members (Tufan et al., 2023). Webster, (2011) described several negative consequences for organizations, including unwanted turnover, reduced employee satisfaction and commitment and increased employee psychological distress. A range of negative impacts as a result of the dark side of leadership have been described, particularly at the individual employee level and includes psychological distress, i.e. reduced self-esteem. anxiety, depression, burnout, disengagement, emotional harm and physical health problems (Mehraein, Visintin & Pittino, 2023). Working in a toxic environment is strongly linked with negative consequences from deviant workplace behaviors such as poor work performance, discontentment. disengagement, reduced job satisfaction, job burnout, decreased organizational commitment, and low morale (El-Gazar et al., 2024).

Deviant behavior at work (**DWB**) has been studied in various terms, including retaliatory, dysfunctional behavior, Organizational misconduct and counterproductive behavior at work (**Hussain et al., 2023**). **Robinson & Bennett, (1995**) defined deviance workplace behavior (DWB) as "a voluntary behavior engaged by employee that is contrary to the significant organizational

norms and it is considered as a threat to the well-being of an organization and/ or its members" (Robinson, & Bennett, 1995). Deviant behavior in the workplace is frequently referred to as an act against the organization's property or assets Bennett & Robinson, (2000). Finally, Deviant workplace behavior is distinguished from unethical workplace behavior by Jeewandara & Kumari, (2021). They define unethical behavior as going against a society's accepted laws, regulations, and standards by inappropriate engaging in wrongdoings arguing behaviors or and Abdullah et al., (2021).

Deviant behavior in the workplace differs in two dimensions, one directed at the organization and the other at the individual. a) Organizational deviance, Includes collective behavior between individuals and organizations, such as theft, sabotage, and low effort in the workplace. b) Interpersonal deviance is the behavior presents between individuals in the workplace, such as making fun of others, playing mean pranks, acting rudely, and arguing (Abas et al., 2024).

Workplace deviance behavior has a bad consequence on nurses and organization.it can leads to lost work time, increase absenteeism, burnout decrease performance, turnover. productivity, efficiency, morale of nurses, quality of care which led to economic threat and loss because the organization pay salary to nurse doesn't work effectively (Abou Hashish, 2020). At the individual level, several studies have also investigated a number of demographic In general, deviant behaviors variables. represent two sides of the coin due to their positive or negative consequences. Having effective leadership is essential for nurses to achieve higher standards of nursing care and better patient outcomes in any hospital. Effective supervision also allows nurses to develop a sense of fairness towards their hospital (Akbiyik et al., 2020).

Significance of the study

For many years, leadership concepts focused on its positive aspects, leading to a bias toward leadership. However, there are unfavorable types of leadership. These kinds of

leadership are samples of nonproductive and ineffective behaviors in organizations Labrague (2021). Toxic leaders tend to "interfere with others' ability to perform work (similar to the way poison may interfere with an individual's ability to function, therefore being considered toxic) rather than successfully lead followers toward destructive destructive leaders do (Milosevic et al. 2019). The study reported the extent of many leaders' destructive behavior and its consequences in the organization and members. healthcare Furthermore, toxic leadership threatens the well-being of both individuals and organizations, and this creates an urgent need to understand the nature and evolution of toxic leadership and the organizations involved (Brouwers & Paltu, **2020).** So, the researchers conducted this study to investigate toxic leadership and its relation to staff nurse's deviant behaviors.

Aims of the Study

Investigate the relationship between toxic leadership and staff nurse's deviant behaviors at Itay El Baroud General Hospital.

Research question

What is the relationship between toxic leadership and staff nurse's deviant behaviors at Itay El Baroud General Hospital?

Materials and Methods

<u>**Design:**</u> A descriptive, correlational research design was used to conduct this study.

Setting: This study was conducted at Itay El Baroud General Hospital, which is affiliated to the Ministry of Health and Population (MOHP), with bed capacity (n= 220) beds. It was included all inpatient units (medical and surgical) and Intensive Care Units (ICUs) (n=16), namely: (1) medical units (n=8), namely: general medical (Male and Female), obstetric, pediatric, poison, orthopedic, neurosurgical, and dialysis units; (2) Surgical units (n=4), as follows: general surgical (Male and Female), and operation units; (3) ICUs (n=5), as: general, neonatal. pediatric, coronary care. emergency units.

<u>Subjects:</u> Two groups of subjects were included in this study.

- a) All head nurses and their assistants, who are working at the abovementioned settings and who was available at the time of data collection, with at least one year of experience. (n=32)
- b) Staff nurses (n=300), who are working in the previously mentioned settings and, who was available at the time of data collection, with at least one year of experience. They was divided based on Epi Info (7); as follows: professional nurses (n=100), technical nurses. (n=200)

<u>Tools:</u> The study used two tools for data collection:

Tool (I): Toxic leadership Scale:

It was developed by (Schmidt, 2008) to assess toxic leadership. It consists of 30 items; categorized into five dimensions, namely: (1) abusive supervision (7-item); (2) authoritarian leadership (6-item); (3) narcissism (5-item); (4) self-promotion (5-item); and (5) unpredictability (7-item). Responses measured on 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Scores was range from (30-150); where low (<90); moderate $(\ge90 - <113)$ and high $(\ge113 -$ 150).

Tool (II): Deviant Behaviors Scale:

It was developed by (Bennett & Robinson, 2000), to assess nurses' perception level toward deviant workplace behaviors. It contains 19 items under two main dimensions, as follows: (1) interpersonal deviance (7-item), and (2) organizational deviance (12-item). Responses was measured on 3-point Likert scale, ranging from (3) always to (1) never. Scores ranged from (19-57) where low (<19); moderate (≥19-<38) and high (≥38-57).

In addition, a demographic characteristics data sheet was developed by the researcher to collect data from head nurses and staff nurses, such as: age, gender, educational qualification, working unit, years of nursing

experience, years of unit experience and marital status.

Methods

- 1. An official permission was obtained from the Dean of Faculty of Nursing, Damanhour University and the responsible authorities of the study settings, after explanation of the purpose of the study.
- 2. The two tools was translated into Arabic, and was tested for its content validity and translation by a panel of five experts in the field of the study. Accordingly, no modifications was done.
- 3. Reliability of the tools was tested statistically using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient test to measure internal consistency of the items composing each dimension of the tools. The result of Cronbach's alpha coefficient test was as follows: Toxic leadership Scale: ($\alpha = 0.887$); and Deviant Behaviors Scale: ($\alpha = 0.826$), indicating adequate and good reliability.
- 4. A pilot study was carried out on (10%) of total sample size, head nurses and their assistants (n=3) and staff nurses (n=30), who was not included in the study sample; in order to check and to ensure the clarity, identify obstacles and problems that might be encountered during data collection. Based on the findings of the pilot study, no modifications were done.
- 5. Data collection for this study was conducted by the researcher through hand delivered, self-administered questionnaire. An individualized interview with each staff nurse was conducted to explain the aim of the study and the needed instructions were given before the distribution of the questionnaire in their settings.
- 6. The two tools was delivered to both study subjects (head nurses and staff nurses); in order to promote self-evaluation and peer /subordinates' evaluations to ensure unbiased responses. The questionnaire was completed by study subjects at their work setting; it took about 20-30 minutes to fill out the two tools. The data was collected in a period of three

months, starting from the first of March 2023 to the end of May 2023.

7. After completion of data collection, the appropriate statistical analysis was used.

Ethical Considerations:

- The research approval was obtained from the Ethical Committee at the Faculty of Nursing-Damanhour University, prior to the start of the study.
- An informed written consent was obtained from the study subjects after explanation of the aim of study.
- Privacy and confidentiality of the collected data was maintained during implementation of the study.
- Anonymity regarding data collected was considered.
- Right to refuse to participate or withdraw from the research was assured during the study.

Statistical Analysis:

collected data was revised. categorized, coded, computerized, tabulated and analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.0. The reliability of the tools was determined by Cronbach's alpha and presented in descriptive and association forms. The necessary tables were then developed. P value ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically significant, and P value ≤ 0.01 was considered highly statistically significant. The following statistical measures were used: Descriptive statistics: Included frequency, precent and Mean with Standard Deviation (Mean± SD), Min – Max, and Mean percent score to describe and summarize the scale and categorical data.

B) Analytic statistics: Chi-square test was used to examine the relationship between variables. The Pearson correlation coefficient test was used to explore the relationship between the toxic leadership and staff nurse's

deviant behaviors. A correlation matrix is a matrix showing the correlation coefficients between two variables. Correlation coefficients measure how strong and in which direction two variables are linked in a straight line. Multivariate regression is a technique that estimates a single regression model with more than one outcome variable. When there is more than one predictor variable in a multivariate regression model. Monte Carlo simulation is a model used to predict the probability of a variety of outcomes when the potential for random variables is present. Graphical presentation: Bar graphs were done for data visualization using Microsoft Excel.

Results

Table 1 shows that pertaining to age, mean± SD of head nurses was 37.59±3.740; compared to 28.94±5.329 for staff nurses. Nearly three quarters of head nurses were from 30 to less than 40 years old (71.9%); whereas nearly three quarters of staff nurses were from 20 to less than 30 years old (71.3%). Regarding working unit, 84.4% of head nurses working in surgical. In relation to gender, all head nurses were female, and also the majority of staff nurses were female (92%). As for educational qualification, above two thirds of head nurses had Bachelor of Science in Nursing (68.8%). Pertaining to years of nursing experience, mean±SD of head nurses was 14.78±4.331: compared to 6.52±5.36 for staff nurses. Above half of head nurses had from 10-15 years of nursing experience (53.1%); whereas above half of staff nurses had ≤ 5 years of nursing experience (53.3%). According to years of unit experience, mean±SD of head nurses was 8.63±4.542; whereas, for staff nurses was 4.51±4.66. Half of head nurses had from 5-10 years of unit. In relation to marital status, the majority of head nurses and nurses were married (93.3%, 86.1%), respectively.

Table 2 shows that less than half of studied subjects, got moderate mean percent

scores of total toxic leadership (45.41%). All toxic leadership dimensions: self-promotion, narcissism, authoritarian leadership, abusive supervision, and unpredictability, got moderate mean percent scores, (51.96%, 48.80%, 43%, 39.86%, 36.28%), respectively.

Table 3 shows that above one third of studied subjects, got moderate mean percent scores of total deviant workplace behaviors (39.19%). Pertaining to organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance dimensions, the studied subjects got moderate mean percent scores (40%, 37.54%), consecutively.

Table 4 reveals that there were highly statistical significant relationships between total toxic leadership and working unit, and gender, where (P=0.0001, 0.008); respectively. Moreover, there were statistical significant relationships between total toxic leadership and educational qualifications and years of nursing experience. where (P=.014. .051), consecutively. However, there were no statistical significant relationships between total toxic leadership and age, marital status and years of unit experience, where (P > 0.05).

Table 5 indicates that there were statistical significant relationships between total deviant workplace behaviors and years of nursing and unit experience, where (P=0.02, 0.045), respectively. However, there were no statistical significant relationships between total deviant workplace behaviors and age, working unit, educational qualification, gender and marital status, where (P > 0.05).

Table 6 represents that there were highly positive statistical significant correlations between total toxic leadership and its dimensions and between total workplace deviant behaviors and its dimensions, where ($P \le 0.01$). On other hand no statistical significant correlations were found between total toxic leadership dimensions and total workplace deviant behaviors dimensions, where (P > 0.05).

Table (1): Demographic characteristics of the study subjects, working at Itay El Baroud General Hospital, (N=332).

Demographics characteristics	Head (N=			f nurses =300)	Total (N-332)	
Demographics characteristics	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1) Age	<u> </u>	I	1	ı	1	
• 20 -	2	6.2	214	71.3	216	65.1
• 30 -	23	71.9	78	26.0	101	30.4
• 40-	7	21.9	5	1.7	12	3.6
• ≥ 50	0	0.0	3	1.0	3	0.9
Mean ±SD	37.59=	±3740	28.9	4±5.328	29.7	8±5.788
2) Working Unit	•		•		•	
Medical	1	3.1	53	17.7	54	16.3
Surgical	27	84.4	117	39.0	144	43.4
• ICU	4	12.5	130	43.3	134	40.3
3) Gender						
• Male	0	0.0	24	8.0	24	7.2
• Female	32	100.0	276	92.0	308	92.8
4) Educational qualifications						
Diploma of Secondary Technical	0	0.0	18	6.0	38	11.4
Nursing School.	U	0.0	10	0.0	30	11.4
Diploma of Technical Nursing	0	0.0	59	19.5	163	49.2
Institute.			39		103	47.2
Bachelor of Sciences-in Nursing	22	68.8	119	39.5	112	33.7
Post-graduate studies.	10	31.2	105	35.0	19	5.7
5) Years of nursing experience		ı				
• ≤5	2	6.3	160	53.3	162	48.8
• ≥5-	1	3.1	90	30.0	91	27.4
≥10-	17	53.1	32	10.7	49	14.8
• ≥15	12	37.5	18	6.0	30	9.0
Mean ±SD	4.78	±4.331	6.52±5.36		7.32±5.807	
6) Years of unit experience						
• ≤5	8	25.0	220	73.3	228	68.7
• ≥5-	16	50.0	56	19.7	75	22.6
≥10-	5	15.6	12	4.0	17	5.1
• ≥15	3	9.4	9	3.0	12	3.6
Mean ±SD	8.63±4.542		4.51±4.66		4.91±4.803	
7) Marital status	1	1			1	
Single	0	0.0	55	18.3	55	16.6
Married	30	93.8	237	79.0	267	80.4
Divorced	1	3.1	5	1.7	6	1.8
Widow	1	3.1	3	1.0	4	1.2

Table (2): Mean percent scores of toxic leadership among studied subjects, working at Itay El Baroud General Hospital, (N=332).

	Studied subjects (N=332)								
Toxic leadership dimensions	Min	Max	Mean± SD	Mean % Score					
Abusive supervision	7	35	13.954±5.230	39.86					
Authoritarian leadership	6	30	12.900±5.088	43.0					
Narcissism	5	35	12.201±4.320	48.80					
Self-promotion	5	25	12.991±4.699	51.96					
• Unpredictability	7	35	15.701±5.639	36.28					
Total toxic leadership	30-	150	68.123±20.795	45.41					

Low score < 0-33.3%; moderate score $\ge 33.3\% - < 66.6\%$; high score $\ge 66.6\% - 100\%$

Table (3): Mean percent scores of deviant workplace behaviors among studied subjects, working at Itay El Baroud General Hospital, (N=332).

Dimensions of deviant workplace behaviors	Min	Max	Mean± SD	% Mean Score
Interpersonal deviance	7	21	7.885±1.862	37.54
Organizational deviance	12	36	14.400±3.692	40.0
Total deviant workplace behaviors	19	57	22.340±5.312	39.19

Low score < 0-33.3%; moderate score \geq 33.3% - < 66.6%; high score \geq 66.6% - 100%

Table (4): Relationship between demographic characteristics of studied subjects and their total toxic leadership, working at Itay El Baroud General Hospital, (N=332).

leadership, working at Itay El Baroud General Hospital, (N=332). Total toxic leadership (N= 332)										
Demographic characteristics	Low (N=236)		Moderate (N=90)		High (N=6)		Total (N=332)		X2 P	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	0/0	r	
1) Age										
• 20 -	152	64.4	60	66.7	4	66.7	216	65.1		
• 30 -	71	30.1	28	31.1	2	33.3	101	30.4	2.266	
• 40-	10	4.2	2	2.2	0	0.0	12	3.6	0.894	
• ≥50	3	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.9		
2) Working Unit										
• Medical	45	19.1	9	10.0	0	0.0	54	16.3	17.568	
• Surgical	113	47.9	30	33.3	1	16.7	144	43.4	0.0001*	
• ICU	78	33	51	56.7	5	83.3	134	40.3	*	
3) Gender										
• Male	12	5.1	10	11.1	2	33.3	24	7.2	9.73	
• Female	224	94.9	80	88.9	4	66.7	308	92.8	0.008* *	
4) Educational qualificati	ons						ı			
Diploma of Secondary Technical Nursing School	33	14.0	5	5.6	0	0.0	38	11.4		
Diploma of Technical Nursing Institute.	116	49.2	44	48.9	3	50.0	163	49.2	0.014*	
Bachelor of Sciences-in Nursing.	75	31.7	35	38.8	2	33.3	112	33.7		
Post-graduate studies.	12	5.1	6	6.7	1	16.7	19	5.7		
5) Years of nursing exper	ience									
• <u>≤</u> 5	118	50.0	41	45.6	3	50.0	162	48.8		
• ≥5-	54	22.9	34	37.7	3	50.0	91	27.4	11.256	
• ≥10-	39	16.5	10	11.1	0	0.0	49	14.8	0.0544	
• ≥15	25	10.6	5	5.6	0	0.0	30	9.0	0.051*	
6) Years of unit experience	e									
• <u>≤</u> 5	162	68.6	62	68.8	4	66.7	228	68.7		
≥5-	50	21.2	23	25.6	2	33.3	75	22.6	2.992	
• ≥10-	14	5.9	3	3.2	0	0.0	17	5.1	0.810	
• ≥15	10	4.3	3	3.3	0	0.0	12	3.6		
7) Marital status										
Single	38	16.1	16	17.8	1	16.7	55	16.6		
Married	189	80.1	73	81.1	5	83.3	267	80.4	2.654	
Divorced	6	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	1.8	0.851	
Widow	3	1.3	1	1.1	0	0.0	4	1.2		

*Significant P≤0.05

** High significant p≤0.01

High score: 66.6 %-<

100%; Moderate score: 33.3 %-< 66.6%; Low score: 0 %-< 33.3%

Table (5): Relationship between demographic characteristics of studied subjects and their total deviant workplace behaviors, working at Itay El Baroud General Hospital. (N=332).

Demographic characteristics Content Co	workplace behaviors, working at Itay El Baroud General Hospital. (N=332).										
1) Age	Demographic characteristics				198)		(N=5)				
• 20 - 78 60.5 13 68.7 2 40.0 21 65.1 • 30 - 42 32.6 56 28.3 3 60.0 10 30.4 • 40 - 7 5.4 5 2.5 0 0.0 12 3.6 • ≥50 2 1.5 1 0.5 0 0.0 3 0.9 Working Unit		No.	0/0	No.	%	No.	%	No.	0/0		
**30 -											
Secondary 1	• 30 -										
Working Unit	• 40-	7		5		0		12	3.6	0.399	
• Medical 20 15.5 33 16.7 1 20.0 54 16.3 6.224 • Surgical 66 51.2 75 37.9 3 60.0 144 43.4 0.399 • ICU 43 33.35 90 54.5 1 20.0 134 40.3 • Male 9 7.0 15 7.6 0 0.0 24 7.2 0.437 • Female 120 93.0 183 92.4 5 100 308 92.8 0.804 4) Educational qualifications 7 18 9.1 1 20.0 38 11.4 7.2 0.804 Diploma of Secondary Technical Nursing Institute. 65 50.4 97 49.0 1 20.0 16 49.2 5.732 Bachelor of Sciences-in Nursing. 38 29.5 71 35.8 3 60.0 19 5.7 Post-graduate studies v 5.4 12		2	1.5	1	0.5	0	0.0	3	0.9		
Surgical 66 51.2 75 37.9 3 60.0 144 43.4 0.399 • ICU 43 33.35 90 54.5 1 20.0 134 40.3 3) Gender Secondary Female 9 7.0 15 7.6 0 0.0 24 7.2 0.437 • Female 120 93.0 183 92.4 5 100 308 92.8 0.804 4) Educational qualifications Educational qualifications 19 14.7 18 9.1 1 20.0 38 11.4 5.732 0.484 Diploma of Secondary Technical Nursing Linstitute. 65 50.4 97 49.0 1 20.0 16 49.2 5.732 Bachelor of Sciences-in Nursing. 38 29.5 71 35.8 3 60.0 19 5.7 Years of nursing experience 5 6 47.3 10 50.5 1 20.0											
ICU						1					
3) Gender • Male 9 7.0 15 7.6 0 0.0 24 7.2 0.437 • Female 120 93.0 183 92.4 5 100 308 92.8 0.804 4) Educational qualifications Uniform of Secondary Technical Nursing School. 19 14.7 18 9.1 1 20.0 38 11.4 5.732 Diploma of Technical Nursing Institute. 65 50.4 97 49.0 1 20.0 16 49.2 6.49.2 6.454 6.5 6.5 7.1 35.8 3 60.0 11 33.7 33.7 3				75		3	60.0			0.399	
• Male 9 7.0 15 7.6 0 0.0 24 7.2 0.437 • Female 120 93.0 183 92.4 5 100 308 92.8 0.804 4) Educational qualifications Use of Secondary Technical Nursing School. 19 14.7 18 9.1 1 20.0 38 11.4 5.732 7.732		43	33.35	90	54.5	1	20.0	134	40.3		
Female 120 93.0 183 92.4 5 100 308 92.8 0.804 Educational qualifications							1				
4) Educational qualifications 100 25.7 100 300 300 350<		-									
Diploma of Secondary 19		_	93.0	183	92.4	5	100	308	92.8	0.804	
Technical Nursing School. 19 14.7 18 9.1 1 20.0 5.732 Diploma of Technical Nursing Institute. 65 50.4 97 49.0 1 20.0 16 49.2 0.454 Bachelor of Sciences-in Nursing. 38 29.5 71 35.8 3 60.0 11 33.7 Post-graduate studies v 5.4 12 6.1 6 00.0 19 5.7 5) Years of nursing experience *** </th <td></td> <td>ions</td> <td></td> <td>ı</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1 1</td> <td></td>		ions		ı	1				1 1		
Nursing. Society So		19	14.7	18	9.1	1	20.0	38			
Bachelor of Sciences-in Nursing. 38 29.5 71 35.8 3 60.0 11 33.7 Post-graduate studies v 5.4 12 6.1 6 00.0 19 5.7 5) Years of nursing experience • ≤5 61 47.3 10 50.5 1 20.0 16 48.8 • ≥5- 28 21.7 61 30.8 2 40.0 91 27.4 • ≥10- 25 19.4 24 12.1 0 0.0 49 14.8 • ≥15 15 11.6 13 6.6 2 40.0 30 9.0 6) Years of unit experience • ≤5 87 68.4 13 70.2 2 40.0 22 68.7 • ≥5- 26 20.2 48 24.2 1 20.0 75 22.6 • ≥15 5	1	65	50.4	97	49.0	1	20.0	16	49.2	0.454	
Post-graduate studies v 5.4 12 6.1 6 00.0 19 5.7 5) Years of nursing experience • ≤5 61 47.3 10 50.5 1 20.0 16 48.8 • ≥5- 28 21.7 61 30.8 2 40.0 91 27.4 14.822 0.020* • ≥10- 25 19.4 24 12.1 0 0.0 49 14.8 14.822 0.020* • ≥15 15 11.6 13 6.6 2 40.0 30 9.0 6) Years of unit experience 87 68.4 13 70.2 2 40.0 22 68.7 • ≥5- 26 20.2 48 24.2 1 20.0 75 22.6 • ≥15 5 3.9 6 3.1 1 20.2 12 3.6 7)	Bachelor of Sciences-in	38	29.5	71	35.8	3	60.0	11	33.7		
5) Years of nursing experience • ≤5 61 47.3 10 50.5 1 20.0 16 48.8 • ≥5- 28 21.7 61 30.8 2 40.0 91 27.4 0.020* • ≥10- 25 19.4 24 12.1 0 0.0 49 14.8 14.822 0.020* • ≥15 15 11.6 13 6.6 2 40.0 30 9.0 6) Years of unit experience • ≤5 87 68.4 13 70.2 2 40.0 22 68.7 • ≥5- 26 20.2 48 24.2 1 20.0 75 22.6 • ≥15 5 3.9 6 3.1 1 20.0 17 5.1 • ≥15 5 3.9 6 3.1 1 20.2 12 3.6 7) Marital status • Single 24 18.6 30		V	5.4	12	6.1	6	00.0	19	5.7		
• ≥5- 28 21.7 61 30.8 2 40.0 91 27.4 14.822 • ≥10- 25 19.4 24 12.1 0 0.0 49 14.8 • ≥15 15 11.6 13 6.6 2 40.0 30 9.0 6) Years of unit experience • ≤5 87 68.4 13 70.2 2 40.0 22 68.7 • ≥5- 26 20.2 48 24.2 1 20.0 75 22.6 • ≥10- 11 8.5 5 2.5 1 20.0 17 5.1 • ≥15 5 3.9 6 3.1 1 20.2 12 3.6 7) Marital status • Single 24 18.6 30 15.2 1 20.0 55 16.6 • Married 10											
• ≥3- 28 ≥1.7 01 30.8 ≥ 40.0 91 ≥1.4 0.020* • ≥10- 25 19.4 24 12.1 0 0.0 49 14.8 0.020* 6) Years of unit experience • ≤5 87 68.4 13 70.2 2 40.0 22 68.7 • ≥5- 26 20.2 48 24.2 1 20.0 75 22.6 • ≥10- 11 8.5 5 2.5 1 20.0 17 5.1 • ≥15 5 3.9 6 3.1 1 20.2 12 3.6 7) Marital status • Single 24 18.6 30 15.2 1 20.0 55 16.6 • Married 103 79.8 16 80.8 4 80.0 267 80.4 • Divorced 0 0.0 6 3.9 0 0.0 6 1.8 <	• ≤5	61	47.3	10	50.5	1	20.0	16	48.8		
• ≥10- 25 19.4 24 12.1 0 0.0 49 14.8 • ≥15 15 11.6 13 6.6 2 40.0 30 9.0 6) Years of unit experience • ≤5 87 68.4 13 70.2 2 40.0 22 68.7 • ≥5- 26 20.2 48 24.2 1 20.0 75 22.6 • ≥10- 11 8.5 5 2.5 1 20.0 17 5.1 • ≥15 5 3.9 6 3.1 1 20.2 12 3.6 7) Marital status • Single 24 18.6 30 15.2 1 20.0 55 16.6 • Married 103 79.8 16 80.8 4 80.0 267 80.4 0.851 • Divorced 0 0.0 6 3.9 0 0.0 6 1.8 <td>• ≥5-</td> <td>28</td> <td>21.7</td> <td>61</td> <td>30.8</td> <td>2</td> <td>40.0</td> <td>91</td> <td>27.4</td> <td></td>	• ≥5-	28	21.7	61	30.8	2	40.0	91	27.4		
• ≥15 15 11.6 13 6.6 2 40.0 30 9.0 6) Years of unit experience • ≤5 87 68.4 13 70.2 2 40.0 22 68.7 • ≥5- 26 20.2 48 24.2 1 20.0 75 22.6 • ≥10- 11 8.5 5 2.5 1 20.0 17 5.1 • ≥15 5 3.9 6 3.1 1 20.2 12 3.6 7) Marital status • Single 24 18.6 30 15.2 1 20.0 55 16.6 • Married 103 79.8 16 80.8 4 80.0 267 80.4 0.851 • Divorced 0 0.0 6 3.9 0 0.0 6 1.8	• ≥10-	25	19.4	24	12.1	0	0.0	49	14.8	0.020*	
• ≤5 87 68.4 13 70.2 2 40.0 22 68.7 • ≥5- 26 20.2 48 24.2 1 20.0 75 22.6 • ≥10- 11 8.5 5 2.5 1 20.0 17 5.1 • ≥15 5 3.9 6 3.1 1 20.2 12 3.6 7) Marital status • Single 24 18.6 30 15.2 1 20.0 55 16.6 • Married 103 79.8 16 80.8 4 80.0 267 80.4 • Divorced 0 0.0 6 3.9 0 0.0 6 1.8	• ≥15	15						30	9.0		
• ≥5- 26 20.2 48 24.2 1 20.0 75 22.6 • ≥10- 11 8.5 5 2.5 1 20.0 17 5.1 • ≥15 5 3.9 6 3.1 1 20.2 12 3.6 7) Marital status • Single 24 18.6 30 15.2 1 20.0 55 16.6 • Married 103 79.8 16 80.8 4 80.0 267 80.4 • Divorced 0 0.0 6 3.9 0 0.0 6 1.8		ce									
• ≥5- 26 20.2 48 24.2 1 20.0 73 22.6 0.045* • ≥10- 11 8.5 5 2.5 1 20.0 17 5.1 • ≥15 5 3.9 6 3.1 1 20.2 12 3.6 7) Marital status • Single 24 18.6 30 15.2 1 20.0 55 16.6 • Married 103 79.8 16 80.8 4 80.0 267 80.4 • Divorced 0 0.0 6 3.9 0 0.0 6 1.8	• ≤5	87	68.4	13	70.2	2	40.0	22	68.7		
• ≥10- 11 8.5 5 2.5 1 20.0 17 5.1 • ≥15 5 3.9 6 3.1 1 20.2 12 3.6 7) Marital status • Single 24 18.6 30 15.2 1 20.0 55 16.6 • Married 103 79.8 16 80.8 4 80.0 267 80.4 • Divorced 0 0.0 6 3.9 0 0.0 6 1.8		26	20.2			1	20.0				
7) Marital status • Single	• ≥10-	11	8.5	5	2.5	1	20.0	17	5.1		
• Single 24 18.6 30 15.2 1 20.0 55 16.6 • Married 103 79.8 16 80.8 4 80.0 267 80.4 0.851 • Divorced 0 0.0 6 3.9 0 0.0 6 1.8	• ≥15	5	3.9	6	3.1	1	20.2	12	3.6		
• Married 103 79.8 16 80.8 4 80.0 267 80.4 0.851 • Divorced 0 0.0 6 3.9 0 0.0 6 1.8	7) Marital status										
• Married 103 79.8 16 80.8 4 80.0 267 80.4 • Divorced 0 0.0 6 3.9 0 0.0 6 1.8 0.851	8	24	18.6	30	15.2	1	20.0			2 654	
• Divorced 0 0.0 6 3.9 0 0.0 6 1.8	• Married	103	79.8	16	80.8	4	80.0	267			
• Widow 2 16 2 10 0 00 4 12	• Divorced	0	0.0	6	3.9	0	0.0	6	1.8	0.001	
77 1UU W	• Widow	2	1.6	2	1.0	0	0.0	4	1.2		

*Significant P≤0.05

** High significant p≤0.01

High score: 66.6 %-< 100%; Moderate score: 33.3 %-< 66.6%; Low score: 0 %-< 33.3

Table (6): Correlation matrix among studied subjects 'of toxic leadership and workplace devia	ınt
behaviors, working at Itay El Baroud General Hospital.; (N=3;	32)

	benaviors, working at itay El Baroud General Hospital.;								
	supervisi on	Authoritar ian leadership	Narcissi sm	Self- promoti on	Unpredictab ility	Total toxic leaders hip	Interperso nal deviance	organizatio nal deviance	Total Deviant Behavi ors
Abusive R supervision	1	.723	.594	.396	.596	.786	.024	.073	.054
P		.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	.661	.185	.325
Authoritaria n leadership		1	.696	.566	.655	.863	.004	.012	.004
P			.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	.937	.832	.941
Narcissism R			1	.640	.685	.864	.033	.051	.041
P			1	.000**	.000**	.000**	.554	.351	.459
self- promotion				1	.645	.743	.048	.069	.057
P					.000**	.000**	.379	.211	.299
Unpredictab ility R					1	.847	.060	.087	.076
P					•	.000**	.277	.116	.170
Total toxic leadership						1	.036	.061	.048
P						1	.508	.267	.384
Interpersona l deviance							1	.684	.870
P							1	.000**	.000**
organization al deviance								1	.947
P									.000**
Total DeviantR Behaviors									1
P									

r: Pearson Correlation

*Significant P≤0.05

** High significant p≤0.01

Interpretation of r: Weak (0.1-0.24); Intermediate (0.25-0.7); Strong (0.75-0.99) perfect (1

Discussion

Nowadays, healthcare organizations require constructive and influential leaders aware of struggles and challenges to keep their existence, be helpful, and adapt to changes like any competitive environment (Kouzes & Posner 2023). Leadership behaviors affect nurses' well-being inside and outside the workplace borders (El-Gazar et al., 2024). However, toxic and ineffective leaders destruct healthcare systems Therefore, the current study aimed to examine the relationship between toxic leadership and deviant workplace behaviors (Labrague, Nwafor, & Tsaras, 2020).

The findings of the present study illustrated that less than half of studied subjects, got moderate mean percent scores of toxic leadership and the highest mean score was related to the self-promotion dimension. This may be due to staff nurses are satisfied with the leaders who encourage them to solve problems, build good relations among staff, offer training opportunities, take an interest in their demands. Regarding the highest mean score which related to the self-promotion dimension a possible explanation for these results is that the head nurses don't try to gain power and control by displaying self-promotion behavior or bypassing failure on to the staff. In contrast, the lowest mean score was related to

unpredictability dimension. This result may be due to the leader's unpredictable behavior vacillates between multiple types of behavior because of the stressful nature of the working environment as in ICUs.

Is in the same line with Ofei et al., (2022) and Shipl et al., (2022) who concluded that the study subjects got moderate mean percentage score of toxic leadership. In addition to that, Abou Ramadan & Eid (2020) who showed that quarter of nursing staff perceived moderate mean score of toxic leadership style at El-Menshawy and Tanta University Hospitals. Moreover, Mahgob et al., (2024) who concluded that highest mean score related to self-promotion dimension but staff nurses had low mean score regarding total toxic leadership. On other hand, this result is contraindicated with Mokhtar et al., (2024) who revealed that the highest mean score was related to abusive supervision. Moreover, Atalla & Mostafa (2023) indicated that the highest mean score was related to the unpredictability dimension. Additionally, Hossny et al., (2023) who concluded that high mean scores in the unpredictability dimension were observed in the university and insurance hospitals, and the selfpromotion dimension had the lowest scores.

The findings of the present study revealed that above one third of studied subjects, got moderate mean percent scores of total deviant workplace behaviors and the highest mean score related to organizational deviance dimensions, but lowest mean score related to interpersonal deviant dimension. This may be due to nurse managers do not pay attention to the general job alienation of clinical nurses to improve their general self-efficacy to feel successful, staff come in late at work without permission.

This result agreed with Shah et al., (2021) who showed that workplace deviance exists in the understudy sector at a moderate mean score. In addition to, Dar & Rahman (2019) and Aksu, (2016) who concluded that the highest mean score is related to organizational deviance dimension, while lowest mean score is related to interpersonal deviance dimension. On the other hand, this result is contraindicated with Abo-Algheit,

(2024) who showed that the studied subjects, got height mean percent scores of total deviant workplace behaviors. Furthermore, Elsehrawy & Mohamed (2023) who illustrated that the staff nurses exhibit low mean score of deviant behavior in the workplace.

The present study showed that there were highly statistical significant relationships between total toxic leadership and working unit, and gender. The results of the current study indicated the highest toxic leaders in surgical units. This may be due stressful nature of the working environment of surgical units and changeability of patients' conditions that need quick actions and unilateral decision making makes them susceptible to toxic leaders to high workload. Moreover, there were statistical significant relationships between total toxic leadership and educational qualifications and years of nursing experience.

This finding may be attributed to the fact that the nursing staff's education helps in dealing with fear and anxiety, which makes them susceptible to toxic leaders and may be due to the old and more experienced staff being proficient, autonomous, and thinking in their work decisions that may differ from their leaders. This result is in line with Hassan et al., (2024) and Mokhtar et al., (2024) who observed that there was a statistically significant relation between total toxic leadership and years of experience. Moreover, Abdallah & Mostafa (2021) who illustrated that there was a highly statistically significant positive relation between total staff nurses perceived toxic leadership and their experience at Tanta International Teaching and El-Menshawy General Hospital. This result is inconsistent with, Hossny et al., (2023) who indicated that, there were significant differences between toxic leadership and age and strong significant differences were observed in toxic leadership among the experience group from 6 to more than 10 years. Also, Atalla and Mostafa (2023) revealed that there was no statistically significant relationship between toxic leadership's overall mean score and all staff nurses' demographic data except age.

The findings of the present study also showed that there are statistical significant relationships between total deviant workplace behaviors and years of nursing and unit experience. A possible explanation for these results is that the more knowledge, skills and abilities of nurses and accompanied with years of experience. This result was similar with study done by **Mekawy and Ismail (2022)** who showed that there was a statistical positive significant relation between perceived nurses counterproductive workplace behaviors and their experience at private Hospital.

On the other side, these results were dissimilar to Ata et al., (2024) who reported that there were strong significant relationships between nurses' workplace deviant behaviors as regards their gender and marital status. Furthermore, Elsehrawy & Mohamed (2023) who showed that none of the personal characteristics were significantly related to Moreover, Okeke & deviant behaviors. Ugwuanyi (2023) who reported that there were statistically significant positive correlations between staff-nurses' workplace deviant behaviors as regards their gender, marital status.

The findings of the present study illustrated that there were highly positive statistical significant correlations between total toxic leadership and its dimensions and between total workplace deviant behaviors and its dimensions. In fact, this may be because nurses' managers often neglect the deviation behaviors in the workplace until it is too late. On the other hand no statistical significant correlations were found between total toxic leadership dimensions workplace and total deviant behaviors dimensions. This is supported by, Bany (2024) who illustrated that there were significant correlation between toxic leadership and its dimensions. Also, Hossny et al., (2023) who concluded that there were significant correlations between dimensions toxic leadership in the university and insurance hospitals. In addition, Ofei et al., (2022) who stated that there were significant differences correlations between dimensions of toxic leadership.

On the other hand, these results were dissimilar to Li et al., (2024) who concluded that deviant employee behaviors were positively related to destructive leadership. Moreover, Hassan et al., (2024) and Zaki & Elsaiad

(2021) who revealed that there was significant negative correlation between the dimensions of toxic leadership. Also, Nadeem et al., (2020) who found positive and significant correlation between toxic leadership on interpersonal deviance and workplace deviance.

Conclusion

The result of the present study concluded that there were highly positive statistical significant correlations between total toxic leadership and its dimensions and between total workplace deviant behaviors and its dimensions. On other hand no statistical significant correlations were found between total toxic leadership dimensions and total workplace deviant behaviors dimensions.

Recommendations

1. Hospital administrators should:

- Establish leadership training programs to provide health care supervisors with the skills they need to build a collaborative and participatory management organization, thus reducing deviant workplace behaviors of staff nurses.
- Identify reasons and ways of preventing nurses' deviant behaviors. Thus, managers may prevent behavior of deviation to the organization.
- Developing an in-service training program on ethical professional behavior in practice and providing intangible rewards, such as posting nurses' names with good attendance on the bulletin board.

2. Head nurses should:

- Training of future and novice leaders in terms of leadership behaviors, ethical standards in management, stress management, selfefficacy and effective communication before the promotion process into a leadership role.
- Design and implement periodical inservice educational programs to enhance staff

nurses' emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship skills.

3. Staff nurses should:

- Communicate openly with their head nurses to discuss their problems and their ideas and opinions with head nurses.
- Attending training program to become aware of organizational policies, resources, rules and regulations, to improve their abilities and skills to work effectively and enhance their responsibility to solve problems by and the ability to take decision.

Future studies:

- Identify factors causing nurses' deviant workplace behaviors.
- Identify the relationship between toxic leadership dimensions with interpersonal deviance behaviors and evaluates the characteristics of the followers of toxic leaders.

References

- Abdallah, S. A. E., & Mostafa, S. A. M. (2021). Effects of toxic leadership on intensive care units staff nurses' emotional intelligence and their organizational citizenship behaviors. *Tanta Scientific Nursing Journal*, 22(3), 211-240.
- Abdullah, N. A., Nasruddin, A. N. M., & Mokhtar, D. M. (2021). The relationship between personality traits, deviant behavior and workplace incivility. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 11(3), 169-184.
- Abdeldayem Ata, A., Saleh Moustafa Saleh, M., Ahmed Kamel, N., & Elsaid Elsabahy, H. (2024). Bridging the gap: Exploring nursing supervisor support influence on nurses' work alienation and deviant behaviors. *Egyptian Journal of Health Care*, 15(1), 2001–2013. doi:10.21608/ejhc.2024.358057
- Abas, B., Vo-Thanh, T., Bukhari, S., Villivalam, S., & Senbeto, D. L. (2024). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance and socioemotional factors at work: the role of socioemotional factors at work:

- demographic traits. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 51(8), 1041-1056.
- Abou Ramdan, A. H., & Eid, W. M. (2020). Toxic leadership: conflict management style and organizational commitment among intensive care nursing staff. *Evidence-Based Nursing Research*, 2(4), 12-12.
- Abo-Algheit, A., El-Sabahy, H., & Kassem, A. (2024). Relationship of Abusive Supervision and Organizational Justice with Workplace Deviance Behavior among Nurse. *Mansoura Nursing Journal*, 11(1), 383-395.
- Abd-Elrhaman, E. A., Helal, W. H., & ArabyEbraheem, S. M. (2020). Organizational justice, work alienation and deviant behaviors amongstaff nurses. *International Journal of Nursing Didactics*, 10(01), 01-11.
- Abdeldayem Ata, A., Saleh Moustafa Saleh, M., Ahmed Kamel, N., & Elsaid Elsabahy, H. (2024). Bridging the Gap: Exploring Nursing Supervisor Support Influence on Nurses' Work Alienation and Deviant Behaviors. *Egyptian Journal of Health Care*, 15(1), 2001-2013.
- Akbiyik, A., Korhan, E. A., Kiray, S., & Kirsan, M. (2020). The Effect of Nurses 'Leadership Behavior on the Quality of Nursing Care and Patient Outcomes. *Creative Nursing*, 26(1), 8-18.
- Aksu, A. (2016). Organizational Deviance and Multi-Factor Leadership. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(8), 589-597.
- Bany, B. M. (2024). The impact of toxic leadership on employee silence: The mediating role of workplace bullying: A study analyzing the perspectives of some leaders at the University of Kufa.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000).

 Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 85(3), 349.
- Bhandarker, A., & Rai, S. (2019). Toxic leadership: emotional distress and coping strategy. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 22(1), 65-78
- Brouwers, M., & Paltu, A. (2020). Toxic leadership: Effects on job satisfaction, commitment, turnover intention and organisational culture within the South African manufacturing industry. SA Journal

- of Human Resource Management, 18(1), 1-11.
- Dar, N., & Rahman, W. (2019). Deviant behaviors and procedural justice: Mediating role of perceived organizational support. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 13(1), 104-122.
- Diab Ghanem Atalla, A., & Hassan Mostafa, W. (2023). Relationship between toxic leadership and work outcomes: a cross-sectional study. *Egyptian Journal of Health Care*, 14(1), 199-211.
- El-Gazar, H. E., Zoromba, M. A., Zakaria, A. M., Ibrahim, S. F., & Elzohairy, M. H. S. (2024). Linking abusive supervision to service sabotage through work alienation in nurses: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 80(2), 745-755.
- Field, R., & Brown, K. (2019). Effective leadership, management and supervision in health and social care.
- Hashish, E. A. A. (2020). Nurses' perception of organizational justice and its relationship to their workplace deviance. *Nursing ethics*, 27(1), 273-288.
- Hassan, A., Aziz, A., & Diab, S. (2024). The relationship between toxic leadership and career success. 3, 89–101.
- Hany, S., Hassan, R., & Badran, F. (2020). Relation between organizational justice and workplace deviance behavior among staff Nurses. *Egyptian Journal of Health Care*, 11(1), 248–259.
- Hassan Mekawy, S., & Ali Mohamed Ismail, S. (2022). Effects of toxic leadership style of nurse mangers on counterproductive work behaviors and intention to quit among staff nurses: A Comparative Study. Egyptian Journal of Health Care, 13(3), 1466-1481.
- Haider, S., Nisar, Q. A., Baig, F., & Azeem, M. (2018). Dark Side of Leadership: Employees' Job Stress & Deviant Behaviors in Pharmaceutical Industry. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research & Allied Sciences*, 7(2).
- Hossny, E. K., Alotaibi, H. S., Mahmoud, A. M., Elcokany, N. M., Seweid, M. M., Aldhafeeri, N. A., ... & Abd Elhamed, S. M. (2023). Influence of nurses' perception of organizational climate and toxic leadership behaviors on intent to stay: A descriptive comparative study. *International journal of* nursing studies advances, 5, 100147.

- Hussain, F., Shahzad, K., Iqbal, J., & Ashraf, H. A. (2023). Transformational Leadership as a Buffer Against Abusive Supervision's Influence on Deviant Workplace Behavior in Pakistan. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 4(3), 348-357.
- Irshad, M., Hussain, M., & Qureshi, M. A. (2021). Abusive supervision: A catalyst for the employee deviance work behavior. *Reviews of Management Sciences*, 3(2), 114-130.
- Jeewandara, S. K., & Kumari, T. (2021). A theoretical review of deviant workplace behavior. *International journal of scientific & technology research*, 10(04), 91-113.
- Karatepe, H., & Türkmen, E. (2023). Nurse performance: A path model of clinical leadership, creative team climate and structural empowerment. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, *32*(3-4), 584-596.
- Khaled Abd El-Aziz Zaki, A., & Samir Abd El-Aziz Elsaiad, H. (2021). Toxic Leadership and its Relation to Nurses' Absenteeism and Their Deviant Behaviors. *Egyptian Journal of Health Care*, *12*(4), 1304-1322.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2023). The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations. John Wiley & Sons.
- Zaki, A., & Elsaiad, H. (2021). Toxic Leadership and its Relation to Nurses' Absenteeism and Their Deviant Behaviors. Egyptian Journal of Health Care, 12(4), 1304-1322.
- Labrague, L. J. (2021). Influence of nurse managers' toxic leadership behaviours on nurse-reported adverse events and quality of care. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 29(4), 855-863.
- 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 of nursing management*, 28(5), 1104-1113.
- Labrague, L. J. (2023). Toxic leadership and its relationship with outcomes on the nursing workforce and patient safety: a systematic review. *Leadership in Health Services*, 37(2), 192-214.

- Li, P., Yin, K., Shi, J., Damen, T. G., & Taris, T. W. (2024). Are bad leaders indeed bad for employees? A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies between destructive leadership and employee outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 191(2), 399-413.
- Mahgob, A. N. H., Mohammed Abdallah Adam, S., & Mohamed El-sayed, S. (2024). Staff Nurses' Perception Regarding Toxic Leadership Behavior of Head Nurses and it's Relation to their Work Engagement. Egyptian Journal of Health Care, 15(1), 511-524.
- Mehraein, V., Visintin, F., & Pittino, D. (2023). The dark side of leadership: A systematic review of creativity and innovation. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 25(4), 740-767.
- Milosevic, I., Maric, S., & Lončar, D. (2020). Defeating the toxic boss: The nature of toxic leadership and the role of followers. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27(2), 117-137.
- Mokhtar Taha, A., Saeed Ahmed, E., & Ahmed Abd Allah, N. (2024). Toxic Leadership as Perceived by Nurses and Its Relation to Job Coping. *Journal of Nursing Science Benha University*, 5(1), 384-402.
- Mohamed, H. A., & Elsehrawy, M. G. (2023). Staff Nurses' Perspective on Authentic Leadership's Role in Creativity, Job Crafting, and Deviant Behaviors at Work. *Port Said Scientific Journal of Nursing*, 10(3), 1-30.
- Nadeem, Q., Saeed, I., & Gul, H. (2020). Effect of destructive leadership on workplace deviance and interpersonal deviance: Mediating role of emotional exhaustion. *International Journal of Business and Economic Affairs*, 5(5), 256-271.
- Ofei, A. M. A., Paarima, Y., Barnes, T., & Poku, C. A. (2022). Toxic leadership behaviour of

- nurse managers on perceived job satisfaction and productivity of nursing workforce in sub-Saharan Ghana: A multi-centre cross-sectional study. *Journal of nursing management*, 30(7), 2733-2742.
- Okeke, C. I., & Ugwuanyi, C. S. (2023). Demographic determinants of work deviant behaviors of rural community-based primary school teachers: A structural equation modeling approach. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 51(1), 168-181.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of management journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Shah, S. A. H., Shah, T. A., Ullah, A., & Yasir, M. (2021). Workplace deviance in public sector organizations: evidence from pakistan. *Journal of Applied Economics and Business Studies*, 5(1), 67-82.
- Schmidt, A. A. (2008). Development and validation of the toxic leadership scale, University of Maryland. *College Park*.
- Shipl, A. M. A. E. F., Nabawy, Z. M., & Al anwer Ashour, H. M. (2022). The relationship between toxic leadership and nurses' followership effectiveness. *Central European Journal of Nursing and Midwifery*, 13(4), 730.
- Thompson, J. (2021). Toxic leadership: Understanding and mitigating the threat. *Canadian Forces College*.
- Tufan, C., Namal, M. K., Arpat, B., Yesil, Y., & Mert, I. S. (2023). The mediating effect of organizational justice perception on the relationship between ethical leadership and workplace deviant behaviors. *Sustainability*, 15(2), 1342.
- Webster, M. A. (2011). Adaptation and visual coding. *Journal of vision*, *11*(5), 3-3.