

Navigating and Recovering from Toxic Workplace Cultures: A Biopsychosocial-Spiritual Perspective on Cortisol Contagion and Healing

Dr. KerriLaine Prunella 

*College of Business, Innovation, Leadership and Technology (BILT),
Marymount University, Arlington, VA, USA, kcp58009@marymount.edu*

Abstract: Systemic workplace toxicity, characterized by psychological unsafety, covert sabotage, and destructive leadership, inflicts severe physiological and neurological harm on employees, transmitted through phenomena such as cortisol contagion. While extant organizational literature thoroughly examines top-down leadership failures, critical gaps remain regarding how targeted individuals navigate this trauma and achieve holistic recovery. Utilizing a phenomenological qualitative research design rooted in Braun and Clarke's six-phase reflexive thematic analysis, this article presents findings from a recent study of the lived experiences of Generation X women followers exposed to hostile organizational cultures. Integrating Padilla et al.'s Toxic Triangle theory with Social Exchange Theory, the findings reveal five central themes: covert workplace bullying, leadership cascades, the illusion of accountability, the toll of toxic attrition, and high-agency self-preservation through outsourced support. To address these systemic failures, this paper proposes an integrated recovery model operating within a biopsychosocial-spiritual matrix, synthesizing psychotherapy, somatic nervous system regulation, and spiritual practice, alongside organizational antidotes and future research directions that emphasize spiritual coping mechanisms in secular workspaces and longitudinal neuroimaging.

Keywords: Workplace Toxicity, Cortisol Contagion, Follower Agency, Biopsychosocial-Spiritual Recovery

Introduction

Systemic organizational toxicity, characterized by chronic incivility, psychological unsafety, gaslighting, and destructive leadership, presents a profound challenge to modern enterprise health. Prolonged exposure to these hostile environments exacts a severe physiological and neurological toll on human beings, locking the sympathetic nervous system into a permanent fight-or-flight response and triggering sustained hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis dysregulation (Beylin & Zawadzki, 2026). Through behavioral cues and mirror neuron loops, stress transmits from toxic leaders and environments to team members via a phenomenon known as cortisol contagion (Dorn et al., 2025). While existing literature has extensively examined the structural mechanics of destructive leadership, critical gaps remain regarding how individuals navigate this trauma and harness targeted recovery strategies. This scholarly article integrates recent qualitative findings on Generation X women followers with neurobiological research, exploring how psychotherapy, neurobiological recovery, and spiritual practice constitute a unified healing trajectory that restores both individual well-being and organizational health.

Problem Statement

Modern workplaces increasingly suffer from pervasive interpersonal hostility, covert bullying, and systemic institutional neglect (Sull et al., 2023). When organizations prioritize financial benchmarks and revenue targets over psychological safety, they create conducive environments that shelter destructive leaders and breach the implicit psychological contract between employer and employee (Graham & Kristal, 2022). For Generation X women followers, this dynamic manifests as covert sabotage, professional marginalization, and severe physiological distress. Despite the mounting human and economic costs of workplace toxicity, including burnout, turnover, and quiet quitting, institutions frequently abdicate accountability, leaving vulnerable employees to absorb the trauma (Rasool et al., 2021). This article further addresses the critical

need to understand how targeted individuals perceive these toxic cultures, how stress cascades through organizations, and what comprehensive recovery models are required to bridge the gap between individual survival and enterprise-level healing.

Study Overview and Findings

To investigate these dynamics, a phenomenological qualitative research design was employed to explore the lived experiences of Generation X women followers who encountered toxic work environments. Grounded in the philosophical frameworks of Husserl and Heidegger, the study utilized purposive sampling to conduct semi-structured interviews with 10 participants representing diverse geographic regions across the United States. Data analysis followed V. Braun and Clarke's six-phase reflexive thematic analysis framework (2006; 2013), using manual open coding and member checking to ensure trustworthiness and thematic saturation. The study's conceptual framework integrated Padilla et al.'s Toxic Triangle theory (2007), encompassing destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments, with Social Exchange Theory (SET) (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), to examine transactional relational breakdowns. Pervasive toxicity induces trauma responses with impairments that mirror clinically diagnostic Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) (Wisdom & Nabors, 2024). Abusive supervision and narcissistic leadership foster work environments characterized by chronic fear, exploitation, and a complete disregard for authentic organizational mission objectives (Padilla et al., 2007; Tepper, 2000; Zaghmout, 2024). This perceived inequity justifies followers' decisions to reciprocate with minimal effort, also known as quiet quitting, i.e., reducing extra-role behavior to match the perceived low value of the employer's reward (Akdemir & İnal, 2023; Bhatt et al., 2024). Recent studies have increasingly focused on understanding its antecedents, behaviors, and consequences, framing it as a significant leadership issue that adversely affects mental health, productivity, and organizational health (McKinsey & Company & LeanIn.Org, 2025; Wolor et al., 2022). While George (2023) focused specifically on information technology professionals, the study's insights and recommendations are broadly applicable to other sectors facing workplace toxicity. By employing rigorous evaluation methods to measure the impact of anti-toxicity interventions, George provided a valuable framework for future research on addressing issues such as bullying and passive-aggressive behavior across diverse industries.

The empirical findings revealed five central themes that capture the essence of workplace toxicity and follower coping mechanisms:

- **Covert Workplace Bullying and Sabotage:** Professional credibility, authority, and confidence are systematically eroded through subtle behavioral shifts, strategic exclusion from critical meetings, and moving performance targets.
- **Leadership Cascades and Systemic Scapegoating:** Destructive behaviors are transmitted top-down through executive gossip, blame-shifting, and political maneuvering, replacing collaboration with survival tactics.
- **The Illusion of Accountability:** Organizations rely on avoidance, performative crisis management, and the transfer of problem supervisors rather than holding high-performing toxic leaders accountable, rendering internal human resources channels ineffective.
- **The Toll of Toxic Attrition:** Prolonged exposure leads to a gradual physical, mental, and professional erosion, resulting in severe exhaustion, health complications, diminished passion, and clinical burnout.
- **Self-Preservation and Outsourced Support:** Abandoned by internal structures, participants exercised high-agency followership by outsourcing support through executive coaching, mental health therapists, prayer, and strategic disengagement or quiet quitting to restore equity.

When organizations breach the psychological contract of safety and fair treatment, employees restore equity by strategically withdrawing effort, a phenomenon known as "quiet quitting" (Afi, 2025; Akdemir & İnal, 2023). This is a protective defense mechanism designed to mitigate further systemic trauma (Maheshwari, 2026).

Human Capital and Financial Risks of Unmanaged Workplace Toxicity

Brain science offers an understanding and facilitates lasting change, which is crucial for recovering from and adapting after toxic experiences. It explains why people resist change and how new habits can be formed (Schwartz-Hebron, 2012). The core idea is that our experiences, habits, skills, and response patterns are encoded in neural networks. By intentionally creating new neural pathways to replace existing ones, individuals can change their default responses. When systemic workplace toxicity remains unaddressed, organizations suffer devastating, compounding losses spanning human capital erosion and severe balance-sheet liabilities. Far from being an abstract cultural nuance, toxic leadership and psychological unsafety generate quantifiable human and financial penalties.

Human Capital Degradation and Attrition

Toxic workplace cultures are a primary catalyst for profound psychological distress, with research indicating that toxic environments are ten times more predictive of employee turnover than compensation dissatisfaction. Prolonged exposure leads to clinical burnout, diminished organizational citizenship behaviors, and defensive disengagement ("quiet quitting"). Furthermore, data show that 80% of workers reported experiencing a toxic workplace culture that impacts their health, breaks down institutional trust, and drains organizational intellectual capital (Bregel, 2025; Sussell et al., 2025).

Massive Financial Drains

The financial damage of unmanaged toxicity manifests through staggering turnover costs, absenteeism, and lost productivity. Culture-driven turnover costs enterprises hundreds of billions of dollars annually, as organizations must repeatedly recruit, onboard, and train replacements for valuable staff driven out by abusive supervision. In addition, incremental unplanned absenteeism and stress-related healthcare utilization cost employers tens of billions annually, severely impacting the organizational bottom line (Backes et al., 2026).

The Multiplier Effect of Toxic Personnel

Research and specialized human capital assessments demonstrate that the presence of a single toxic employee or leader imposes "soft costs" that require multiple high-performing employees just to offset (Akinyele & Chen, 2025; Hogan, 2025). Avoiding or removing toxic actors yields a significantly higher return on investment than attempting to recruit superstar talent into a broken culture, underscoring that cultural hygiene is an imperative financial risk-management strategy. Recognize that withdrawing discretionary effort (quiet quitting) is a valid, calculated defense mechanism to protect remaining cognitive and emotional reserves from further systemic trauma (Afi, 2025). If the transaction costs of remaining in the toxic environment (e.g., physical illness, chronic stress) outweigh all potential rewards, the ultimate coping mechanism for self-preservation is a total exit from the firm (Topa et al., 2022).

Recommendations: The Biopsychosocial-Spiritual Matrix-An Integrated Recovery Model

Spiritual resilience serves as a foundational existential framework that helps a survivor process workplace trauma, protect their professional identity, and engage in meaning-making (Vveinhardt & Deikus, 2022). These practices are also known to promote neuroplasticity, which enhances cognitive flexibility and adaptability (Frisina, 2024). Workplace mobbing represents

a prolonged, systematic psychological assault characterized by repeated verbal and non-verbal aggression that destroys a victim's personal, social, and professional life, systematically pushing them into an intense power imbalance and a state of perceived powerlessness (Ilieva et al., 2024).

Clinical Counseling: Trauma Processing and Coping Strategies

Because prolonged exposure to a toxic workplace or abusive supervision causes severe subclinical trauma, victims frequently experience heightened work stress, emotional exhaustion, diminished self-esteem, depression, and anxiety that closely mirror post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (Graham et al., 2022). If internal reporting channels (such as Human Resources) are compromised or subservient to executive interests, survivors must bypass the organization to construct an external "scaffolding" of support through independent counselors, mentors, and therapists.

Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) helps survivors process this trauma by systematically targeting automatic, anxious thoughts, evaluating negative experiences objectively, correcting self-blame, and formulating adaptive coping strategies to rebuild self-efficacy (Hudays et al., 2022). To address acute, intrusive sensory memories of workplace trauma, Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR) is highly effective (Horst et al., 2017). EMDR uses dual-attention bilateral stimulation to target etiological traumatic memories, successfully desensitizing the traumatic distress and reducing post-treatment post-traumatic symptoms and anxiety more effectively than CBT in the immediate term (Khan et al., 2018).

Brain Science: Neuroplasticity and Conscious Rewiring

While counseling and spiritual practices provide cognitive and existential tools, brain science explains the physical mechanism of recovery through neuroplasticity, the brain's physical capacity to structurally reorganize its neural connectivity in response to training and experience (Miftari, 2025). Response patterns, stress reactions, and cognitive biases are physically encoded as specific neural pathways (Schwartz-Hebron, 2012). Every time a survivor reacts to a toxic trigger with fear, avoidance, or defensive silence, that electrical pathway is reinforced, hardwiring a self-reinforcing default loop. Furthermore, chronic stress overactivates the amygdala, causing heightened risk aversion and severely reducing optimal decision-making (Miftari, 2025). Quieting these physical stress responses also blocks the "contagion" of negative emotions, which can spread like contagious diseases through social interactions and compromise long-term mental health (Liu et al., 2025).

Clinical modalities such as Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) and Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR) may be effective for restructuring internalized self-blame, processing somatic stress memories, and dismantling cognitive distortions induced by chronic gaslighting (Horst et al., 2017). Concurrently, somatic interventions and nervous system regulation techniques help re-establish parasympathetic dominance, lower baseline cortisol levels, and mitigate HPA-axis dysregulation (Beylin & Zawadzki, 2026). Furthermore, spiritual practices, including prayer, meditation, sacred reflection, and faith community fellowship, provide existential anchoring, cognitive reframing, and a transcendent locus of control that decouples personal self-worth from toxic organizational evaluations—incorporating prayer and spiritual practices as proactive survival techniques to preserve psychological capital when institutional support is bankrupt (Vveinhardt & Deikus, 2022).

Organizational Healing and Antidotes

Enterprise-level recovery requires structural interventions designed to reverse cortisol contagion and eliminate the conducive environments that shelter abusive supervision (Graham & Kristal, 2022). Organizations must implement trauma-informed leadership training that

educates executives on emotional contagion, psychological safety, and the neurological costs of hostile management. Furthermore, enforcing strict behavioral boundaries, embedding psychological safety metrics into performance evaluations, and holding high-performing leaders accountable for cultural health will dismantle the profit-over-people paradigm and rebuild organizational trust. A central takeaway is that toxic leadership and conducive environments foster "subclinical trauma responses" mirroring Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) in women (Wisdom & Nabors, 2024). Recovery requires a multi-layered approach: clinical interventions such as Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR) and Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), combined with personal resilience strategies including prayer, faith-based practices, and art therapy (Burbach et al., 2024; Khan et al., 2018)

Future Research Directions

Future research directions must identify critical gaps in current literature regarding spiritual coping mechanisms in secular workplaces and longitudinal neuroimaging studies of survivors of toxic work cultures. While existing studies examine general burnout and turnover intentions, little empirical attention has been devoted to how employees navigate faith and spiritual practices within rigidly secular institutions, or how structural hostility alters neural pathways over time. Expanding inquiry into these domains will yield robust frameworks for holistic employee recovery and sustainable organizational design.

References

- Afi, M. (2025). Social exchange theory and employee withdrawal behaviors in modern enterprises. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Dynamics*, 14(2), 112–128.
- Akdemir, A., & İnal, K. (2023). Quiet quitting as a reaction to psychological contract breach. *Management Research Review*, 46(8), 1045–1062.
- Akinyele, A. I., & Chen, Z. (2025). Dark clouds of leadership: Causes and consequences of toxic leadership. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 55(4), 476–503. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.2024.2442185>
- Backes, J., Mueller, S. I., Geissler, A., & Ehlig, D. (2026). Occupational health interventions' impact on absenteeism and economic returns: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 52(2), 79–97. <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.4265>
- Beylin, N. R., & Zawadzki, M. J. (2026). Recalibrating stress regulation through mindfulness: A framework for adapting interventions for ACE-affected populations. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 17, 1801095. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1801095>
- Bhatt, N., Sharma, R., & Gupta, S. (2024). Exploring the antecedents of quiet quitting: A social exchange perspective. *Personnel Review*, 53(4), 889–907.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. SAGE.
- Bregel, S. (2025, October 10). 80% of employees say their workplace is toxic. *Fast Company*. <https://www.fastcompany.com/91418555/80-percent-of-employees-say-their-workplace-is-toxic>
- Burbach, L., Brémault-Phillips, S., Nijdam, M. J., McFarlane, A., & Vermetten, E. (2024). Treatment of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder: A State-of-the-art Review. *Current Neuropsychopharmacology*, 22(4), 557–635. <https://doi.org/10.2174/1570159X21666230428091433>
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874–900.
- Dorn, T., Auer, A., Walther, L.-M., Sauter, C., Bandle, E., & Wirtz, P. H. (2026). Stress protection by your group – increasing group size reduces physiological stress contagion. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 186, 107747. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2026.107747>
- Frisina, M. E. (2024). Best behaviors: Leveraging neuroscience to enhance leadership skills. *Frontiers of Health Services Management*, 41(2), 4–12. <https://doi.org/10.1097/HAP.0000000000000205>
- George, A. S. (2023). Toxicity in the workplace: The silent killer of careers and lives. *Partners Universal International Innovation Journal*, 1(2), 1–21. <https://zenodo.org/records/7852087>
- Graham, K. A., Yoo, G., & Kristal, E. K. (2022). The psychology of abusive supervision. *Oxford Research Encyclopedias, Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190236557.013.816>

- Hogan Assessments. (2024, May 14). *The cost of a toxic workplace and toxic employees*. <https://www.hoganassessments.com/blog/cost-of-toxic-workplace-toxic-employees/>
- Horst, F., Den Oudsten, B., Zijlstra, W., de Jongh, A., Lobbestael, J., & De Vries, J. (2017). Cognitive Behavioral Therapy vs. Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing for Treating Panic Disorder: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1409. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01409>
- Hudays, A., Gallagher, R., Hazazi, A., Arishi, A., & Bahari, G. (2022). Eye movement desensitization and reprocessing versus cognitive behavior therapy for treating post-traumatic stress disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(24), 16836. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192416836>
- Ilieva, J., Stoilkovska, A., & Todosovski, A. (2024). Enhancing workplace environment by addressing mobbing: Impacts on motivation and productivity. *UTMS Journal of Economics*, 15(1), 54–63.
- Khan, A. M., Dar, S., Ahmed, R., Bachu, R., Adnan, M., & Kotapati, V. P. (2018). Cognitive behavioral therapy versus eye movement desensitization and reprocessing in patients with post-traumatic stress disorder: Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *Cureus*, 10(9), e3250. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.3250>
- Liu, H., Zhang, D., Zhu, Y., Ma, H., & Xiao, H. (2025). Emotions spread like contagious diseases. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1493512. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1493512>
- McKinsey & Company & LeanIn.Org. (2025). *Women in the workplace 2025*. McKinsey & Company.
- Miftari, F. (2025). Neuro-Management and strategic decision-making: Integrating neuroscience in to organizational leadership and consumer behavior. *UTMS Journal of Economics*, 16(2), 189–195.
- Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 176–194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.001>
- Rasool, S. F., Wang, M., Tang, M., Saeed, A., & Iqbal, J. (2021). How toxic workplace environment effects the employee engagement: The mediating role of organizational support and employee wellbeing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(5), Article 2294. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18052294>
- Schwartz-Hebron, R. (2012). Using neuroscience to effect change in the workplace. *Employment Relations Today*, 39(2), 11–15. <https://doi-org.marymountuniv.idm.oclc.org/10.1002/ert.21360>
- Sull, D., Sull, C., Cipolli, W., & Brighenti, C. (2022, March 16). Why every leader needs to worry about toxic culture. *MIT Sloan Management Review*. <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/why-every-leader-needs-to-worry-about-toxic-culture/>
- Sussell, A. L., Yeoman, K., Nixon, C. T., Scott, K. A., Robinson, T. S., & Poplin, G. S. (2025). US workers’ self-reported mental health outcomes by industry and occupation. *JAMA Network Open*, 8(6), e2514212. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2025.14212>
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178–190. <https://doi.org/10.5465/1556375>
- Topa, G., Aranda-Carmena, M., & De-Maria, B. (2022). Psychological contract breach and outcomes: A systematic review of reviews. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(23), 15527. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192315527>
- Vveinhardt, J., & Deikus, M. (2022). The New Testament and workplace mobbing: structuring of victims’ experiences. *Religions*, 13(11), 1022. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13111022>
- Wisdom, J. P., & Nabors, N. (2024). Women’s traumatic experiences of leadership: Case studies and hypothesized mechanisms. *Psychology of Leaders and Leadership*, 27(2), 268–287. <https://doi.org/10.1037/mgr0000156>
- Wolor, C. W., Ardiansyah, A., Rofaida, R., Nurkhin, A., & Rababah, M. A. (2022). Impact of toxic leadership on employee performance. *Health Psychology Research*, 10(4), Article 57551. <https://doi.org/10.52965/001c.57551>
- Zaghmout, A. (2024). The toxic triangle framework in modern organizational settings: A comprehensive review. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 45(1), 34–50.