

## ABUSIVE SUPERVISION: DIMENSIONS & SCALE

M. Muzammil Ghayas and Dr. Rubina Jabeen

### ABSTRACT

*This study aims to explore dimensions of abusive supervision and to develop a scale for measuring abusive supervision dimensions. Qualitative and quantitative data were collected from Karachi, Istanbul and Dubai at different points in time. The final sample comprised of 103 and 506 respondents from Karachi for qualitative and quantitative data respectively, 447 respondents from Istanbul and 480 respondents from Dubai. Summative Content Analysis, Exploratory Factor Analysis, Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Multiple Regression analyses were used as analyses techniques. Results suggested that abusive supervision is a multi-dimensional construct. The scale was also developed and validated in all three geographical locations. Furthermore, dimensions of abusive supervision were found to be positively associated with turnover intentions.*

**Keywords:** *Abusive Supervision, Credit Stealing, Belittling Behavior, Yelling and Scapegoating.*

### INTRODUCTION

Violent and Abusive behaviours are products of psychological issues. These behaviours have often been the topic of discussion for the psychologists. A growing number of organizations are now facing the challenge of abusive supervision. Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler and Ensley (2004) stated that each year, almost 10 to 16 per cent of the entire workforce in the United States face abusive supervision regularly. On the other hand, Namie and Namie (2000) found that 89% of the respondents, who have reported to be experiencing the workplace bullying, consider their leaders/supervisors to be the main perpetrator of bullying. Similarly, Rayner, Hoel, and Cooper (2002) suggested that in 50% of all the workplace bullying cases in Norway, the supervisor is alleged to be the main perpetrator of bullying. Furthermore, this percentage climbs to 80% in the United Kingdom (Reyner et al. 2002). Hence, Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf and Cooper (2005) claimed that the nature of bullying systems seems to have remained constant.

This abusive supervision, as stated by Tepper, Duffy, Henle, & Lambert (2006), may result in an annual organizational cost of almost US\$ 23.8

billion. This makes abusive supervision an important topic of organizational psychology. Hence, the topic of abusive supervision has been able to gain the attention of researchers (e.g. Peng, Schaubroeck, Chong, & Li, 2019; Caesens, Nguyen, & Stinglhamber, 2019; Tepper, 2000). However, a vast majority of the researchers have studied abusive supervision as a one-dimensional construct (e.g. Caesens, et al., 2019; Tepper, 2000). However, Tepper (2007) asserted that there is a need to study the dimensionality of abusive supervision. In this regard, the study of Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) loaded the items into two dimensions namely passive-aggressive abusive behaviour and the active-aggressive abusive behaviour. However, the study of Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) does not differentiate between different types of active-aggressive abusive behaviour and passive-aggressive abusive behaviour. This makes the dimensionality of abusive supervision relatively under-studied phenomenon. Hence, Martinko, Harvey, Brees and Mackey (2013) suggested that the study of Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) was the only published work on the topic of the dimensionality of abusive supervision; hence, there exists a need to study the dimensionality of abusive supervision. Although, it's been years since Martinko et al., (2013) reinforced the view of Tepper (2007) that dimensions of abusive supervision be studied, however, this topic has remained under-researched to this date and per the best of researcher's knowledge, the study of Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) is the only published work on the topic of dimensionality of abusive supervision. Hence, to fill this gap, the present research study seeks to study the dimensions of abusive supervision. Hence, by opening the new horizons of the topic of abusive supervision, this research significantly contributes to developing a greater understanding of organizational psychology.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Theoretical Background**

This study is based on leader-member exchange (LMX) theory. Graen (1995) suggested that leader-member exchange (LMX) theory is a relationship-based approach to leadership that focuses on the two-way relationship between leaders and their followers. Hence, basic idea of this theory is that there exists a relationship among the leaders and followers and quality of the relationship among the leaders and followers influences the work outcomes of subordinates (Deluga, 1998). However, these relations may get affected when supervisors are involved in abusive

supervision and the subordinates may develop negative attitude towards supervisors.

### **Abusive Supervision**

Tepper (2000) defined abusive supervision as the “display of hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviours, excluding physical contact”. Using derogatory names, silent treatment, and humiliating an employee in front of other employees are the behaviours that can be categorized as the abusive supervision (Keashly, 1998; Zellars, Tepper & Duffy, 2002).

### **Dimensions of Abusive Supervision**

Researchers (Tepper, 2000; Zellars et al., 2002; Al-Hawari, Bani-Melhem & Quratulain, 2019; Peng, et al., 2019; Caesens, et al., 2019) have studied abusive supervision as a one-dimensional construct. However, the study of Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) is the only published study that seeks to investigate abusive supervision as a multi-dimensional construct (Martinko, Harvey, Brees & Mackey, 2013). Hence, the dimensionality of abusive supervision is under-researched.

Tepper (2007) evaluated non-physical supervisory hostility constructs to find similarities of these constructs with abusive supervision on a four-point criterion to clarify how these constructs overlap and differ from abusive supervision. However, the criteria of Tepper (2007) seek to enquire into the constructs in their entirety. Hence, this approach either suggests that the construct overlaps with the concept of abusive supervision in its entirety or it rejects the construct in its entirety. However, when it suggests that the construct differs from abusive supervision, it may have been the case that this rejection is made on the basis that one or two dimensions of construct do not fit into the criteria as suggested by Tepper (2007). In other words, there is a possibility that a construct does not fit into the criteria although one or two dimensions overlaps the concept of abusive supervision and can be used as the dimension of abusive supervision. Hence, this study does not seek to enquire into the constructs in their entirety but rather seek to enquire into the dimensions of these constructs.

However, applying criteria suggested by Tepper (2007) on dimensions of similar constructs rather than applying on constructs in their entirety makes the third criterion (i.e. whether the construct’s content domain captures non-hostile behaviour) of Tepper (2007) redundant because the first criterion (i.e. whether the construct focuses exclusively on hostility

perpetrated by supervisors against specific subordinate targets) has already included the term hostility. However, this criterion talks about the exclusivity on hostility perpetrated by supervisors against specific subordinate targets. In other words, criterion one and three talks about different things but there is a need to re-arrange the criteria to avoid confusion. Hence, this study contextualized and rearranged the criteria suggested by Tepper (2007) which is given as: (a) whether the construct's content (or the part of the construct) domain captures non-hostile behaviour, (b) whether the construct (or the part of the construct) focuses exclusively on hostility perpetrated by supervisors against specific subordinate targets, (c) whether the construct (or the part of the construct) definition excludes other forms of hostility (e.g., physical and sexual), and (d) the role that intention plays in the conceptual definition of the construct (or the part of the construct). It should be noted that this study assumes that the inability of a construct to meet one criterion provides sufficient enough reason to stop evaluating it on the subsequent criteria.

**Ashforth's Petty Tyranny, Yelling and Belittling Behavior** Ashforth's (1987, 1994) model of petty tyranny is quite similar to the construct of abusive supervision. Petty tyranny is defined as the oppressive, capricious and vindicates the use of power by a superior. Ashforth (1994) envision that petty tyranny consists of six sub-dimensions, namely arbitrariness and self-aggrandizement, belittling subordinates, lack of consideration, forcing style of conflict resolution, discouraging initiative, and non-contingent punishment. However, the majority of dimensions of the petty tyranny captures the behaviours that cannot be considered as hostile (Tepper, 2007). Hence, it is a distinct concept than that of abusive supervision. However, this study differs from the study of Tepper (2007) in a manner that this study of Tepper (2007) seeks to enquire into the similar constructs in their entirety, whereas, this research study seeks to enquire into the dimensions of these constructs, therefore, this study evaluates each dimension of petty tyranny on a four-point criterion used in the study.

Tepper (2007) stated that lack of consideration and discouraging initiative dimensions of petty tyranny construct does not necessarily constitute hostility; therefore, we excluded these dimensions from the analyses and evaluated the rest of the dimensions on the four-point criteria.

Another dimension that Ashfort (1994) suggested being the dimension of petty tyranny is the Arbitrariness and self—aggrandizement. Use of

authority for personal gain, playing favourites among the sub-ordinates and administering the policies of organization unfairly is the typical example of this dimension (Ashforth, 1994). This dimension can also not be considered as the dimension of abusive supervision because although it includes playing favourites among the subordinates and administering policies unfairly, it does not necessarily mean that it constitutes abuse. For instance, a supervisor may promote the interests of someone else without being hostile to you.

Ashforth (1994) proposed that “forcing style of conflict resolution” where the leader forces followers to accept his point of view is a form of petty tyranny as well. This can be instrumental in making employees feel un-empowered. This can also not be considered as a dimension of abusive supervision because although forcing style of conflict resolution can be instrumental in making employees feel un-empowered and feeling of being empowered has a positive association with the positive work outcomes such as employee engagement (Saleem, Iqbal, Sandhu & Amin, 2018), however, provision of such an authority is not the prerogative of an employee. Hence all these dimensions of petty tyranny fail to meet the requirements of the criterion.

Per Ashforth (1994), another dimension of petty tyranny construct is non-contingent punishment. The term non-contingent punishment can be explained as the provision of arbitrary punishment by a supervisor to a subordinate (Thau, Aquino & Bommer, 2008). Hence, this sort of punishment is different from contingent punishment which is perceived by a subordinate to be related to performance (Thau, et al. 2008). Hence, it is the punishment which is perceived by the employees as unjust (Ashforth, 1994). Therefore, Thau, et al., (2008) suggested that this overlaps with the concept of abusive supervision. Although non-contingent punishment is undoubtedly a hostility but punishment is a broader term and cannot fit into the dimensionality of abusive supervision as there can be several types of punishments for instance pay deductions or yelling at a subordinate. In this regard, it is argued that deducting salary of employees unfairly is not possible for supervisors as these matters are governed by policies. However, expressing anger on a subordinate when subordinate has not done anything can be categorized as a form of non-contingent punishment (Thau, et al., 2008). This can be categorized as yelling, which overlaps with the concept of interpersonal injustice which has been proposed by Colquitt (2001) to be the fourth dimension of

organizational justice construct. Yelling is certainly a form of hostility because it is the inherent right of the employees that they are treated with dignity and respect. Furthermore, the term yelling has been used by previous researchers (Keashly, 1998) while defining abusive supervision. Although, this sort of hostility cannot only be attributed to the supervisors, however, this is often done by hierarchical supervisory agents as well, because when hierarchical supervisory agents are involved in the abuse, employees are often left with no choice but to remain silent (Tepper, 2000). Therefore, it is concluded that supervisors are the main perpetrators of this sort of abuse. Furthermore, it can be argued that although sometimes physical violence is also accompanied by yelling, however, yelling it-self does not constitute physical hostility. The last point of the criteria suggests that hostility is perpetrated intentionally by the supervisor. Yelling is essentially an act of hostility that is perpetrated intentionally because it is an active form of aggression. Hence, yelling is included in this study as a contender for being part of the construct of abusive supervision.

The term belittling behavior can be defined as the way of making something or someone seems less important. Ashforth (1994) suggests that criticizing subordinate in front of others and embarrassing subordinates are examples of belittling behaviour. Since belittling behaviour involves making someone seem less important, therefore, this can be categorized as hostility. Furthermore, although others such as colleagues etc. can also be involved in this sort of abuse, however, supervisors are main perpetrators of this hostility because when supervisors are involved in this sort of abuse, employees are left with no choice but to remain silent (Tepper, 2000). Moreover, it does not include physical violence. Furthermore, since belittling involves making someone seems less important, therefore, it is an active form of aggression and thus an act of intentional hostility. Hence, it is concluded that belittling behaviour is a strong contender for being part of the construct of abusive supervision as it meets the requirements of the four-point criteria.

**Need for Achievement and Credit Stealing** Jackson (1974) defined the need for achievement in terms of maintaining high standards and aspiring to accomplish difficult tasks. Fulfilment of this need provides the employees with the opportunity to gain recognition. Per the two factor theory of Herzberg et al. (1959), recognition is one of the motivators. However, neither the recognition of one's efforts especially in the form of

appreciation can be characterized as generosity towards a sub-ordinate nor its absence can be characterized as abuse. It is because a sub-ordinate may have done something extra-ordinary that may have earned him recognition or the supervisor may not have thought that he has done anything worthy of earning him recognition. Hence, recognizing one's efforts or credit giving behaviour are broader concepts and do not fit in the concept of abusive supervision. However, Keashly, et al., (1994) used the term credit stealing while defining abusive supervision.

In this regard, one may suggest that the concept of credit stealing fits in the criterion because the matter of subjective judgment that if the employee has done something extra-ordinary or not is resolved in case of credit stealing, as no one would have thought or would have been able to steal the credit of anything if an employee has not done anything extraordinary. The second criterion suggests that the abuse has to be directed towards a subordinate by a supervisor. Arguably, this is often done by hierarchical supervisory agents because it is not easy for others to do so because the employees may resist this. However, when supervisors are involved in this sort of abuse, employees are left with no choice but to remain silent (Tepper, 2000). Furthermore, though it is an immoral act done by the supervisor, however, this does not include any sort of physical contact. The last point of the criteria suggests that one needs to ascertain that this hostility is perpetrated intentionally by the supervisor. Arguably, credit stealing is an active act and thus cannot be considered as an unintentional act. Hence, credit stealing is included in this study as a contender for being part of the construct of abusive supervision.

**Scapegoating** Girad (1989) suggested that the term scapegoating is used in the biblical stories that involve the ritual transfer of evil to a live goat and it is because of this particular reason that the process of scapegoating is named so. Hence, scapegoating involves shifting the blame from oneself to someone else. This makes the concept of scapegoating seems to be similar to the concept of abusive supervision. The first criterion suggests that it be established as the hostility. Since scapegoating involves shifting blame to a person who is not responsible for the failure and this may result in negative consequences for him or her, therefore, it constitutes hostility. The second criterion suggests that it has to be established that this hostility is perpetuated by the supervisor. In this regard, it can be argued that it is very difficult for the colleagues to be involved in this sort of hostility because the employee may resist efforts

of scapegoating. However, when supervisors are involved in the abuse, employees are left with no choice but to remain silent (Tepper, 2000). Hence, supervisors are the main perpetrators of this sort of abuse. The third criterion suggests that it should not include other forms of hostility such as physical contact. Although, scapegoating involves shifting of the blame of a failure from a person to another and constitutes hostility, however, this shift of blame itself does not contain the element of physical violence. The last point of the criteria suggests that one needs to ascertain that this hostility is perpetrated intentionally by the supervisor. In this regard, one may argue that scapegoating is an act of hostility that is perpetrated intentionally because it is an active form of aggression in which a person who is to be blamed for the failure tries to shift the blame on another. Hence, scapegoating is included in the study as a contender for being part of the construct of abusive supervision.

**Turnover Intentions** Since this study seeks to explore the dimensions of abusive supervision, hence, seeking to find the association of dimensions of abusive supervision with its consequences is beyond the scope of this research. However, for testing the concurrent and predictive validity, there exists a need to have the instrument tested against a construct that is well established to be having an association with abusive supervision. Lyu, Ji, Zheng, Yu, & Fan, (2019) suggested that abusive supervision has a positive association with the turnover intention. This view of Xu et al., (2018) reinforces the view of other researchers (Xu et al., 2018; Khan, Qureshi, & Ahmad, 2010) that abusive supervision significantly predicts the turnover intentions. Therefore, for testing concurrent and predictive validity, we propose the following hypothesis:

*H1: Dimensions of Abusive Supervision have a significant relationship with Turnover Intentions.*

## METHODOLOGY

This is a multi-stage study is divided into two stages. The first stage of the study is concerned about exploring dimensions of abusive supervision, whereas, the second stage is concerned about developing and validating the scale for measuring dimensions of abusive supervision.

### **Exploring the dimensions through qualitative analysis**

The first stage of the research seeks to inquire into dimensions of abusive supervision by enquiring into qualitative data gathered through



open-ended questionnaires. Cresswell (2008) suggested that studying 5 to 25 cases are enough to infer about a phenomenon. On the other hand, Glaser and Strauss (1967) suggested that the point of diminishing return to be used as the saturation point. In other words, Glaser and Strauss (1967) suggested that sample size be considered acceptable when the data started to repeat itself. Hence, for the qualitative data, the data were collected from 103 employees of the IT sector who have been working with the same supervisor for at least 6 months. This is done so because this is well above the suggestion of Cresswell (2008). Furthermore, while analyzing the content of the data, it was also found that the data had already started to repeat itself after 19 observations.

### **Scale Development**

Clark and Watson (1995) argued that reviewing the relevant literature is important in the process of scale development as it helps the researcher to see how other researchers have approached the same problem; which in turn is helpful in clearly articulating the construct. The scale developed by Tepper (2000) is a widely used scale to measure abusive supervision. This scale measures abusive supervision using 15 items and nearly all the researchers have used the same scale for measuring abusive supervision. Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) loaded the same scale on two factors namely active-aggressive abusive behaviour and the passive-aggressive abusive behavior. However, researchers (e.g. Shoss, Eisenberger, Restubog, and Zagenczyk, 2013 and Tepper et al., 2009) have also used a shortened version of the scale. Hence, Tepper's (2000) scale is the most important scale that is needed to be reviewed while developing any scale for measuring the dimensions of abusive supervision. This is evident from the fact that Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) used the same scale while trying to explore the dimensionality of abusive supervision and loaded the abusive supervision scale of Tepper (2000) on two dimensions namely active-aggressive abusive behaviour and the passive-aggressive abusive behaviour. However, these factors were highly correlated and have included seemingly unrelated items in the same factor. For instance, two seemingly unrelated items "Doesn't give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of effort" and "Blames me to save himself/herself embarrassment" were loaded in the same factor. Although, both the items were pointing towards the abusive supervisory behaviours, however, these two items were talking about different types of abuses namely credit stealing and scapegoating. This certainly raises the question that as to why the study of Mitchell and

Abrose (2007) fails to explore the dimensions that seem to be the dimensions of the abusive supervision if one evaluates the scale of Tepper (2000). In this regard, Clark and Watson (1995) argued that failure to add sufficient breadth of a content area may result in the under-representation of the content area in the final scale. Hence, there exists a need to evaluate the content breadth of each of the content area on the scale.

Therefore, abusive supervision scale of Tepper (2000) was carefully analysed. In this regard, 16 industry experts were asked to evaluate the items and place the items in the proposed dimensions of abusive supervision. The experts pinioned that 10 items in the abusive supervision scale were representing the content related to the proposed dimensions of abusive supervision. Experts believed that five items in the scale were representing the belittling behaviour (there was a consensus on 4 items and 2 thought that the item “makes negative comments about me to others” can be used to measure yelling dimension) and three items were covering the content definition of the yelling (14 experts believed that the item “makes negative comments about me to others” should be used to measure the belittling behaviour dimension of abusive supervision whereas two thought that it should be used to measure yelling, hence, it was decided that this should be used to measure belittling behaviour). However, experts suggested that scapegoating and credit stealing were under-represented in abusive supervision scale of Tepper (2000) as only one item of the scale could be used to measure each of the dimensions. Since Clark and Watson (1995) suggested that presence of only one or two items of the content area reduces the chances of content being represented in the final scale and there is a need to write more items about the content. Therefore, it was decided to add more items to the scale so that the yelling, scapegoating and the credit stealing dimensions be represented adequately in the scale. Hence, a total of 15 more items were presented to 16 industry experts and were asked to come up with one item for yelling and three items for scapegoating and credit stealing each. Hence, a total of seven items were added in the original 15 items scale of abusive supervision developed by Tepper (2000). Once, these seven items have added the experts were then asked again to categorize the items in the extended scale in the four categories. Whereas, the remaining 5 items of the scale were eliminated from the study as 13 out of 16 experts thought that these items will be useless in exploring any of the new dimension. Hence, there were 17 items in all on the scale. On the other hand, the turnover intention was measured using a separate three-

item scale developed by Cummann, Fichman, Jenkis and Klesh (1979). The scale is a popular measure and has been used by numerous researchers (such as Shah, Khattak, Zolin, & Shah, 2019; Hwang and Kuo, 2006; Elçi et al, 2012) for measuring the turnover intention. The respondents were requested to rate their opinion for each question on a 5-point Likert scale varying from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

### **Data Collection and Analyses Techniques for the Second Stage of Study**

In the second stage of the study, the data were collected from three different geographical locations namely Karachi, Dubai and Istanbul. For each of the geographical location, data were collected at three different points in time. There was a difference of two months between time one and time two and a difference of one month between time two and time three. Hence, there was a difference of three months between time one and time three. At time one, data were collected from 537 employees of the IT Sector of Karachi who has been working with the same manager for at least 6 months. Out of these 537 employees, 16 left their job and the supervisors of 8 respondents were changed between time one and time three. Furthermore, there were 7 such employees whose supervisors left the job between time one and time three. Hence, these 31 responses were considered as invalid due to the discontinued relationship between supervisor and subordinate. Hence, there were 506 valid responses from Karachi. On the other hand, at time 1, data were collected from 502 such employees of the IT Sector of Istanbul who has been working with the same supervisor for at least 6 months, out of these 501 respondents, 25 left their job and the supervisors of 22 respondents were changed between time one and time three. Furthermore, there were 8 such employees whose supervisors left the job between time one and time three. Hence, there were 447 valid responses from Istanbul. In Dubai, at time 1, the data were collected from 501 such employees of the IT Sector who have been working with the same supervisor for at least 6 months, out of these 501 respondents, 13 left their job and the supervisors of 65 respondents were changed between time one and time three. Furthermore, there were 2 such employees whose supervisors left the job between time one and time three. Hence, there were 480 valid responses from Dubai. At time one, data were collected using two separate instruments, one of the instrument was used to measure the dimensions of abusive supervision, whereas the other included the turnover intentions related items. At the time two data were collected again from the same respondents using the instrument that was

previously used to measure dimensions of abusive supervision. At time three, data were again collected from the instrument that was previously used to measure the turnover intention related items. This was done for measuring predictive validity. The need to study collect the data at time three is because at a time two data of abusive supervision was collected again so if the turnover intention related data were collected at time two again, it would have caused the common method bias.

In the second stage of the research, principal component analysis with varimax rotation was used to test explore the underlying dimensions of abusive supervision, whereas, confirmatory factor analysis was used to confirm underlying dimensions of abusive supervision and established convergent and discriminant validities of the instrument. The correlation between the responses to a particular item at time one and the responses to that item at time two was performed to measure the test-retest reliability of the instrument. Moreover, Multiple Regression Analyses were also applied for testing the concurrent and the predictive validities of the instrument.

## RESULTS

### Results of Summative Content Analysis

The first stage of the study used summative content analysis. Below are the results of summative content analysis:

Table 1. Summative Content Analysis Results

	Little (Belittling Behaviour)	Scapegoat (Scapegoating)	Scream/Yell/Shout (Yelling)	Credit (Credit Stealing)	Total
Direct Word Count	10	17	81	98	206
Euphemistic Word Count	69	87	48	19	223
Total Frequency	79	104	129	117	429

The above table presents the direct word frequency, euphemistic word (i.e. indirect reference) frequency and the total frequency of appearance of each of the themes. Data were collected from 103 employees working in the IT sector. After carefully analysing the responses, four major themes namely Belittling Behaviour, Scapegoating, Yelling and Credit Stealing were identified. Results of the summative content analysis suggested that in all 103 respondents collectively used direct or euphemistic words or phrases that talk about the belittling behaviour 79 times, scapegoating 104 times, yelling 129 times and the credit stealing 117 times. Further analysis suggests that the 103 respondents used direct words that were associated

with these four dimensions 206 times and the euphemistic words or phrases 229 times. Hence, these 103 respondents used 429 such words or phrases that talk about these four behaviours that can be considered as abusive supervision dimensions.

### Exploratory Factor Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis was used to explore the underlying facets of abusive supervision. In this study, three separate exploratory factor analyses were applied to the data collected from three separate geographical locations.

The KMO value for the EFA applied on the data collected from the respondents in Karachi was 0.83, the chi-square approximation of Bartlett's test was 5517.22 with sig value 0.00 which are considered satisfactory for running factor analysis.

Table 2. Rotated Component Matrix Karachi Data

Items	1	2	3	4
My supervisor doesn't give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of efforts			0.853	
My supervisor takes credit for the tasks I do			0.844	
I don't expect my supervisor will let me take credit of anything			0.886	
My supervisor never takes credit for the tasks I do ®			0.894	
My supervisor tells me that my thoughts and feelings are stupid	0.842			
My supervisor reminds me of my past mistakes and failures	0.868			
My supervisor makes negative comments about me to others	0.888			
My supervisor tells me I'm incompetent	0.889			
My supervisor is rude to me				0.936
My supervisor ridicules me				0.941
My supervisor expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason				0.912
My supervisor blames me to save himself/herself embarrassment	0.927			
My supervisor often blames me for his/her mistakes	0.944			
Whenever my supervisor is in trouble, he/she shifts the blame on me	0.921			
My supervisor does not blame me for his/her mistakes ®	0.918			

The above table suggests that there was a total of dimensions of abusive supervision namely credit Stealing (CS), Belittling Behaviour (BLB), Yelling (Y) and Scapegoating (SG). All these items have factor loading of above 0.7 which indicates that these items truly represent the factors.

On the other hand, the KMO value for the EFA applied on the data collected from the respondents in Istanbul was 0.82, the chi-square

approximation of Bartlett's test was 4571.91 with sig value 0.00 which are considered satisfactory for running factor analysis.

Table 3. Rotated Component Matrix Istanbul Data

Items	1	2	3	4
My supervisor doesn't give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of efforts			0.845	
My supervisor takes credit for the tasks I do			0.835	
I don't expect my supervisor will let me take credit of anything			0.881	
My supervisor never takes credit for the tasks I do ®			0.884	
My supervisor tells me that my thoughts and feelings are stupid		0.837		
My supervisor reminds me of my past mistakes and failures		0.862		
My supervisor makes negative comments about me to others		0.886		
My supervisor tells me I'm incompetent		0.885		
My supervisor is rude to me				0.930
My supervisor ridicules me				0.936
My supervisor expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason				0.891
My supervisor blames me to save himself/herself embarrassment	0.921			
My supervisor often blames me for his/her mistakes	0.942			
Whenever my supervisor is in trouble, he/she shifts the blame on me	0.919			
My supervisor does not blame me for his/her mistakes ®	0.897			

The results obtained from the above table points to the fact that abusive supervision has the same four dimensions that were explored during the analysis of the data collected from Karachi.

Last but not the least, the KMO value for the EFA applied on the data collected from the respondents in Dubai was 0.818, the chi-square approximation of Bartlett's test was 4757.052 with sig value 0.000 which are considered satisfactory for running factor analysis.

Table 4. Rotated Component Matrix Dubai Data

Items	1	2	3	4
My supervisor doesn't give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of efforts			0.896	
My supervisor takes credit for the tasks I do			0.937	
I don't expect my supervisor will let me take credit of anything			0.913	
My supervisor never takes credit for the tasks I do ®			0.892	
My supervisor tells me that my thoughts and feelings are stupid		0.842		
My supervisor reminds me of my past mistakes and failures		0.868		
My supervisor makes negative comments about me to others		0.876		
My supervisor tells me I'm incompetent		0.886		
My supervisor is rude to me				0.913

My supervisor ridicules me	0.931
My supervisor expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason	0.890
My supervisor blames me to save himself/herself embarrassment	0.856
My supervisor often blames me for his/her mistakes	0.837
Whenever my supervisor is in trouble, he/she shifts the blame on me	0.885
My supervisor does not blame me for his/her mistakes ®	0.889

The results obtained from the above table points to the fact that abusive supervision has the same four dimensions that were explored during the analysis of the data collected from Karachi and Istanbul. Hence, the results obtained from the exploratory factor analysis are robust.

### Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Three separate Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was employed on data collected from Karachi, Istanbul and Dubai. The CMIN/df value for the data collected from Karachi was 0.66 GFI was 0.98, AGFI was 0.98, NFI was 0.99, CFI was 1.00 and RMSEA was 0.00. On the other hand, the CMIN/df value for the data collected from Istanbul was 0.76 GFI was 0.98, AGFI was 0.97, NFI was 0.98, CFI was 1.00 and RMSEA was 0.00.

Lastly, the CMIN/df value for the data collected from Dubai was 0.93 GFI was 0.97, AGFI was 0.97, NFI was 0.98, CFI was 1.00 and RMSEA was 0.00. Therefore, it is concluded that all the three CFA models were statistically fit, whereas, the standardized factor loadings that were obtained through CFA are present in Table 5.

Table 5. CFA Standardized Factor Loadings (SFL)

Standardized Factor Loadings (SFL)	Karachi	Istanbul	Dubai
CS1	0.785	0.772	0.848
CS2	0.770	0.757	0.937
CS3	0.858	0.853	0.885
CS4	0.876	0.862	0.843
BLB1	0.779	0.775	0.782
BLB2	0.816	0.808	0.818
BLB3	0.860	0.856	0.840
BLB4	0.855	0.849	0.849
Y1	0.914	0.905	0.868
Y2	0.927	0.925	0.927
Y3	0.845	0.809	0.811
SG1	0.901	0.895	0.785
SG2	0.939	0.937	0.753
SG3	0.889	0.890	0.862
SG4	0.884	0.848	0.876

Since the standardized factor loadings (SFL) of all the items are greater than 0.7, therefore, these items are confirmed.

**Reliability**

Cronbach alpha was used to test the internal reliability of the instrument, whereas, composite reliability is calculated through the formula presented by Fornell and Larcker (1981).

Table 6. Reliability

Variables	Number of Items	Karachi		Istanbul		Dubai	
		Composite Reliability	Cronbach alpha	Composite Reliability	Cronbach alpha	Composite Reliability	Cronbach alpha
CS	4	0.894	0.893	0.886	0.885	0.931	0.931
BLB	4	0.897	0.896	0.893	0.892	0.893	0.892
Y	3	0.924	0.923	0.912	0.910	0.903	0.902
SG	4	0.947	0.946	0.940	0.939	0.891	0.891

The above table shows Cronbach alpha and composite reliability for the variables explored through EFA and confirmed through CFA. Nunnally (1967) suggested that Cronbach alpha value for construct should be greater than 0.7. On the other hand, Fornell and Larker (1981) suggested that the composite reliability or construct should be 0.7. Since the values of both Cronbach alpha and composite reliability for all variables are greater than 0.7, therefore, the data is reliable.

Furthermore, the test-retest reliability provides the researcher with the method of measuring the stability or reliability of the instrument over the period. For this study, the test-retest reliability was measured by analyzing the correlation between the responses to a particular item on time one with the responses to that particular item on time two. Table 7 presents the results of the correlation between the same items at different points in time.

Table 7. Convergent Validity

Variables	Karachi		Istanbul		Dubai		Status
	AVE	CR	AVE	CR	AVE	CR	
CS	0.678	0.894	0.660	0.886	0.773	0.931	Valid
BLB	0.686	0.897	0.677	0.893	0.677	0.893	Valid
Y	0.803	0.924	0.776	0.912	0.757	0.903	Valid
SG	0.816	0.947	0.798	0.940	0.673	0.891	Valid

Since the correlation between each of the item at time one with the response to that item at time two is high and significant, therefore, test-retest reliability is also established. Furthermore, since the results of the three data sets are quite similar and are reliable, therefore, this points towards the robustness of the developed instrument.



## Validity

For convergent validity, the AVE and Composite Reliability were calculated using the formula of Fornell and Larker (1981).

Table 8. Test Retest Reliability

Correlation	Karachi	Istanbul	Dubai
CS1(T1)-CS1(T2)	0.974**	0.957**	0.895**
CS2(T1)-CS2(T2)	0.975**	0.953**	0.965**
CS3(T1)-CS3(T2)	0.974**	0.962**	0.962**
CS4(T1)-CS4(T2)	0.978**	0.965**	0.937**
BLB1(T1)-BLB1(T2)	0.961**	0.952**	0.939**
BLB2(T1)-BLB2(T2)	0.967**	0.960**	0.920**
BLB3(T1)-BLB3(T2)	0.975**	0.967**	0.950**
BLB4(T1)-BLB4(T2)	0.976**	0.962**	0.961**
Y1(T1)-Y1(T2)	0.960**	0.948**	0.921**
Y2(T1)-Y2(T2)	0.965**	0.967**	0.952**
Y3(T1)-Y3(T2)	0.966**	0.935**	0.936**
SG1(T1)-SG1(T2)	0.959**	0.939**	0.947**
SG2(T1)-SG2(T2)	0.966**	0.973**	0.946**
SG3(T1)-SG3(T2)	0.976**	0.963**	0.955**
SG4(T1)-SG4(T2)	0.971**	0.943**	0.973**

Note: \*\* represents correlation is significant at 0.01 level

Table 8 indicates the convergent validity of the instrument. Fornell and Larker (1981) suggested that for proving the convergent validity, AVE should be greater than 0.5 and the Composite Reliability should be greater than AVE. Since, both the conditions are met, therefore, in terms of convergent validity, there is no issue.

Furthermore, for discriminant validity, Kline (2005) suggested that correlation of the variable and other latent variables should be less than AVE for that variable. Table 9, 10 and 11 present the analyses of discriminant analysis for Karachi, Istanbul and Dubai data respectively.

Table 9. Discriminant Validity for Karachi Data

Discriminant Validity for Karachi Data				
Construct Items	CS	BLB	Y	SG
CS	<b>0.678*</b>			
BLB	0.069	<b>0.686*</b>		
Y	0.093	0.081	<b>0.803*</b>	
SG	0.011	0.093	0.011	<b>0.816*</b>

Note: \* represents AVE value as the criteria

Table 10. Discriminant Validity for Istanbul Data

Discriminant Validity for Istanbul Data				
Construct Items	CS	BLB	Y	SG
CS	<b>0.660*</b>			
BLB	0.078	<b>0.677*</b>		
Y	0.065	0.104	<b>0.776*</b>	
SG	0.014	0.072	0.042	<b>0.798*</b>

Note: \* represents AVE value as the criteria

Table 11. Discriminant Validity for Dubai Data

Discriminant Validity for Dubai Data				
Construct Items	CS	BLB	Y	SG
CS	<b>0.773*</b>			
BLB	0.073	<b>0.677*</b>		
Y	0.037	0.110	<b>0.757*</b>	
SG	0.006	0.073	0.114	<b>0.673*</b>

Note: \* represents AVE value as the criteria

Since AVE values of studied variables are greater than the correlations; therefore, there is no issue of discriminant validity (Kline, 2005).

Concurrent validity is a type of criterion validity that seeks to provide evidence that the scale is good enough to predict the other related outcomes. This is a little different from the predictive validity because the predictive validity seeks to collect the data for the predictors and the criterion on two different points in time (McIntire & Miller, 2005). However, in the concurrent validity, the data for both the predictors and the criterion are collected at the same time.

Therefore, for measuring the concurrent validity, data collected for dimensions of abusive supervision at time one were regressed against the data collected for turnover intentions at time one.

Table 12. Regression Analyses for Concurrent Validity

	Karachi		Istanbul		Dubai	
	B	p-value	B	p-value	B	p-value
CS	0.424	0.000	0.413	0.000	0.222	0.000
BLB	0.153	0.000	0.150	0.000	0.152	0.000
Y	0.085	0.026	0.086	0.034	0.085	0.029
SG	0.222	0.000	0.239	0.000	0.436	0.000
	Adjusted R Square = 0.277		Adjusted R Square = 0.282		Adjusted R Square = 0.287	
	F-Statistics = 49.426		F-Statistics = 43.348		F-Statistics = 49.211	
	sig-value = 0.000		sig-value = 0.000		sig-value = 0.000	

Table 12, suggests that all the dimensions of abusive supervision at the three locations significantly predicts turnover intentions. Hence, concurrent validity is established for the instrument.

On the other hand, for establishing the predictive validity, the data collected for dimensions of abusive supervision at time one were regressed against the data collected for turnover intentions at time three.

Table 13. Regression Analyses for Predictive Validity

	Karachi		Istanbul		Dubai	
	$\beta$	p-value	B	p-value	B	p-value
CS	0.424	0.000	0.431	0.000	0.213	0.000
BLB	0.165	0.000	0.160	0.000	0.169	0.000
Y	0.078	0.042	0.087	0.032	0.082	0.037
SG	0.221	0.000	0.228	0.000	0.427	0.000
	Adjusted R Square = 0.281		Adjusted R Square = 0.290		Adjusted R Square = 0.281	
	F-Statistics = 50.223		F-Statistics = 46.582		F-Statistics = 47.777	
	sig-value = 0.000		sig-value = 0.000		sig-value = 0.000	

Table 13, suggests that all the dimensions of abusive supervision at the three locations significantly predict turnover intentions. Hence, concurrent validity is established for the instrument. Since the results of the three data sets are quite similar and are valid at different locations and at different points in time, therefore, this indicates the robustness of the developed instrument.

## CONCLUSIONS

### Conclusions

This study suggests that Belittling Behavior (BLB) which is described as the dimension of petty tyranny by Ashforth (1994) is one of the dimensions of abusive supervision. This study also suggests that Scapegoating (SG) is a dimension of abusive supervision. Yelling, which is linked to the interpersonal injustice dimension of organizational justice construct proposed by Colquitt (2001) is also uncovered as the dimension of abusive supervision. This study also suggests that Credit Stealing (CS) is one of the dimensions of abusive supervision. This is consistent with the study of Tepper (2000) in a manner that although Tepper (2000) has not used credit stealing as the dimension of abusive supervision, however, Tepper (2000) used an item that talks about giving credit to the subordinate. Hence, this study concludes that the construct of abusive supervision is not a one-dimensional construct but is rather a multi-dimensional construct. However, unlike the study of Mitchell and Ambrose

(2007), this study suggests that it is a four-dimensional construct. The exploration of the dimensions of abusive supervision is in line with the suggestions of Tepper (2007) and Martinko et al., (2013). Hence, this study significantly contributes to the literature related to abusive supervision. Moreover, it is also found that the scale is valid and reliable in all three geographical locations and gives consistent results at different points in time. Hence, the scale developed during the course of the study is a robust scale for measuring the dimensions of abusive supervision. Furthermore, the dimensions of abusive supervision were found to be having significant association with turnover intention. This makes the present research study consistent with the studies of previous researchers (e.g. Lyu, et al., 2019; Xu et al., 2018; Elçi, et al., 2012).

### **Limitations and Avenues for Future Research**

Unlike the previous researchers (e.g. Caesens, et al., 2019; Lyu, et al., 2019; Xu et al., 2018), this study has explored the dimensions of abusive supervision that remained unexplored in the study of Mitchell and Ambrose (2007). Therefore, it is evident that dimensions uncovered during the course of study have not been researched previously about antecedents and consequences of abusive supervision. Hence, there is a need to study these dimensions concerning the antecedents and consequences of abusive supervision. Furthermore, future researchers should test the moderating role of perceived alternative employment opportunities in the relationship between abusive supervision dimensions and turnover intentions.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Hawari, M. A., Bani-Melhem, S., & Quratulain, S. (2019). Do Frontline Employees Cope Effectively with Abusive Supervision and Customer Incivility? Testing the Effect of Employee Resilience. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1-18.
- An, F., & Wang, B. (2016.) Abusive supervision and counterproductive work behaviour: Moderating effect of negative affectivity. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 9(01), 66.
- Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human relations*, 47(7), 755-778.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(3), 386.
- Caesens, G., Nguyen, N., & Stinglhamber, F. (2019). Abusive supervision and organizational dehumanization. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34(5), 709-728.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. 1979. The Michigan organizational assessment questionnaire. *Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.*
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological assessment*, 7(3), 309-319.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Deluga, R. J. (1998). Leader-Member Exchange Quality and Effectiveness Ratings: The Role of Subordinate-Supervisor Conscientiousness Similarity. *Group & Organization Management*. 23 (2), 189–216.
- Elçi, M., Şener, İ., Aksoy, S., & Alpkan, L. (2012). The impact of ethical leadership and leadership effectiveness on employees' turnover intention: The mediating role of work related stress. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58, 289-297.
- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2005). Workplace

Bullying: individual pathology or organizational culture. *Workplace violence*, 229-247.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of marketing research*, 18(1), 39-50.

Girard, R. (1989). *The Scapegoat*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Graen, G. B. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). "The Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of LMX theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level, multi-domain perspective". *Leadership Quarterly* 6 (2): 219–247.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. New York: John Wiley.

Hwang, I. S., & Kuo, J. (2006). Effects of job satisfaction and perceived alternative employment opportunities on turnover intention: An examination of public sector organizations. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 8(2), 254-259.

Jackson, D.N. (1974). *Personality Research Form manual* (2nd ed). Port Huron, MI: Research Psychologists Press

Keashly, L. (1998). Emotional abuse in the workplace: Conceptual and empirical issues. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 1, 85–117.

Keashly, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L. M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and victims*, 9, 341-341.

Khan, S. N., Qureshi, I. M., & Ahmad, H. I. (2010). Abusive supervision and negative employee outcomes. *European journal of social sciences*, 15(4), 490-500.

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation mod.*

Lyu, D., Ji, L., Zheng, Q., Yu, B., & Fan, Y. (2019). Abusive supervision

- and turnover intention: Mediating effects of psychological empowerment of nurses. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences*, 6(2), 198-203.
- Martinko, M. J., Harvey, P., Brees, J. R., & Mackey, J. (2013). A review of abusive supervision research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(1), 120-137.
- McIntire, S.A. & Miller, L.A. (2005). *Foundations of Psychological Testing*, 2nd Edition, Sage Publishing Co.
- Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1159.
- Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2000). Workplace bullying: The silent epidemic. *Employee Rights Quarterly*, 1(2), 1-12.
- Nunnally, J. C., Bernstein, I. H., & Berge, J. M. T. (1967). *Psychometric theory* (Vol. 226). New York: McGraw-hill.
- Peng, A. C., M. Schaubroeck, J., Chong, S., & Li, Y. (2019). Discrete emotions linking abusive supervision to employee intention and behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 72(3), 393-419.
- Rayner, C., Hoel, H. and Cooper, C. L. (2002). *Workplace bullying. What we know, who is to blame, and what can we do?*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Saleem, A., Iqbal, J., Sandhu, M. A., & Amin, S. (2018). Impact of Empowerment & Emotional Labor on Teacher's Work Engagement: A Moderating Role of Job Experience. *Review of Economics and Development Studies*, 4(2), 237-245.
- Shah, T. A., Khattak, M. N., Zolin, R., & Shah, S. Z. A. (2019). Psychological empowerment and employee attitudinal outcomes. *Management Research Review*. 42(7) 797-817
- Shoss, M. K., Eisenberger, R., Restubog, S. L. D., & Zagenczyk, T. J. (2013). Blaming the organization for abusive supervision: The roles of perceived organizational support and supervisor's organizational embodiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(1), 158.

- Thau, S., Aquino, K., & Bommer, W. H. (2008). How employee race moderates the relationship between non-contingent punishment and organizational citizenship behaviors: A test of the negative adaptation hypothesis. *Social Justice Research, 21*(3), 297-312.
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of management journal, 43*(2), 178-190.
- Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of management, 33*(3), 261-289.
- Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., Breaux, D. M., Geider, S., Hu, C., & Hua, W. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 109*(2), 156-167.
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Henle, C. A., & Lambert, L. S. (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(1), 101-123.
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Hoobler, J., & Ensley, M. D. (2004). Moderators of the relationships between coworkers' organizational citizenship behavior and fellow employees' attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(3), 455.
- Wu, T. Y., & Hu, C. (2009). Abusive supervision and employee emotional exhaustion: Dispositional antecedents and boundaries. *Group & Organization Management, 34*(2), 143-169.
- Xu, S., Martinez, L. R., Van Hoof, H., Tews, M., Torres, L., & Farfan, K. (2018). The impact of abusive supervision and co-worker support on hospitality and tourism student employees' turnover intentions in Ecuador. *Current issues in Tourism, 21*(7), 775-790.
- Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of applied psychology, 87*(6), 1068.