**Research Paper**

# Impact of Abusive Leadership on Employees' Productivity

Nikita Dabas[1]*

## ABSTRACT

There are a lot of researches on impact of abusive leadership on employees' productivity. Abusive leadership is impacting employees' productivity negatively. There are studies showing it. This research is an addition to the literature in same field. This research is aimed to study that abusive leadership impact employees' productivity negatively. Data was collected using social platforms, such as WhatsApp. Total number of participants was (n) 51. Further the impact was checked on three different factors such as age, gender and qualification. On the basis of age, we divided data into three groups (18-24), (25-34), (34-59). In results findings shows that the impact of abusive leadership is negative for first two groups, but there is no impact on third group. On the bases of our data, we divided the data into two genders male and female. Findings show significant negative impact of abusive leadership on both genders. On the basis of age, we again divided the data into three groups, School pass outs, undergraduates and postgraduates. The research founds out significant negative impact of abusive leadership on all the qualification groups. Our hypothesis "Abusive leadership impacts employees' productivity negatively" Is proved.

*Keywords:* *Abusive Leadership, Employees' Productivity*

**A**busive Leadership. There are many words or terms that are widely used to describe abusive leadership. These terms are aggressive supervision, abusive supervision, workplace bullying or bad experience with supervisor, mentor or manager. These are different words people use to explain abusive leadership, they differ in literal meaning but the essence remains overlapping. Most important domain to abusive leadership is always remains the perception of employees. The way employees perceive the behavior of their supervisors in extended display of physical or non physical behaviors- such behaviors can be, insulting in public or downgrading, it can also be taking credit of work that is done by their subordinates, ignoring subordinates or trying to take over the privacy of employee (Tepper, 20002). Abusive leadership is said to be the perception of manager by employees in negative light. When a leader does not provide warm environment to their subordinate, the employee start feeling disconnected. In this condition, employees' often tend to perceive some of the behaviors abusive, whereas in actual these behaviors are not abusive. Some the behaviors that employees' can perceive as abusive are, ignorance, and tone while talking (that is not intentional). Abusive leadership can be identify as sustained in the same like children or elderly abusive, it is likely to be pursued till (1) the target terminates the

[1]Counselling Psychologist
*Corresponding Author

relationship, (2) the agent terminates the relationship, (3) the agent modifies his or her behavior (Jezl, Molider& Wright, 1996). Abusive leadership does not have one face. We cannot say that only physical abuse is a kind of abusive people faces at workplace. There are certain rules to stop physical violation at work space. Sometimes the behavior of leader or manage at work that is not appropriate for the employees is also abuse. This behavior includes ignoring, talking rudely, continuously criticizing the work employee do, making it obvious that you do not like that employee. This behavior can be unintentional but it impacts employees and their productivity. Abusive leadership is a common concept of study in workplace. There are numerous studies done over abuse in workplace by leaders on subordinate. There are some behaviors of leaders that can be taken as abusive in nature and their leadership can be termed as abusive leadership;

Use of power to receive benefits from employees. Leaders try to use their power to get benefits. These benefits can be anything, like making their subordinates to work for them. They ask for 'help' from the employees to complete their work on time and do not even recognize them for their efforts. Employees tend to realize this and want to escape from such situations. The motives behind this behavior of leaders are not right. They do not want employees to succeed and cannot tolerate the success of sub ordinates. Managers in nations with high power distance have unlimited power and control over their employees (khatri, 2009).

Manipulation of employees to get what leader wants. When leaders fail to get what they aimed to have, they try to manipulate their subordinates. This manipulation can be of different form. They can try to offer them better position, or even threaten them for worsen. This fear or manipulation is a way of indirect abuse. Manipulation is always seemed as a good quality of managers, as they can make their employees their ways. But when leaders use this quality for their personal use and start harassing employees, it takes the form of abusive leadership.

Maintain distance from knowledgeable subordinates. An abusive leader tries their best to maintain distance from subordinates that are intelligent, confident, informative and strong headed. Such employees do not tend to fall in their tactics and put their points very strongly. An abusive leader will always stay away from such subordinates as they feel a threat from such employees. And like to have a team which is easy to manipulate.

Abusive leaders want complete obedience. Abusive leaders want their subordinates to follow them blindly. They have a strict policy for any questions against their way of work. They cannot handle someone who asks about their work. They do not want interference or suggestions from others as they alone want to fly.

Blaming people. An abusive leader blames subordinates that deny following them blindly. These leaders try to put the blame of everything that goes wrong on the teammate that denies following their order. They can do to any point to make sure that the employee suffers to the core.

**Self-importance.** An abusive leader will always keen to show their importance, and want continence gratification from their managers. They use the work done by their subordinates to show off on their own names.
Workplace bullying, deviances are similar to abusive leadership. Abuse in workplaces has been studied vastly in European (e.g., Bjorkqvist et al., 1994) and North American countries

(e.g. Baron and Neuman, 1998). Abusive leadership is something not many people had studied. It is not been studied in a particular manner. Although Tepper studies abusive supervision in 2000 & 2007, Hoel and Cooper studied workplace bullying in 2001, workplace aggression was studied by Schat and Kelloway in 2002, in 2007 Ferris and his colleagues studied the concept of leader bullying. Similarly, some other aspects like Narcissist leadership, bad leadership, and emotional abuse were studied by different researchers (citations from Alison, Grandy &Starratt, 2010). Leaders have been seemed in positive light. We try to look at the qualities leaders have. But abusive leadership is another face of leadership. The excessive use of power, power used in wrong direction, use of power to harm the employees has become quite common. In 1994 & 1997 Ashforth specified six aspects to the behavior of these paper tigers. The aspects are, 1st they act in unreasonable ways, 2nd they try to show criticize their employees in public, 3rd they do not think about others, 4th they do not try to resolve conflicts but orders to finish the conflict, 5th they do not encourage people with new initiatives and 6th they uses non – contingent punishment. He discovered these aspects after asking to 500+ young employees about their current managers. One aspect of researches in domain of abusive supervision is that nations with high cultural power distance i.e. countries that have strong traditional values and inequalities in terms of religion, race or caste lack in researches about abusive leadership. Researches are mainly done in US, and US has a low score in cultural power distance. Apart from cultural aspect to abusive leadership, there are other factors that can lead to abuse of employees. Those factors are gender of employees; females are seemed to be more prone to physical abuse in workplace. Age is also a factor to abusive leadership. Ashforth (1994 & 1997), said young employees are prone to abusive leadership. They get harassed in passive ways, like insult in public and not considering their view points in decision making. Neuman & Baron in 1997 suggest that abusive leadership includes speaking badly about employees, spreading baseless rumors about them, giving them wrong information and forming negatively biases opinion about their sub ordinates. Keashly in 2001 suggested that those actions that are done without any given thought and hurts the employees and are frequent in nature can be classified as abusive behavior. In 2002 Duffy and his colleagues said that abusive behaviors are those acts that effect individuals in negative sense that can be their ability to make decisions, creativity or ability to maintain relations with others. In Indian context Murari and Gupta (2011) said that, abusive leaders pursue same behavior if it is satisfactory to them. They always say that what they are doing is the right thing to do. These researches shows that the leaders with abusive behavior tend to focus on self gratifications, even if it is harmful for the employees.

**Employee's Productivity**. Employee productivity is the evaluation of workers output. Productivity is assessing by output of an employee in given time. The productivity of an employee tells about the efficiency employee have. Other than that, of time, employee's productivity also compared to the fellow worker doing the same work. Employee's productivity is most important aspect for any organization. As employees productivity decide the success of business. Productivity is defined in terms of input and output. Inputs are the efforts employees put to or the resources he/she uses to do some work and the output is the result of the work. If the input is high and output is less, the employee is considered as less productive. If the input and output is equal then the employee is productive. Similarly, if the output is higher than the input, employee is considered highly productivity. Employees productivity is precisely impact the company's benefit. Productive employees take less time and resources to complete the tasks. They save a lot of resources and time of organization. Companies like to hire such employees to decrease their cost value. Employee productivity again means the maximum output from small efforts. It is something employees can

improve with continuance efforts. Productivity is something you keep improving every day. Productivity is always measured in terms of monetary benefits. Productivity means a balance between all factors of production that will give the maximum output with the smallest effort (Peter F. Drucker). Productivity is an attitude of mind. It is an attitude of progress, of the steady improvement of that which exits. It is the certainly of being able to do better than yesterday and continuously. It is constant adaption of economic and social life to changing conditions. It is the continual effort to apply new techniques and method. It is the faith in human progress (European Productive Council). Employee's productivity can be measured through the benefits they do to firm. Apart from benefits that a firm gets from an employee, an employee should also know about his/her performance. If they do well to the firm, they should get appraisal for it. If they fail to deliver the desired outcomes, they can be told to improve. This performance-based appraisal is known as performance appraisal. According to (A1 ford & Beatty) performance evaluation is the evaluation or appraisal of the relative worth to the company of a man's services on his job. Performance appraisal is a process of evaluating an employee's performance of a job in terms of its requirements (Clotheir, Spriegel& Scot). Performance appraisal is done by the managers. Employees can also do self analysis of their performance to know about themselves. Regular assessment of performance for workers is very important. It helps employee to understand things that he is doing right and things that are going wrong. It also helps firms to give appraisals, bonus etc. According to Harry Levinson (1976) performance appraisal plays three main roles, 1st is to provide fair evaluation of their performance, 2nd is to modify the actions of employees towards their best performance and 3rd it provide data to leaders for further assessments. The intent behind the performance appraisal is to objectively evaluate performance of employees. The after effects of the presentation examination are utilized in setting that heading for the individual execution advancement by bringing out both execution qualities and shortcomings and hence creating activity (Education insight Document, 2007). Performance appraisal is now used not only to evaluate but also as a method to reinforce the actions we want employees to perform. In 2010 Singh and his fellow researchers suggested that performance appraisal is very dynamic instrument for assembling subordinates in mature and managed firm in order to move towards organizational goals. Execution evaluation works for authoritative advancement as well as aides in individual development. It is an aspect that is widely used throughout the world for effective work performance that is important for leaders and staff assessments. It is important for the organization to track the development of goals and increase employee's productivity. Performance criteria need to be in sync with aims, related to job responsibilities, defined and quantitative, in employee's supervision and understandable by participants (Dattner, 2010). It is important to provide clear, performance based feedback to employees (Caroll&Schneier, 1982). It is important to give subordinates with feedback and it is appreciated widely as an important activity for personal and organizational growth (Baruch, 1996). Employee's perception of appraisal system is very important, if employees doubt feedback system and think it is biased because to favoritism, employees tend to ignore the feedback. In such cases feedback is of no use (Levy & William 2004). An appraisal system needs to be fair, unbiased and true only then it will be able to serve its true meaning. It should praise people that did good and also motivate employees that are lacking it their performance. An appraisal system need to contribute in achieving firm's goals. Performance appraisal should take place quarterly or annually. It keeps the employees on toes as well companies goals can be reached systematically. Performance appraisal needs to be systematic and transparent so that everyone can understand about the feedbacks they are receiving.

Performance appraisal impacts employee's productivity. As the employees want appraisal from their leaders and when they get positive feedback for their work, they feel motivated to enhance their performance. Performance appraisal framework is utilized as a strategy to deal with the individual execution of workers in all establishments. It guides organizations to recognize employee's potential as well as help them in providing better training to employees. A performance appraisal system is a decent instrument that can be utilized to improve the nature of an organization's work power performance of which it is considered as a significant perspective in HR the board and as a feature of the control procedure in organizations (Shal, 1999). As we discussed earlier, performance appraisal has the power to impact individual's performance. If the correct and true feedback is given performance appraisal can increase employee's productivity. Employee's productivity is directly influenced by their motivation and commitment. If the employees get right feedback they get more motivated to do their part in the firm. If the feedback is not up to the expectations and firm provide them with better training and guidance, employees get committed to the organization and aimed to do better next time to enhance their performance. It is very important for the appraisal system to be able to influence employee's productivity in positive ways; otherwise, the system is not valid for its work. There are many reasons for conducting performance appraisal in organizations, but it mainly focuses on the improvement of individuals and firms productivity. When a firm tries to achieve multiple goals it cause less participation of efforts, energy and focus from the employees (Rees & Porter, 2001). Subordinates with high performances tends to sense of responsibility, goals that are achievable, risk taking, they have a plan to work, they take feedbacks for their benefits and they look for opportunities to show their skills. According to Robbins (2009) performance evaluation can be done through five main aspects i.e. quality, quantity, time, efficient and independence. Evaluation of performance is important for motivating employees to perform, improvement in training, enhance potential and their views about the goal. One of main work of performance evaluation is to increase employee's productivity (Werther & Davis 1996). Same thing i.e. performance appraisal increase workers productivity is said by Sin (1996). Performance evaluation plays important role in improving productivity as we are aware of employee's strengths and weaknesses.

**Abusive leadership and employee's productivity**. Abusive leadership impacts an employee's performance negatively. It not only cause decline in subordinate's performance but it also create self doubt in employee. Tepper in 2002 suggested that if employees face injustice or mistreatment from their leaders, they put fewer efforts to acquire equality. So the employees start decreasing their efforts if they feel that the employer do not treat them equal or misbehave with them. Employees start taking extra time to complete the work they can do in fewer hours. They do not respond to leader's orders, even starts giving silent treatment to the leader. Employees start complaining about things that does not matter much to them. Subordinates start showing reluctant behavior. According to a survey in 2018, 13 % of US workforce faces abusive leadership. Abusive leadership cause less productivity, absenteeism and unwillingness in employees that cause high loss in organizations. If the leader is abusive, employee tends to loss internal motivation to work and they function on external motivation, it causes firm a big cost. As the employees' want to leave the firm as soon as possible. They work in abusive environment only because they do not have many opportunities and they will leave the firm soon after finding a better environment. Abusive leadership not only impact employee's productivity but also mental and emotional health. Employees tend to show depressive sign if they are facing abusive leadership. Abusive leadership also destroys the creative side of employees. As the leader wants the employees to work his way, he/ she will not listen to the idea an employee gave, it decreases the self

confidence of employee. Unfair treatment is also a way of abuse, when the manager/ leader do not treat employees fairly or equally. It not only impacts the productivity of individual and the outcomes but it also increases the group conflicts. The employees will have a doubt about themselves, their decision making and worth. Team work in considered very important in an organization as the firm and its employees work towards a single goal. But when group conflict happen it start impacting the firm as well the leader. When people work in same firm for same goal, they demand same treatment and power. An abusive leader will not listen to people and their suggestion that again can cause problem for firm. If the manager or leader treat the employee equally and with respect it is possible that the employee works with his heart and gets emotionally attached to the firm and never it. There are various studies that shows abusive leadership not only decreases productivity and creativity of employees but also impact organization citizenship behavior. This means abusive leadership not only impact employee individually but also fellow workers and organization itself. It not only create disturbance in employee work but also in team work, working equations with people towards whom leader shows biased behavior. So the leaders should keep in mind to treat every employee equally and must avoid misbehaving not only physically but verbally also. They should try to be unbiased towards any particular employee.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### *Abusive leadership*
New nurses were found to provide better care to patients and they were staying for longer time with the field that helped in solving the problem of nursing shortage only if paid close attention to leadership. They study suggested supportive leadership practices. They also said abusive leadership can be proven harmful for the nurses that just started their career and they are likely to provide poor health career services and leave. These results were found in research done with 541 novice nurses of Canada. (Stephanie Austin el. Al, 2015).

While the emphasis is on productive leadership, despite everything overwhelms administration explore, an expanding number of studies examine various types of Abusive leadership. This meta-investigation incorporates various concepts of dangerous leadership and dissects the connection between damaging supervision and result factors. The exploration for articles yielded in excess of 200 investigations of which 57 could be remembered for the meta-examination. Results demonstrate the normal negative relationships with positive employees' results and practices (e.g., mentalities towards the pioneer, prosperity, and individual execution) and positive connections with negative results (e.g., turnover expectation, opposition towards the pioneer, counterproductive work conduct). True to form, the most noteworthy connection emerges between ruinous authority and mentalities towards the pioneer. Shockingly, the following most elevated connection was found between dangerous initiative and counterproductive work conduct. Subsequent to examining the outcomes, a plan for future research is proposed. Given the negative effect of damaging initiative, more information is particularly vital with respect to what triggers ruinous administration (Birgit Schyns& Jan Schilling, 5 September 2012).

There are numerous hurtful leadership styles — the self- centered leaders, the inexperienced leaders, the oblivious leaders, and leaders that are careless, inhuman, or even nasty. To understand what at last being viewed as managers characteristics that are in opposition to the great request, order and profitability, the creator directed a survey of the writing to acquire a present typology (the gathering of things by their similitude) of chose hurtful authority styles — explicit styles that are counter to empowering others to succeed, beat difficulties, accomplish wanted outcomes, and make a positive situation in which to work. The paper

concentrated on three unmistakably hurtful authority styles (damaging, harassing, and harmful), and set these in sets with one another and inside the space of dangerous administration when all is said in done. Shared traits, estimations, negative effects, and approaches to improve these destructive initiative styles were recognized from the writing and point by point. The paper closed with suggestions for future research and activity (Wallace A. Burns, 1ˢᵗjuly 2017).

Recent studies of organizational behavior have witnessed a growing interest in unethical leadership, leading to the development of abusive supervision research. Given the increasing interest in the causes of abusive supervision, this study proposes an organizing framework for its antecedents and tests it using meta-analysis. Based on an analysis of effect sizes drawn from 74 studies, comprising 30,063 participants, the relationship between abusive supervision and different antecedent categories are examined. The results generally support expected relationships across the four categories of abusive antecedents, including: supervisor related antecedents, organization related antecedents, subordinate related antecedents, and demographic characteristics of both supervisors and subordinates. In addition, possible moderators that can also influence the relationships between abusive supervision and its antecedents are also examined. The significance and implications of different level factors in explaining abusive supervision are discussed (Yucheng Zhang & Timothy C. Bednall, 25ᵗʰapril 2015).

*Employees productivity.*
This paper considers the issue of creating workforce plans utilizing meetings of sub ordinates having diverse efficiency. They showed that the current chart of this issue is frequently incorrect for high-contact firm associations since it overlooks the probability of client appearances. In particular, the current portrayal usually overestimates the quantity of less productive workers important to convey a predefined, holding up time-sensitive client support level. They present another, a nonlinear portrayal of this staffing issue that catches its nonlinear nature and show its prevalence by means of a broad arrangement of work visit booking issues for the two-group case (Gary M. Thompson, John C. Goodale, 17 sept. 2004).

Two different methodologies are utilized in this article to consider efficiency per worker: the determinants of its development rate during the 1990s are first analyzed, and afterward the determinants of its level, utilizing a progressively basic methodology. ICT are appeared to have a positive and critical impact on both development rates and levels of profitability. In spite of the fact that the sample of nations is larger and GMM are utilized. In the two segments of the paper, the business rate and efficiency display a huge negative relationship, emerging from the centralization of work on the most beneficial individuals from the workforce. Pointers of monetary profundity and value strength are seen as noteworthy (Nicolas Belorgey, Rémy Lecat, Tristan-Pierre Maury,April 2004).

This study shows that previous experience and tenure in the current job have significant, positive effects on wages and productivity. Hours of training are positively related to productivity and wage growth but generally not to levels of either. Lastly, gender effects are evident. Productivity growth and current productivity levels are slightly higher for females while their wages are significantly lower (Harry J. Holzer).

*Abusive leadership and employee's productivity.*
This study suggests that two types of ineffective leadership styles that are abusive and authoritarian leadership have similar negative impact on employees i.e., poor performance, job dissatisfaction and intent to quit. Negative leadership also causes anxiety and depression in employees. These findings were found in a sample of 232 nurses and 24 supervisors (Lindsay S. Pyc, Daniel P. Meltzer & Cong Liu, 21stApril 2016.).

This study tried a directed mediation model to look at the connections between abusive leadership, group cohesion, and job outcome factors among military faculty in various organization circumstances. Utilizing protection of assets (COR) hypothesis as an establishing structure, reactions were gathered from military faculty who were positioned "in battalion" (for example at home, in a low-pressure circumstance), conveyed, (a high pressure circumstance), and sent to a functioning battle zone (an outrageous pressure circumstance). Speculations were centered on group level appraisals of harmful authority and employment results. Staggered investigations were utilized to control for singular level impacts. Corroborative factor examination indicated support for a five-factor structure of harmful initiative that incorporates measurements of self-advancement, damaging management, unconventionality, narcissism, and dictator authority. The higher-request build of harmful initiative and its five part measurements had direct negative impacts on every one of the four occupation result factors: bunch level employment fulfillment, bunch profitability, bunch level authoritative trust, and gathering level hierarchical duty. Harmful initiative additionally had an immediate negative impact on bunch attachment. Gathering union was seen as a full arbiter of the connections between self-advancement, harsh management, and unusualness and gathering level employment fulfillment. Gathering attachment was seen as a halfway go between for the 17 outstanding connections between the poisonous administration measurements and occupation results. Relative significance examination showed that while the poisonous administration measurements of flightiness and injurious management were key indicators of employment results, self-advancement was the measurement with the most prescient force. No help was found for the conjectured connections brought about by arrangement status. Future bearings are proposed for inquire about on damaging initiative styles, and suggestions for specialists are talked about (Andrew A. Schmidt, 2014).

This study tests the relationship between corporate psychopathy traits and abusive supervision, employees' job satisfaction and intention to quit their job. A total of 97 employees from a non-profit organization completed measures of their abusive supervision and corporate psychopathy traits as well as self-report measures of job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Corporate psychopathy was positively and significantly correlated with abusive supervision and turnover intentions and negatively correlated with employees' job satisfaction. SEM results indicate that, although the B-Scan 360 has a direct influence on turnover intentions, it influences job satisfaction through abusive supervision behavior. Our results indicate psychopathy may be an underlying factor explaining abusive supervision which is detrimental to employee attitudes (Cynthia Mathieu & Paul Babiak, 1st December 2015).

This study explored the career-long effects of abusive leadership on athlete aggression and task performance. Abusive leadership scores were derived from ratings by two independent raters' evaluations of coaches' biographies, and athlete aggression and task performance data were derived from objective sources. Data were obtained from players ($N = 693$) and coaches ($N = 57$) involved in the National Basketball Association (NBA) between the 2000–2001 and 2005–2006 seasons. Controlling for tenure, salary, team winning percentage, and

absence due to injuries, multilevel modeling showed that exposure to abusive leadership influenced both the trajectory of psychological aggression and task performance over players' careers. These findings suggest that the effects of abusive leadership extend far longer than currently acknowledged, thus furthering our understanding of the nature and effects of abusive leadership (Erica L. Carleton et. al, 2016).

This research sheds light on the role of the dark side of leadership in employee and suggests that abusive supervision impact individual creativity negatively. (Dong Liu, Hui Liao & Raymond Loi, 2012).

### Hypothesis
$H_o$ - Abusive leadership impact employees' productivity negatively.
$H_1$ – There is no impact of abusive leadership on employees' productivity.

## METHODOLOGY

### Measures

**Abusive Supervision scale**. This scale was developed by, B M Purwanto, Hani Handoko&FenikaWulani in Indonesia. Purpose for the development of this scale was to develop a scale to assess abusive leadership in Indonesia. Abusive leadership is said to be subjective perception of leaders from their subordinates. This scale was developed with a different context to Tepper's scale (2000). Tepper's scale has a reliability of 0.90. Tepper's scale is widely used by many researchers to study abusive leadership, Tepper himself in one of his review paper raise the issue of not having sufficient scales to assess abusive leadership. They feel the need to develop this scale because Tepper's scale has a low power distance of cultural orientations. This scale has high power distance of cultural orientations. Before developing the scale they interviewed employees to gather information about abusive supervision from the sub ordinates. The scale has three dimensions humiliations, passive abuse and anger active abuse. Internal reliability of the scale is 0.922, 0.845 & 0.947 respectively. This is a five Likert scale which have gave 1 to strongly disagree, 2 to disagree, 3 to neutral, 4 to agree and 5 to strongly agree.

**Performance appraisal**. Performance appraisal is taken from Jasmine Sharon's study on employees' perception towards performance appraisal. This form tells us about the kind of appraisal system employees' would like to have. It contains aspects that employees like to have in their appraisal system. Questions in this form are like "employees should have authority to determine work objects", "employees' should have good organizational communication", "it should help employee to perform", and "employee should be satisfied with consistent and fair rating of the team" and so on. This form is also a Likert scale and the scoring is same as abusive supervision scale.

**Other factors**. Other that performance appraisal system and Abusive leadership scale, I used gender, age and qualification as a factor to check whether there is any specific impact of age, gender or qualification on facing abusive leadership. While collecting data there were no restriction of qualification, age and gender. Later while analyzing the data I divided age into three parts as well as qualification. Other variable are analyzed as many studies shows that young employees, female employees are more prone to abusive leadership.

### Participants
In this study total numbers of participants are 51, out which 29 are females and 22 are males. Qualification, age and gender were not restricted before data collection. After data

collection, participants were divided into two halves on the basis of gender that is male and female. On the basis of qualification data was divided into three parts, participants from age 18 – 24 are classified into one group, age 25 – 34 were in second and 35+ were in one group. One the basis of qualification divided into three groups, one group is of participants who are school pass outs, second group have undergraduates and third group is of postgraduates and higher educations.

*Procedure*

Two questionnaires (abusive supervision scale and employee performance appraisal form) were combined in Google forms to collect the data. The instructions "The following questionnaire is used strictly for academic research purpose. The information provides by you will be confidential and will not be used for any other purpose. We also ensure that your information and identity will not be revealed" were clearly mentioned on the form. Later the questionnaire was selectively circulated to the working population through social media. After the completion of data collection, raw data was coded on the basis of age, gender, qualification and the answers provided by the participants. After coding data was analyzed through SPSS. Data was read through regression analysis. To write down this study, previous conducted researches were studied. On the basis of very personal experience, I developed interest to study the impact of a leader on employee. As it is very important relation in any organization and determine many factors for employees' as well as leaders. This study helped me in understanding the way a leader can impact the employee.

*Analysis*

To analyze the data, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 16 is used. Before the analysis the data was coded as follow; gender- male- 0, female-1, age- 0 to the age group of 18 to 24, 1 (25-34) and 2 (35-59), though there were no age restrictions at the time of data collection, 59 was the highest age in data. On the basis of qualification, 0 to (school pass outs), 1 to (undergraduates) and 2 to (postgraduates). Answers to the responses were also coded according to the scoring given by researchers. For Abusive leadership scale, scoring was as follow, 1(strongly disagree), 2(disagree), 3(neutral), 4(agree) & 5(strongly agree). For ideal performance appraisal form scoring was done similar to Abusive leadership scale that means, 1(strongly disagree), 2(disagree), 3(neutral), 4(agree) & 5(strongly agree). After coding the data, it was run in SPSS. We used linear regression to study the data. Linear regression is a way to study the equation between a dependent variable and independent variable. Linear regression is used where we try to study one variable that explains the relation. Linear regression tells us the output of independent variable on dependent variable. Linear variable is different from correlation, because correlation tells us the relation between two or more variables where independent and dependent variables do not play much important roles, whereas in linear regression, dependent variable and independent variables are fixed. Dependent variable is measured on continuous measurement scale where independent variable can be gender, qualification, age and even continuous measurements also. We have analyzed this data by putting employees' productivity as dependent variable, abusive leadership as a constant variable. For further analysis, we checked if it is significant for age, qualification and gender. Results will be discussed below.

# RESULTS

*Table 1*

| Variables | | Abusive Supervision | | | Employees Productivity | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | Mean | SD | N | Mean | SD |
| Gender | Male | 22 | 68.36 | 24.011 | 22 | 80.27 | 12.391 |
| | Female | 29 | 58.93 | 21.302 | 29 | 88.72 | 8.799 |
| Age | 18-24 | 25 | 61.20 | 22.153 | 25 | 82.44 | 11.121 |
| | 25-34 | 23 | 64.87 | 23.507 | 23 | 86.78 | 11.233 |
| | 35-59 | 3 | 63.67 | 03.238 | 3 | 94.00 | 5.568 |
| Qualification | School | 7 | 67.86 | 16.628 | 7 | 76.71 | 10.673 |
| | Undergraduates | 26 | 62.65 | 19.626 | 26 | 83.65 | 11.207 |
| | Post graduates | 18 | 61.61 | 29.139 | 18 | 90.39 | 9.115 |

*Table1: is the descriptive representation of the data.*

## On basis of Gender:
## Males
## Table 2

| R | | | Change Statistics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gender = male (Selected) | R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| .320a | .102 | 12.031 | .102 | 2.276 | 1 | 20 | .147 |

| Model | Un standardized Coefficients | | SC | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. |
| Employees productivity | 91.550 | 7.903 | -.320 | 11.585 | .000 |
| | -.165 | .109 | | -1.509 | .147 |

*SC is standardized coefficient.

*Where employees productivity is constant, Abusive leadership is dependant variable for males.

The value of $R^2$ is .102 that means it proves 10.2% of data. This says 10.2% of variance for employees' productivity was predictable from the abusive leadership in males. A significance value is .147 that is significant at $p < 0.05$. Abusive leadership does impact employees' productivity negatively. Correlation (R) between employees' productivity and abusive leadership for males is, -.320, this shows the negative relation between two variables for males. Here, a = 91.550, b = -.165, this means with increase on one unit of abusive leadership will decrease employees productivity by .165 points. Standardized coefficient (beta) suggests, with increase in one unit of standard deviation, employees' productivity will decrease by .320 points.

## Females
## Table 3

| R | | | Change Statistics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gender = female (Selected) | R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| .379 | .143 | 8.294 | .143 | 4.515 | 1 | 27 | .043 |

| Model | | Un standardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | 97.938 | 4.601 | | 21.284 | .000 |
| | abusive leadership | -.156 | .074 | -.379 | -2.125 | .043 |

*Where employees productivity is constant, Abusive leadership is dependant variable for females.*

The value of $R^2$ is .143 that means it proves 14.3% of data. This says 14.3% of variance for employees' productivity was predictable from the abusive leadership in females. A significance value is .043 that is significant at $p < 0.05$. Abusive leadership does impact employees' productivity negatively. Correlation (R) between employees' productivity and abusive leadership for females is, -.379, this shows the negative relation between two variables for females. Here, a = 97.938, b = -.156, this means with increase on one unit of abusive leadership will decrease employees productivity by .156 points. Standardized coefficient (beta) suggests, with increase in one unit of standard deviation, employees' productivity will decrease by .379 points.

## On the basis of Ages
### *Age group – 18 to 24*
**Table 4**

| R<br>Age = 18-24 (Selected) | R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| .473ª | .223 | 10.011 | .223 | 6.614 | 1 | 23 | .017 |

| Model | | Un standardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | 96.959 | 5.990 | | 16.186 | .000 |
| | abusive leadership | -.237 | .092 | -.473 | -2.572 | .017 |

*Where employees productivity is constant, Abusive leadership is dependant variable for age group 18 to 24.*

The value of $R^2$ is .223 that means it proves 22.3% of data. This says 22.3% of variance for employees' productivity was predictable from the abusive leadership in age group 18 to 24. A significance value is .017 that is significant at $p < 0.05$. Abusive leadership does impact employees' productivity negatively. Correlation (R) between employees' productivity and abusive leadership for age group 18-24 is, -.473, this shows the negative relation between two variables for age group 18-24. Here, a = 96.959, b = -.237, this means with increase on one unit of abusive leadership will decrease employees productivity by .237 points. Standardized coefficient (beta) suggests, with increase in one unit of standard deviation, employees' productivity will decrease by .473 points.

### Age group – 25 to 34
**Table 5**

| R<br>Age = 25-34 (Selected) | R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| .411ª | .169 | 10.481 | .169 | 4.269 | 1 | 21 | .051 |

| Model | | Un standardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 99.523 | 6.542 | | 15.212 | .000 |
| | abusive leadership | -.196 | .095 | -.411 | -2.066 | .051 |

*Where employees productivity is constant, Abusive leadership is dependent variable for age group 25 to 34.

The value of $R^2$ is .169 that means it proves 16.9% of data. This says 16.9% of variance for employees' productivity was predictable from the abusive leadership in age group of 25 to 34. A significance value is .051 that is significant at $p < 0.05$. Abusive leadership does impact employees' productivity negatively. Correlation (R) between employees' productivity and abusive leadership for age group 25-34 is, -.411, this shows the negative relation between two variables for age group 25-34. Here, a = 99.523, b = -.196, this means with increase on one unit of abusive leadership will decrease employees productivity by .196 points. Standardized coefficient (beta) suggests, with increase in one unit of standard deviation, employees' productivity will decrease by .411 points.

## Age group - 35 plus
**Table 6**

| R | | | Change Statistics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age = 35 - 59 (Selected) | R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| .027 | .001 | 7.871 | .001 | .001 | 1 | 1 | .983 |

The value of $R^2$ is .001. This means this data is not significant to predict impact of abusive leadership on employees' productivity for the age group above 35. The reason for this can be theless number of participants from this age group.

## On the basis of qualifications
## School Pass outs
**Table 7**

| R | | | Change Statistics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| qualification =school (Selected) | R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| .787a | .620 | 7.208 | .620 | 8.152 | 1 | 5 | .036 |

| Model | | Un standardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 111.005 | 12.315 | | 9.014 | .000 |
| | abusive leadership | -.505 | .177 | -.787 | -2.855 | .036 |

*Where employees productivity is constant, Abusive leadership is dependant variable for school pass outs.

The value of $R^2$ is .620 that means it proves 62% of data. This says 62% of variance for employees' productivity was predictable from the abusive leadership in school pass outs. A significance value is .036 that is significant at $p < 0.05$. Abusive leadership does impact employees' productivity negatively. Correlation (R) between employees' productivity and abusive leadership for employees that are school pass outs is -.787, this shows statistically significant negative relation between two variables for employees that are school pass outs.

Here, a =111, b = -.505, this means with increase on one unit of abusive leadership will decrease employees productivity by .505 points. Standardized coefficient (beta) suggests, with increase in one unit of standard deviation, employees' productivity will decrease by .787 points.

## Undergraduates
**Table 8**

| R | | | Change Statistics | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| qualification= undergraduates (Selected) | R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change | |
| .391[a] | .153 | 10.526 | .153 | 4.341 | 1 | 24 | .048 | |

| | | Un standardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | 97.656 | 7.030 | | 13.891 | .000 |
| | abusive leadership | -.223 | .107 | -.391 | -2.084 | .048 |

*Where employees productivity is constant, Abusive leadership is dependant variable for under graduates.*

The value of $R^2$ is .153 that means it proves 15.3% of data. This says 15.3% of variance for employees' productivity was predictable from the abusive leadership in undergraduates. A significance value is .048 that is significant at $p < 0.05$. Abusive leadership does impact employees' productivity negatively. Correlation (R) between employees' productivity and abusive leadership for employees that are undergraduates is -.391, this shows statistically significant negative relation between two variables for employees that are undergraduates. Here, a = 97.656, b = -.223, this means with increase on one unit of abusive leadership will decrease employees productivity by .223 points. Standardized coefficient (beta) suggests, with increase in one unit of standard deviation, employees' productivity will decrease by .391 points.

## Post graduates
**Table 9**

| R | | | Change Statistics | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| qualification = post graduates (Selected) | R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change | |
| .351[a] | .123 | 8.796 | .123 | 2.253 | 1 | 16 | .153 | |

| | | Un standardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | 97.160 | 4.964 | | 19.571 | .000 |
| | abusive leadership | -.110 | .073 | -.351 | -1.501 | .153 |

*Where employees productivity is constant, Abusive leadership is dependant variable for post graduates.*

The value of $R^2$ is .123 that means it proves 12.3% of data. This says 12.3% of variance for employees' productivity was predictable from the abusive leadership in post graduates. A significance value is .153 that is significant at $p < 0.05$. Abusive leadership does impact employees' productivity negatively. Correlation (R) between employees' productivity and

abusive leadership for employees that are post graduates is -.351, this shows statistically significant negative relation between two variables for employees that are post graduates. Here, a = 97.160, b = -.110, this means with increase on one unit of abusive leadership will decrease employees productivity by .110 points. Standardized coefficient (beta) suggests, with increase in one unit of standard deviation, employees' productivity will decrease by .351 points.

## DISCUSSION

In the study one can see the negative impact of abusive leadership on employees' productivity on almost every factor present study checked. Firstly, research checked the impact of abusive leadership on employees' productivity for male employees. Research finds that the productivity of male employees gets negatively impacted by abusive leadership. With the reference of table 2, correlation between the variable is - .320, which shows strong negative relation between two variables for male gender. The negative value of b shows decreases in productivity by .164 points with the increase of one unit in abusive leadership. Similar results were shown in a research Abusive leadership- a barrier to employees' empowerment by Krishna Murari in 2013. In his research majority of participants were male. He found out that abusive leadership is a barrier in employees' empowerment.

Secondly the study examines the impact of abusive leadership on employees' productivity for female employees. Research finds out the productivity of female employees also gets negatively impacted by abusive leadership. With the reference of table 3, correlation between the variable is - .379, which shows strong negative relation between two variables for male gender. The negative value of b shows decreases in productivity by .156 points with the increase of one unit in abusive leadership. A research 'Ineffective leadership and employees negative outcomes' online published in 2016 by Lindsay S. Psy at el. have similar findings. This research was done on nurses and 87% of participants were females.
In above two paragraphs, we can see there is significant negative impact of abusive leadership regardless of the gender.

Thirdly, study examines the impact of abusive leadership on employees' productivity for employees from the age group of 18 to 24.Research finds out that the productivity of employees from this age group is highly negatively impacted by abusive leadership. With the reference of table 4, correlation between the variable is - .473, which shows strong negative relation between two variables for this age group of employees. The negative value of b shows decreases in productivity by .237 points with the increase of one unit in abusive leadership. We can see the highly negative relation between variables for this age group. There are studies that show young employees' faces more abusive than other groups. One of such research 'young employees' faces abusive leadership' by Alison Starratt shows that young employees face more abuse in workplace.

Fourthly, the study examined the impact of abusive leadership on employees' productivity for employees from the age group of 25 to 34. The study found out that the productivity of employees for this age group is also highly negatively impacted by abusive leadership. With the reference of table 5, correlation between the variable is - .411, which shows strong negative relation between two variables for this age group of employees. The negative value of b shows decreases in productivity by .196 points with the increase of one unit in abusive leadership. A research published on 24th April 2020 shows that abusive leadership not only

impact the productivity of employees but also increase the willingness to leave the organization. 61% of the participants were from this age group only.

Sixthly, for the age group of 35 and above, the study did not find any relationship between employees' productivity and abusive leadership. There can be various possible reasons for the same. The one that this study is considering is less number of participants from this age group in my study. And second reason is that the people from this age group have developed resilience towards the abusive leadership.

Seventhly, study examined the impact of abusive leadership on employees' productivity for School pass outs employees. This study found out that the productivity of employees from this group of qualification is also highly negatively impacted by abusive leadership. With the reference of table 7, correlation between the variable is - .787, which shows highly negative relation between two variables for this group of employees. The negative value of b shows decrease in productivity by .505 points with the increase of one unit in abusive leadership.

Eighthly, research examined the impact of abusive leadership on employees' productivity for employees for the group of undergraduates. The research found out that the productivity of employees for this group is also highly negatively impacted by abusive leadership. With the reference of table 8, correlation between the variable is - .391, which shows strong negative relation between two variables for this age group of employees. The negative value of b shows decrease in productivity by .223 points with the increase of one unit in abusive leadership.

And lastly, the study examined the impact of abusive leadership on employees' productivity for employees for the group of post graduates. Research found out that the productivity employees for this age group is also highly negatively impacted by abusive leadership. With the reference of table 9, correlation between the variable is - .351, which shows strong negative relation between two variables for this group of employees. The negative value of b shows decrease in productivity by .110 points with the increase of one unit in abusive leadership.

It shows that almost all the factors in this study have negative impact of abusive leadership on employees' productivity.

## CONCLUSION

The Alternative Hypothesis that abusive leadership impact employees' productively negatively is accepted because of the findings. The findings of the study shows negative correlation between the two variables for almost all the factors we studied. There is a negative correlation in abusive leadership and employees' productivity for both the gender. It shows abusive leadership decrease employees' productivity regardless of their gender. There is again a negative correlation for age factor. Only for the age group above 35 shows no impact of abusive leadership that shows our null hypothesis, which is there is no impact of abusive leadership on employees' productivity is accepted only for this age group. This can be possible because many researches shows people from this age group develop resilience that may help them in maintaining their performance. Other two age groups (18-24 & 25-34) show that abusive leadership decreases their productivity. For third and last factor qualification, there is again very strong negative correlation between two variables. That means regardless of the employees' qualification their productivity decreases due to

abusive leadership. It is an addition to the existing literature for abusive leadership and its impacts. This study can be used by organizations to understand their employees' decreasing performance. This study also opens opportunities for studies on the bases of specific factors like, gender, age and qualification. Limited number of participants is one limitation of study, another limitation is limited number of variables.

## REFERENCES

Arvey, R. D., & Murphy, K. R. (1998). Performance evaluation in work settings. *Annual review of psychology*, *49*(1), 141-168.

Ashforth, B. E., Saks, A. M., & Lee, R. T. (1997). On the dimensionality of Jones'(1986) measures of organizational socialization tactics. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *5*(4), 200-214.

Baruch, Y. (1996). Self performance appraisal vs direct-manager appraisal: A case of congruence. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.

Burns, W. A. (2017). A descriptive literature review of harmful leadership styles: Definitions, commonalities, measurements, negative impacts, and ways to improve these harmful leadership styles. *Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership*, *3*(1), 33-52.

Carleton, E. L., Barling, J., Christie, A. M., Trivisonno, M., Tulloch, K., & Beauchamp, M. R. (2016). Scarred for the rest of my career? Career-long effects of abusive leadership on professional athlete aggression and task performance. *Journal of sport and exercise psychology*, *38*(4), 409-422.

Choudhary, S. (2016). Job evaluation: A srtategy for compensation consistency. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, *5*(5), 90-100.

Dattner, B. (2010). Performance appraisal-Dattner consulting.

Drucker, P. F. (1995). *People and performance: The best of Peter Drucker on management*. Routledge.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2011). The concept of bullying and harassment at work: The European tradition. *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice*, *2*, 3-40.

Fernet, C., Trépanier, S. G., Demers, M., & Austin, S. (2017). Motivational pathways of occupational and organizational turnover intention among newly registered nurses in Canada. *Nursing outlook*, *65*(4), 444-454.

Gichuhi, A. W., Abaja, P. O., & Ochieng, I. (2013). Effect of performance appraisal on employee productivity: A case study of supermarkets in Nakuru Town, Kenya. *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, *2*(11), 42-58.

Goodale, J. C., & Thompson, G. M. (2004). A comparison of heuristics for assigning individual employees to labor tour schedules. *Annals of Operations Research*, *128*(1-4), 47-63.

Holzer, H. J. (1990). The determinants of employee productivity and earnings. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, *29*(3), 403-422.

Jezl, D. R., Molidor, C. E., & Wright, T. L. (1996). Physical, sexual and psychological abuse in high school dating relationships: Prevalence rates and self-esteem issues. *Child and adolescent social work journal*, *13*(1), 69-87.

Keashly, L. (2001). Interpersonal and systemic aspects of emotional abuse at work: The target's perspective. *Violence and victims*, *16*(3), 233-268.

Khatri, N. (2009). Consequences of power distance orientation in organisations. *Vision*, *13*(1), 1-9.

LeBlanc, M. M., &Kelloway, E. K. (2002). Predictors and outcomes of workplace violence and aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 444–453.

Levinson, H. (1976). Psychological man.

Liu, D., Liao, H., &Loi, R. (2012). The dark side of leadership: A three-level investigation of the cascading effect of abusive supervision on employee creativity. *Academy of management journal*, *55*(5), 1187-1212.

Malik, M. S., & Aslam, S. (2013). Performance Appraisal and Employee's Motivation: A Comparative Analysis of Telecom Industry of Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, *33*(1).

Mathieu, C., &Babiak, P. (2015). Tell me who you are, I'll tell you how you lead: Beyond the Full-Range Leadership Model, the role of corporate psychopathy on employee attitudes. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *87*, 8-12.

Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (1998). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets. *Journal of management*, *24*(3), 391-419.

Pyc, L. S., Meltzer, D. P., & Liu, C. (2017). Ineffective leadership and employees' negative outcomes: The mediating effect of anxiety and depression. *International Journal of Stress Management, 24*(2), 196–215.

Rees, W. D., & Porter, C. (2001). *The skills of management*. Cengage Learning EMEA.

Schmidt, A. A. (2014). *An examination of toxic leadership, job outcomes, and the impact of military deployment* (Doctoral dissertation).

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*(1), 138-158.

Singh, V. K., Kochar, B., &Yuksel, S. (2010). An empirical study on the efficiency of performance appraisal system in oil and natural gas commission (ONGC). *India İşletmeAraştırmalarıDergisi*, *2*(2), 65-78.

Starratt, A., & Grandy, G. (2010). Young workers' experiences of abusive leadership. *Leadership & organization development journal*.

Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinates' resistance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(5), 974–983.

Timm, D., Tran, N., Taylor, A. J., Robbins, M. M., & Powell, R. (2009). Evaluation of Mixture Performance and Structural Capacity of Pavements Using Shell Thiopave. *National Center for Asphalt Technology at Auburn University*, *44*, 09-05.

Van Ark, B., O'Mahoney, M., & Timmer, M. P. (2008). The productivity gap between Europe and the United States: trends and causes. *Journal of economic perspectives*, *22*(1), 25-44.

Varhama, L. M., &Björkqvist, K. (2004). Conflicts, workplace bullying and burnout problems among municipal employees. *Psychological reports*, *94*(3_suppl), 1116-1124.

Werther, B. (1996). William ve Keith Davis. *Human Resources and Personel Management, 5th Edition, Irwin McGraw-Hill, Boston*.

Youngcourt, S. S., Leiva, P. I., & Jones, R. G. (2007). Perceived purposes of performance appraisal: Correlates of individual-and position-focused purposes on attitudinal outcomes. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *18*(3), 315-343.

Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(6), 1068–1076.

Zhang, Y., &Bednall, T. C. (2016). Antecedents of abusive supervision: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *139*(3), 455-471.