

An Assessment Of Abusive Supervision On Employees' Productivity In Nigerian Private Universities

Omoyele , Olufemi Samuel

Department of Business Administration & Marketing
Redeemer's University, Ede Osun State
omoyeleo@run.edu.ng
+2348035634973

Akanbi, Paul Ayobami

Department of Business Administration
Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo
paulayobami2013@gmail.com
+234803481365

pp 330-339

ABSTRACT

Supervision is essential for organizational growth as it helps in controlling the activities of employees in an organization. However, in some cases supervisors become abusive as a result of some personal factors, environmental factor, or even employees factors. When such happens, it affects the employee-supervisor relationship which could affect the job satisfaction, leads to turnover intention among other factors. This study therefore assessed the impact of abusive supervision on employees' productivity in Nigerian private universities. The sample size of 301 was selected by means of online survey from lecturers from Caleb University and PAN- Atlantic University Lagos, Nigeria. Three research questions and hypotheses were formulated to guide the study. A self-developed questionnaire was selected for data collection. Data collected was analysed using regression analysis, mean and standard deviations. The result indicated that abusive supervisor greatly affect labour productivity and lead to poor management of employee. Based on the result the study concluded that abusive supervision is closely associated with many negative psychological outcomes such as helplessness, decreased self-efficacy, poor management, and low labour productivity. On the basis of these findings, the study recommended that organization should employ qualified and experienced supervisors to oversee the activities of the employees, among others.

Keywords: Abusive supervision, labour productivity, proper management

Introduction

Organizations are increasingly becoming concerned about the impact of negative or destructive leadership on workers (Cortina et al., 2017). In Mullen, Fiset and Rheume (2018), two forms of destructive leadership which affects employees were mentioned; supervisor workplace incivility and abusive supervision. Tepper (2000, 178) defined abusive supervision as subordinates' perceptions of the extent to which their supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviours, excluding physical contact. As observed by Hershcovis et al. (2017) maltreatment from supervisors' which often arises as a result of power tussle or differences has a significant negative effect than those from colleagues, as the control of resources are in the hands of supervisors, which could also be used to influence any outcome.

The role of the supervisor is an important one as they are charged with directing, evaluating and coaching employees. However, where there are supervisors who are supportive and motivate subordinates to achieve their goals; there are others who treat their subordinates in a humiliating and derisive manner, otherwise, abusive. In effect, employees with the perception of abuse from their supervisors tend to engage in counterproductive work behaviours aimed at both the supervisor and the organization (Mullen et al, 2018).

Gonzalez-Morales, Kernan, Becker and Eisenberger (2012) described abusive supervision to be the extent to which subordinates are conscious of their supervisor's involvement and display of hostile behaviours both verbal and nonverbal, exclusive of physical contact. Ssemugenyi, Amboka and Kazibwe (2019) revealed that abusive supervision impacts negatively on employees in terms of their behaviours, attitudes and psychological health. To this end, there exists a negative relationship between abusive supervision and organizational commitment, as it pressures subordinates into obedience and leads to counterproductive attributes (Ssemugenyi, et al., 2019).

A lot of organizations are presently facing the issue of abusive supervision in varying degree and its negative impact on the physical and psychological wellbeing of the victims and people around them (Carlson, Ferguson, Hunter, & Whitten, 2012). Ssemugenyi, Amboka and Kazibwe (2019) reported the possibility of subordinate's hostility towards a supervisor as the factor impelling supervisors to exhibit abusive acts towards poor performing subordinates. The study however disputed this observation, as it pointed out that some supervisors abuse subordinates as they deem it to be the best model to apply and practise regardless of their education, orientation, and work philosophy. In view of the impact of abusive supervision on employees' productivity, it is important to examine the antecedents of abusive supervision and its

impacts, so as to proffer measures to minimize its occurrence in Nigerian private universities.

Statement of research problem

Abusive supervision is associated with negative behaviours which are not physical but tend to have a long-term insidious effect. A physical abuse by a supervisor to an employee can immediately be reported and dealt with; unlike abusive supervision, such as a silent treatment or rude behaviour which is less likely to be reported, thus making it to be an unaddressed issue at the workplace. Thus, abusive supervision often continues unaddressed at the workplace. Another factor responsible for the problem of abusive supervision is status and power differences between a supervisor and a subordinate (Tepper, 2000); as supervisors tend to yield to the temptation to display power over subordinates by minimizing their control over work processes and the work environment (Kenneth, Kent & Ranida, 2013). Also, given that supervisors control subordinates roles, assignments and rewards, they have the means to pick and channel abuse on employees or groups. On the other hand, reporting an abusive supervision might pose some risk for the employee or victim; as the status of the supervisor may make the report unbelievable and bring untold problems to the person, who may also be at the risk of losing the job. Based on this, they are subjected to a long term effect of abusive supervision and other effects such as stress, low productivity, and workplace deviance (Kenneth, et al, 2013).

Wood (2018) observed that the victims of abusive supervision tend to emulate such behaviour and display same towards their colleagues. To this end, it becomes apparent that abusive supervision damages employees' productivity as well as businesses, thus rendering them ineffective. Despite being necessary, supervision is often a misunderstood function that can have huge consequences on the productivity of employees.

Objectives of the study

1. To ascertain the factors that lead to abusive supervision in Nigerian private universities
2. To determine the impact of abusive supervision on labour in Nigerian private universities
3. To determine the extent to which abusive supervision affects proper management of employees in Nigerian private universities

Research questions

1. What are the factors that lead to abusive supervision in Nigerian private universities?
2. What is the impact of abusive supervision on labour in Nigerian private universities?
3. To what extent does abusive supervision affects proper management of employees in Nigerian private universities?

Theoretical/Literature Review

Every business organization, including institutions is structured in such a way that some are superior/leaders while others are subordinates. These two parties work together in ensuring that the objectives of the organizations are achieved. In other words, both parties complement each other, while one gives directives, the other carries out the role. As a result, supervision is essential for the growth of every business organizations. It supports growth, united teams, gives room for excellent performance, enhances accountability, helps in verifying potentials, instils independence through delegating responsibilities, reinforce relationships and adequate communication, and ensure proper evaluation of individual contributions towards achieving organizational goals (Hershcovis et al., 2017). However, most time, some supervisors abuse their roles as leaders which have damaging and destructive effects to the organization (Cortina et al., 2017; Schyns and Schilling, 2013). As a result, the present study focuses on the effect of abusive supervision on employees' productivity.

Abusive supervision is defined as the extent to which subordinates are conscious of their supervisor's involvement and display of hostile behaviours both verbal and nonverbal, exclusive of physical contact (Gonzalez-Morales, Kernan, Becker & Eisenberger, 2012). Ssemugenyi, Amboka and Kazibwe (2019) revealed that abusive supervision impacts negatively on employees in terms of their behaviours, attitudes and psychological health.

Abusive supervision leads to emotional abuse (Lee et al., 2018; Mitchell, Vogel & Folger, 2015) as the subordinate will be suppress as a result of the fear of retrenchment. Even though, humans are not easily suppressed, however, the fear of losing their source of incomes compiled them into accepting abusive treatment such as public humiliation, harassment, criticism, even to a point of taking the blamed meant for the supervisors or superiors.

Although subordinates are willing to accept abuses and suppression from their supervisors, they also have a way of expressing their dissatisfaction in the form of turnover, poor productivity, among others. This explains why abusive supervision leads to negative productivity. According to Lee et al., (2018); Hershcovis et al., (2017) and Samantha (2016) abusive supervisor leads to negative impact on labour productivity given the psychology stress it imposes on the mind of the employees/subordinates.

Without doubt, abusive supervision has negative impacts on employee's productivity as it could lead to both physical and emotional damage. Subordinate are faced with helplessness, decreased self-efficacy, poor management, and low labour productivity (Colquitt, Long, Rodell & Halvorsen-Ganepola, 2015; Elovainio, Heponiemi, Jokela, Hakulinen, Pesseau, Aalto, & Kivimäki, 2015; Farh & Chen, 2014; Lian, Brown, Ferris, Liang, Keeping, & Morrison, 2014; Lian, Ferris, Morrison, & Brown,

2014; Ferris, Spence, Brown & Heller, 2012). Thus, good leadership and supervision is inevitable for sustainability, growth and productivity of organization.

The reasons why supervisors are abusive varied and are attributed to different factors ranging from malicious supervisor, environmental factors as well as individual factors. Previous studies have attempted to identify predictors of abusive supervision, especially, at the employee level. Kedharnath (2014) identified followers' attribution styles as major influence on their perceptions of abusive supervision. Martinko, Harvey, Sikora, and Douglas (2011) blamed subordinates' hostile attribution styles such as attributing their poor performance on their supervisors' rigidity or hostile intentions. Tepper (2007) pointed out that employees who show negative affectivity are more easily victimized. Felps, Mitchell, and Byington (2006) blamed abusive supervision to the interaction of several organization-level and individual-level factors, as opposed to resulting only from isolated acts of aggression performed by malicious supervisors.

This study is built from the premise of leaders' implicit followership theories (LIFTs) which is built on similar principles as implicit leadership theories, but with a different emphasis. According to the theory, just like employees have prototypes about leaders, so also are the leaders who also have prototypes about followers. These prototypes, according to Kedharnath (2014), are believed to operate in many of the same ways that leader prototypes operate in ILTs. Sy (2010) identified six LIFTs dimensions to include: Industry, Enthusiasm, Good Citizen, Conformity, Insubordination, and Incompetence. Among these dimensions, Industry, Enthusiasm and Good Citizen are considered as prototypical or positive LIFTs, whereas Conformity, Insubordination, and Incompetence are classified as follower anti-prototypical or negative LIFTs (Kedharnath, 2014).

Whiteley, Johnson and Sy (2012) study revealed that the positive expectations (LIFTs) have positive impact on the quality of the relationship between leaders and followers, which in turn positively influences follower job performance. Leaders' positive LIFTs also influence followers' perceptions of leaders' charisma, which then influences follower performance (Kedharnath, 2014). Leaders' negative LIFTs, when combined with leaders' negative affect, negatively relate to follower perceptions of leaders' charisma (Johnson, Sy, & Kedharnath, in Kedharnath, 2014). Positive LIFTs and leader and follower wellbeing are positively related, as well as positive LIFTs and leader' and followers' liking for each other (Kruse, 2010).

Deducing from the above premise, it is clear that abusive supervision is not only cause by the characteristics of the supervisor, but also the followers/subordinates attributes, as well as the

characteristics of the organization. Regardless of what causes abusive supervision, the literature so far had revealed that it has negative implication of employees' job performance.

Hypotheses

H01: There is no significant impact of abusive supervision on labour in Nigerian private universities

H02: Abusive supervision does not significantly affect proper management of employees in Nigerian private universities

Research Methodology

Given the current school lockdown, an online survey was conducted targeting lectures from Caleb University, and PAN-Atlantic University, Lagos, Nigeria. The questionnaire was distributed using online survey software (Qualtrics) and broadcast through social media. The questionnaire was self-developed to cover the research questions and objectives formulated to guide the study. Though self-developed, the researcher also adapted some items from the standardized Abusive Supervision Scale developed by Tapper (2000). Three hundred and one (301) respondents filled the questionnaire. Being distributed online, it is difficult to ascertain if all the respondents were from the target population. Regression analysis was adopted in testing the hypothesis whereas mean and standard deviations were used to analyse the data descriptively.

Data Analysis and Result

Demographic data

The study focused solely on the staff of the selected institution under study. As presented in Table 1 below, both male (53.2%) and female (46.8%) staff participated in the study with diverse age group and educational qualifications, with the highest being those with Master degree holders (63.5%)

Table 1: Demographic data of the respondents

| Demographics | Perimeter | Staff (n=301) | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------------|------------|
| | | Freq | Percentage |
| Gender | Male | 160 | 53.2 |
| | Female | 141 | 46.8 |
| Age | 18-30 years | 37 | 12.2 |
| | 31-40 years | 154 | 51.2 |
| | 41-50 years | 102 | 33.9 |
| | 51 years and above | 8 | 2.7 |
| Highest educational qualification | B.Sc/ B.A./BEd/H ND or Equivalent | 79 | 26.2 |
| | Master's Degree | 191 | 63.5 |
| | PhD | 24 | 8.0 |
| | Others | 7 | 2.3 |

Online survey (2020)

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 below presents information on the diverse factors that lead to abusive supervision in Nigerian private university. As indicated on the table, the average mean of 4.09 and standard deviation of 0.89 indicates that all the variables are the various reasons leading to abusive supervision. When supervisor feels that a particular employees is a threat to their position, they are bound to be host to such employees (mean=3.86;stdev=0.79), maybe with the aim of frustrating the employee to leave on their own accord. The Table also revealed that some employees have provocative behaviour (mean=3.84;stdev=0.99) which naturally attracts hatred. Also, workload/pressure (mean=4.43;stdev=0.92) could make supervisor abusive toward the employee. Other factors identified in this study include fatigue, transfer of aggression, or when pressured to cope with demand on self-resources.

Table 2: Factors that lead to abusive supervision in Nigerian private universities

| Variables | Mean* | Stdev |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| Threats to leaders' identity, threat of power and control | 3.86 | 0.79 |
| Provocative subordinate behavior | 3.84 | 0.99 |
| Workload/pressure to perform | 4.43 | 0.92 |
| Coping with demands on self-resources | 4.57 | 0.73 |
| Fatigue | 3.77 | 0.83 |
| Displaced aggression | 3.73 | 1.17 |
| Overall Means and standard deviation | 4.09 | 0.89 |

* 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3=Undecided 4= agree, 5= strongly agree

Source: Research Data computation (2020)

Table 3 below shows the impact of abusive supervision on labour productivity in Nigeria private universities. As indicated in the Table, abusive supervision could lead to workplace deviance (mean=3.64; stdev=0.63); negative work attitude(mean=3.50; stdev=0.55); turnover intention (mean=3.56;stdev=0.59), and psychological stress(mean=3.50; stdev=0.47).

Table 3: The impact of abusive supervision on labour productivity in Nigerian private universities

| Variables | Mean* | Stdev. |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| Workplace deviance | 3.64 | 0.63 |
| negative work attitudes | 3.50 | 0.47 |
| Turnover intentions | 3.56 | 0.59 |
| Psychological stress | 3.50 | 0.47 |
| Overall Means and standard deviation | 3.55 | 0.56 |

* 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= agree, 4= strongly agree

Source: Research Data computation (2020)

Table 4 below presents the extent to which abusive supervision affect proper management of employees in Nigerian private universities. As indicated in the Table. Abusive supervision increases turnover intention, instil fears of negative evaluation, destructive and public criticism and could stress employees and damages their affective liking for their jobs.

Table 4: The extent to which abusive supervision affects proper management of employees in Nigerian private universities

| Variables | Mean* | Stdev |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| Abusive supervision increases turnover intentions | 4.77 | 0.97 |
| Fear of negative evaluation from supervisors' influences subordinates to work effectively | 4.03 | 0.98 |
| Destructive and public criticism reduces the subordinates' sense of belonging and leas to depression | 4.19 | 0.63 |
| Abusive supervision stresses employees and damages their affective liking for their jobs. | 4.21 | 0.79 |
| Overall Means and standard deviation | 4.30 | 0.84 |

* 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= Undecided, 4=agree, 5= strongly agree

Source: Research Data computation (2020)

Table 5 below presents the various and diverse ways of which supervisor abuses their employees. These include ridiculing them, treating them as if there were stupid, giving them silent treatment, humiliating them in front of their colleagues, invading their privacies, constantly reminding them of their past mistakes and failures, not giving them credits for their jobs or good efforts, among others.

Table 5: Abusive supervision measurement

| Variables | Mean* | Stdev |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| My boss ridicules me | 4.00 | 0.87 |
| My boss tells me my thoughts or feelings are stupid | 4.16 | 0.75 |
| My boss gives me the silent treatment | 4.15 | 0.72 |
| My boss puts me down in front of others | 3.51 | 1.21 |
| My boss invades my privacy | 3.89 | 0.90 |
| My boss reminds me of my past mistakes and failures | 4.02 | 0.91 |
| My boss doesn't give me credits for jobs requiring a lot of effort | 3.88 | 1.04 |
| My boss blames me to save himself/herself embarrassment | 2.86 | 1.01 |
| My boss breaks promises he/she makes | 4.25 | 0.86 |
| My boss expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason | 2.77 | 1.14 |
| My boss makes negative comments about me to others | 3.51 | 1.21 |
| My boss is rude to me | 3.89 | 0.90 |
| My boss does not allow me interact with coworkers | 4.02 | 0.91 |
| My boss tells me I am incompetent | 3.88 | 1.04 |
| My boss lies to me | 4.16 | 0.75 |
| | 3.79 | 0.94 |

* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

Source: Research Data computation (2020)

Note:

- 1- I cannot remember him/her ever using this behaviour with me
- 2- he/she seldom uses this behaviour with me
- 3- he/she occasionally uses this behaviour with me
- 4- he/she uses this behaviour moderately with me
- 5- he/she uses this behaviour very often with me

Test of hypotheses

H01: There is no significant impact of abusive supervision on labour in Nigerian private universities

Table 6: Regression analysis of the impact of abusive supervision on labour

| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob. |
|-------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|----------|
| C | 3.010 | 2.25685 | 1.451 | 0.148 |
| FLAS | 0.467 | 0.76342 | 2.989 | 0.001 |
| IASOL | -0.364 | 0.74836 | 5.441 | 0.000 |
| EASAPME | -0.119 | 0.93229 | 1.771 | 0.001 |
| AS | -0.118 | 1.29468 | 1.771 | 0.032 |
| R-squared | 0.151 | Mean dependent Var | | 12.99346 |
| Adjusted R-Squared | 0.301 | SD. dependent Var | | 3.098167 |
| TSE of Regression | 47.32 | Akaike info criterion | | 4.997962 |
| Sum of Square residual | 136.7 | Schwarz Criterion | | 5.116803 |
| Log-likelihood | -376.3 | Hannan-Quinn criterion | | 0.00010 |
| F-statistics | 8.849 | Durbin-Watson Stat | | 2.16401 |
| Prob(F-Statistic) | 0.001 | | | |

Source: Researcher's computation (2020)

$$\text{Labour Productivity} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \text{FLAS} + \alpha_2 \text{IASOL} + \alpha_3 \text{EASAPME} + \alpha_4 \text{AS} + \epsilon \dots \dots \dots \text{model 1}$$

Where:

C = Constant

FLAS = factors that lead to abusive supervision in Nigerian private universities

IASOL= the impact of abusive supervision on labour in Nigerian private universities

EASAPME =the extent to which abusive supervision affect proper management of employees in Nigerian private universities

AS= Measures of Abusive supervision

$$\text{LabourProductivity} = 3.010 + 0.467\text{FLAS} - 0.364\text{IASOL} - 0.119\text{EASAPME} - 0.118\text{AS} + \epsilon$$

Probability value is the most efficient test of significance, according to Imeokparia (2014). If probability value is greater than 0.05(p>0.05), then it is insignificant. The decision is to reject H1 and accept H0. Conversely if probability value is less than 0.05 (p<0.05), this shows that it is significant. The decision is to reject H0 and accept H1. From the result aboveprobability is 0.000 which is less than 0.05. This shows that abusive supervision has significant impact on labour; however, the impact is negative.

H02: Abusive supervision does not significantly affect proper management of employees in Nigerian private universities

Table : Regression analysis of the effect of abusive supervision on proper management of employees in Nigerian private universities

| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob. |
|----------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------|
| C | 3.010 | 2.25685 | 1.451 | 0.148 |
| FLAS | 0.467 | 0.76342 | 2.989 | 0.001 |
| IASOL | -0.364 | 0.74836 | 5.441 | 0.000 |
| EASAPME | -0.119 | 0.93229 | 1.771 | 0.001 |
| AS | -0.118 | 1.29468 | 1.771 | 0.032 |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------|------------------------|----------|
| R-squared | 0.176 | Mean dependent Var | 0.720 |
| Adjusted R-Squared | 0.353 | SD. dependent Var | 3.098167 |
| TSE of Regression | 47.324 | Akaike info criterion | 4.997962 |
| Sum of Square residual | 136.77 | Schwarz Criterion | 5.116803 |
| Log-likelihood | -376.34 | Hannan-Quinn criterion | 0.00010 |
| F-statistics | 42.040 | Durbin-Watson Stat | 2.16401 |
| Prob(F-Statistic) | 0.000 | | |

Source: Researcher's computation (2020)

$$\text{Proper management of employee } \varepsilon \dots \text{model 2} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \text{FLAS} + \alpha_2 \text{IASOL} + \alpha_3 \text{EASAPME} + \alpha_4 \text{AS} +$$

Where:

C=Constant

FLAS = factors that lead to abusive supervision in Nigerian private universities

IASOL= the impact of abusive supervision on labour in Nigerian private universities

EASAPME =the extent to which abusive supervision affect proper management of employees in Nigerian private universities

AS= Measures of Abusive supervision

$$\text{Proper management of employees} = 3.010 + 0.467\text{FLAS} - 0.364\text{IASOL} - 0.119\text{EASAPME} - 0.118\text{AS} + \varepsilon$$

From the result of this study, we reject H0. This implies that abusive supervision has significant impact on proper management of employees in Nigerian private universities. However, the impact is negative.

Discussion and conclusion

Both hypotheses in this study revealed that abusive supervision leads to negative labour productivity as well as poor management. The goal of supervision is to enhance labour productivity. However, following the system of favouritism which is common among Nigerian institutions, especially private sectors, most entrepreneurs employed individuals who are not even qualify to work in an institution to become a supervisor. Such action has negative implications on labour productivity. Chika and Chijioke (2013) and Agwu (2014) are of the view that incapable and unqualified supervisors are often frustrated for lack of knowledge of what is right or wrong , and as a result, they uses force to achieve compliance. This sometimes results in abusive supervision. Poor supervision therefore imposes threats to the overall labour productivity. They might succeed in making employees work beyond their limits, but there is no guarantee that such employees will deliver quality jobs. Consequently, Frimpong et al. (2011) blamed poor planning and inadequate tools, equipment, or materials to which has negative impact on

productivity. Thus, abusive supervision plays significant role in influencing employees' behaviour which in return has implications on labour productivity. Abusive supervisor does not only affect the productivity but also their emotional (Martinko et al., 2013), physical (Cortina et al., 2017) and safety at workplace (Lee et al., 2018; Mackey et al., 2017) which have psychological effect on the employees and as such affects their productivity (Hershcovis et al., 2017). Emotional abuse is considered the work cruellest abuse as it result to unnecessary the fear for possible retrenchment, harassment, public humiliation, criticism and helplessness. It is difficult to work to meet the satisfaction of a brutalize supervisor as they often scrutinize the work performed by subordinates as a way of justifying their actions. The result of this study supports that of earlier studies by researchers such as Lee et al., (2018); Hershcovis et al., (2017) and Samantha (2016) respectively, who also revealed that abusive supervisor greatly affect labour productivity because it results in psychology stress. This is so because abusive supervision is humiliating and ridicules subordinates in front of others which affect the state of mine of such employees. Based on the result from this study, one could conclude that abusive supervision is closely associated with many negative psychological outcomes such as helplessness, decreased self-efficacy, poor management, and low labour productivity. Thus, good leadership and supervision is inevitable for sustainability, growth and productivity of organization.

On the basis of these findings that the present study recommends that organization should employ experienced and well trained leaders to oversee the activities of the employees and not to employ supervisor based on personal relationship with the individual have with the organization.

The study also recommends constant training and professional development for leaders/supervisors to help eliminate all negative attributes which may affect their roles in the organization.

References

- Colquitt, J. A., Long, D. M., Rodell, J. B., & Halvorsen-Ganepola, M. D. K. (2015). Adding the "in" to justice: A qualitative and quantitative investigation of the differential effects of justice rule adherence and violation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 278–297
- Cortina, L.M., Kabat-Farr, D., Magley, V.J. & Nelson, K. (2017), "Researching rudeness: the past, present, and future of the science of incivility", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22 (3), pp. 299-313,
- Elovainio, M., Heponiemi, T., Jokela, M., Hakulinen, C., Pesseau, J., Aalto, A.-M., & Kivimäki, M. (2015). Stressful work environment and wellbeing: What comes first? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20, 289–300.
- Farh, C. I. C., & Chen, Z. (2014). Beyond the individual victim: Multilevel consequences of abusive supervision in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99, 1074–1095.
- Felps, W., Mitchell, R., & Byington, E. (2006). How, when, and why bad apples spoil the barrel: Negative group members and dysfunctional groups. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 27, 175-222.
- Ferris, D. L., Spence, J. R., Brown, D. J., & Heller, D. (2012). Interpersonal injustice and workplace deviance: The role of esteem threat. *Journal of Management*, 38, 1788–1811.
- Herscovis, M.S., Ogunfowora, B., Reich, T. & Christie, A. (2017). Targeted workplace incivility: the roles of belongingness, embarrassment, and power, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 38, (7), pp. 1057-1075,
- Lee, J., Huang, Y., Cheung, J.H., Chen, Z. & Shaw, W.S. (2018). A systematic review of the safety climate intervention literature: past trends and future directions, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, doi: 10.1037/ocp0000113.
- Lian, H., Brown, D. J., Ferris, D. L., Liang, L. H., Keeping, L. M., & Morrison, R. J. (2014). Abusive supervision and retaliation: A self-control framework. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57, 116–139.
- Lian, H., Ferris, D. L., Morrison, R., & Brown, D. J. (2014). Blame it on the supervisor or the subordinate? Reciprocal relations between abusive supervision and organizational deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99, 651–664.
- Mackey, J.D., Frieder, R.E., Brees, J.R. & Martinko, M.J. (2017). Abusive supervision: a meta-analysis and empirical review, *Journal of Management*, 43 (6), 1940-1965
- Martinko, M., Harvey, P., Brees, J., & Mackey, J. (2013). A review of abusive supervision research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34, 120-137.
- Martinko, M., Harvey, P., Sikora, D., & Douglas, S. (2011). Perceptions of abusive supervision: The role of subordinates' attribution styles. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 751-764.
- Martinko, M.J., Harvey, P., Brees, J.R. & Mackey, J.D. (2013). A review of abusive supervision research, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 34 (1), 120-137
- Mitchell, M. S., Vogel, R. M., & Folger, R. (2015). Third parties' reactions to the abusive supervision of coworkers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 1040–1055.
- Mullen, J., Fiset, J., & Rhéaume, A. (2018). Destructive forms of leadership: The effects of abusive supervision and incivility on employee health and safety. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-06-2018-0203>
- Samantha, K. (2016). Abusive supervision in the workplace: An examination of current research and a proposal for preventive measures. *University Honors Theses. Paper 303*. <https://doi.org/10.15760/honors.248>
- Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 138–158.
- Sy, T. (2010). What Do You Think of Followers? Examining the Content, Structure, and Consequences of Implicit Followership Theories. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*.
- Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33, 261–289
- Whiteley, P. (2010, August). Positive Perceptions of Followers as Ingredients for the Pygmalion Effect in Managerial Settings. Symposium presented at the Annual Academy of Management Conference, Montreal, Canada.
- Whiteley, P., Sy, T., & Johnson, S. (2012). Leaders' conceptions of followers: Implications for naturally occurring Pygmalion effects. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 822-834

Questionnaire assessing the impact of abusive supervision on employees' productivity in Nigerian private Universities**Dear Respondent,**

I am carrying out a study on “the impact of abusive supervision on employees' productivity in Nigerian private Universities”, and you have been chosen to be part of the study. This questionnaire is only for academic purpose; it will not be used for any other purpose not otherwise stated. Kindly select the response which applies to you. All information will be kept confidential

SECTION A

Please tick () where appropriate

1. Gender: Female () Male ()

2. Age group: 18-30 () 31-40 () 41-50 () 50 and above ()

3. Highest Educational Qualification: SSCE/GCE () OND/ND () B.SC. () M.SC/MBA () PHD () Others ()

SECTION B:

Instructions: Please tick (✓) as appropriate where

Key: Strongly agree (4), Agree (3), Disagree (2), and strongly disagree (1).

| S/N | ITEMS | SA | A | D | SD |
|------------|---|----|---|---|----|
| RQ1 | The factors that lead to abusive supervision in Nigerian private universities | | | | |
| 1 | Threats to leaders' identity, threat of power and control | | | | |
| 2 | Provocative subordinate behaviour | | | | |
| 3 | Workload/pressure to perform | | | | |
| 4 | Coping with demands on self-resources | | | | |
| 5 | Fatigue | | | | |
| 6 | Displaced aggression | | | | |
| RQ2 | What is the impact of abusive supervision on labour in Nigerian private universities | | | | |
| 7 | Workplace deviance | | | | |
| 8 | negative work attitudes | | | | |
| 9 | Turnover intentions | | | | |
| 10 | Psychological stress | | | | |
| RQ3 | To what extent does abusive supervision affect proper management of employees in Nigerian private universities | | | | |
| 11 | Abusive supervision increases turnover intentions | | | | |
| 12 | Fear of negative evaluation from supervisors' influences subordinates to work effectively | | | | |
| 13 | Destructive and public criticism reduces the subordinates' sense of belonging and leads to depression | | | | |
| 14 | Abusive supervision stresses employees and damages their affective liking for their jobs. | | | | |

Section C; Abusive supervision measurement (Tepper, 2000)

Instructions: Please tick (✓) as appropriate where

Key:

1- I cannot remember him/her ever using this behaviour with me

2- he/she seldom uses this behaviour with me

3- he/she occasionally uses this behaviour with me

4- he/she uses this behaviour moderately with me

5- he/she uses this behaviour very often with me

| S/N | ITEMS | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | My boss ridicules me | | | | | |
| 2 | My boss tells me my thoughts or feelings are stupid | | | | | |
| 3 | My boss gives me the silent treatment | | | | | |
| 4 | My boss puts me down in front of others | | | | | |
| 5 | My boss invades my privacy | | | | | |
| 6 | My boss reminds me of my past mistakes and failures | | | | | |
| 7 | My boss doesn't give me credits for jobs requiring a lot of effort | | | | | |
| 8 | My boss blames me to save himself/herself embarrassment | | | | | |
| 9 | My boss breaks promises he/she makes | | | | | |
| 10 | My boss expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason | | | | | |
| 11 | My boss makes negative comments about me to others | | | | | |
| 12 | My boss is rude to me | | | | | |
| 13 | My boss does not allow me interact with coworkers | | | | | |
| 14 | My boss tells me I am incompetent | | | | | |
| 15 | My boss lies to me | | | | | |