DESTRUCTIVE LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Ece IlhanMUMTAZOGLU[a], BehcetOZNACAR[b]

Abstract

The study was carried out with the participation of 23 academicians working in the field of higher education in Turkey and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. Qualitative approach with phenomenology pattern was used in the study. The aim of the research is to determine the views of academics working in the field of higher education in the 2020-2021 academic year about the phenomenon of destructive leadership in higher education institutions. Participants working in the field of higher education stated the formation of destructive leadership as a phenomenon that generally originates from the leader and/or arises from the needs of the system and followers.

The phenomenon of destructive leadership becomes visible and sustainable with leader, follower behaviors and ambient atmosphere. It is stated that even if the leader, follower and environment seem to win in the short term, they face negative effects in the long term. The phenomenon of destructive leadership in organizations can be an obstacle to the sustainability of the desired educational standards. For a sustainable quality and strong structure, the phenomenon of destructive leadership should be prevented.

Keywords:*Sustainability, Destructive Leadership, Higher Education, Toxic Triangle,*

1. Introduction

The concept of leadership is as old as human history. Communities formed by people coming together due to their biological or environmental needs have created the need to be managed and directed (Gündüz and Dedekorkut, 2014; Yıldız, 2015; Çetinkaya, 2017). The job of directing and mobilizing for a common purpose requires talents and persuasion skills that are not found in all people. It is seen that leaders with these skills can direct communities and organizations formed over time in line with common goals and have the power to influence people (Eren, 2010; Eraslan, 2004).

Leadersemerge not out of their own free will but out of necessity of their environment. As a result of these emerging requirements, leaders have existed since the first day that human beings lived together. In general, if people are influenced by a person in order to achieve their goals, leadership can be mentioned at that point. The concept of leadership, which is identified with the field of management, shows itself in many different fields (education, politics, art, sports, etc.) and emerges as a needed phenomenon.

a. Phd. Student.,Education Management, Economyand Planning Department, Near East University, NorthernCyprus.
ecezkok@gmail.com
b. Assoc. Prof. Dr.,Education Management, Economyand Planning Department,
Near East University, NorthernCyprus

Throughout its history, the concept of leadership, whose personal, behavioral and environmental-oriented features have been examined, has been thought to have a positive meaning, and all research has focused on studies on increasing the productivity of both institutions and employees (Bass, 1995; Ciulla, 1995; İbicioğlu, 1998; Eraslan, 2004; Kellerman, 2004; Bryman, 2007; Serinkan, 2008; Aydın, Erdağ and Sarıer, 2010; Yukl, 2010; Derue et al., 2011; Gündüz and Dedekorkut, 2014; Black 2015; Gigliotti and Ruben, 2017; Dinç, 2019).

In leadership practices, subjects such as determining leadership types and leader characteristics, researching which leadership theory is more effective, and the leader's relations with his subordinates, personality traits, values and management style were tried to be determined (Russell and Stone, 2002; Brown, Trevion and Harrison, 2005). ; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, and Peterson, 2008; Kakabadse, Kakabadse, and Kouzmin, 2011).In studies investigating the effectiveness of leadership, it is seen that the success of leadership is evaluated with the success of the organization. When the organizations that encounter unsuccessful results are examined, it is seen that the mentioned negative results are not only due to the characteristics or behaviors of the leader, and therefore, it is necessary to evaluate other variables related to leadership (Thoroughgood and Padilla, 2013). In recent studies, the perception

that leadership has a positive meaning has begun to change with the aforementioned point of view (Sezici, 2015).

Studies have been conducted that examine the influence power of the leader on a process-result basis, and show that the leader harms the institution or the employee in cases where leaders own interests come to the fore by ignoring the interests of the institution and employees (Yukl, 2006; Einarsen, Aasland, and Skogstad, 2007). Notelaers and Einarsen et. 2010; Pelletier, 2012; Krasikova, Green, and Lebreton, 2013; Çelebi, Güner, and Yıldız, 2015; Erickson, Shaw, Murray, and Branch, 2015; Gündüz and Dedekorkut, 2014; Sezici, 2015; Başar, Sığır, and Basım , 2016). Looking at the literature, there are more than 5,000,000,000 articles, papers, books, etc. made about the concept of leadership. evaluated as the bad side of the leader when there is academic work; Studies focusing on the negative behaviors of the leader, which reduce job satisfaction and motivation of the employee, increases the level of burnout, and disrupts the sustainable structures effectively, seem to be quite limited (Güneş, 2020). When these limited number of studies are examined, the
oppressive, authoritarian, narcissistic and egocentric attitudes and behaviors of the leader and the negative experiences of the employees who are exposed to these behaviors have been identified (Howell and Avolio, 1992; Hogan and Hogan, 2001; Rosenthal and Pittinskya, 2006).

In addition, the same studiesdraw attention to , negative decisions that are harmful to the organization and that may directly affect the organizational atmosphere and hinder the maintenance of the productive structures of the organizations (Aydın, 2010; Celep, 2014; Gedikoğlu, 2015; Güney, 2015; Korkmaz, Çelebi, Yücel et, 2015; Yıldız, 2015; Çetinkaya, 2017).As a result of all these studies, it has been accepted over time that bad leadership, which is a major factor against organizations' being sustainable structures and staying alive, ceases to be a phenomenon on its own and consists of three main elements consisting of followers, environment and leaders (Alferder, 2013). This understanding was developed over time and reflected in bad leadership theories and entered the literature as a favorable environment, sensitive followers and destructive leader components must be together for destructive leadership to take place (Padilla et al. 2007). This requirement was described by Padilla et al. (2007) gathered around 5 features and defined in the

context of the toxic triangle theory (Başar, 2019). The five features mentioned in this context are;
• Destructive leadership behaviors can havepositiveornegativeconsequences,
• The followers of the destructive leader exhibit behaviors such as pressure, absolute dominance, using for their own interests rather thanpersuading, influencingorincreasingtheirloyalty,
• Disruptive leadership shows a self-centered tendency that thinks more of its own interests than the needs of its followers,
• Theconsequences of destructive leadership can be negative for both the organization and the followers,
• Thedestructiveleadershipprocess, which has negative consequences for organizations, feeds with the victims employees and the environment that gives the leadership this type of opportunity.

2. Methodology

In this study, a qualitative approach was used and the study was phenomenologically patterned, since it was aimed to examine the destructive leadership phenomenon in the field of higher education in depth in the context of the views of academics. Constructivist approach emerges as a research area put forward by educational psychologists and expresses the view that people reach knowledge through the model they create as a result of their own experiences and thoughts (Bayraktar, 2011).The constructivist approach first focused on "how people learn" the information, then focused on "how people construct" the learned information. The most sensitive point in the constructivist approach is that it is concerned with the formation of knowledge about that reality rather than trying to create a reality (Patton, 2014). While this approach emphasizes that people should be handled differently because they are different from the natural environment and physical environment, it is seen that it focuses on examining the reality of each person in their own environment and the interaction of that reality with the reality that other people make sense of (Patton, 2014).

Since the aim of this study is to reveal the perceptions, experiences, interpretations and interpretations of the participants about the destructive leadership phenomenon, it was patterned with phenomenology (phenomenology), which is among the case studies. In case studies, factors related to a situation or event are discussed in detail. Phenomenology has been

expressed as a research design that provides a detailed discussion of the phenomena that occur unconsciously in daily life and that cannot be fully understood, and helps to better understand these phenomena. According to Yıldırım and Şimsek (2016), the phenomena to be examined are encountered in different species throughout life. Being familiar with these phenomena beforehand does not mean that they are fully understood. In this context, it will be useful to make use of phenomenology for studies that aim to examine phenomena that are not completely foreign but not clearly understood.

Working group

In order to determine the study group of this research, the criterion sampling method, which is one of the purposeful sampling methods, was chosen. It is considered very important for the people in the determined study group to have ideas and experience about the phenomenon being investigated, and this is very useful in collecting relevant data (Creswell, 2016). The study group of this research consists of 18 academicians working in the Republic of Turkey (TC) and 5 academics working in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Contrary to quantitative research, qualitative research is conducted with a smaller number of study groups.However, despite the small number of people, the researcher can have moreanddetailedinformation on thesubject.Qualitativestudiesareusedwhen it is desired to conduct research based on more observations and interviews, and to investigate the facts in depth rather than numerical analyzes about a subject (Cohen et., 2007).

Data Collection

In this research, semi-structured interview technique, which is one of the qualitative data collection methods and is frequently recommended in studies designed with the phenomenology approach, was used (Demir and Akarsu, 2018; Mertkan, 2015). While using the interview technique, the participants are able to express their experiences that they have not noticed yet, and it also enables the participants to convey their opinions with their own expressions, with the effect of mutual communication (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2016). For this reason, it is important to extract deep information about the subject from the data obtained in order to understand the feelings and thoughts of the participants (Kuş, 2009). In the semi-structured interview form developed by the researchers, data is collected with predetermined and prepared questions (Karasar, 1998). However, even if the boundaries of the chosen subject are determined, it allows for free in-depth analysis without excluding the main subject, and data collection by creating a program to be used most efficiently in a limited time (Patton, 2014).

Analysis of Data

In line with the semi-structured interview questions developed during the research process, a total of 23 academicians were interviewed. Content analysis was applied to the data obtained as a result of the interviews with the participants. Content analysis is a non-obtrusive research method that can be performed without affecting behavior. Content analysis is a research technique used to create clear and systematic communication. By performing content analysis, determining the research question, determining the sample, creating coding with conceptualization, data collection, coding the obtained data, describing the data, understanding and evaluating the data, and interpreting the data collected as a result of the interviews are formed. The contributions of performing content analysis to the researcher can be listed as follows; Saving time and money on research, re-performing a part of the work if deemed necessary, allowing a very long process to examine the research phases in depth.

In addition, it can be stated that this technique creates an extra reliability for the research, since theeffects of theresearcher ontheparticipantsareverylow. Intheprocess of analyzing the data obtained as a result of the research, the categorical data analysis technique was used. This technique is based on first separating the message extracted from the obtained data into different headings and then categorizingtheseparatedheadingsbypre-establishedcriteria(Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2006).

3. Results
1.   Formation of Disruptive Leadership in the Field of Higher Education

All of the participants working in the field of higher education expressed their opinions about the formation of the destructive leadership phenomenon they experienced.In Table 1, the percentage distribution of the views of academicians on the formation of the destructive leadership phenomenon in the field of higher education is given.

Table 1. **Reasons for the Formation of Disruptive Leadership in the Field of Higher Education**

Theme	Instructors Number of Persons	Rate	Faculty Members Number of Persons	Rate	Total Number of Persons	Rate
Sourced From TheLeader	10	%100	13	%100	23	%100
Based on Need.	8	%80	9	%69.2	17	%73.9

It is seen according to those in Table 1, that it is reported as in thoughts in daily events in higher education. General information about the participants' plans for higher education education.Programs are generally intended designs in an ambiguous manner, with identification with "leader"; It is delivered as "need". The codes for the expressions related to these people are included under the themes of "originated by the leader" and "based on the needs".

1.1. Sourced From The Leader

When the participants are asked how the destructive leadership phenomenon, which is stated to be exhibited in the field of higher education, is asked, the opinion that it is primarily a leader-based formation emerges. The participants stated that the destructive leadership, which is expressed in higher education, occurs because of the characteristics of the leaders and the power obtained.

In this direction, Table 2 presents the percentage distributions of the opinions of the academicians about the destructive leadership phenomenon originating from the leader.

Table 2. **Leader-Based Formation of Disruptive Leadership in the Field of Higher Education**

Theme	Instructors Number of Persons	Rate	Faculty Members Number of Persons	Rate	Total Number of Persons	Rate
Characteristics Of The Leader	10	%100	13	%100	23	%100
The Desire To Have Power.	9	%90	11	%84.6	20	%86.9

Considering the distributions in Table 2, it is remarkable that all of the participants, while evaluating the leader-driven formation of destructive leadership, state that it occurs due to leader characteristics. In addition to this opinion, more than half of the participants; It was seen that the leader stated that he was the source related to the power factor. In this context, under the title of "leader's characteristics", the characteristics and personality traits defined by the participants, and under the title of "having power", the findings regarding the perception of the power that the leader has or wants to be as a factor in the formation of destructive leadership are presented.

"We are talking about an institution. Something is being created. Someone or someone is creating that thing. I'm talking about a narcissistic person here, what can he create? What can we expect? Surely there will be destruction" (16).

If he does not try to understand and listen to the people next to him, whom we call a leader, but closes his eyes and says only "what will happen to me" or "how can I rise", that's where all the problems begin. You are (are) an example, a model, you are chosen. There is always a narcissistic attitude. You don't have the luxury of saying "I" my friend. You have to say "we". You don't know everything. This is not possible anyway" (6).

1.2. Based on Need

When the participants were asked how the destructive leadership phenomenon, which is expressed by all participants in the field of higher education, occurred, they expressed the opinion that it stems from the need after the reasons arising from the leader. In this direction, Table 3 presents the percentage distributions of the opinions of the academicians about the need-based destructive leadership phenomenon.

Table 3. **The Based on Need Formation of Disruptive Leadership in the Field of Higher Education**

Theme	Instructors Number of Persons	Rate	Faculty Members Number of Persons	Rate	Total Number of Persons	Rate
System Requirement	6	%60	8	%61.5	14	%82.3
Need For Followers	5	%50	8	%61.5	13	%76.4

Looking at the distributions in Table 3, it is seen that while more than half of the participants state

that it is due to the need for the system, less of them express their opinion as the need for followers. Although it may seem like an inconsistent statement at first glance, it is ironic

that the participants' views that the system they are in and the followers within the organization need to demonstrate destructive leadership. In this context, the findings related to the factors in the formation of destructive leadership in the field of higher education expressed by the participants; presented under the headings of "system requirement" and "follower requirement".

"You want to live the way you learned the academy without realizing it. If you experience a situation different from your habits, you are unhappy and a lot of other things come with it. Professors here, there is a tradition, of course, the culture of the organization. Our newly graduated and appointed friends who are accustomed to this culture, for example, know this culture. Our dean left for a while, we were stunned. We want, so we think we don't, but... have our offices constantly audited. Did we come, did we go, what time did we

leave... We are used to it. You know what

happened, all the freedom provided by our acting teacher was abused. We want this, this is our teaching" (18).

Everyonewantsto be in it. Humankind wants it the easy way. When human beings want, we can think like commerce. Supply and demand. Merit is not considered in order to work at the university and to rise in this field. No matter how many claims are in this direction. No. ....when you look at the environment, such people (with destructive features) are needed for the system to meet this need, so the holes that will put them into the system are not closed. ... you misunderstood, it is not done on purpose. The systemwants it, wegive it" (8).

2. The Impact of Disruptive Leadership on the Environment

Those working in the field of higher education depicted the elements related to these aspects in the field of higher education.Table 4 is given.

Table 4. **The Impact of Disruptive Leadership on the Environment.**

Theme	Instructors Number of Persons	Rate	Faculty Members Number of Persons	Rate	Total Number of Persons	Rate
Loss of Reputation of Institutions	6	%60	12	%92.3	18	%78.2
Inability to Survive in The New World	5	%50	10	%76.9	15	%65.2
Degeneration	7	%70	11	%84.6	18	%78.2
Normalization Of Unethical Behavior and Immorality	9	%90	13	%100	22	%95.6
Believing If It Happened Once, It Has Happened Before And It Will Happen Again	9	%90	12	%92.3	21	%91.3
Loss of Faith in Justice.	10	%100	13	%100	23	%100
Facing Constraints and Barriers in Decision Making	3	%30	8	%61.5	11	%47.8
Prevention of Joint Action	5	%50	8	%61.5	13	%56.5
Uncertainty in Goals and Objectives in The Organization.	7	%70	9	%69.2	16	%69.5
Covering Up Misbehaviors	9	%90	10	%76.9	19	%82.6
Questioning The Quality Of Education, Personnel and Institution	6	%60	13	%100	19	%82.6
Trouble Fulfilling AcademicRequirements	4	%40	10	%76.9	14	%60.8
Changing Expectations and Desires in The Context of Culture	9	%90	12	%92.3	21	%91.3

Looking at Table 4, it is seen that the participants made evaluations directly in the context of higher education and the system that includes higher

education. In this context, it is noteworthy that the belief in justice in the field of higher education has been shaken by all of the participants. The majority

of the participants believe that ethical and unethical attitudes are normalized, expectations and wishes change undesirably, if it has happened once, it has

happened before and can be repeated, mistakes are covered, the quality of all elements in the environment is questioned, institutions lose reputation, corruption, lack of merit, It is seen that they talk about effects such as the uncertainty of goals. It is seen that more than half of the participants also evaluated factors such as difficulties in fulfilling academic requirements, inability to act together, and inability to survive in the developing world. In addition, it is noteworthy that some of the participants evaluated all these effects as a coup to the academy. When the effect of the destructive leadership phenomenon was asked to the participants, it was seen that it was evaluated in the context of the higher education system and universities. It has been stated that the education system, which is primarily considered within the scope of higher education, is working somehow, but it has been stated that the universities within this system are seen as "institutions that will go bankrupt".

"Depends on which angle we look at it, a 2000 model car is also running today. However, I think that any institution with such leaders in the new world cannot achieve high success. These are relative, of course. Technological vs. I think their operation in the long run is relative. I think that institution is institutions that have gone bankrupt. Look at the dates for institutions that are no longer mentioned. If we look at their history, you can see

that their organizational culture is this kind of destructive culture" (3).

"E management is not limited to just here. The class has a manager. Who? It's us. Teacher. We have a manager, who is it? I'm firing department head. His is the dean, his is the rector. Of course, pass the in-between. The hierarchy is intact with us. Even if the student says that I do not understand something in the lesson, this lesson does not work "the teacher is guilty. If you come to me, I would say that I do not have much energy left over the course load. The dean is guilty. If you ask the dean, there is not much staff. What do I do? Who is the rector? If you ask the rector, what should I do, my brother, the policy is clear, I can't hire staff according to my mind, you know the source? Who did we come to?? in short, the word. Who is the destroyer? I am asking you" (22).

3. The Outlook andSustainability of Disruptive Leadership in Higher Education

When the participants were asked how the phenomenon of disruptive leadership in the field of higher education appeared and was sustained, it was seen that the current environment atmosphere and person behaviors were generally mentioned. In this direction, the percentage distribution of the participants' appearance of destructive leadership, which is stated to occur in the field of higher education, and the reasons for its sustainability in the field are given in Table 5.

Tablo 5. **Appearance of Disruptive Leadership in Higher Education and Reasons for Sustainability**

Theme	Instructors		Faculty Members		Total	
	Number of Persons	Rate	Number of Persons	Rate	Number of Persons	Rate
Leader Behavior	10	%100	13	%100	23	%100
Follower Behavior	10	%100	13	%100	23	%100
Ambient Atmosphere	10	%100	13	%100	23	%100

When the distributions in Table 5 are examined, it is seen that all of the participants evaluated the leader behaviors, follower behaviors and environment atmosphere within the scope of the appearance of destructive leadership that is stated to occur in the field of higher education and the reasons for its sustainability in the field. It is noteworthy that the most important factor in the perception of the destructive leadership phenomenon by the participants is the behavior of the leader and follower. It is also among the findings that the participants talked about the features that appear in the environment. In this direction, the codes obtained as a result of the

analysis are included under the themes of "leaderbehavior", "followerbehavior" and "AmbientAtmosphere".

3.1LeaderBehavior

The reason for the emergence of the destructive leadership phenomenon, which is stated to be exhibited in the field of higher education, was first defined by the leadership characteristics by the participants. When asked how they saw this phenomenon, that they primarily expressed their thoughts to be the behavior of the leader. The themes in which the mentioned behaviors are discussed and the percentage distribution of

opinions are given in Table 6.

Table 6. **Leader Behaviors**

Theme	Instructors Number of Persons	Rate	Faculty Members Number of Persons	Rate	Total Number of Persons	Rate
Competence	10	%100	13	%100	23	%100
Ethic	10	%100	13	%100	23	%100
Comminication	10	%100	13	%100	23	%100
Pressure	10	%100	13	%100	23	%100

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that leader behaviors are evaluated within the scope of the appearance of destructive leadership, which is stated to occur in the field of higher education, and the reasons for its sustainability in the field. In this context, the most mentioned leader behaviors are; competency, ethics, communication and pressure. Leader behaviors that are effective in making destructive leadership visible and sustainable in the field of higher education are presented under the relevant headings.

"You can never, ever speak for a period ahead. He changes the subject, he has a meeting, his wife called. Because he doesn't know what to do, he hasn't even thought about it. Somebody will do it anyway" (9).

"We started talking day and night about the thesis. Then messages started to come in the middle of the night on unrelated topics. I ignored it at first... I couldn't reach it when I wanted it for the thesis... I warned it implicitly... she felt rejected and it cost me 1 term... She tried to make me collapse in front of the jury. He gave me hard time…" (20).

For one thing, I think there is a conceptual problem. A leading compliment, this human boss. I think seriously... having a hidden power and authority, not having a controller of himself... Power poisoning. That's why you have no equal. It happens when a leader of the same status who will brake himself is not suitable for his portfolio. Actually, he's the one who steals They see the people below them as a tool in line with their own ideals for their own purposes. He sees people as subjects. Almost like a commodity. Whether those people have dreams, feelings, ambitions, it doesn't matter to him. It wants to be shaped in that direction, digesting it, pressing it. Fear is overcome, if you do not take shape, problems arise" (17).

3.2 Follower Behavior

The participants stated that the behavior of followers should also be addressed about how the phenomenon of disruptive leadership in higher education appears and is sustainable, and they also stated their observations on this subject. The percentage distribution of the views of the participants within the scope of the outlook and sustainability in the field of highereducation is given in Table 7.

Table 7. **Follower Behaviors**

Theme	Instructors Number of Persons	Rate	Faculty Members Number of Persons	Rate	Total Number of Persons	Rate
PassiveFollowers	8	%80	12	%92.3	20	%86.9
Active Followers	5	%50	9	%69.2	14	%60.8

When Table 7 is examined, it is noteworthy that almost all of the participants' opinions stemming from the passive stance of the followers, and that more than half of them stem from the active stance of the followers in the visibility and sustainability of the phenomenon of destructive leadership in the higher education field. Since opinions are expressed based on 2 types of follower behavior, findings are presented under the themes of "passive follower" and "active follower" under this section.

"There are some friends who never go the way of unity, even though they know how wrong it is. I don't know if it is right to say that there is a benefit from this administration, but they think that they will benefit" (18).

"Even if you are someone who is trying to gain the trust of the person and make them listen, you will just be a sucker. There are many here, we watch the helplessness of all of them. you may make a futile effort or even become poisoned by the ideas of the person you are trying to criticize" (15).

3.3 AmbientAtmosphere

Participants stated that the impact of the environment on the visibility and sustainability of higher education is great. Within the influence of

the environment, it is seen that the participants express their opinions within the atmosphere of

the environment. The percentage distribution of participant opinions in this direction is given in Table 8.

Table 8. **Ambient Atmosphere**

Theme	Instructors Number of Persons	Rate	Faculty Members Number of Persons	Rate	Total Number of Persons	Rate
Organizational CultureThat Accepts Disruptive Leadership	7	%70	10	%76.9	17	%73.9
Validity of Assignment and Promotion Criteria	6	%60	13	%100	19	%82.6
Learned Culture and Values	7	%70	9	%69.2	16	%69.5
Country-Society And University Relationship	8	%80	13	%100	21	%91.3
ResearchAnd Publication Ethics Violations	7	%70	13	%100	20	%86.9
Interests Relations.	10	%100	13	%100	23	%100
Rapid Rise	8	%80	11	%84.6	19	%82.6
Gossip Culture	6	%60	7	%53.8	13	%56.5
The Interference Of Politics inEducation.	9	%90	12	%92.3	21	%91.3
Punishment of The one WhoDiscovered It, Not The One Who Did It.	6	%60	9	%69.2	15	%65.2
Central Management	5	%50	13	%100	18	%78.2

Considering the participant views, the destructive leadership in the field of higher education becomes visible and sustainable by making the environment suitable. In this direction, it was seen that the participants who evaluated the higher education institution shared their opinions through their own observations and experiences, while describing the environment, generally focused on the culture and atmosphere of the current environment.

"Let's say there is disruptive leadership, it can't be alone. First of all, we need to examine where it exists. When you look at our institution, for example, there is a structure that can remove such behaviors" (15).

"You entered higher education, of course, there are certain titles. In order to receive them, you have to fulfill the conditions offered by the system. So many articles, so many books or book chapters or congresses... the system says you're done with them" (1)

4. Result and Discussion

In this study, the phenomenon of destructive leadership was examined in depth in the context of higher education in line with the views of academics in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and Turkey. Considering the findings of the research, primarily the leadership characteristics related to the formation of the destructive leadership phenomenon. When we consider the results, in the light of the findings about how the destructive

leadership is seen and sustainedin the field of higher education, the behavior of the leader and then the behaviors of the followers are discussed, and the atmosphere of the environment is also mentioned. The findings obtained in this context are similar to the study in which Tepper (2007) defined destructive leader behaviors.In his study, Tepper (2007) focused on destructive leadership behaviors, mostly non-violent behaviors, and focused on the fact that leaders show excessive authority, prioritize informal relationships, and expect similar behaviors from followers and make decisions in this way.

Einarsen, Aasland, and Skogstad (2007) stated that destructive leaders do not hesitate to apply mobbing in order to achieve the desired phenomenon. In addition, when we look at the study of Blumen (2004), it is seen that destructive leaders basically create a close circle based on personal relationships.Tepper (2007) mentioned the negative consequences of the perception that followers acquire by observing destructive leader behaviors and this situation supports the findings on the appearance of destructive leadership in the field of higher education.Mumford et al. (2007) evaluated the characteristics of followers and the environment in terms of the emergence, triggering and sustainability of disruptive leadership. While it was stated that followers' deprivation, victimization and perceptions of lack of justice could pave the way for demonstrating destructive leadership, features such as violence as a control

element and a centralized approach were put forward in the context of environment characteristics. In this context, it is clear that the features revealed by Mumford et al. (2007) were similarly evaluated by the participants who provided the findings of this study.

Likewise, in the study of the Minister and Yılmaz (2019); In institutions where destructive leadership behaviors are observed, it is seen that people who make things difficult, tense, inconsistent, do not hesitate to humiliate employees, consider themselves superior, and are insensitive to the environment and other people. It is also mentioned that these people exhibit behaviors that suppress emotions, do not feel the purpose of any job assigned to employees, and cause individuals to feel physically and mentally tired. In the analysis made as a result of the research, it was stated that these behaviors exhibited lead to complex emotions in individuals and caused a decrease in their motivation.Considering the effects of disruptive leadership, the findings of this study determined the views of followers as feeling worthless, losing their motivation, and wanting to leave the environment, while similar results were obtained in the study of Olafsson and Johannsdottir (2004), such as the feeling of insecurity, loss of motivation, and the strengthening of the intention to leave the job. At the same time, Shaw, Erickson, and Harvey (2011) stated in their study, similar to this study, that the reason why employees experience stress is the inadequacy of leaders. According to Reed and Bullis, (2009), it is seen that destructive leadership is considered as systematic behaviors that negatively affect the commitment, motivation, and compliance of employees to the organization, sabotage the goals and resources of the organization and abuse the interests of the organization.

Also, Aasland et al. (2010) evaluated the unbalanced state of the participants in this study within the framework of destructive leadership by talking about attitudes such as constructive and destructive behaviors. There are studies showing that destructive leadership also neutralizes job satisfaction on followers (Reed and Bullis, 2009; Schyns and Schilling, 2013). Schaubroeck, Walumbwa, Ganster and Kepes (2007).While followers with low job satisfaction are more affected by the destructive leadership phenomenon, they show symptoms such as depression, complaints, and alienation from work, while Nyberg et al. (2011) stated that this type of bad leadership negatively affects the fitness and mental health of the followers at the organizational level. When the environment in which destructive leadership takes place is evaluated by the participants, it is clearly stated that there will be losses in the long run.

Krasikova, Green, LeBreton, (2013) similarly have results in their studies, where immoral or unlawful behavior is considered destructive leadership behavior, even if it achieves goals in the short term. The point mentioned at this stage was evaluated as endangering the prestige of the relevant organization. In the researches, it is seen that destructive leadership is the goal of achieving short-term gains, rather than targeting long-term organizational goals or the loss of the organization (Illies and ReiterPalmon, 2008). When we look at the study results of Schyns and Schilling (2013), the effects of destructive leadership on the leader are similar to the views of the participants. While Schyns and Schilling (2013) talk about the results such as followers' resistance to the leader and their attitude towards the leader, they also stated that distrust towards the leader will occur.Tepper (2007) stated that it is normal for institutions to fail, considering the behaviors, attitudes and influences within the scope of destructive leadership. In this direction, it is thought that it is inevitable for organizations to pay the price in case of destructive leadership (Gündüz and Dedekorkut, 2014).

In his study, Akman (2016) found a positive and significant relationship between destructive leadership behaviors on individuals' willingness to come to work, their motivation and their commitment to the organization. In addition, a positive significant relationship was found between the sub-dimensions of negative mood and feeling of destructive leadership, and professional burnout and emotional weariness. When the findings are examined, it has been determined that the feeling of destructive leadership behaviors can cause negative emotions.The end of destructive leadership behaviors seen in organizations will bring positive results for all individuals in the organization. The people participating in the research suggested solutions such as controlling the leaders as a solution, structuring the power in their hands in a controllable way, and learning to listen to the individuals in front of them. Similarly, in Couper (2007) for leaders, "don't try to do all the work yourself, give importance to the division of duties, do not put distance or excessive bureaucratic relationship between you and the individuals in the institution, make a habit of self-criticism, be

open to learning continuously" made recommendations.Thoroughgood et al (2011) stated that institutions should conduct their internal audits strictly and see how much they adhere to their beliefs and values. They expressed their opinion that even a small crack in the management can be seen in the organizations of destructive leadership behaviors. In this research, the participants expressed an opinion that the power in the hands of the leader can be controlled. As a result of the study conducted by Aasland et al., (2010), it was stated that although leaders in organizations have a personality that is suitable for exhibiting destructive behaviors, similar to the results of this research, in environments where ethical values, respect and order are present, their tendencies towards these behaviors can be suppressed.

It is seenthat there are generally theoretical-based studies on the phenomenon of destructive leadership, which has a close past in the national and international literature, and it is noteworthy that there are attempts based on concept explanation. There are few studies in the field of education, unfortunately there is almost no destructive leadership study in the field of higher education. A limited number of studies in the field of higher education are seen only in the international literature. While it has been revealed in many other studies that destructive leadership has irreversible consequences for the leader, his followers and the institution he is in, it is clear thatdestructive leadership is perceived in a similar way in the field of higher education. It is very important to prevent destructive leadership before the mentioned effects are seen or to eliminate it in the current situation before it causes further damage.

In addition to all these formation evaluations, participant views on how disruptive leadership appears in the field of higher education and how it is sustainable; was evaluated in the context of leader behavior, follower behavior and ambient atmosphere.

Participants discussed the pressure exerted by leaders, communication problems, unethical actions and lack of knowledge. While the destructive leadership is visible and sustainable with the actions of the leader in general and the preferences that shape his actions, the situation of having leadership qualities is also considered as a major factor.

At the same time, the behaviors of the followers are discussed among the factors that affect the appearance and sustainability of

destructive leadership in the field. While the passive and active behaviors of the followers were evaluated as contributing to and supporting the destructive leadership, the absence of the behaviors of preventing or resisting the destructive leadership was also considered as supportive.

Disruptive leadership appears to be a common phenomenon in higher education.It is striking that all of the participants had some experience or observation of disruptive leadership in higher education.It is clearly seen that the aforementioned type leaders cause irreversible harm to the followers, the institutions they work for and themselves in the long run, and the negative impact on the perception of social justice in the institution and the sustainability of education policies.In this direction, it is clear that control mechanisms should be improved in order to eliminate destructive leadership in the field of higher education or to minimize itsdamage.

References

[1] Aasland, M. S.,Skogstad, A., Notelaers, G., Nielsen, M. B. andEinarsen, S. (2010). The Prevalence Of Destructive Leadership Behaviour. British Journal Of Management, 21.

[2] Akman, Y. (2016). The Relationship Between Destructive Leadership And Job Burnout: A Research On Teachers. Journal of Theory and Practice in Education, 12(3).

[3] Alderfer, C. (2013). Not Just Football: An İntergroup Perspective On The Sandusky Scandal At Penn State. Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives On Science and Practice, 6.

[4] Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty Tyranny In Organizations. Human Relations, 47.

[5] Aydın, M. (2010). Eğitim Yönetimi. Ankara: Hatipoğlu Yayınları.

[6] Başar, U. (2019). Liderin Karanlık Kişilik Özellikleri İle Çalışanın Tükenmişliği Arasındaki İlişkide Çalışanın Karanlık Liderlik Algısının Aracı Rolü: Çok Düzeyli Bir Araştırma. (Yayınlanmamış Oktora Tezi) Başkent Üniveristesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

[7] Başar, U.,Sığrı, Ü. ve Basım, N. (2016). İş Yerinde Karanlık Liderlik. İş Ve İnsan Dergisi, 3(2).

[8] Brown, M. E.,Trevion, L. K. andHarrison, D. A. (2005) Ethical Leadership: A Social Learning Perspective For Construct Development And Testing, Organizational BehaviorAndHuman DecisionProcesses, 97.

[9] Celep, C. (2014). Leadership Behavior of

Education Manager. Ankara: Nobel Publications

[10] Cohen, L.,Manion, L. andMorrison, K. (2007). Observation. ResearchMethods in Education,

[11] Couper, I.D. (2007). The Impotence Of Being Important-Reflections On Leadership. TheAnnals Of FamilyMedicine, 5(3).

[12] Creswell, J. W. (2016). QualitativeResearchMethodsQualitativeResearchandResearch Design AccordingtoFiveApproaches (M. Tüm andS. B. Demir, Trans.) Siyasal Kitapevi (TranslatedFromThe 3rd Edition.)

[13] Creswell, J. W. (2016). Researchdesignqualitative, quantitativeandmixedmethodapproaches (S. B. Demir, Trans.). Ankara: Egiten Kitap Publishing (Translatedfromthe 4th edition.)

[14] Çelebi, N., Güner, A. G. H., ve Yıldız, V. (2015). Toksik Liderlik ÖlçegininGeliştirilmesi.

[15] Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 4(1).

[16] Çetinkaya, H. and Ordu, A. (2017) Okul Yöneticilerinin Toksik (Zehirli) Liderlik Davranışları İle Öğretmenlerin Tükenmişlik Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi,31.Denizli.

[17] Demir, N.,and Akarsu, B. (2018). Ortaokul Öğrencilerinin Bilimin Doğası Hakkında Algıları. Journal of EuropeanEducation, 3(1).

[18] Einarsen, S.,Aasland, M. S. andSkogstad, A. (2007). Destructive Leadership Behaviour: A Definition And Conceptual Model. The Leadership Quarterly, 18(3).

[19] Erickson, A.,Shaw, B., Murray, J. andBranch, S. (2015). Destructive Leadership. Thoroughgood, C., Tate, B., Sawyer, K., Ve Jacobs, R. (2012). Bad To The Bone: Empirically Defining And Measuring Destructive Leader Behavior. Journal Of Leadership &Organizational Studies, 19(2).

[20] Gedikoğlu, T. (2015). Liderlik ve Okul Yönetimi. Ankara: Anı.

[21] Gündüz, Y., ve Dedekorkut, S. E. (2014). Yıkıcı Liderlik. Mersin UniversityJournal Of TheFaculty Of Education, 10(1).

[22] Güneş, R. (2020) The Relatıons Of Perceıved Destructıve Leadershıp and Self-Construals Wıth Employees' Psychologıcal Dısharmony and Organızatıonal Cynıcısm: The Roles of Need Thwartıng, Psychologıcal Contract Breach and Task Sıgnıfıcance. Marmara University,İstanbul.

[23] Güney, S. (2015). Liderlik. Ankara: Nobel.

[24] Hogan, R. andHogan, J. (2001). Assessing Leadership: A View From The Dark Side. International Journal Of Selection and Assessment,9.

[25] Howell, J. M. andAvolio, B. J. (1992). The Ethics Of Charismatic Leadership: Submission Or Liberation? Academy Of Management Executive,6.

[26] .Illies, J. J. andReiter, P, R. (2008). Responding Destructively İn Leadership Situations: The Role Of Personal Values And Problem Construction. JournalOf Business Ethics, 82(1).

[27] Johannsdottir, H. L. andÓlafsson, R. F. (2004). CopingWithBullying İn TheWorkplace: TheEffect Of Gender, Age AndType Of Bullying. British Journal Of GuidanceandCounselling, 32(3).

[28] Kakabadse, N. K.,Kakabadse, A. K. andKouzmin, A. (2011) Leadership Renewal: Towards The Philosophy Of Wisdom, International Review Of AdministrativeSciences, 67 (2).

[29] Karasar, N. (1998). Bilimsel ArastırmaYontemi (15. Baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

[30] .Korkmaz, M.,Çelebi, N., Yücel, A. S., Şahbudak, E., Karta, N. andŞen, E. (2015). Management and Leadership in Educational Institutions. Ankara: Nobel Publications.

[31] Krasikova, D. V.,Green, S. G. and Lebreton, J. M. (2013). Destructive Leadership: A Theoretical Review, Integration, and Future Research Agenda. Journal Of Management, 39(5).

[32] Kuş, E. (2009). Nicel–Nitel Araştırma Teknikleri Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Teknikleri Nicel Mi. Nitel Mi, 3.

[33] Mertkan, Ş. (2015). Karma Araştırma Tasarımı. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

[34] Mumford, T.,Campion, M. andMorgeson, F. (2007). The Leadership Skills Strataplex: Leadership Skill Requirements Across Organizational Levels. LeadershipQuarterly, 18.

[35] Nyberg, A.,Alfredsson, L., Theorell, T.,Westerlund, H., Vahtera, J. andKivimaki, M. (2009). ManagerialLeadershipandIschaemicHeartDiseaseAmongEmployees: TheSwedishWolfStudy. OccupationalEnvironmentalMedicine, 66.

[36] Padilla, Art; Robert HoganandRobert B. Kaiser (2007) The Toxic Triangle: Destructive Leaders, Sosceptible Followers and Conducive Environments, The Leadership Quarterly, 18.

[37] Patton, M.,Q. (2014). Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods. (1st Edition).(M. Bütün and S. B. Demir, Trns.). Ankara: Pegem Academy.

[38] Pelletier, K. L. (2012). Perceptions Of And Reactions To Leader Toxicity: Do Leader–Follower Relationships And İdentification With Victim Matter? Leadership Quarterly, 23.

[39] Reed, G. E. andBullis, R. C. (2009). The İmpact Of Destructive Leadership On Senior Military Officers And Civilian Employees. Armed Forces andSociety, 36(1).

[40] Rosenthal, S. A. andPittinskya, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic Leadership. Leadership Quarterly,17.

[41] Russell, R.,F. andA. Gregory Stone (2002) A Review Of Servant Leadership Attributes: Developing A Practical Model, Leadership and Organization, 23 (3).

[42] Schyns, B. andSchilling, J. (2013). How Bad Are The Effects Of Bad Leaders? A Meta-Analysis Of Destructive Leadership and Its Outcomes. The Leadership Quarterly, 24(1).

[43] Schaubroeck, J.,Walumbwa, F. O., Ganster, D. C. and Kepes, S. (2007). Destructive Leader Traits And The Neutralizing Influence Of An "Enriched" Job. The Leadership Quarterly, 18(3).

[44] Sezici, E. (2016). İzleyicilerin Yıkıcı Liderlik Algısı ve Sonuçları. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, (47).

[45] Shaw, J. B.,Erickson, A. andHarvey, M. (2011). A Method For Measuring Destructive Leadership And Identifying Types Of Destructive Leaders In Organizations. The Leadership Quarterly, 22(4).

[46] Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive Supervision In Work Organizations: Review, Synthesis, and Research Agenda. Journal Of Management, 33(3).

[47] Thoroughgood, C. N.,Hunter, S. T. and Sawyer, K. B. (2011). Bad Apples, Bad Barrels, And Broken Followers? An Empirical Examination Of Contextual Influences On Follower Perceptions and Reactions to Aversive Leadership. Journal of Business Ethics, 100(4).

[48] Thoroughgood, C. N. andPadilla, A. (2013). Destructive Leadership and The Penn State Scandal: A Toxic Triangle Perspective. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 6(2).

[49] Walumbwa, F.,O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S. andPeterson, S. J. (2008) Authentic Leadership: Development And Validation Of A Theory-Based Measure, Journal Of Management, 34 (1).

[50] Yıldırım, A. and Şimşek, H. (2006). Sosyal

Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri. (5.

[51] Baskı). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

[52] Yıldırım, A. and Şimşek, H. (2016). Sosyal

Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri. (10.

[53] Baskı). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık..

[54] Yıldız, S. M. (2015). Lider-Üye Etkileşimi, İşyerinde Mobbing Ve Mesleki Tükenmişlik İlişkisi. Ankara: Detay.

[55] Yılmaz, S. and Bakan, İ. (2019). The Effect Of Toxıc Leadershıp On Burnout: A Fıeld Research. Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 9(2).

[56] Yukl, G. (2006). Leadership In Organizations. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. Zahra, S. A., Priem, R. L., andRasheed, A. A. The Antecedents And Consequences Of Top Management Fraud. Journal Of Management, 31.