The Effect of Dark Leadership on Organizational Commitment: A Research in The Banking Sector[1]

Nurbanu BAHADIR [iD] [a] **Yasin ÇAKIREL** [iD] [b]

[a] Kırklareli University, Kırklareli, Turkey. nurbanuisci@gmail.com.
[b] Kırklareli University, Kırklareli, Turkey. yasincakirel@klu.edu.tr.

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Keywords: Leadership Dark Leadership Organizational Commitment Received 27 March 2021 Revised 22 May 2022 Accepted 25 May 2022 **Article Classification:** Research Article	**Purpose** – The purpose of this study is to examine the impacts of dark leadership on organizational commitment. As opposed to the positive leadership styles' benefits, it is expected to see a negative impact of the negative leadership styles on organizational commitment. Dark leadership is a term to describe the leadership in a context where the leaders' negative personality traits negatively affect the organizational decision-making and the public impression of the organization. **Design/methodology/approach** – In this study, there are 559 employees who work either in a bank branch or a general directorate of banking in Istanbul. To examine the impacts of the dark leadership on the bankers' organizational commitment, "simple linear regression analysis" and "multiple linear regression analysis" are used. **Findings** – Study findings reveal a significant negative impact of the dark leadership on the bankers' organizational commitment. Moreover, it is found that dark leadership has meaningful negative impacts on the bankers' affective commitment and continuance commitment. Furthermore, findings show a positive impact of the dark leadership on the bankers' normative commitment. There is limited empirical research related to the impacts of dark leadership on organizational commitment; therefore, this study aims to contribute to the gap in the human resources management, organizational behavior, and management and organizations literature. **Discussion** – It is possible to say that dark leadership should seek help from experts and/or institutions in order to prevent the negative effect of dark leadership on employees' organizational commitments. At this point, the human resources management unit plays an important role in identifying dark leaders.

1. INTRODUCTION

Becoming more and more significant every day, leadership is regarded as an important factor in the success of organizations. In general, the leader's abilities and positive qualities have long been of interest for the leadership literature. Leaders are considered to be successful, charismatic and impressive individuals with superior skills who lead both their organizations and their followers to success with their policies in line with these skills and positive characteristics.

The concept of leadership is basically a concept that refers to positive characteristics, abilities, positive methods and results, often associated with constructive leadership. However, contrary to popular belief, leaders may not always have these positive qualities. These negative traits that leaders have are also defined as "the dark side of leadership", "dark leadership". As is known, Conger (1990) first stated in his work "The Dark Side of Leadership" that there are positive aspects of leadership as well as a negative and dark side. Although it does not clearly define the concept of dark leadership, it is the basic work that reveals the starting point of the concept.

Over time, negative leadership behaviors have been noticed and investigated by different disciplines. With the researches, approaches to Petty Tyranny (Ashforth, 1994), Toxic Leadership (Whicker, 1996), Abusive Supervision (Tepper, 2000), Narcissistic Leadership (Glad, 2002), Destructive Leadership (Padilla et al., 2007)

---

and Unethical Leadership (Lašáková and Remišová, 2015) have been revealed and dark leadership has been elaborated.

The behavior of leaders is an important influence factor in organizations because the consequences of the behavior of the leaders greatly affect the employees (Yukl, 1999) The results of the research, which suggest that employees increase loyalty to their leaders, indicate that the positive attitudes and behaviors exhibited by the leader are the result of positive perception by employees (Ballı, 2014: 32). Studies on dark leadership have indicated that employees have negative effects on their organizational commitment (Ballı and Çakıcı, 2016; Weaver et al., 2010).

In this study, the concept of dark leadership is comprehensively discussed by examining dark leadership behaviors in organizations and the sub-dimensions of this type of leadership. The main purpose of the research is to examine whether the dark leaders that exist in the organizations have an effect on the loyalty of employees to the organization and, if so, to investigate the direction and degree of this effect.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Dark Leadership

Although there is no agreed definition of the concept of dark leadership, there are definitions of it made by addressing different aspects of the concept. Dark leadership has been defined by Einarsen et al. (2007: 2) as "systematic and repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor or manager who disregards the objectives, duties, resources and effectiveness of the organization, the welfare of its subordinates, and the legitimate interest of the organization by weakening job satisfaction." Wilson-Starks (2003: 2) has defined dark leadership as "a leadership approach that is done through the poisoning of creativity, autonomy and innovation behaviors in what people do and ultimately harms the company." Dark leadership can be defined as the negative personality traits of the individuals who are leaders negatively affecting the decisions taken on behalf of the organization and behaviors towards the audience (Ballı and Ballı, 2017: 75).

Başar et al. (2016) has defined dark leadership as "frustrating, narcissistic, insincere and bullying behavior that constitutes the dark side of leadership and is exhibited towards one or more followers, causing physiological and/or psychological harm to followers" (quoted: Başar, 2019). Tandon and Mishra (2017: 275-276) have defined dark leadership as an organized and repetitive behavior by a leader, supervisor, manager who disrupts the legitimate interest of the organization by harming the purposes, duties, resources, effectiveness and job satisfaction of subordinates. Saleh et al., (2018: 32) has defined dark leadership as containing various types of behavior that are inherent in dark leadership, such as mocking, lying to and deceiving employees, accusing the wrong person of mistakes and discrimination.

Upon reviewing the definitions, it can be said that in general, the dark side of the leader can have various negative consequences for his followers, the organization to which he is affiliated and his environment.

The dark side of leadership, which attracts attention along with the concept of dark leadership, has been handled in different aspects by different researchers and they have come up with various concepts. Some of these are passive-aggressive leadership, coercive leadership, rude leadership, bullying leadership, petty tyranny, toxic leadership, unethical leadership, narcissistic leadership, abusive supervision, destructive leadership. The 'Dark Leadership Scale' developed by Fındıklı, Afacan and Okan (2018), which is a compiling and descriptive study by considering the overlapping concepts and recurring aspects of dark leadership as a result of literature review, is also the first scale developed in our country. In order to determine the effect of dark leadership on organizational commitment, which is the main purpose of the study, the "Dark Leadership Scale" developed by Fındıklı, Afacan and Okan (2018) based on the perception of the employees of the organization has been used by examining dark leadership behaviors. On the scale developed, a measuring tool of six dimensions has been obtained; namely petty tyranny, toxic leadership, unethical leadership, narcissistic leadership, abusive supervision and destructive leadership. The sub-dimensions of dark leadership are defined below, respectively.

Petty Tyranny: Ashforth (1994) first developed a new variable called petty tyranny, combining similar traits that can be found collectively in a leader. He defined petty tyranny as the type of leadership that leaders use their power over others, essentially their subordinates. In his work, the petty tyrant has expressed the characteristics of leadership in the form of arbitrary movement and self-deprecation, exaggeration and

boasting, contempt for his subordinates, disregard, difficulty resolving conflicts, discouraging attempts and unprovoked punishment.

Toxic Leadership: Lipman-Blumen (2005: 18) have described the toxic leader in their study as "individuals who exhibit destructive behaviors and have dysfunctional personal qualities and, due to all these characteristics, can cause serious and lasting harm to individuals, groups, organizations, societies and even beyond." The form of leadership consisting of negative characteristics that have negative effects as a result of attitudes and behaviors exhibited towards employees within an organization and reduce the overall performance of the organization is defined as toxic leadership.

Unethical Leadership: Brown and Mitchell (2010: 588) have defined unethical leadership as "actions carried out by organizational leaders that are illegal and/or contrary to moral standards, decisions taken and decisions that enforce processes and structures that promote the unethical behavior of followers." In addition to this definition; leaders can also directly support the unethical behavior of others without taking part in unethical behavior (Lašáková and Remišová, 2015: 321).

Narcissistic Leadership: Biçer (2020) has stated that narcissism includes "attitudes and behaviors that reflect one's excessive self-appreciation, self-indulgence, extreme selfishness, arrogance, boasting and superiority over others". Narcissism is considered to be fundamentally undesirable personality traits, and narcissistic leaders can have negative and unintended consequences in the organization when their powers and personal activities expand. It is a fact that narcissistic leaders "think only of themselves, that the world revolves around their axis and without them the organization will not reach its true potential and will eventually disappear" (Biçer, 2020, p. 280).

Abusive Supervision: Tepper (2000: 178) refers to abusive supervision as "subjective assessments of the ongoing, non-physical, verbal and non-verbal hostile behavior of the superior supervisor."

Destructive Leadership; Sezici (2016: 108) has defined destructive leadership in his work as *"the leader's repetitive and systematic display of behaviors that have the power to weaken the organization's assets, activities and relationships in defiance of the established norms of the organization or regardless of its formality, and/or may result in damage to the quality of working life of its viewers with the drive to obtain personal financial interest and/or spiritual satisfaction".*

In studies, it is known that dark leadership and its sub-dimensions cause many negative consequences on followers and organization. Some of these are psychological problems (Pelletier, 2010), decreased organizational commitment (Weaver et al., 2010; Akhtar and Shaukat, 2016; Ballı and Çakıcı, 2016; Yalçınsoy and Işık, 2018) decrease in job motivation, work performance and job satisfaction (Harris et al., 2007; Robins et al. (2001), Avey et al. (2011), Pelletier, 2010), causing organizational cynicism (Dobbs and Do, 2018), adversely affecting the health of the organization (Reyhanoğlu and Akın, 2016), negatively affecting the organizational climate (Reed, 2004; Reyhanoğlu and Akın, 2016) causing burnout (Merecz et al., 2009; Uzunbacak et al., 2019), causing alienation to work (Akhtar and Shaukat, 2016), reducing organizational citizenship behavior (Aryee et al., 2007; Rafferty and Restubog, 2011), increased intention for loafing and quitting (Tepper, 2000; Sezici, 2016).

2.2. Organizational Commitment

Looking at the current definitions of the concept of organizational commitment, Çekmecelioglu (2006: 155) has expressed organizational commitment as "the willingness of employees to remain within the organization, their commitment to the objectives and values of the organization". According to Bateman and Strasser (1984:95), organizational commitment is "a function of perceived cohesion between the individual and the organization". Becker et al., (1996: 464) define organizational commitment as "psychological attachment to the workplace of the recruiter". Uçar and Kök (2018: 234) define organizational commitment as "employees adopting the objectives and values of the organization, over-striving for the benefit of the organization and the desire to remain in the organization". The main reason why the concept of organizational commitment is expressed by different researchers in various ways is the idea that organizational commitment is represented in separate dimensions.

Upon reviewing the studies in the literature, it is observed that different organizational dimensions of commitment have been defined by different researchers. It is observed that the O'Reilly and Chatman model (1986) includes dimensions of harmony, identification and internalization commitment and the Angle and Perry model (1992), Mayer and Schoorman (1998) includes the dimensions of continuance commitment and importance commitment. In addition, the Jaros model (2007) has defined emotional, continuance commitment and moral commitment dimensions, and dimensions of moral, calculating and alienating commitment have been defined in the model created by Penley and Gould based on the Etzioni model (quoted: Emhan and Gök, 2011: 160). Etzioni (1988) has addressed the moral commitment, self-interest commitment and forced commitment dimensions. Despite these various definitions, the organizational dimensions of loyalty put forward by Meyer and Allen (1991), which remain accepted and valid today, are used (Uçar and Kök, 2018: 236).

Meyer and Allen (1991) have discussed organizational commitment in three dimensions: emotional commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Emotional, continuance commitment and normative commitment dimensions represent three separate psychological states that fundamentally reflect a desire, need and obligation to stay (Meyer and Allen, 1991: 82). Organizational commitments dimensions are provided below in detail.

Emotional Commitment basically refers to the desire of employees to continue work entirely of their own desires and wills. Emotional commitment can be expressed as the extent to which individuals adopt the values of the organization they are affiliated with and the extent to which they identify with all the values of the organization. The individual who feels this level of commitment fully accepts the values of the organization and has a strong demand to remain part of the organization. This dimension is the best expected form of the organizational commitment of the individual and individuals who have the sense of dedication and loyalty that organizations demand. Individuals with emotional commitments make additional efforts for the organization, when necessary, by displaying positive attitudes and behaviors towards the organization they are affiliated with and the work they do (Bayram, 2005: 132).

Continuance Commitment is the belief that employees continue because they think there are no other business alternatives, and that there will be costs that will accompany ceasing of employment in addition to the side betting theory (Ballı and Çakıcı, 2016: 171). Continuance commitment is based on individuals' desire to stay in the organization, the investments they have made in the organization and the costs of giving up all the benefits they have (Uçar and Kök, 2018: 237).

Normative Commitment basically refers to the ethical idea that people should stay in the organization and continue to work (Ballı and Çakıcı, 2016:171). The normative commitment, also called 'gratitude commitment' in some sources, is based on the fact that the individual feels obliged to stay in the organization, acting with the idea that he or she has responsibilities and duties towards the organization. The emphasis on loyalty by the family, the community, the personal environment or the organization, and the feeling of obligation arising from the reasons such as the praise of those who work in one organization consistently, consider it a moral imperative to stay in the organization believing in the importance of individual loyalty (Çöl and Ardıç, 2008:160)

When looking at the numerous researches and definitions on organizational commitment, it is noted that what is common is a situation that leads to attitudes and behaviors that have positive consequences for both the individual and the organization (Koç, 2009: 203).

2.3. *The Relationship between Dark Leadership and Organizational Commitment*

Based on studies on leadership and organizational commitment relationship, it is generally associated with positive leadership behavior. The results of the research, which suggest that employees increase loyalty to their leaders, indicate that the positive attitudes and behaviors exhibited by the leader are the result of positive perception by employees (Ballı, 2014: 32). Adult people devote the vast majority of their lives to work, and therefore, a person's quality of life is strongly influenced by the quality of work life (Weaver, Metal and Yancey, 2010: 104).

Fred Herzberg (1968) argues that in his theory of double-factor job satisfaction, control is a contextual factor that is even more important in affecting job satisfaction than job satisfaction. When a leader exhibits positive

and positive behaviors, the employees of the organization focus more on their organizations and work. However, it is often an important source of power over the daily life of an employee leader, and a bad leader can make his work life challenging for some employees (Weaver, Metal and Yancey, 2010: 104).

Leaders are encouraged to send the message to their followers that they are valuable members of the organization, to encourage them to participate in decisions, to establish organizational commitment to carry out intra-organizational communication in a healthy manner (Bayram, 2005: 137).

Of the three components of organizational commitment, emotional commitment is the most predictive concept of keeping employees in the organization. If dark leaders diminish the emotional commitment of their employees, the organization may lose valuable staff (Weaver, Metal and Yancey, 2010: 106). It shows that an employee is more likely to remain in his organization to the extent that he or she has strong connections to the organization and society. Therefore, if dark leaders reduce the emotional commitment of employees, this makes them feel less belonging within the organization and increases their likelihood of leaving the organization later (Weaver, Metal and Yancey, 2010: 109).

Examining whether the subordinates of dark leaders have greater intentions to leave their organizations and whether they lower their allegiance to their organization, Weaver et al. (2010) have concluded that dark leadership was inversely proportional to employees' emotional attachment to the organization and employees' willingness to remain in the organization. Subordinates whose dark leadership perception increase have decreased organizational allegiances and intentions to stay in the organization (Weaver, Metal and Yancey, 2010: 116). Similarly, Ballı and Çakıcı (2016) have examined the effect of dark leadership on organizational commitment in their study on employees in hotel businesses and found a significant negative relationship between dark leadership and organizational commitment.

3. METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

3.1. Purpose of the Research

The main purpose of the research is to examine whether the dark leaders that exist in the organizations have an effect on the loyalty of employees to the organization and, if so, to investigate the direction and degree of this effect. The importance of the positive characteristics of the leaders on the path to success of the organizations is frequently examined in the studies. This thesis study aims to show whether the commitment of the employees of the organization to the organization is affected by these negative attitudes and behaviors by addressing the negative aspects of the leaders, which are the opposite of the positive characteristics.

3.2. Sample of the Research

The population of the research consists of branch and directorate employees operating in the banking sector in Istanbul Province. The survey within the scope of the study has been delivered to 862 employees between 04.02.2019-01.02.2020 using easy sampling method and the number of surveys that received returns is 576. As a result of review, 17 of these 576 surveys have been found to be invalid. Therefore, the sample of the research consists of the remaining 559 bank employees who have done the valid surveys. According to these figures, the return rate of the submitted survey forms is 66.4%. The number of valid questionnaires obtained has been sufficient for statistical analyses to be performed.

3.3. Measurement Tools and Statistical Data Used in Research

The data needed to achieve the goal determined in the thesis study has been collected by the survey method. The questionnaire applied for this purpose is available in ANNEX_1. The questionnaire consists of three parts in total. In the first part, there are 9 questions about the dark leadership scale of Fındıklı, Afacan, & Okan (2018) consisting of a total of 35 substances and 6 sub-dimensions, in the second part, Meyer and Allen's (1991) organizational commitment scale consisting of 18 articles and 3 sub-dimensions, and finally, in the third part, 9 questions about demographic characteristics. The reaction categories of items found on both scales have been subjected to 5-point Likert scale. Reaction categories are: (1) I Strongly Disagree (2) I Disagree (3) I Neither Agree nor Disagree (4) I Agree (5) and I Strongly Agree. Table 1 shows the scales and sub-dimensions used in the study in detail.

Table 1: Scales and Sub-Dimensions Used in The Study

Scale Name	Authors	Dimensions	Number of Items
Dark Leadership Scale	Fındıklı, Afacan, & Okan, (2018)	Petty Tyranny	7
		Toxic Leadership	9
		Unethical Leadership	4
		Narcissistic Leadership	5
		Abusive Supervision	3
		Destructive Leadership	7
Organizational Commitment Scale	Meyer & Allen, (1991)	Emotional Commitment	6
		Continuance Commitment	6
		Normative Commitment	6

"Dark Leadership Scale (0.99)" developed by Fındıklı, Afacan, & Okan (2018) has been used to measure dark leadership. The dark leadership scale developed consists of a total of 6 dimensions: "petty tyranny (0.96)", "toxic leadership (0.96)", "unethical leadership (0.92), "narcissistic leadership (0.96)", "abusive supervision (0.86)" and "destructive leadership (0.95)".

The "Organizational Commitment Scale" developed by Meyer and Allen (1991) and renewed by Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993) has been used to measure organizational commitment. The organizational commitment scale consists of 3 sub-dimensions: emotional commitment, normative commitment and continuation commitment. In our country, the validity and reliability of the scale was first made by Wasti, A. (2000), and the suitability of the scale was determined on a sample of 351 public employees and 916 private sector employees. The validity and reliability of the organizational commitment scale have also been studied by different researchers (Ergün and Çelik, 2018).

3.4. Analyses and Findings

3.4.1. Factor Analyses

In the survey conducted within the scope of the study, there are 35 statements that have been asked to measure the concept of Dark Leadership. From these statements, statements that do not meet the necessary requirements regarding the suitability for factor analysis have been removed from the analysis. The results of the factor analysis with the remaining 24 statements are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Factors and Reliability Analysis Results on Dark Leadership Scale

Factor Name	Dark Leadership Scale Statements	Factor Weight	Eigenvalue	Factor Descriptiveness (%)	Cronbach Alpha
Petty tyranny	They distance himself from their subordinates.	0,641	12,992	17,978	0,925
	They will not give up their behavior unless they get a collective response.	0,764			
	They force the people to accept their own opinion.	0,727			
	Their oppressive attitude reduces team motivation.	0,624			
	When they are told of their negative behavior, they react to their subordinates.	0,662			
	They won't let their subordinates take the initiative.	0,568			
	They are more oppressive towards passive people.	0,600			

Toxic Leadership	They prevent the promotion of subordinates that they deem a competitor.	0,686	1,353	15,345	0,870
	They believe that those with low seniority have low skills.	0,752			
	They humiliate their subordinates in front of others.	0,637			
	They are not open to innovation.	0,733			
	They forget their promises.	0,642			
Unethical Leadership	They use the company facilities for their own benefit.	0,772	1,169	12,959	0,917
	They discard their subordinates for their own benefit.	0,734			
	They do not feel the need to empathize with their subordinates.	0,600			
	They use every method to achieve their own goals.	0,651			
Narcissistic Leadership	They praise themselves at every opportunity.	0,775	0,947	12,267	0,913
	They give an example of themselves for each event.	0,827			
	They describe themselves as perfect.	0,794			
Abusive Supervision	My manager always tells me what to do.	0,810	0,817	10,655	0,842
	My manager always wants more than I can do.	0,796			
	My manager forgets I'm human.	0,539			
Destructive Leadership	They draw the power of their oppressive behavior from their own superiors.	0,862	0,755	5,937	0,628
	They provide concessions to the group that they create.	0,481			
Total Described Variance				75,141	
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Scale Validity					0,967
Bartlett Sphericity Test Chi-Square					10233,443
Sd					276
p-value					<0,000

Joliffe criterion has been used to determine the number of appropriate factors in the factor analysis. According to this criterion, it is appropriate to take factors such as 0.7 and greater eigenvalue (Özdamar, 2004, s. 248). Looking at the results of the Bartlett Sphericity Test and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) in Table 2; according to the Bartlett Sphericity Test, there appears to be sufficient correlation between variables to perform factor analysis (X^2= 10233,443; p<0,000). KMO value has been obtained as 0.967 and it is observed that the fitness of the variables with factor analysis is excellent. As a result of factor analysis; six factors have been obtained in accordance with the original scale and the factors explain 75,141% of the total variance. Each of these factors, called petty tyranny, Toxic Leadership, Unethical Leadership, Narcissistic Leadership, Abusive Supervision and Destructive Leadership, has Cronbach Alpha values of 0.925, 0,870; 0,917; 0,913; 0.842 and 0.628, respectively. Looking at these values, it is observed that the factors of petty tyranny, toxic leadership, unethical

leadership, narcissistic leadership and abusive supervision are highly reliable. Destructive leadership is considered reliable with a value of 0.628 due to the lack of statements under the factor.

In the survey conducted within the scope of the research, there are 18 statements that have been asked to measure the concept of Organizational Commitment to the participants. From these statements, statements that do not meet the necessary requirements regarding the suitability for factor analysis have been removed from the analysis. The results of the factor analysis with the remaining 15 statements are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Factor and Reliability Analysis Results on Organizational Commitment Scale

Factor Name	Organizational Commitment Scale Statements	Factor Weight	Eigenvalue	Factor Descriptiveness (%)	Cronbach Alpha
Emotional Commitment	I'd be happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.	0,621	3,779	25,195	0,892
	I really feel like the problems of this organization are my own.	0,607			
	This organization has a special significance for me.	0,663			
	I don't feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.[a]	0,848			
	I don't feel like "part of the family" in my organization.[a]	0,877			
	I don't feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.[a]	0,865			
Continuance Commitment	Right now, it's very difficult for me to leave this organization, even if I wanted to.	0,838	3,169	21,125	0,856
	If I decided I wanted to quit my job now, a lot of things would be turned upside down in my life.	0,837			
	I feel like I have too few alternatives to leave this organization.	0,680			
	If I hadn't added so much of myself to this organization, I might have considered working elsewhere.	0,752			
Normative Commitment	Even if it's in my best interest, I don't think it's right to leave my organization.	0,725	2,868	19,123	0,804
	If I leave my organization now, I'll feel guilty.	0,825			
	This organization deserves my loyalty.	0,851			
	I wouldn't leave my organization right away because I have a responsibility to the people who work here.	0,528			
	I don't feel obligated to work with my current managers.	0,771			
	Total Described Variance			65,443	
	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Scale Validity				0,854
	Bartlett Sphericity Test Chi-Square				4808,096
	Sd				105
	p-value				<0,000

a: This statement contains negative meaning and is encoded in reverse direction during data entry.

Looking at the results of the Bartlett Sphericity Test and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) in Table 3; according to the Bartlett Sphericity Test, there appears to be sufficient correlation between variables to perform factor analysis (X^2= 4808,096; p<0,000). KMO value has been obtained as 0.854 and it is observed that the fitness of the variables with factor analysis is excellent. As a result of factor analysis; three factors have been obtained in accordance with the original scale and the factors explain 65,443% of the total variance. Each of these factors, called Emotional Commitment, Continuance Commitment and Normative Commitment, has Cronbach Alpha values of 0.892, 0.856 and 0.804, respectively. Looking at these values, it is observed that all factors are quite reliable.

3.4.2. Hypothesis Tests

As a result of the factor analyses carried out in the validity and reliability part of the research; dark Leadership statements have been found to consist of six dimensions (petty tyranny, toxic leadership, unethical leadership, narcissistic leadership, abusive supervision, destructive leadership) and Organizational Commitment statements in line with the original scale (emotional commitment, continuation commitment, normative commitment). In the analysis carried out in the continuation of the study, the factors formed as a result of factor analyses have been used. Simple Linear Regression analysis and Multiple Linear Regression analysis have been used to test the hypotheses within the scope of the research.

The independent variable of the research is dark leadership and its sub-dimensions are toxic leadership, petty tyranny, narcissistic leadership, destructive leadership, abusive supervision and unethical leadership. The dependent variable is organizational commitment variable and its sub-dimensions are emotional commitment, normative commitment and continuation commitment. Within the scope of the study, the effect of dark leadership on organizational commitment and sub-factors has been investigated. In addition, the effect of sub-factors of dark leadership on organizational adhering and sub-factors has been also investigated.

The analysis to test H_1 hypothesis and sub-hypotheses is presented in Table 4 below.

Hypothesis 1: Dark leadership affects organizational commitment.
Hypothesis 1$_a$: In terms of Petty Tyranny, dark leadership affects organizational commitment.
Hypothesis 1$_b$: In terms of Toxic Leadership, dark leadership affects organizational commitment.
Hypothesis 1$_c$: In terms of Unethical Leadership, dark leadership affects organizational commitment.
Hypothesis 1$_d$: In terms of Narcissistic Leadership, dark leadership affects organizational commitment.
Hypothesis 1$_e$: In terms of Abusive Supervision, dark leadership affects organizational commitment.
Hypothesis 1$_f$: In terms of Destructive Leadership, dark leadership affects organizational commitment.

Table 4: Examining the Impact of Dark Leadership and Its Factors on Organizational Commitment

Simple Linear Regression Analysis				
Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment				
Independent Variable	**Coefficient**	**St. Error**	**t value**	**p-value**
Dark Leadership	-0,452	0,038	-11,956	<0,001
R=0,452	**R²=0,204**	**F value=142,954**	**p value<0,001**	
Multiple Linear Regression Analysis				
Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment				
Independent Variable	**Coefficient**	**St. Error**	**t value**	**p-value**
Petty Tyranny	-0,252	0,037	-6,739	<0,001
Toxic Leadership	-0,164	0,037	-4,384	<0,001
Unethical Leadership	-0,237	0,037	-6,343	<0,001

Abusive Supervision	-0,265	0,037	-7,083	<0,001
Destructive Leadership	-0,107	0,037	-2,876	<0,05
R=0,477	**Corrected R²=0,221**	**F value=32,660**	**p value<0,001**	

As can be inferred from Table 4, it has been determined that the H1 hypothesis could not be rejected as a result of Simple Linear Regression analysis. It is observed that it is possible to predict the organizational commitment variable with a dark leadership variable and that the model is statistically significant (F=142,954; p<0,001).

As a result of the regression analysis, it has been revealed that narcissistic leadership from the sub-dimensions of dark leadership had no significant effect on organizational commitment (b=-0.063; p=0.090>0.05). Accordingly, narcissistic leadership has been removed from the analysis and the analysis has been repeated. As a result of multiple linear regression analysis for the testing of sub-hypotheses, it has been concluded that the hypotheses H1a, H1b, H1c, H1e, H1f cannot be rejected (F=32,660; p<0,001). Petty tyranny, toxic leadership, unethical leadership, abusive supervision and destructive leadership have been found to have a negative and significant effect on organizational commitment.

The analysis to test the H2 hypothesis and sub-hypotheses is presented in the Table 5 below.

Hypothesis 2: Dark leadership affects emotional commitment.
Hypothesis 2a: In terms of petty tyranny, dark leadership affects emotional commitment.
Hypothesis 2b: In terms of toxic leadership, dark leadership affects emotional commitment.
Hypothesis 2c: In terms of unethical leadership, dark leadership affects emotional commitment.
Hypothesis 2d: In terms of narcissistic leadership, dark leadership affects emotional commitment.
Hypothesis 2e: In terms of abusive supervision, dark leadership affects emotional commitment.
Hypothesis 2f: In terms of destructive leadership, dark leadership affects emotional commitment.

Table 5: Examining the Impact of Dark Leadership and Its Factors Emotional Commitment

Simple Linear Regression Analysis				
Dependent Variable: Emotional Commitment				
Independent Variable	**Coefficient**	**St. Error**	**t value**	**p-value**
Dark Leadership	-0,326	0,040	-8,137	<0,001
R=0,326	**R²=0,106**	**F value=66,218**	**p value<0,001**	
Multiple Linear Regression Analysis				
Dependent Variable: Emotional Commitment				
Independent Variable	**Coefficient**	**St. Error**	**t value**	**p-value**
Petty Tyranny	-0,157	0,039	-3,993	<0,001
Toxic Leadership	-0,182	0,039	-4,638	<0,001
Unethical Leadership	-0,223	0,039	-5,670	<0,001
Abusive Supervision	-0,193	0,039	-4,917	<0,001
R=0,380	**Corrected R²=0.139**	**F value=23,444**	**p value<0,001**	

It has been concluded that the H₂ hypothesis in the study cannot be rejected as inferred from the table (F=66,218; p<0,001). According to this result, it has been determined that dark leadership has a negative and significant effect on emotional commitment.

As a result of the regression analysis, it has been revealed that narcissistic leadership and destructive leadership from the sub-dimensions of dark leadership had no significant effect on emotional commitment. Other sub-dimensions and regression analysis have been repeated. As a result of repeated Multiple Linear Regression Analysis, it has been concluded that the hypotheses H₂ₐ, H₂ᵦ, H₂ᵧ, H₂ₑ hypotheses cannot be rejected (F=23,444; p<0,001). According to the results of the analysis, small tyranny, toxic leadership, unethical leadership and abusive supervision have been found to have a negative and significant effect on emotional commitment.

The analysis to test the H₃ hypothesis and sub-hypotheses is presented in the Table 6 below.

Hypothesis 3: Dark leadership affects continuance commitment.
Hypothesis 3ₐ: In terms of petty tyranny, dark leadership affects continuance commitment.
Hypothesis 3ᵦ: In terms of toxic leadership, dark leadership affects continuance commitment.
Hypothesis 3ᵧ: In terms of unethical leadership, dark leadership affects continuance commitment.
Hypothesis 3ᵈ: In terms of narcissistic leadership, dark leadership affects continuance commitment.
Hypothesis 3ₑ: In terms of abusive supervision, dark leadership affects continuance commitment.
Hypothesis 3բ: In terms of destructive leadership, dark leadership affects continuance commitment.

Table 6: Examining the Impact of Dark Leadership and Its Factors Continuance Commitment

Simple Linear Regression Analysis				
Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment				
Independent Variable	**Coefficient**	**St. Error**	**t value**	**p-value**
Dark Leadership	-0,260	0,041	-6,343	<0,001
R=0,260	**R²=0,067**	**F value=40,234**	**p value<0,001**	
Multiple Linear Regression Analysis				
Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment				
Independent Variable	**Coefficient**	**St. Error**	**t value**	**p-value**
Petty Tyranny	-0,179	0,041	-4,403	<0,001
Abusive Supervision	-0,155	0,041	-3,832	<0,001
Destructive Leadership	-0,178	0,041	-4,391	<0,001
R=0,296	**Corrected R²=0,083**	**F value=17,785**	**p value<0,001**	

As is observed from the table, it has been concluded that the H₃ hypothesis cannot be rejected (F=40,234; p<0,001). According to this result, dark leadership has a negative and significant effect on continuance commitment.

Multiple Linear Regression analysis has revealed that toxic leadership, unethical leadership and narcissistic leadership, which are sub-factors of dark leadership, has no significant effect on continuance commitment. After these are removed, regression analysis has been repeated with the remaining sub-factors. As a result of the analysis, it has been concluded that the hypotheses H₃ₐ, H₃ₑ and H₃բ cannot be rejected (F=17,785; p<0,001).

Petty tyranny, abusive supervision and destructive leadership have a negative and significant effect on the continuance commitment.

The analysis to test the H₄ hypothesis and sub-hypotheses is presented in Table 7 below.

Hypothesis 4: Dark leadership affects normative commitment.

Hypothesis 4ₐ: In terms of petty tyranny, dark leadership affects normative commitment.

Hypothesis 4ᵦ: In terms of toxic leadership, dark leadership affects normative commitment.

Hypothesis 4c: In terms of unethical leadership, dark leadership affects normative commitment.

Hypothesis 4d: In terms of narcissistic leadership, dark leadership affects normative commitment.

Hypothesis 4ₑ: In terms of abusive supervision, dark leadership affects normative commitment.

Hypothesis 4f: In terms of destructive leadership, dark leadership affects normative commitment.

Table 7: Examining the Effect of Dark Leadership and Its Factors Normative Commitment

Simple Linear Regression Analysis

Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment

Independent Variable	Coefficient	St. Error	t value	p-value
Dark Leadership	0,245	0,041	5,970	<0,001
R=0,245	**R²=0,060**	**F value=35,642**	**p value**<0,001	

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment

Independent Variable	Coefficient	St. Error	t value	p-value
Petty Tyranny	0,123	0,041	2,975	<0,05
Unethical Leadership	0,153	0,041	3,694	<0,001
Abusive Supervision	0,121	0,041	2,920	<0,05
R=0,230	**Corrected R²=0.048**	**F value=10,344**	**p value**<0,001	

As a result of simple linear regression analysis for the testing of the H₄ hypothesis, it has been concluded that the H₄ hypothesis could not be rejected (F=35,642; p<0,001). Contrary to the hypotheses H₁, H₂ and H₃, the relationship between normative commitment and dark leadership appears to have a positive and significant effect.

As a result of the regression analysis, it has been observed that toxic leadership, narcissistic leadership and destructive leadership from the sub-dimensions of dark leadership has no significant effect on normative commitment. After these sub-factors are removed, regression analysis has been performed again with the remaining sub-dimensions. As a result of repeated analysis, it has been concluded that the hypotheses H₄ₐ, H₄c and H₄ₑ cannot be rejected (F=10,344; p<0,001). Accordingly, petty tyranny, unethical leadership and abusive supervision have been found to have a positive and significant effect on normative commitment.

4. CONCLUSION

Dark leadership, the subject matter of the research, is the dependent variable, and organizational commitment is the dependent variable. At the heart of the study, it has been assumed that the perception of dark leadership would have a negative effect on the organizational commitment of employees, resulting in a decrease in their

loyalty to the organization. Although it is thought that it will be valid in all sectors, it is considered that the high loyalty of employees, especially in the banking sector, has significant effects on the quality of the work.

As a main purpose of the research; upon reviewing whether dark leadership has a significant effect on Organizational Commitment, a significant and negative effect has been determined. This indicates that employees with a high perception of Dark Leadership have decreased their Organizational Commitment. Other results obtained within the scope of this purpose can be listed as follows:

- Dark Leadership has a negative and significant effect on Emotional and Continuance Commitments and a positive and significant effect on Normative Commitment. - It also has a negative and significant effect on Emotional Commitment and Continuance Commitment and a positive and significant effect on Normative Commitment.

- Toxic Leadership and Unethical Leadership factors have a negative and significant effect on Organizational Commitment and Emotional Commitment; they do not have a significant effect on continuance commitment. In addition, while Unethical Leadership has a positive and significant effect on Normative Commitment; Toxic Leadership, on the other hand, had no significant effect.

- Destructive Leadership factor has a negative and significant effect on Organizational Commitment and Continuance Loyalty; no significant effect has been identified on Emotional Commitment and Normative Commitment.

- Finally, no significant effects of Narcissistic Leadership have been found on the Organizational Commitment and its sub-dimensions.

In light of these findings, it is possible to say that organizational commitment decreases as the perception of dark leadership increases.

In a similar study, "Dark Organizational Commitment and Its Impact on Personnel Turnover Rate" by Weaver, Metal and Yancey (2010), the research findings concluded that Dark Leadership has a negative and significant effect on Organizational Engagement in line with our research results. Similarly, in the study titled "The Effect of Dark Leadership in Hotel Enterprises on Organizational Commitment and Organizational Voice", it has been concluded that Dark Leadership has a negative and significant effect on Organizational Commitment in line with our research results. In addition, the research findings support findings in the Ballı's (2014) study on the negative and significant effects of Dark Leadership on Emotional Commitment and Continuance Commitment. Unlike our research findings, Ballı (2014) concluded that Dark Leadership has a negative and significant effect on Normative Commitment. It is thought that various factors (selected universe, sector, etc.) may cause this change.

As a result of the literature review, it has been determined that there is an insufficient number of researches on dark leadership and organizational influences in the banking sector in domestic and foreign literature and there is a lack of research in this field. In this context, it is thought that the dark leadership will contribute to the organizational effects of addressing different variables such as organizational cynicism, organizational health, organizational climate, organizational silence, organizational cynicism, job satisfaction, motivation, employee performance, and burnout. It is considered that carrying out such studies in public institutions will contribute to the research gap due to the determination of the leaders in the form of appointments. In addition, the application of the dark leadership and organizational commitment variable used in this study in different sectors and in different universes is important in terms of the reliability of the results for the effects and/or relationships between the variables.

It is possible to say that dark leadership should seek help from experts and/or institutions in order to prevent the negative effect of dark leadership on employees' organizational commitments. At this point, the human resources management unit plays an important role in identifying dark leaders. Accordingly, it is thought that measuring the dark leadership behaviors perceived by employees at regular intervals will contribute to the positive steps to increase organizational commitment. Finally, it is thought that taking into account the findings obtained by the practitioners can contribute to the solution of problems such as burnout, loss of motivation, decrease in performance, absence from work, dismissal, and alienation from work.

Finally, despite the originality of the study and its remarkable contributions, it has some limitations. The research results obtained within the scope of the study can only be evaluated within the scope of banks in Istanbul. Other evaluations and generalizations cannot be made. In addition, many constraints were encountered in the data collection process. Access to bank branches and directors has been difficult. The managers/directors of these institutions were generally reluctant to grant entry permits. This problem is one of the issues that slows down the data collection process. In addition to the time spent persuading the officials of the institution, it was necessary to persuade each respondent separately. Most of the respondents stated that they do not have time to spare. The reason for this is thought to be due to the intense work of bank branches. In addition to all these problems, some of the respondents stated that they could not answer the questionnaire due to various concerns after looking at the questionnaire questions. They explained the reason for these concerns by stating that they thought their job security was threatened, that they were afraid of their managers/managers in this regard, and that they might lose their jobs. In addition, it was determined that some of the data obtained was filled carelessly. This was seen as a problem and these data were cleared from the study through reverse coded control questions.

Kaynakça

Akhtar, S., & Shaukat, K. (2016). Impact of Petty Tyranny on Alienation from Work: Role of SelfEsteem and Power-Distance. *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, 1-11.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1991). The Measurement and Antecedents ofAffective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*(1), 1-18.

Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1981). An Empirical Assessment of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 26*(1), 1-14.

Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L.-Y., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 191-201.

Ashforth, B. E. (1994). Petty Tyranny in Organizations. *Human Relations, 47*(7), 755-778.

Avey, J. B., Palanski, M. E., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2011). When Leadership Goes Unnoticed: The Moderating Role of Follower Self-Esteem on the Relationship Between Ethical Leadership and Follower Behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 98*, 573–582.

Ballı, E. (2014). Otel işletmelerinde Karanlık Liderliğin Örgütsel Bağlılık ve Örgütsel Sessizlik Üzerine Etkisi. *Doktora Tezi*. Mersin, Türkiye: Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Ballı, E., & Ballı, A. İ. (2017). Karanlik Liderlik ve Örgütsel Etik İklim Arasındaki İlişki: Otel İşletmelerinde Bir Araştırma . *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 74-81.

Ballı, E., & Çakıcı, A. (2016). Karanlık Liderliğin Örgütsel Bağlılık ve Örgütsel Sessizlik Üzerine Etkisi: Otel Çalışanları Üzerinde Bir Araştırma. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 25*(3), 167-180.

Başar, U. (2019). Liderin Karanlık Kişilik Özellikleri İle Çalışanın Tükenmişliği Arasındaki İlişkide Çalışanın Karanlık Liderlik Algısının Aracı Rolü: Çok Düzeyli Bir Araştırma . *Doktora Tezi*. Ankara, Türkiye: Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Başar, U., Sığrı, Ü., & Basım, N. (2016). İş Yerinde Karanlık Liderlik. *İş ve İnsan Dergisi, 3*(2), 65-76.

Bateman, T., & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal, 27*, 95-112.

Bayram, L. (2005). Yönetimde Yeni Bir Paradigma: Örgütsel Bağlılık. *Sayıştay Dergisi*(59), 125-139.

Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, D. M., & Gilbert, N. L. (1996). Foci And Bases Of Employee Commitment: Implications For Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(2), 464-482.

Biçer, C. (2020). Mirror, Mirror, On The Wall, Who's The Fairest Of Them All? Narcissistic Leaders In Organizations And Their Major Effects On Employee Work Behaviors. *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi, 10*(1), 280-291.

Brown, M. E., & Mitchell, M. S. (2010). Ethical and Unethical Leadership: Exploring New Avenues for Euture Research. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 20*(4), 583-616.

Conger, J. A. (1990). *The Dark Side of Leadership.* 11 28, 2018 tarihinde www.academia.edu: http://www.academia.edu/3252899/The_dark_side_of_leadership adresinden alındı

Çekmecelioğlu, H. (2006). İş Tatmini ve Örgütsel Bağlılık Tutumlarının İşten Ayrılma Niyeti ve Verimlilik Üzerindeki Etkilerinin Değerlendirilmesi: Bir Araştırma. *"İş,Güç" Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, 8*(2), 153-168.

Çöl, G., & Ardıç, K. (2008). Sosyal Yapısal Özelliklerin Örgütsel Bağlılık Üzerine Etkileri. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 22*(2), 157-174.

Dobbs, J. M., & Do, J. J. (2018). The Impact of Perceived Toxic Leadership on Cynicism in Officer Candidates. *Armed Forces & Society, 20*(10), 1-24.

Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive Leadership Behaviour: A Definition and Conceptual Model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1-10.

Emhan, A., & Gök, R. (2011). Bankacılık Sektöründe Personel Memnuniyeti ve Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkilerin Araştırılması. *Muhasebe ve Finansman Dergisi* , 157-174.

Ergün, H., & Çelik, K. (2018). Örgütsel Bağlılık Ölçeği Türkçe Uyarlaması. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 113-121.

Etzioni, A. (1988). Normative-Affective Factors: Toward a New Decision-Making Model. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 9*(2), 125-150.

Fındıklı, M. A., Afacan, C., & Okan, G. (2018). Karanlık Liderlik Ölçeği: Çalışanların Algısı Üzerine Bir Ölçek Geliştirme Çalışması . *26. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi* (s. 347-353). Trabzon: Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi.

Glad, B. (2002). Why Tyrants Go Too Far: Malignant Narcissism and Absolute Power. *Political Psychology, 23*(1), 1-37.

Harris, K. J., Kacmar, K. M., & Zivnuska, S. (2007). An investigation of abusive supervision as a predictor of performance and the meaning of work as a moderator of the relationship. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 252-263.

Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time, how do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review, January-February*, 53-62.

Jaros, S. (2007). Meyer And Allen Model Of Organizational Commitment: Measurement Issues. *The Icfai Journal of Organizational Behavior, 6*(4), 7-25.

Koç, H. (2009). Örgütsel Bağlılık ve Sadakat İlişkisi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 8*(28), 200-2011.

Lašáková, A., & Remišová, A. (2015). Unethical Leadership: Current Theoretical Trends and Conceptualization. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 34*, 319 – 328.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). The Allure of Toxic Leaders: Why Followers Rarely Escape Their Clutches. *Ivey Business Journal*, 1-8.

Mayer, R. C., & Schoorman, F. D. (1998). Differentiating antecedents of organizational commitment: a test of March and Simon's model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*, 15-28.

Merecz, D., Drabek, M., & Moscicka, A. (2009). Aggression at the workplace--psychological consequences of abusive encounter with coworkers and clients. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health, 22*(3), 243-260.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A Three-Component Conceptualization Of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review,, 1*(1), 6189.

O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification, and Internalization on Prosocial Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(3), 492-499.

Özdamar, K. (2004). *Paket Programlar ille İstatistiksel Veri Analizi - 2.* Kaan Kitapevi.

Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The Toxic Triangle: Destructive Leaders, Susceptible Followers and Conducive Environments. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*, 176-194.

Pelletier, K. L. (2010). Leader Toxicity: An Empirical Investigation Of Toxic Behavior And Rhetoric. *Leadership, 6*(4), 373–389.

Rafferty, A. E., & Restubog, S. L. (2011). The Influence of Abusive Supervisors on Followers' Organizational Citizenship Behaviours: The Hidden Costs of Abusive Supervision. *British Journal of Management, 22*, 270–285.

Reed, C. G. (2004). *Toxic Leadership.* ABD: U.S. Army MILITARY REVIEW.

Reyhanoğlu, M., & Akın, Ö. (2016). Toksik Liderlik Örgütsel Sağlığı Olumsuz Yönde Tetikler mi? *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştımaları Dergisi, 5*(3), 442-459.

Robins, R. W., Tracy, J. L., & Trzesniewski, K. (2001). Personality Correlates of Self-Esteem. *Journal of Research in Personality, 35*, 463–482.

Saleh, H. G., Hu, W., Hassan, H. M., & Khudaykulova, M. (2018). Dark Leadership Impact on Psychological Well-being and Work-Family Conflict: Implications for Project Success of Bahrain Companies. *Journal of International Business Research and Marketing, 3*(3), 32-39.

Sezici, E. (2016). İzleyicilerin Yıkıcı Liderlik Algısı ve Sonuçları. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*(47), 107-123.

Tandon, P., & Mishra, S. (2017). Confronting the Dark Side of Leadership: A Conceptual Framework. *Proceedings of International Conference on Strategies in Volatile and Uncertain Environment for Emerging Markets* (s. 275-281). New Delhi: Indian Institute of Technology Delhi.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of Abusive Supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(2), 178-190.

Uçar, P., & Kök, S. B. (2018). Özel Banka Çalışanlarının Örgütsel Bağlılık Düzeyleri. *Asia Minor Studies-International Journal Of Social Sciences, 6*(AGP Özel Sayısı), 234-245.

Uzunbacak, H. H., Yıldız, A., & Uzun, S. (2019). Toksik Liderliğin Çalışanların Tükenmişlik Düzeylerine Etkisi. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7*(1), 211-219.

Wasti, S. A. (2000). Meyer ve Allen'in Üç Boyutlu Örgütsel Bağlılık Ölçeğinin Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Analizi. *8. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi.*

Weaver, S. G., Metal, N. I., & Yancey, G. B. (2010). The Impact of Dark Leadership on Organizational Commitment and Turnover. *Leadership Review, 10*, 104 – 124.

Whicker, M. (1996). *Toxic Leaders: When Organizations go Bad.* Wesport: VA: Quorum Books.

Wilson-Starks, K. Y. (2003). *Toxic Leadership.* 11 08, 2018 tarihinde www.transleadership.com: https://translate.google.com.tr/translate?hl=tr&sl=en&u=http://transleadership.com/wp-content/uploads/ToxicLeadership.pdf&prev=search adresinden alındı

Yalçınsoy, A., & Işık, M. (2018). Toksik Liderlik ile Örgütsel Bağlılık ve İşten Ayrılma Niyeti İlişkisine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences,, 17*(3), 1016-1025.

Yukl, G. (1999). An Evaluation Of Conceptual Weaknesses In Transformational And Charismatic Leadership Theories. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 285-305.