

How Abusive Supervision Affects Job Performance- From Both Direct and Indirect Perspectives

Ming Gao *

School of Nanjing University of Science & Technology, Nanjing, China

* Corresponding Author Email: gaoming200010@163.com

Abstract. Abusive supervision has received a great deal of attention since it was proposed by Tepper, and it has been shown to have complex effects on abused employees. Recently, scholars have begun to focus on abusive supervision as perceived by third parties to study the impact of this workplace abuse phenomena on a wider range of bystanders in the organization. As a negative leadership style, abusive supervision is in relation to job performance closely and widely, extending from the direct abused victims to the indirect perceived third parties. This paper will summarize the previous literature on the impact of abusive supervision on job performance from both direct and indirect perspectives.

Keywords: abusive supervision; the third party's perspective; job performance.

1. Introduction

As is known to all, abusive supervision is one kind of counterproductive leader behaviors. Since Tepper (2007) noted that it is estimated abuse supervision affects roughly 13.6% of employees in the U.S., and it comes at a significant cost [1], people have recognized the importance of studying abusive supervision, which involves repeated verbal and nonverbal mistreatment, directed by supervisors. The proportion may be even higher in times of economic hardship.

After Tepper (2018) pointed that the study of abuse supervision can be more comprehensive and powerful if it takes third parties into account than only discussing it from the perspective of the perpetrator and the victim. Researchers began to focus their attention on abuse supervision from a third-party's perspective. With researches carried out, it has become clear that abuse supervision affects not only the physical and psychological well-being of the direct abused employees, but also the emotions and behaviors of third parties. However, the relationships are multiple, not just passive as is traditionally believed.

This article is a review that compiles previous research results and summarizes the impact of abusive supervision on employee performance. The benefits of enhancing work performance for both employees and organizations are self-evident. Therefore, how to avoid the side effects of counterproductive leader behaviors on performance and understanding when it will do good to employee performance behavior are important issues that require our attention.

2. Abusive supervision

2.1. Conceptual Meanings

Since Tepper introduced the concept of abusive supervision in 2000, national and international scholars have begun to focus on this negative leadership style. Abusive management refers to the persistent verbal or nonverbal hostile behaviors perceived by subordinates, other than physical contacts [2]. Based on it, Zhang and Liu (2018) [3] had proposed dividing abusive supervision into overt behaviors (e.g., yelling, public punishment) and covert behaviors (e.g., rude looks, ignoring someone, taking undue credit for what subordinates have done, withholding information from employees).



From the above, we can conclude that abusive supervision is non-physical, continuous, subjective, and hostile.

2.2. Measurement

At present, scholars often use survey questionnaires to measure employees' subjective perception of superiors' abusive behavior. Scholars at home and abroad mostly refer to the fifteen item abuse supervision scale developed by Tepper (2000) and make appropriate modifications and deletions according to the actual research environment when measuring, so the scale is not unified.

For example, Aryee (2007) [4] removed 5 sensitive items based on the particularity of China's cultural context, leaving the remaining 10 items to form the Chinese version of the abuse supervision measurement scale. This scale was later widely used in the study of abuse management situations in China. In addition to a single dimensional measurement method, Wulani (2013) [5] also expanded the measurement dimension of abuse supervision by measuring 25 items from multiple dimensions of anger, shame, and negative abuse.

2.3. Research status

2.3.1. Antecedents

Up to now, the academic community focuses on exploring the factors that lead to abusive supervision at the lever of organizational environment, the perpetrator and the target.

Organizational environments such as hostile atmosphere [6], the effectiveness of human resources [7], the uncertainty of industry environments [8], work complexity and organizational culture [9] can cause leaders' abusive supervision.

As for leaders, the dark personality traits of managers [10], narcissistic traits [11], conscientiousness [12], and instrumental beliefs [13] are fuses for their abusive management. Meanwhile, personal experiences of leaders, as Aryee (2007) [14] have found that being unfairly treated by superiors can lead them to choose employees who are better suited for them to vent. Family abuse during childhood can also have a positively impact on their future abusive supervision.

In addition, individual characteristics of employees such as adaptability [15], Zhongyong thinking [16], self-construal [9], attribution style and leader member exchange relationship [17] also interfere with employees' perception of leaders' abusive behavior.

2.3.2. Outcomes

The researches on the outcome variables of abusive supervision mainly focus on the psychological and behavioral aspects of employees. The abusive supervision of superiors can trigger changes in the psychological state of subordinates.

Employees who are subjected to abusive management may experience negative emotions such as anger [18] and anxiety [1], which can also reduce employees' organizational self-esteem [19] and increase psychological insecurity.

Negative emotions can cause employees' subsequent deviant behaviors. Chen (2022) [20] tested the impact of abusive supervision on employee creativity based on the theory of emotional events, and the results showed a negative correlation between abusive supervision and creativity, with negative effects serving as mediators and interpersonal harmony as mediators. Hao (2022) [21] argued that when subordinates are exposed to the long-term abusive management, they may feel a sense of resource loss, leading to emotional exhaustion, which further bring as a result to their knowledge hiding behavior. Yan (2014) [22] explored abusive supervision from the perspective of resource conservation theory and found that abusive supervision not only weakens employee organizational loyalty and voice, but also enhances exit and neglect behavior.

3. Abusive supervision from the third party perspective

3.1. Conceptual Meanings

By reviewing literature on abuse supervision from a third party's perspective, it can be found that scholars have come up with several different definitions of it. Harris (2013) [23] pointed out that vicarious abusive supervision refers to subordinates' observation or awareness of the superior's abusive management experienced by colleagues. It refers to the indirect experience of abusive management through others, which mainly comes from the verbal expression of the direct participant or the observation of a third party. Some scholars name this indirect experience as observed abuse [24]. Peer abusive supervision, proposed by Peng (2014) [25], measuring the degree to which employees perceive their colleagues being subjected to abusive management by the same supervisor.

Table 1. Different definitions of abuse supervision from a third-party perspective

Definition	Proposer
Vicarious abusive supervision	Harris et al. (2013)
Peer abusive supervision	Peng et al. (2014)
Observed abuse	Mitchell et al. (2015)

3.2. Measurement

Regarding the measurement of abuse supervision from a third-party perspective, some scholars directly used the classic abusive supervision scale developed by Tepper [24]. While others simplified the scale based on the specific situation, as Peng (2014) [25] selected three active and two passive forms of aggression to form a five-item scale (2, 4, 7, 8, and 11 of the original 15 items). The specific measurement method is to change the subject of each item in the scale from "me" to "my colleague" to measure the degree of the colleague had suffered from abusive supervision which the respondent perceived.

3.3. Research status

The influence of any events occurred in organization is not singular, abusive supervision not only affects the psychology state and behaviors of point employees, but also affects third-party employees who perceive this negative leadership behavior.

3.3.1. Outcomes

Indirect abusive supervision has an impact on the emotions of third-party employees, and the outcome depends on the relationship with the abused employee, LMX, third-party employees' own moral principles and attribution to this organizational phenomenon.

The study of Qiao (2021) [26] suggested that when in a competitive relationship with abused individuals, employees may feel gloating after experiencing peer abuse supervision, thereby increasing their work engagement. Xu (2020) [27] based on competition theory, pointing out that when third-party employees have a highly competitive relationship with the victim, they will experience "pleasure", while this sense of malice will be alleviated when they are in a cooperative state with the abused employee. In addition, Mitchell (2015) [24] held the view that the differences in the responsible parties perceived by third parties when attributing can also lead to different emotions. When a third party feels that the abuser is the responsible party, it can generate moral anger or empathy; but when a third party believes that the responsibility is attributed to the victim, they will generate identification and satisfaction.

Furthermore, abusive supervision can also affect the behaviors of third-party employees, mainly including explicit behavioral responses such as coworker support, coworker exclusion, supervisor-oriented deviant behavior and implicit behavioral responses such as silence. Mitchell (2015) [24]

found that if employees perceive their colleagues being subjected to abusive management, they will feel angry and create a sense of unfairness, which thereby will prompt them to confront managers and even the organization to support abused colleagues. Priesemuth (2019) [28] held the same view, arguing that norms and principles of fairness may contribute to moral outrage among third-party employees to against peer abusive supervision, which leads to their prosocial behavior such as protective behavior toward coworkers. Although the initiator of abusive behavior in organizations is usually the manager, third party employees who witness abusive behavior may participate in and assist the abuser by committing bullying together. Schaubroeck (2016) [29] found that witnessing colleagues being subjected to abusive management can undermine the level of respect for abused colleagues, and therefore may participate in the abuser's teams and do uncivilized behaviors towards colleagues. When the third-party employee attributes the abuse to the abuser, there will be deviant behavior towards supervisors. Zhang (2020) [30] found that according to the theory of moral justice, third party employees with a sense of justice may generate anger towards supervisor's abusive behavior, which can lead them to communicate directly with their supervisor or engage in supervisor directed deviant behavior. Huang (2019) [31] argued that existing researches mainly focus on explicit behavioral responses, neglecting their implicit behavior, such as silence. So they studied the spillover effects of abusive supervision from a third party perspective, result has shown a positive correlation between peer abuse supervision and third party's silence.

4. Jop performance

4.1. Conceptual Meanings

The content of job performance is rich, it covers widely and has diverse dimensions. Scholars' definitions of it also change with different perspectives and contexts.

Astin (1964) [32] was the first person to propose job performance. He believed that when an employee's behavior can contribute to achieving organizational goals, the results of their work can be defined as job performance. Campbell (1990) [33] thought that job performance refers to the ability of employees to maintain interpersonal relationships and organizational incentives in order to maintain the good operation and development of the enterprise while completing tasks within their scope of responsibility.

4.2. Dimension division and measurement

The concept of job performance has been considered as a unidimensional structure for a long time since it was introduced. However, As Campbell (1993) [34] argued that job performance should be understood as being under individual control, closely linking to the achievement of organizational goals and encompassing diverse actions on individuals and organizations and interpersonal interactions, more and more scholars gradually recognized job performance as a multidimensional concept. Depending on the focus of the study, job performance was classified into two-dimensional, three-dimensional, and multidimensional structures.

4.2.1. Unidimensional model

Benjamin (1989) [35] emphasized in the definition of job performance that task performance is equivalent to overall work performance. Later, Williams (1991) [36] designed a single dimensional performance scale that only includes in-role behavior.

4.2.2. Two-dimensional model

Through Borman and Motowidlo's [37] research and analysis, they argued that job performance is a two-dimensional structure that contains task performance and contextual performance. Task performance is the employee's contribution to the achievement of the organization's strategic goals through daily business activities and the fulfillment of the duties set by the job position. Contextual performance, is an act of non-direct production and service that originates from the employee's

spontaneous behavior. To a certain extent, it can improve task performance, thus enhancing the efficiency of the entire organization. Motowildo and Van Scotter (1996) [38] further expanded the dimensions of contextual performance: interpersonal skills, maintenance of great work relationships, and motivation to help others accomplish their tasks.

In terms of measurement, the job performance scale developed by Borman and Modowidlo (1997) [39] is most frequently used in relevant research. It measures task performance and contextual performance respectively, and contextual performance includes both interpersonal facilitation and job dedication. Based on the previous research, Yu, revised the scale of task performance and contextual performance which is specially consistent with the management situation in China.

4.2.3. Three-dimensional model

The three-dimensional model of job performance was developed by Kahn and Katz (1978) [40]. It was based on the role-behavior theory, firstly, employees must be part of the organization and committed to not leaving it; secondly, employees must complete their job tasks according to their responsibilities; and finally, they must behave in a way that is beneficial to the organization after completing their character assignment requirements. By analyzing previous studies, Allworth and Hesketh (1997) [41] argued that job performance should also reflect employees' adaptability to change, so they added adaptive performance to it when measuring. They proposed a three-dimensional performance model and proved that adaptive performance is an independent dimension through empirical analysis. Hesketh and Neal (1999) [42] defined adaptive performance as the ability of individuals' adaption to work environment which is turbulent. Pulakos (2000) [43] highlighted the complexity of the adaptive performance and conducted a systematic study about it. They defined adaptive performance as employees adapting their behavior to the demands of work environment and emergencies to demonstrate adaptability. It was showed in problem solving, crisis management, learning skills and adaption to humanistic and cultural environment. Researchers generally consider that adaptive performance is complementary to the content of job performance.

4.2.4. Multidimensional model

In 1993, Campbell divided job performance into eight dimensions. He proposed an eight-dimensional performance model that includes team consciousness, individual disciplines and several other dimensions, each dimension has corresponding description on characteristics. In present, the eight-dimensional model is the most popular among existing models. In 2005, Wen [44] constructed a four-dimensional research model to discriminate job performance from interpersonal performance based on management practices in China. Han (2007) [45] also developed a four-dimensional job performance scale including task performance, contextual performance, learning performance and innovation performance through interviews and empirical study.

Table 2. Different dimensional divisions of job performance

Dimension division	Proposer
unidimensional structure	Benjamin (1989)
	Williams (1991)
two-dimensional structure	Borman & Motowidlo (1993)
	Motowildo & Van Scotter (1996)
three-dimensional structure	Kahn & Katz (1978)
	Hesketh (1997)
multidimensional model	Allworth & Campbell (1993)
	Wen Zhiyi (2005)

4.3. Antecedents

When reviewing the relevant literature, we found that scholars at the beginning of the study considered individual factors as the main influencing factor of job performance, but at the later stage of the study, some scholars believed that organizational environment factors also have a deeper impact on job performance. Here we will discuss the factors that influence job performance from three levels: employees, managers, and organizational environment.

4.3.1. Individual

Standing at the place of employees, on the one hand, demographic variables have a certain impact on job performance. Zhang (2008) [46] found that individual differences, such as gender, age, and level of education play an important role in job performance.

On the other hand, the individual's work ability and experience, psychological capital, resilience, cognitive thinking and motivation are influencing factors that cannot be ignored. Vecchio (2010) [47] came to the conclusion that individual competencies such as possession of skills, perception of risk preference, and achievement motivation can have great impacts on job performance. Madrid (2018) [48] thought psychological capital is a set of personal resources comprised by hope, efficacy, optimism and resilience, which previous research has supported as being valuable for general work performance. Their study analyzed the temporal meaning of each psychological capital dimension, this paper theorizes the relative weights of psychological capital dimensions on proficiency, adaptivity, and proactivity, proposing also that higher relative weight dimensions are helpful to cope with job demands and perform well. Hao and Long (2018) [49] questioned about why and when empowering leadership has different effects on employee work performance, finally revealed that empowering leadership was more likely to increase employee work performance when their role breadth self-efficacy is high. Walpita and Arambepola (2020) [50] used a Cross-sectional study enrolled 230 nurses from Sri Lanka to examine the relationship between resilience and job performance, the conclusion was higher resilience level at work is associated with better working performance.

4.3.2. Management

A significant body of scientific research has shown management practices influence work efficiency.

Firstly, research in the area of leadership style has shown that it is an important predictor of employees' performance. Podsakoff (2000) [51] collected the effect of leadership style on organizational citizenship behavior through a meta-analysis and concluded that transformational, transactional, supportive leadership are significantly related to organizational citizenship behavior. These findings are supported by the latest research. As Arshad (2021) [52] showed that Ethical leadership is effective in enhancing employee organizational citizenship behavior. Ausat (2022) [53] thought that transformational leadership can have beneficial effects on employees' performance like commitment and intimacy.

Secondly, human resource management plays a leading role in the overall management of the company. It improves the work ability and competitiveness of staff through recruitment and selection, regular assessment and training. High-performing human resource management practices also help promote employee performance which can have a psychological impact on employees' careers, making them act with a sense of job security and organizational belonging. Stirpe (2021) [54] conducted a study based on the job demand-resource model and showed that employee satisfaction with human resource management practices affects employee engagement and further positively promote employee performance. When superiors set clear work tasks and goals for subordinates, employees will work harder because they have a clear direction [55], which in turn improves job performance. Niati (2021) [56] aimed to determine the effect of training on work performance and career development by mediating work motivation. Results showed that training and motivation can improve job performance. Furthermore, training, motivation, and job performance can improve career

development of employees at work. So, It is recommended for organization to improve training program, motivation and work performance of employees.

4.3.3. Organization environment

It is also known that the work environment is one of the main antecedents that influence employee behavior. The positive and dynamic work environment can facilitate employee performance and stimulate employees' inner potential, while the awful one can significantly reduce employee performance. Organizational climate, culture, conditions, rules and regulations, as well as implicit organizational support and employee relations can all be described as environmental factors that change job performance.

Rasool (2020) [57] analyzed the relationships between workplace violence, occupational stress, and sustainable work performance, the results of this study highlighted that from both direct and indirect angles, workplace violence negatively influences sustainable work performance. Work environment pressure also can have a negative impact on performance. As to the effect of technostress on university teachers' work performance, techno-complexity and techno-insecurity have significant negative influences on their work performance [58]. In terms of workplace, activity-based working seems to be a promising concept that can be implemented and promoted based on some benefits for work performance and perceptions of the work environment when it is coupled with appropriate management support and organization [59].

By summarizing the antecedents influencing job performance, it is easy to find that job performance is the result of many factors, not only influenced by employees' personal traits and work attitudes, but also closely related to the organization's management. In addition, the organizational environment can play a dual role in performance, so this provides the organization with a management inspiration: harmonious and positive work environment is the key to help employees work both initiatively and creatively, and even it is the basis of whether an enterprise can fully improve employee performance.

Table 3. Antecedents of job performance

Level	Factors	Authors
Individual	individual differences work ability self-efficacy psychological capital resilience at work	Zhang Lanxia <i>et al.</i> (2008) Vecchio <i>et al.</i> (2010) Hao & Long (2018) Madrid <i>et al.</i> (2018) Arambepola <i>et al.</i> (2020)
Management	leadership style human resource management	Podsakoff <i>et al.</i> (2000) Arshad <i>et al.</i> (2021) Ausat <i>et al.</i> (2022) Stirpe <i>et al.</i> (2021) Meyer <i>et al.</i> (2018) Niati <i>et al.</i> (2021)
Organization -environment	work atmosphere workplace work environment pressure	Rasool <i>et al.</i> (2020) Engelen <i>et al.</i> (2019) Li <i>et al.</i> (2021)

5. Abusive supervision and job performance

5.1. From the direct perspective of victims

Because of the destructive nature of abusive supervision, it makes sense that most of the current research findings on the impact of abusive supervision about the performance of directly victimized employees are on the negative side. After all, as independent individuals, perceived negative management behaviors of leaders are bound to bring about changes in psychological state. Tepper (2000) [2] suggested that as leaders with abusive management behaviors are unable to give feedback with effective information and abusive punishment combat subordinates' self-esteem, employees will reduce in-role behaviors and decrease task performance. Li Yuhui (2016) [60] also focused on the change in mental state during abusive management, he thought that abusive supervision reduces employees' job performance by increasing their psychological distress.

Organizational context and individual differences make the effect of abusive supervision on job performance different. Characterized by hierarchical culture, Srikanth (2022) [61] explored the possibility of an inverted U-shaped relationship between abusive supervision and subordinate performance, and the results also showed that subordinate accountability plays a moderating role in this curvilinear relationship, meanwhile attentiveness playing a mediating role. With a theoretical anchoring in the conservation of resources theory, De Clercq et al. (2021) [62] investigated how employees' exposure to abusive supervision ultimately might lead to enhance supervisor ratings of their job performance because employees may react with defensive silence. This process is more likely to occur among neurotic employees. Zhou (2016) [63] discussed the implications of abusive supervision variability as it relates to understanding the impact of abusive supervision on subordinates' performance. Results showed abusive supervision variability augmented the negative impacts of abusive supervision on job performance and organizational citizenship behavior, such that these negative relationships would be stronger when the variability of abusive supervision was low as opposed to high.

5.2. From the indirect perspective of third parties

Several scholars have studied the spillover effects of abuse management on performance from the third party's perspective, with findings concentrating on both effects on task performance and contextual performance.

Shao (2018) [64] hypothesized that prevention-focused third parties will increase their performance effort as a response to peer abusive supervision. It turns out that this is indeed the case, the indirect effect of abuse supervision on third-party performance effort mediated by performance instrumentality is moderated by prevention orientation, so the effect will be stronger when third-party prevention orientation is high. Qiao and Zhang (2021) [65] used the emotion-based process model of schadenfreude as a basis to suggest that third parties will experience schadenfreude and increase their work engagement as a response to peer abusive supervision. As is known to all, job engagement will increase job performance in a great measure.

Drawing on affective event theory, when perceiving peer abusive supervision, third-party employees will first make cognitive evaluations, and observers with high hostile attribution bias will be more inclined to attribute this phenomenon to the supervisor, believing that the supervisor is hurting the coworker intentionally rather than urging the coworker to improve performance. This will result in third party's negative affectivity, then they will tend to retaliate against the supervisor with a relatively safe confrontational behavior such as cyberloafing, which will undoubtedly reduce task performance.

The impact of peer abusive supervision on contextual performance is also twofold. Mitchell (2015) [24] examined third parties' reactions to the abusive supervision of coworkers from two paths. They predicted that third parties would feel anger when targets of abuse were considered undeserving of mistreatment; angered third parties would then be motivated to produce supervisor-directed deviant

behavior and support the target coworker. Conversely, third parties would feel satisfied when targets were considered deserving of mistreatment; contented third parties would then be motivated to exclude the targeted coworker. Positive organizational climate is a key driver of knowledge sharing among members, but negative organizational climate can lead to knowledge hiding among members. Research has shown that peer abuse supervision has a positive effect on salespeople's customer knowledge hiding, and the relationship between peer abusive supervision and sales employees' customer knowledge hiding is moderated by rivalry such that the relationship is positive when rivalry is high rather than low. The knowledge hiding behavior of individuals in the organization may improve individual performance in a short period of time, but in the long run, the spread of this behavior is extremely detrimental to organizational innovation and development.

6. Conclusion

Leadership styles have always been a popular topic of interest for researchers. Leaders' behavior plays a very important role in employee performance and organizational effectiveness, different leadership styles have various effects on the attitudes and behavior of subordinates. With the increasing problems caused by negative leadership styles in the organization, which greatly affect the internal harmony and external competitiveness, scholars have gradually realized the importance of bringing attention to negative leadership styles.

Existing researches focus on the effects of abuse supervision on the emotions and behaviors of abused employees, but not only the perpetrator and the target, but also third parties as bystanders are involved in abuse management in organizations. In a review of the literature on the effects of abuse supervision and employee performance, we find that studies from the perspective of third parties are few, most of them concentrate on the effects on the performance of victimized employees.

The effect of abusive supervision on employee performance is not unidirectional, although people hold the view that negative leadership styles reduce employee performance traditionally. As work performance is affected not only by management style, but also by various factors, such as employee personal characteristics, organizational environment and so on. The results of previous studies reveal that the relationship between abusive supervision and performance is not consistent, but most studies show that the relationship is negative, both for direct victims and the third-party employees.

This provides management inspiration to the organization: to avoid the negative impact of negative leadership on the internal harmony and development of the organization in the long term, managers should not only reduce the use of oppressive and high-handed policies, but also adopt appropriate leadership styles to create a positive ethical atmosphere, so that subordinates will raise awareness of respect and friendliness, thus strengthening the individual perception of fairness in interaction and making positive feedback. In a word, the organization should actively create a friendly, cooperative, tolerant and supportive organizational culture, so that employees can show their self-driven ability in such a cordial atmosphere, thus improving the overall performance and enabling the company to develop firmly in the ever-changing market environment.

7. Future research

Firstly, researches on abusive supervision on work performance from the third-party perspective is still scarce. More studies could be done in the future to explore the consequences of abusive supervision from this angle and make this studying area more comprehensive and clearer.

Secondly, society in China is characterized by a significant relational orientation, Chinese attach great importance to relational values during social interactions. Abusive supervision not only damages the LMX, but also do harm to colleague relationship. It is possible to base the study on the cultural context in China and explore the effects of abuse supervision on performance in our country's management situation specially.

Finally, new explanation mechanisms on when and why abusive supervision increases or decreases work performance from both perspectives can be found, helping to reveal the "black box" of the relationship between negative leadership styles and work performance.

References

- [1] Tepper B J. Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda[J]. *Journal of management*, 2007, 33(3): 261-289.
- [2] Tepper B J. Consequences of abusive supervision[J]. *Academy of management journal*, 2000,43(2): 178-190.
- [3] Zhang J, Liu J. Is abusive supervision an absolute devil? Literature review and research agenda[J]. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 2018, 35: 719-744.
- [4] Aryee. S, Chen Z.X, Sum LY, et al. Antecedents and Outcomes of Abusive Supervision: Test of a Trickle-Down Model[J]. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,2007,92(1):191-201.
- [5] WULANI, FENIKA. Peran pemoderasian faktor personal dan situasional pada hubungan abusive supervision dengan anteseden dan konsekuensinya. Diss. Universitas Gadjah Mada, 2013.
- [6] Mawritz, Mary B., Robert Folger, and Gary P. Latham. "Supervisors' exceedingly difficult goals and abusive supervision: The mediating effects of hindrance stress, anger, and anxiety." *Journal of organizational behavior* 35.3 (2014): 358-372.
- [7] Harris, Kenneth J., Paul Harvey, and K. Michele Kacmar. "Abusive supervisory reactions to coworker relationship conflict." *The Leadership Quarterly* 22.5 (2011): 1010-1023.
- [8] Hmieleski K M, Ensley M D. A contextual examination of new venture performance: Entrepreneur leadership behavior, top management team heterogeneity, and environmental dynamism[J]. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 2007, 28(7): 865-889.
- [9] Xi M, Xu Q, Zhong W G, et al. Abusive supervision and subordinate silence: A moderating model of multilevel characteristics[J]. *Nankai Business Review*, 2015, 18(3): 132-140.
- [10] Kiazad K, Restubog S L D, Zagenczyk T J, et al. In pursuit of power: The role of authoritarian leadership in the relationship between supervisors' Machiavellianism and subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervisory behavior[J]. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 2010, 44(4): 512-519.
- [11] Waldman D A, Wang D, Hannah S T, et al. Psychological and neurological predictors of abusive supervision[J]. *Personnel Psychology*, 2018, 71(3): 399-421.
- [12] Eissa G, Lester S W. Supervisor role overload and frustration as antecedents of abusive supervision: The moderating role of supervisor personality[J]. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2017, 38(3): 307-326.
- [13] Watkins T, Fehr R, He W. Whatever it takes: Leaders' perceptions of abusive supervision instrumentality[J]. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2019, 30(2): 260-272.
- [14] Aryee S, Sun L Y, Chen Z X G, et al. Abusive supervision and contextual performance: The mediating role of emotional exhaustion and the moderating role of work unit structure[J]. *Management and Organization Review*, 2008,4(3): 393-411.
- [15] Mackey J D, Ellen B P, Hochwarter W A, et al. Subordinate social adaptability and the consequences of abusive supervision perceptions in two samples[J]. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2013, 24(5):732-746.
- [16] SHEN Y, MA C, BAI X, et al. Linking abusive supervision with employee creativity: The roles of psychological contract breach and Zhongyong thinking style[J]. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 2019, 51(2): 238.
- [17] Burton J P, Taylor S G, Barber L K. Understanding internal, external, and relational attributions for abusive supervision[J]. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2014, 35(6): 871-891.
- [18] Dhanani L Y, LaPalme M L. It's Not Personal: A Review and Theoretical Integration of Research onVicarious Workplace Mistreatment[J]. *Journal of Management*, 2019, 45(6).
- [19] Farh C I C, Chen Z. Beyond the individual victim: Multilevel consequences of abusive supervision in teams[J]. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2014, 99(6): 1074.
- [20] Chen L, Ye Z, Shafait Z, et al. The effect of abusive supervision on employee creativity: The mediating role of negative affect and moderating role of interpersonal harmony[J]. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2022, 13: 796355.
- [21] Hao Q, Wei K, Zhang B. How to attenuate the effects of abusive supervision on knowledge hiding: The neutralizing roles of coworker support and individual characteristics[J]. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 2022, 26(7): 1807-1825.
- [22] YAN Dan. The Influence Mechanism of Abusive Supervision on Employee's EVLN Behavior—Based on Resource Conservation Theory [J]. *Science and Technology Management Research*, 2014, (20):123 -131

- [23] Harris, Kenneth J., et al. "An investigation of abusive supervision, vicarious abusive supervision, and their joint impacts." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 153.1 (2013): 38-50.
- [24] Mitchell M S, Vogel R M, Folger R. Third parties' reactions to the abusive supervision of coworkers[J]. *Journal of applied psychology*, 2015, 100(4): 1040.
- [25] Peng A C, Schaubroeck J M, Li Y. Social exchange implications of own and coworkers' experiences of supervisory abuse[J]. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2014, 57(5): 1385-1405.
- [26] Qiao Y, Zhang Z, Jia M. Their pain, our pleasure: How and when peer abusive supervision leads to third parties' schadenfreude and work engagement[J]. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2021, 169: 695-711.
- [27] Xu E, Huang X, Jia R, et al. The "evil pleasure": Abusive supervision and third-party observers' malicious reactions toward victims[J]. *Organization Science*, 2020, 31(5): 1115-1137.
- [28] Priesemuth M, Schminke M. Helping thy neighbor? Prosocial reactions to observed abusive supervision in the workplace[J]. *Journal of Management*, 2019, 45(3): 1225-1251.
- [29] Schaubroeck J M, Peng A C, Hannah S T. The role of peer respect in linking abusive supervision to follower outcomes: Dual moderation of group potency[J]. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2016, 101(2): 267.
- [30] Zhang Y, Liu X, Chen W. Fight and flight: a contingency model of third parties' approach-avoidance reactions to peer abusive supervision[J]. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 2020, 35: 767-782.
- [31] Huang J, Guo G, Tang D, et al. An eye for an eye? Third parties' silence reactions to peer abusive supervision: the mediating role of workplace anxiety, and the moderating role of core self-evaluation[J]. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 2019, 16(24): 5027.
- [32] Astin W. Criterion-centered research[J]. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 1964, 24(4): 807-822.
- [33] Campbell J P. Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology[J]. 1990.
- [34] Campbell, Mc Cloy Oppen & Sager. *A theory of Performance and Associates Personnel Selection in Organizations*. San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass, 1993.
- [35] Bernardin, Peng J S. *Human Resource Management: A Practical Approach* [M]. Nanjing University Press, 2009.
- [36] Williams L J, Anderson S E. Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and In-Role Behavior[J]. *Journal of Management*, 1991, 17(3):601-617.
- [37] Borman W C, Motowidlo S M. Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance[J]. 1993.
- [38] Van Scotter J R, Motowidlo S J. Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance[J]. *Journal of applied psychology*, 1996, 81(5): 525.
- [39] Motowidlo S J, Borman W C, Schmit M J. A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance[M]//*Organizational citizenship behavior and contextual performance*. Psychology Press, 2014: 71-83.
- [40] Katz D, Kahn R. *The social psychology of organizations*[M]//*Organizational behavior 2*. Routledge, 2015: 152-168.
- [41] Heskett B, Allworth E. Adaptive performance: Updating the criterion to cope with change[Z]. Paper presented at the 2nd Australian Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, Melbourne, 1997.
- [42] Ilgen, Daniel R., and Elaine D. Pulakos. *The Changing Nature of Performance: Implications for Staffing, Motivation, and Development*. *Frontiers of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, CA 94104, 1999.
- [43] Pulakos, Elaine D., et al. "Adaptability in the workplace: development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance." *Journal of applied psychology* 85.4 (2000): 612.
- [44] Wen Z Y. Four-Factor Model of Job Performance [J]. *Journal of Capital Normal University (Social Sciences Edition)*, 2005(05): 105-111.
- [45] Han Y, Liao J Q, Long L R. Model of development and empirical study on employee job performance construct[J]. *Journal of Management Sciences in China*, 2007, 10(5): 62-77.
- [46] Zhang L X, Liu J, Zhao H D, Lv W. Relationship between Working Attitude and Performance of Knowledge Workers [J]. *Chinese Journal of Management*, 2008(01):138-143
- [47] Robert P. Vecchio and Joseph E. Justin and Craig L. Pearce. Empowering leadership: An examination of mediating mechanisms within a hierarchical structure[J]. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2010, 21(3): 530 -542.
- [48] Madrid H P, Diaz M T, Leka S, et al. A finer grained approach to psychological capital and work performance[J]. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 2018, 33: 461-477.
- [49] Hao P, He W, Long L R. Why and when empowering leadership has different effects on employee work performance: The pivotal roles of passion for work and role breadth self-efficacy[J]. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 2018, 25(1): 85-100.
- [50] Walpita Y N, Arambepola C. High resilience leads to better work performance in nurses: Evidence from South Asia[J]. *Journal of nursing management*, 2020, 28(2): 342-350.

- [51] MacKenzie, S. B., P. M. Podsakoff, G. A. Rich. Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance[J]. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 2000, 29 (2): 115- 134.
- [52] Arshad M, Abid G, Torres F. Impact of prosocial motivation on organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating role of ethical leadership and leader–member exchange[J]. *Quality & Quantity*, 2021, 55(4).
- [53] Ausat A M A, Suherlan S, Peirisal T, et al. The Effect of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Commitment and Work Performance[J]. *Journal of Leadership in Organizations*, 2022, 4(1).
- [54] Stirpe L, Profili S, Sammarra A. Satisfaction with HR practices and employee performance: a moderated mediation model of engagement and health[J]. *European Management Journal*, 2021(6) :1-11.
- [55] Meyer H, Reudenbach C, Hengl T, et al. Improving performance of spatio-temporal machine learning models using forward feature selection and target-oriented validation[J]. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 2018, 101: 1-9.
- [56] Niati D R, Siregar Z M E, Prayoga Y. The effect of training on work performance and career development: the role of motivation as intervening variable[J]. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2021, 4(2): 2385-2393.
- [57] Rasool S F, Wang M, Zhang Y, et al. Sustainable work performance: the roles of workplace violence and occupational stress[J]. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 2020, 17(3): 912.
- [58] Li L, Wang X. Technostress inhibitors and creators and their impacts on university teachers' work performance in higher education[J]. *Cognition, Technology & Work*, 2021, 23: 315-33
- [59] Engelen L, Chau J, Young S, et al. Is activity-based working impacting health, work performance and perceptions? A systematic review[J]. *Building research & information*, 2019, 47(4): 468-479.
- [60] Yuhui L, Zhen W, Canwei H, et al. The effects of abusive supervision on psychological distress and job performance: a moderated mediation[J]. *Management Review*, 2016, 28(2): 127.
- [61] Srikanth Peruvemba B., Thakur Munish, Dust Scott B. The curvilinear relationship between abusive supervision and performance: The moderating role of conscientiousness and the mediating role of attentiveness[J]. *Journal of Business Research*, 2022, 150.
- [62] De Clercq D, Jahanzeb S, Fatima T. What an abusive supervision ultimately might enhance performance ratings among silent, neurotic employees[J]. *Personnel Review*, 2021, 50(5): 1297-1315.
- [63] Zhou L. Abusive supervision and work performance: The moderating role of abusive supervision variability[J]. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 2016, 44(7): 1089-1098.
- [64] Shao P, Li A, Mawritz M. Self-protective reactions to peer abusive supervision: The moderating role of prevention focus and the mediating role of performance instrumentality[J]. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2018, 39(1): 12-25.
- [65] Qiao Y, Zhang Z, Jia M. Their pain, our pleasure: How and when peer abusive supervision leads to third parties' schadenfreude and work engagement[J]. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2021, 169: 695-711.