

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345448023>

The influence of abusive supervision on employees' motivation and extra-role behaviors: The daily-basis investigation

Article in *Chinese Management Studies* · August 2019

DOI: 10.1108/CMS-04-2018-0495

CITATIONS

40

READS

346

4 authors, including:



Liang-Chih Huang

National Chung Cheng University

20 PUBLICATIONS 1,134 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Cheng-Chen Timothy Lin

National Pingtung University of Science and Technology

16 PUBLICATIONS 887 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Szu-Chi Lu

National Taichung University of Science and Technology

10 PUBLICATIONS 731 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Chinese Management Studies

The influence of abusive supervision on employees' motivation and extra-role behaviors: The daily-basis investigation

Liang-Chih Huang, Chun-Hui Su, Cheng-Chen Lin, Szu-Chi Lu,

Article information:

To cite this document:

Liang-Chih Huang, Chun-Hui Su, Cheng-Chen Lin, Szu-Chi Lu, (2019) "The influence of abusive supervision on employees' motivation and extra-role behaviors: The daily-basis investigation", Chinese Management Studies, <https://doi.org/10.1108/CMS-04-2018-0495>

Permanent link to this document:

<https://doi.org/10.1108/CMS-04-2018-0495>

Downloaded on: 05 June 2019, At: 13:18 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 52 other documents.

To copy this document: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by

Token:Eprints:KF9EV5INC39EPKD3K7GP:

For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit www.emeraldinsight.com/authors for more information.

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

The influence of abusive supervision on employees' motivation and extra-role behaviors

The daily-basis investigation

Influence of abusive supervision

Liang-Chih Huang

Department of Labor Relations, National Chung Cheng University, Min-Hsiung, Taiwan

Chun-Hui Su,

Operation Department, Yeong Chin Machinery Industries Co., Inc, and

Cheng-Chen Lin and Szu-Chi Lu

Department of Business Administration, National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, Pingtung, Taiwan

Received 27 April 2018
Revised 2 August 2018
Accepted 29 December 2018

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to attempt to unlock how and why abusive supervision influences employees' day-to-day behaviors. Thus, the present study proposes that employees who are continuously faced with a supervisor's hostile verbal and nonverbal behavior might obstruct their willingness to exhibit two different kinds of extra-role behaviors [i.e. organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and voice] because sustained abusive behavior might hinder employees from their tasks and result in disengagement. Abused employees are more likely to disengage from their current tasks, and this is likely to in turn result in lower OCB and voice.

Design/methodology/approach – The data were collected from a Taiwan mid-sized high-tech manufacturing company. The present study adopted a within-person approach (a daily-basis research design) and collected data from 60 front-line employees over 10 working days. Although all variables were self-rated, common method variance is minor. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to ensure discriminant and convergent validity, and hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) was used to test the hypotheses.

Findings – The results of CFA ensure the measures have discriminant and convergent validity, while the results of HLM analysis showed that work engagement fully mediates the negative relationship between abusive supervision and the two kinds of extra-role behaviors. The bootstrapping results also support the full mediation effect of work engagement.

Originality/value – The present study used the job demands-resources model to examine how abusive supervision influences employees' OCB and voice and found that work engagement is one possible mechanism between these two types of extra-role behavior. Specifically, a daily research design discovered that in a given working day, once a leader exhibits abusive supervision behavior, compared with any given day without abusive behaviors, employees will find it difficult to focus on their current tasks (i.e. through exhibiting decreased work engagement), which will in turn influence their willingness to exhibit OCB and voice on that particular day. Thus, both researchers and managers should focus on the daily interactions between leaders and employees because it is impossible to achieve organization success in one day, but rather such success is the aggregate result of both leaders' and employees' daily efforts.

Keywords Voice, Work engagement, Abusive supervision, Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB), Daily-basis research design

Paper type Research paper



Introduction

To adapt to rapid change and complex environments, efficiently working and improving operational procedures quickly become the most important essentials for organizations to survive. To achieve this aim, organizations not only require employees to act on the duties and responsibilities of their assigned roles but also require them to perform according to behaviors that are not always described in employment contracts. [Van Dyne et al. \(1995\)](#) pointed out that extra-role behaviors (e.g. organizational citizenship behavior and voice) is not only a type of behavior that is outside the role of typical expectations but also one that offers significant added benefits for organizations. Indeed, these promotive extra-role behaviors enhance effectiveness by suggesting new means of executing tasks or assisting task accomplishment ([Van Dyne et al., 1995](#)). Thus, previous researchers have intensively investigated how leaders' behaviors increase these promotive extra-role behaviors. However, it is also important to understand what kind of leadership (e.g. abusive supervision; [Tepper, 2000](#)) might hinder these extra-role behaviors. Abusive supervision is ubiquitous in an organization ([Tepper, 2000](#)), and researches have shown that abusive supervision has detrimental effects on employee attitudes ([Mackey et al., 2017](#); [Schyns and Schilling, 2013](#); [Zhang and Liao, 2015](#)) and performance ([Harris et al., 2011](#); [Mackey et al., 2017](#); [Schyns and Schilling, 2013](#); [Zhang and Liao, 2015](#)). Therefore, due to its prevalence and resulting high costs ([Barnes et al., 2015](#); [Schyns and Schilling, 2013](#)), it is important to examine how abusive supervision hinders employee behaviors ([Schyns and Schilling, 2013](#)).

As defined by [Tepper \(2000\)](#), abusive supervision refers to the "sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behavior, excluding physical contact (p. 170)." However, as pointed out by [Barnes et al. \(2015\)](#), most prior abusive supervision researches have adopted a static approach, which implies that some leaders exhibit abusive supervision behaviors, while some leaders do not, and further emphasizes [Tepper's \(2000, p. 170\)](#) "sustained display". Thus, [Barnes et al. \(2015\)](#) suggested that abusive supervision should examine the behavior fluctuations belonging to a given leader; that is, the leader might exhibit abusive supervision on some days while not showing such behavior on other days. Moreover, [Johnson et al. \(2012\)](#) found that abusive supervision behaviors varied more within persons than between persons. Thus, compared to the previous between-person paradigm of abusive supervision researches, the present study adopts a within-person approach (e.g. daily-basis research design) to examine how daily abusive supervision affects employees' daily extra-role behaviors and under what types of mechanisms such behaviors take place.

According to the job demands-resources model (JD-R model; [Demerouti et al., 2001](#)), job demands require employees to continually invest physical or mental effort in the physical, social or organizational aspects of their jobs ([Demerouti et al., 2001](#)). In addition, research has found that dealing with job demands will decrease employees' work engagement ([Crawford et al., 2010](#); [Nahrgang et al., 2011](#)) and thereby impair employees' outcomes ([Nahrgang et al., 2011](#)). Based on the JD-R model, there are two reasons to view abusive supervision as social or organizational aspects of job demands. First, in the workplace, leaders, as representatives of the organization, might have great influence on employee behaviors because of the power of various kinds that they wield ([French and Raven, 1959](#)). Second, as employees might interact with leaders on a daily basis, leaders' abusive behavior could be viewed as part of the social side of job demands ([Tepper, 2007](#)). [Schyns and Schilling \(2013\)](#) have pointed out that abusive supervision decreases employees' motivation. Moreover, [Barnes et al. \(2015\)](#) found that daily abusive supervision impairs daily work unit engagement. [Sonnentag et al. \(2010\)](#) research also stated that as "not all days are created equal," researchers should pay more attention to the predictors of daily-level work engagement to understand why employees feel more engaged at work on some days than

others. [Schaufeli and Taris \(2014\)](#) summarized three daily studies and pointed out that the variations in daily work engagement can be explained by daily job demands. Hence, the present study proposes that leaders' daily abusive behavior might be an important antecedent affecting employees' engagement in or disengagement from their current jobs on specific days, and the state of engagement or disengagement at work would further affect their behaviors. In short, on a given day, when employees face leaders' abusive behavior, they might decrease their work engagement, decreasing their willingness to exhibit organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and voice.

The present study advances existing literature on daily abusive supervision, daily work engagement and daily extra-role behavior in several aspects. Our main contribution is that the present study responds to recent calls for greater attention to actual leader behaviors *in situ* ([Johnson et al., 2012](#); [Lin et al., 2016](#)) and uses a daily-basis approach ([Schyns and Schilling, 2013](#)) to examine abusive supervision and its daily outcomes, and their underlying process, daily work engagement ([Sonnentag et al., 2010](#)). Specifically, this research draws upon theory based on the JD-R model to examine how daily abusive supervision affects employees' daily extra-role behaviors via daily work engagement. That is, employees who are abused by leaders are less likely to be willing to help their peers or provide useful suggestions to leaders compared to those who are not abused, because abused employees cannot give their full attention to the tasks. More important, using a daily-basis approach has some advantages compared to the static approach, such as reduced retrospective bias ([Reis and Gable, 2000](#)) and social desirability ([Bakker, 2014](#)). Second, the present study also advances existing studies of daily work engagement in response to [Xanthopoulou and Bakker's \(2012\)](#) call to examine the outcomes of daily work engagement (i.e. OCB and voice). Third, although growing empirical evidence has separately illustrated that abusive supervision decrease OCB or voice ([Zhang and Liao, 2015](#)), the present research attempts to integrate abusive supervision and two different kinds of promotive extra-role behaviors – affiliative promotive behavior (i.e. OCB) and challenging promotive behavior (i.e. voice) – into one empirical investigation and further seeks to examine how daily abusive supervision influences these behaviors through daily work engagement ([Bakker, 2014](#)).

Theory and hypotheses

Daily abusive supervision

As defined by [Tepper \(2000\)](#), an employee whose leader exhibits “abusive supervision” will be mistreated continually by the leader's hostile behavior, whether verbal or nonverbal, though this does not include physical contact. Those abused employees will in turn negatively influence their performance and attitudes ([Schyns and Schilling, 2013](#)), consequentially resulting in high costs ([Barnes et al., 2015](#); [Schyns and Schilling, 2013](#)) and damaging several beneficial outcomes for employees, leaders and organizations ([Johnson et al., 2012](#); [Schyns and Schilling, 2013](#)).

The research of [Johnson et al. \(2012\)](#) found that compared to transformational behavior and consideration behavior, abusive behavior has 61 per cent within-person variance and is relatively inconsistent on a day-to-day basis. That is, a leader who exhibits an abusive supervision behavior today does not necessarily do so tomorrow. [Barnes et al. \(2015\)](#) further extended Johnson's research to suggest daily abusive supervision. Unlike previous abusive supervision research that adopted a static approach, which assumed abusive supervision to be one type of leadership style or an average behavior in a particular period, [Barnes et al. \(2015\)](#) argued that any leader could exhibit high abusive supervision behavior in one day while showing low exhibitions of such behavior on another day, and suggested that, on a given day, whether a leader exhibits abusive behavior or not is meaningful. In short, they

proposed that leader abuse is a behavior that could fluctuate on a day-to-day basis. Thus, the present study follows this view and adopts a daily perspective to examine how daily abusive behaviors influence employees' day-to-day workplace motivation and behaviors.

Daily work engagement

Prior research conceptualized work engagement as a relatively stable individual difference construct (Rich *et al.*, 2010). As defined by Kahn (1990), work engagement refers to “the simultaneous employment and expression of a person’s “preferred self” in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional) and active, full performances” (Kahn, 1990, p. 700). Moreover, Kahn (1990) suggested that work engagement has three components: psychological meaningfulness, which refers to “a feeling that one is receiving a return on investments of one’s self in a currency of physical, cognitive, or emotional energy” (pp. 703-704); psychological safety, which refers to “feeling able to show and employ one’s self without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status, or career” (p. 708); and psychological availability, which refers to “the sense of having the physical, emotional, or psychological resources to personally engage at a particular moment” (p. 714).

Although numerous studies have taken a relatively stable view when examining work engagement (Gupta *et al.*, 2017; Lam *et al.*, 2016; Matta *et al.*, 2015; Schmitt *et al.*, 2016), Bakker (2014) argues that a given person might display fluctuations (e.g. engagement or disengagement) in his/her daily work experience. In addition, some researches (Sonnentag *et al.*, 2010; Xanthopoulou and Bakker, 2012) have pointed out that at least one-third of the total variance of work engagement is within-person variance. Thus, engagement not only varies at the between-person level (e.g. trait-like variable) but also fluctuates at the within-person level (e.g. state-like variable). Researches have examined some day-level antecedents and outcomes of daily work engagement. For instance, the research of Barnes *et al.* (2015) found that the quality of daily sleep influences daily work unit engagement through daily supervisory ego depletion and daily abusive supervisory behavior. Moreover, Sonnentag (2003) found that day-level recovery would affect day-level work engagement, which would in turn influence day-level personal initiative and pursuit of learning. Thus, these results indicate clearly that employees are engaged in work on one day while disengaged on another, and investigating the fluctuations of work engagement at the within-person level is therefore meaningful.

Daily abusive supervision and daily work engagement

According to the JD-R model (Demerouti *et al.*, 2001), job demands refer to “those physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical or mental effort and are therefore associated with certain physiological and psychological costs” (p. 501), and high job demands might result in negative outcomes such as exhaustion (Demerouti *et al.*, 2001) and health problems (Bakker *et al.*, 2003). Due to their authority and power (French and Raven, 1959), leaders have greater influence over employees' motivation and behavior. Thus, a leader who exhibits abusive behavior could be regarded as one type of social or organizational job demand that requires employees' extra efforts to handle and may further be regarded as related to certain psychological costs (Tepper *et al.*, 2017) such as lower work engagement as a result. Research (Scheuer *et al.*, 2016) has found that when employees view abusive supervision as a hindrance, job demands will decrease work engagement. Moreover, some studies (Breevaart and Bakker, 2018) have found that daily hindrance demands have a negative relationship with daily work engagement.

Abusive supervision involves employees' perceptions of mistreatment by the leader's hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, and should in turn decrease employees' work engagement and future performance. Compared with effective leadership, which emphasizes that the leader should help employees perceive their tasks as meaningful and valuable (Bono and Judge, 2004), abused employees view their work as meaningless (Barnes *et al.*, 2015) and are unwilling to invest their efforts in their work. Moreover, because abusive behavior might signal an unsafe and risky situation, employees might fear the leader's abusive behavior and may thus be unwilling to show up and trust such a situation. In addition, employees whose leaders exhibit abusive supervision may not be located in a resourceful situation as employees might fear and avoid such a leader as much as possible and may also be emotionally detached from them. Thus, such employees would find it difficult to perform their tasks when they cannot easily access necessary resources (e.g. physical, emotional or psychological). Therefore, under abusive supervision, employees may not perceive psychological meaningfulness in their work, may not feel safe in presenting their work and may not easily access the resources essential for their requested tasks. Researchers have found that workplace bullying (Einarsen *et al.*, 2018) decreases employees' work engagement. Moreover, Barnes *et al.* (2015) pointed out that abusive supervision behavior occurring on a daily basis would in turn influence daily unit work engagement. Although there is no direct support for the relationship between daily abusive supervision and daily work engagement, based on the above arguments and research findings we propose that, on any given day, a leader who exhibits abusive behavior will hinder employees' work engagement. Thus, the present study expects that daily abusive supervision would decrease employees' daily work engagement:

H1. Daily abusive supervision is negatively related to daily work engagement.

Daily work engagement, daily organizational citizenship behavior and daily voice

OCB is one kind of extra-role behavior (Van Dyne *et al.*, 1995) and is defined as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization" (Organ, 1988, p. 4). Van Dyne *et al.* (1995) further argued that OCB is an affiliative and promotive behavior. That is, exhibiting OCB can not only solidify and maintain interpersonal relationships but also may boost and encourage something to happen or occur. Moreover, examining daily OCB is meaningful because, under the definition of Organ (1988), each OCB (e.g. daily OCB) will be aggregated and thus promote the effectiveness of organizational function. The present study thus focuses on the relationship between employees' daily work engagement and daily OCB, not the average level.

Compared with OCB, voice, which originates from dissatisfaction and seeks to improve or change the status quo (Hirschman, 1970), is the other type of extra-role behavior that emphasizes challenging behavior and may potentially damage relationships with others (Van Dyne *et al.*, 1995). Although offering voice might result in negative interpersonal relationships, voice still plays a critical role in organizational success (Crant, 2000) in competitive and complex environments because it can offer new procedures to enhance operational effectiveness. Moreover, employees can engage voice at any particular moment, such as employees who are engaged in their work on a particular day (Morrison, 2011). Thus, it is meaningful to examine the relationship between work engagement and voice on the daily level.

Engaged employees believe that their tasks are meaningful, their working situation is safe and they can easily access any needed resources. Thus, such employees can offer their

CMS

full attention and invest all of their resources (e.g. physical, cognitive and emotional) in daily tasks and may further recognize other relevant issues. Moreover, engaged employees might include a wider range of behaviors (e.g. including OCB) in their tasks, which can contribute to reaching the organization's ultimate goals (Christian *et al.*, 2011; Rich *et al.*, 2010). For instance, previous research has found that employees exhibiting high work engagement tend to show more OCB (Gupta *et al.*, 2017; Matta *et al.*, 2015). In addition, because employees displaying high work engagement keep focused on their daily tasks, they can easily determine the potential problems in the organization's operational functions. Hence, to enhance their daily working effectiveness, and because they include a wider range of behaviors, engaged employees are more likely to speak up than disengaged employees. For instance, previous research has pointed out that engaged employees will exhibit more voice than disengaged employees (Lam *et al.*, 2016; Schmitt *et al.*, 2016). Therefore, although there is no direct support for daily work engagement, OCB, and voice, based on the above arguments and previous research, the present study expects that, on a given day, employees who are engaged in their daily tasks will perform more OCB and voice:

H2a. Daily work engagement is positively related to daily OCB.

H2b. Daily work engagement is positively related to daily voice.

The mediating role of daily work engagement

As previously discussed, on a given day, a leader who exhibits abusive behavior might cause the perception of low meaning in tasks, unsafe situations, and lacking resources for employees, thus resulting in work disengagement on that day. Disengaged employees under such circumstances not only cannot concentrate their focus on current tasks but are also unwilling to invest their resources and efforts (e.g. physical, cognitive and emotional) in accomplishing them. Most important, disengaged employees have a shorter range of behavior than engaged employees and are thus unlikely to perform more OCB and voice. The present study thus expects that the negative effect of daily abusive supervision on daily OCB and daily voice is mediated by daily work engagement:

H3a. Daily work engagement mediates the negative relationship between abusive supervision and daily OCB.

H3b. Daily work engagement mediates the negative relationship between abusive supervision and daily voice.

Figure 1 depicts the theoretical framework hypothesized in the present study.

Method

Procedure

The present study adopted a daily within-person research design including 10 working days (i.e. two weeks) of data collection. Initially, the second author (C. H. Su) contacted the human



Figure 1.
Theoretical model

resources (HR) department to ask for assistance in conducting the questionnaire surveys. After work each day, participants responded to the questionnaire, which consisted of questions on abusive supervision, work engagement, OCB and voice, and returned it in a sealed envelope. They completed the questionnaire in a meeting room from which their leaders were absent. Additionally, we collected the participants' demographic information, such as age, gender, educational level, service tenure and work tenure, with the leader as the control variable.

Sample

The data were collected from front-line employees in one Taiwan mid-sized high-tech manufacturing company. We chose front-line employees as our sample because the clients of high-tech manufacturing industries usually require high-quality products, and thus we reasoned that front-line employees might more often encounter harsh leadership behavior than in other occupations. In addition, they also need to devote their full attention to their current job to maintain product quality. Thus, these characteristics matched the context of our research questions. Sixty full-time employees participated in this two-week (i.e. 10-working-day) survey. Because all participants were voluntarily, our response rate was 100 per cent, yielding a final sample size of 600 (60 employees \times 10 working days). Further, 50 per cent of participants were male, and the average age was 33.63 ($SD = 6.34$). Only 13.3 per cent of participants did not have a junior college diploma or higher. Moreover, average serving tenure was 5.68 years ($SD = 5.7$), and average working tenure with leader was 2.77 years ($SD = 3.75$). Moreover, to match each day questionnaires, an identification number was assigned for each participant.

Measures

In the present study, all measures were rated on a six-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*).

Abusive supervision. Participants responded to a 15-item measure developed by [Tepper \(2000\)](#) to disclose their level of perception on their leader's abusive supervision behavior. The alpha coefficient was 0.97.

Work engagement. Participants' work engagement was measured by a seven-item measure developed by [Young \(2011\)](#) to show their level of perceptions on work engagement. The alpha coefficient was 0.96.

Organizational citizenship behavior. Participants completed an eight-item measure developed by [Lin and Peng \(2010\)](#) to indicate their level of organizational citizenship behavior. The alpha coefficient was 0.93.

Voice. Participants completed an 11-item measure developed by [Belschak and Hartog \(2010\)](#) to show their level of voice behavior. The alpha coefficient was 0.96.

Data analysis

Because of the within-person research design, hierarchical linear modeling (HLM; HLM version 6.08, [Raudenbush et al., 2004](#)) was used to test the hypotheses. Initially, the intra-class correlations (ICC1) of dependent variables were calculated. The results revealed significant between-individual variances in work engagement ($\chi^2 = 2578.24$; $df = 59$; $p < 0.001$; ICC1 = 0.81), OCB ($\chi^2 = 2516.42$; $df = 59$; $p < 0.001$; ICC1 = 0.81), and voice ($\chi^2 = 3486.78$; $df = 59$; $p < 0.001$; ICC1 = 0.85). Thus, it was appropriate to choose HLM as the analytic method for the present study. In addition, because the main interest of this study was focused on the within-person level (e.g. level 1) rather than the between-person level (e.g. level 2), as suggested by prior research ([Enders and Tofghi, 2007](#)), group-mean centering

(e.g. individual-mean centering) was adopted for the independent variables (i.e. abusive supervision and work engagement) to rule out the potential between-person influence on dependent variables.

Before testing the theoretical hypotheses, three different sets of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) were conducted to ensure the discriminant validity of measures. We used Lisrel version 8.80 (Jöreskog and Sörbom, 1996) to test CFA. Table I provides the results of CFA. The results of the chi-square difference tests revealed that the alternative model was better than null model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 28887.2$; $df = 1$; $p < 0.001$), and the baseline four-factor model ($\chi^2 = 6189.03$; $df = 768$; RMSEA = 0.11; SRMR = 0.06; NNFI = 0.96; CFI = 0.96) was better than the first alternative model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 11972.29$; $df = 10$; $p < 0.001$). In addition, the standardized factor loading of each item associated with its related latent construct is larger than 0.5 (range, 0.63-0.95) and significant. Therefore, taken as a whole, the CFA results provide support for the measures of discriminant and convergent validity.

In addition, to control the CMV of our variables, we conducted Harman’s one-factor test (Podsakoff and Organ, 1986). The results indicate that there are four factors and the explained variance of the total variance of the first factor is less than 50 per cent; thus, CMV in our variables is relatively minor.

Results

The means, standard deviations and correlations between the variables are shown in Table II. Additionally, the alpha coefficients of variables are shown on the diagonal.

H1 stated that daily abusive supervision has a negative effect on daily work engagement, and the present study used HLM to test this relationship. The results are shown in Table III. In Model 1, Level-2 control variables, such as age, gender and education, and two different kinds of tenure, were entered. Then, abusive supervision in Model 2 were added, and it was found that the coefficient of abusive supervision was significant (unstandardized $\beta = -0.61$, $SE = 0.18$, $p < 0.01$). Therefore, H1 was supported. H2 expected that employees’ daily work engagement would have a positive effect on their extra-role behaviors. In Model 3, control variables were entered; then, work engagement was added in Model 4. The results showed that daily work engagement has a positive effect on OCB, and the coefficient was significant (unstandardized $\beta = 0.40$, $SE = 0.07$, $p < 0.001$). Therefore, H2a was supported. To test H2b, control variables in Model 7 were entered, and work engagement was added in Model 8. The results showed that daily work engagement has a positive effect on voice, and the coefficient was significant (unstandardized $\beta = 0.42$, $SE = 0.05$, $p < 0.001$). Thus, H2b was supported.

In H3a and 3b, it was expected that daily work engagement would play a mediating role between abusive supervision and extra-role behaviors. Abusive supervision was centered upon in Model 5, and the coefficient of abusive supervision for OCB was not significant (unstandardized $\beta = -0.15$, $SE = 0.14$, *n.s.*). Then, work engagement was added in Model 6, and the coefficient of work engagement for OCB was significant (unstandardized $\beta = 0.37$,

Fit index	Factors	χ^2	<i>df</i>	$\Delta\chi^2$ (<i>df</i>)	RMSEA	SRMR	NNFI	CFI
Null model	One factor	41,138.24	779		0.29	0.19	0.87	0.88
Baseline model	Four factors	6,189.03	768	6,062.04 (10)***	0.11	0.06	0.96	0.96
Alternative model	Two factors ^a	12,251.07	778	28,887 (1)***	0.16	0.11	0.93	0.93

Table I. Confirmatory factor analysis

Notes: ^aTwo factors: Work engagement, OCB and voice were combine into one factor because of their high correlations, and abusive supervision was the other factor; *** $p < 0.01$

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Age	33.63	6.31									
2. Gender	1.50	0.50	-0.18***								
3. Education	2.02	0.62	-0.15***	0.25***							
4. Serving tenure	5.68	5.65	0.61***	0.09*	-0.05						
5. Working tenure with leader	2.77	3.72	0.34***	0.23***	0.07	0.48***					
6. Abusive supervision	1.67	0.88	-0.03	0.20***	0.32***	0.15***	0.14***	(0.97)			
7. Work engagement	4.16	1.17	0.16***	0.06	-0.07	0.00	-0.06	-0.50***	(0.96)		
8. OCB	4.61	0.92	0.27***	0.13***	-0.00	0.11**	0.01	-0.33***	0.77***	(0.93)	
9. Voice	4.42	1.02	0.17***	0.12**	-0.01	0.03	-0.09*	-0.34***	0.81***	0.89***	(0.96)

Notes: ^a*n* = 600; Cronbach's alphas appear across the diagonal in parentheses; **p* < 0.05; ***p* < 0.01; ****p* < 0.001

Table II.
Descriptive statistics
and intercorrelations
matrix of the study
variables^a

Influence of
abusive
supervision

Table III.
Hierarchical linear modeling analysis of the meditation effect

Variables	Mediator		Dependent variables			Dependent variables				
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8	Model 9	Model 10
<i>Control variables (level 2)</i>										
Age	0.06(0.02)**	0.06(0.02)**	0.06(0.02)**	0.06(0.02)**	0.06(0.02)**	0.06(0.02)**	0.05(0.02)*	0.05(0.03)*	0.05(0.02)*	0.05(0.03)*
Gender	0.41(0.30)	0.41(0.29)	0.45(0.22)*	0.60(0.22)**	0.47(0.23)*	0.58(0.22)**	0.49(0.26)	0.58(0.26)*	0.49(0.26)	0.55(0.26)*
Education	-0.12(0.21)	-0.12(0.21)	0.01(0.14)	-0.07(0.14)	-0.02(0.14)	-0.07(0.14)	-0.02(0.17)	-0.07(0.17)	-0.01(0.17)	-0.07(0.16)
Serving tenure	-0.03(0.02)	-0.03(0.02)	-0.01(0.02)	-0.02(0.02)	-0.01(0.02)	-0.02(0.02)	-0.02(0.02)	-0.02(0.02)	-0.02(0.02)	-0.02(0.02)
Working tenure with leader	-0.04(0.03)	-0.04(0.03)	-0.04(0.04)	-0.04(0.03)	-0.03(0.03)	-0.04(0.03)	-0.06(0.04)	-0.06(0.04)	-0.06(0.04)	-0.05(0.04)
<i>Independent variable</i>										
Abusive supervision		-0.61(0.18)**			-0.15(0.14)	0.03(0.10)			-0.28(0.13)*	-0.10(0.12)
Mediator				0.40(0.07)***		0.37(0.07)***		0.42(0.05)***		0.35(0.06)***
Work engagement										

Notes: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

$SE = 0.07, p < 0.001$). Similarly, abusive supervision was entered into Model 9, and the coefficient of abusive supervision for voice was significant (unstandardized $\beta = -0.28, SE = 0.13, p < 0.05$). Then, work engagement was added in Model 10, and the coefficient of work engagement for voice was significant (unstandardized $\beta = 0.35, SE = 0.06, p < 0.001$). Based on Baron and Kenny's (1986) rule of the mediation effect, $H3a$ may not be supported by the present research data. However, based upon Preacher and Hayes's (2004) perspective, Baron and Kenny's (1986) suggestions for the rule of the mediation effect was strict, and they recommended that the independent variable might not necessarily need to have a significant effect on dependent variables. Therefore, to confirm the mediation effect of work engagement on the relationship between abusive supervision and extra-role behaviors, the present research followed Preacher and Hayes's (2004) recommendations and implemented the Sobel test and bootstrapping for the theoretical model. The results of the Sobel test for OCB and voice were both significant ($p < 0.05$). Moreover, the results of bootstrapping also showed that work engagement mediates the relationship between abusive supervision, OCB and voice (for OCB, $ab = -0.23, p < 0.05, 95$ per cent CI $[-0.40, -0.09]$; for voice, $ab = -0.21, p < 0.05, 95$ per cent CI $[-0.37, -0.08]$). Thus, based on the results of Models 6 and 10 in Table III and of bootstrapping, we may conclude that daily work engagement fully mediates the negative relationship between abusive supervision, OCB, and voice. In conclusion, these results support $H3a$ and 3b.

Discussion

The present study examined how abusive supervision influences employees' two different kinds of extra-role behavior and found that work engagement is one possible mechanism between these two types. Specifically, through using a daily research design, it was discovered that in a given working day, once a leader exhibits abusive supervision behavior, employees will find it difficult to focus on their current tasks (i.e. through exhibiting decreased work engagement), which will in turn influence their willingness to exhibit OCB and voice on that particular day. In other words, abused employees might be led to be disengaged from their current work tasks, and this disengagement may in turn lead to exhibiting decreased OCB and voice.

Theoretical implications

The main contribution of the present study is the utilization of a daily-basis research design, rather than the prevailing static approach that assumes that abusive supervision presupposes a chronic factor (Barnes *et al.*, 2015) to examine abusive supervision. To date, very few researches (Barnes *et al.*, 2015; Johnson *et al.*, 2012) have used such a daily perspective in developing abusive supervision literature. The findings of the present study not only stand with these existing researches, which propose that abusive behavior fluctuates on a daily basis, but also extend previous literature by suggesting that the fluctuation of abusive behavior may influence employees' motivation and extra-role behaviors. That is, variations in leaders' daily abusive behaviors might influence employees' daily work engagement, which in turn could affect their daily extra-role behaviors. Moreover, the present study adopted the JD-R model to examine these relationships.

The results of the present study support the view that daily abusive supervision can be viewed as part of job demands and are associated with fluctuations in daily work engagement. That is, on a given day, leaders' abusive behavior might continually require employees' sustained physical or mental efforts, entailing the physiological and psychological costs of dealing with such behavior, in turn leading employees to disengage from their current tasks. Specifically, on a day-to-day basis, comparing with leaders who do

not exhibit abusive behaviors, leaders who exhibit abusive behaviors toward their employees, such as by insulting employees, might cause employees to feel that what they do is meaningless. Further, a leader's abusive behaviors may also cause employees to feel that they might not be safe in their current situation, and may also lead them to feel that they do not have access to necessary resources (e.g. physical, emotional or psychological). This finding is also similar to the research of Barnes *et al.* (2015), which revealed that daily abusive supervisory behavior has a negative influence on daily work unit engagement. Thus, the JD-R model is a useful lens to examine abusive supervision and its relevant variables, and future research is encouraged to adopt it.

Prior research has pointed out the concept of the state of work engagement (Bakker, 2014; Barnes *et al.*, 2015; Sonnentag, 2003; Sonnentag *et al.*, 2010; Sonnentag *et al.*, 2012; Xanthopoulou and Bakker, 2012), which might influence individuals' behaviors such as proactive behaviors (Sonnentag, 2003; Sonnentag *et al.*, 2010). Xanthopoulou and Bakker (2012) pointed out that more research is needed to examine the outcomes of daily work engagement. The present study's findings reveal that the fluctuation of work engagement on a given day would influence employees' willingness of exhibiting OCB and voice. That is, comparing with engaged employees, those disengaged employees might prove reluctant to perform affiliative or challenging promotive behaviors, such as helping other employees or providing useful suggestions for their leader or organization, because they think their work is not meaningful or they cannot access necessary resources when needed. Thus, the current results are not only aligned with work engagement literature (Bakker, 2014; Barnes *et al.*, 2015; Sonnentag, 2003; Sonnentag *et al.*, 2010; Sonnentag *et al.*, 2012; Xanthopoulou and Bakker, 2012), but further examine the relationship between daily work engagement and employees' extra-role behavior as well.

Moreover, implementing a daily perspective as used in the present study might also benefit the comprehension of employees' extra-role behaviors. As literally interpreted, extra-role behaviors are not found in formal job requests and reward systems, but are rather some types of discretionary behaviors that employees can choose to perform or not based upon their willingness. For instance, OCB is one kind of extra-role behavior in which aggregation can promote the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988). Thus, each daily OCB exhibiting is important for promoting the organization. Voice is the other type of extra-role behavior that employees might exhibit at any particular moment (Morrison, 2011). According to extra-role behavior, once employees choose to remain silent, the organization might suffer by losing valuable suggestions. Therefore, our findings show that it is meaningful to examine daily OCB and voice. Based on these results as a whole, we encourage future research to closely examine leadership and employees' motivation and behaviors on a daily basis. The findings of this study illustrate that using the daily perspective is meaningful and helpful to extend upon theoretical knowledge of what is actually occurring in leaders' and employees' daily activities in an organization.

Practical implications

The findings of the present study provide some practical implications to organizations for surviving in a rapidly changing and complex environment. The first implication concerns why abusive supervision has detrimental effects on an organization. In general, the results reveal that leaders should avoid exhibiting abusive supervision behaviors in day-to-day interactions with employees because exhibiting such behaviors may lead to organizations missing out on beneficial outcomes that arise from employees' extra-role behaviors such as

OCB and voice. Although exhibiting abusive behaviors might be inevitable, especially when employees cannot meet required expectations or repeatedly make serious mistakes, the target should be focused upon such mistakes or the reasons why failures occur rather than focusing on personal insults. Thus, organizations are encouraged to provide training programs to enhance leaders' communication skills.

The second implication concerns how to choose suitable leaders. Due to the detrimental effects of abusive supervision, organizations should be very careful in promoting suitable employees to positions of leadership. Prior research (Mackey *et al.*, 2017) has pointed out that neuroticism and negative affectivity are positively associated with abusive supervision, and agreeableness, conscientiousness and positive affectivity are negatively associated with abusive supervision. Thus, organizations should avoid promoting employees who show a high tendency of neuroticism and negative affectivity, while promoting employees who show a high tendency toward agreeableness, conscientiousness and positive affectivity.

The third implication concerns how to decrease potential abusive supervision. That is, maintaining health and suitable quality of life among employees and leaders alike may also decrease exhibiting abusive behavior. For instance, on a daily basis, sleep quality may negatively influence abusive supervision (Barnes *et al.*, 2015). Thus, it is suggested that organizations should not only foster leaders' performance but also consider their health condition, especially sleep quality. Another way to avoid abusive supervision is through ensuring that upper-level leaders avoid exhibiting abusive behaviors toward their mid-level leaders (Mawritz *et al.*, 2012) because, through social learning processes, mid-level leaders might consider that it is proper to lead their subordinates through such negative behaviors. Therefore, as a learning exemplar for all organizations, especially for those mid-level leaders, it is suggested that upper-level leaders should avoid exhibiting abusive supervision.

Strengths, limitations and future research

The main methodological strength of the present study is that it adopted the daily research design to examine the current theory. Unlike prior leadership research, which often suggested how a particular leadership type influences employees' behaviors in an average term, using this research design might not only reduce retrospective bias (Reis and Gable, 2000) and social desirability (Bakker, 2014) but also reveal how leaders' behavior fluctuations influence employees' motivation and behaviors in day-to-day life interactions. Although the present study provides some support for how the fluctuation of abusive supervision influences employees' motivation and behaviors, some limitations in the present study still exist. One such limitation is that the present study only considered one type of leadership behavior (i.e. abusive supervision). As suggested by prior research (DeRue *et al.*, 2011), one leader might not limit engagement to one type of leadership. For instance, although consideration behaviors are effective as transformational behaviors (Judge *et al.*, 2004), when considering transformational, consideration and abusive behaviors, consideration behaviors only have a minimal impact on perceived effectiveness (Johnson *et al.*, 2012). Thus, future research should consider different types of leadership behaviors (e.g. transformational leadership behaviors) with abusive supervision simultaneously on a day-to-day basis.

The other limitation is that we only collected data from front-line employees in one mid-sized high-tech manufacturing company. This may hinder the generalization of our findings to other occupations and industries. Thus, future research should replicate our study and collect data from the other occupations and industries. The finally limitation of the present

study is that it used self-report measures, which may suffer the issue of common method bias (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2012). Therefore, it is suggested that future research use other reporting measures (e.g. wherein the leader evaluates employees' OCB and voice) to mitigate this consideration.

References

- Bakker, A.B. (2014), "Daily fluctuations in work engagement: an overview and current directions", *European Psychologist*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 227-236, doi: [10.1027/1016-9040/a000160](https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000160).
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E. and Schaufeli, W.B. (2003), "Dual processes at work in a call centre: an application of the job demands-resources model", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 393-417, doi: [10.1080/13594320344000165](https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320344000165).
- Barnes, C.M., Lucianetti, L., Bhawe, D.P. and Christian, M.S. (2015), "'You wouldn't like me when I'm sleepy': leaders' sleep, daily abusive supervision, and work unit engagement", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 58 No. 5, pp. 1419-1437, doi: [10.5465/amj.2013.1063](https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.1063).
- Baron, R.M. and Kenny, D. (1986), "The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 51 No. 6, pp. 1173-1182, doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173).
- Belschak, F.D. and Hartog, D.N.D. (2010), "Pro-self, prosocial, and pro-organizational foci of proactive behavior: differential antecedents and consequences", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 83 No. 2, pp. 475-498, doi: [10.1348/096317909X439208](https://doi.org/10.1348/096317909X439208).
- Bono, J.E. and Judge, T.A. (2004), "Personality and transformational and transactional leadership", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89 No. 5, pp. 901-910, doi: [10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.901](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.901).
- Breevaart, K. and Bakker, A.B. (2018), "Daily job demands and employee work engagement: the role of daily transformational leadership behavior", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 338-349, doi: [10.1037/ocp0000082](https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000082).
- Christian, M.S., Garza, A.S. and Slaughter, J.E. (2011), "Work engagement: a quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 64 No. 1, pp. 89-136, doi: [10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x).
- Crant, J.M. (2000), "Proactive behavior in organizations", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 435-462, doi: [10.1177/014920630002600304](https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600304).
- Crawford, E.R., Lepine, J.A. and Rich, B.L. (2010), "Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: a theoretical extension and meta-analytic test", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 95 No. 5, pp. 834-848, doi: [10.1037/a0019364](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019364).
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Nachreiner, F. and Schaufeli, W.B. (2001), "The job demands-resources model of burnout", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86 No. 3, pp. 499-512, doi: [10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499).
- DeRue, D.S., Nahrgang, J.D., Wellman, N. and Humphrey, S.E. (2011), "Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: an integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 64 No. 1, pp. 7-52, doi: [10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01201.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01201.x).
- Einarsen, S., Skogstad, A., Rørvik, E., Lande, Å.B. and Nielsen, M.B. (2018), "Climate for conflict management, exposure to workplace bullying and work engagement: a moderated mediation analysis", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 29 No. 3, pp. 549-570, doi: [10.1080/09585192.2016.1164216](https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1164216).
- Enders, C.K. and Tofiqhi, D. (2007), "Centering predictor variables in cross-sectional multilevel models: a new look at an old issue", *Psychological Methods*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 121-138, doi: [10.1037/1082-989X.12.2.121](https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.12.2.121).
- French, J.R.P., Jr and Raven, B. (1959), "The bases of social power", in Cartwright, D. (Ed.), *Studies in Social Power*, Univer, MI, Oxford, pp. 150-167.

- Gupta, M., Shaheen, M. and Reddy, P.K. (2017), "Impact of psychological capital on organizational citizenship behavior: mediation by work engagement", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 36 No. 7, pp. 973-983, doi: [10.1108/JMX-06-2016-0084](https://doi.org/10.1108/JMX-06-2016-0084).
- Harris, K.J., Harvey, P. and Kacmar, K.M. (2011), "Abusive supervisory reactions to coworker relationship conflict", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp. 1010-1023, doi: [10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.07.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.07.020).
- Hirschman, A.O. (1970), *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Johnson, R.E., Venus, M., Lanaj, K., Mao, C. and Chang, C.H. (2012), "Leader identity as an antecedent of the frequency and consistency of transformational, consideration, and abusive leadership behaviors", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 97 No. 6, pp. 1262-1272, doi: [10.1037/a0029043](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029043).
- Jöreskog, K.G. and Sörbom, D. (1996), *LISREL 8: User's Reference Guide*, Scientific Software International, Chicago.
- Judge, T.A., Piccolo, R.F. and Ilies, R. (2004), "The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89 No. 1, pp. 36-51, doi: [10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.36](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.36).
- Kahn, W.A. (1990), "Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 33, pp. 692-724, doi: [10.2307/256287](https://doi.org/10.2307/256287).
- Lam, L.W., Loi, R., Chan, K.W. and Liu, Y. (2016), "Voice more and stay longer: how ethical leaders influence employee voice and exit intentions", *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Vol. 26 No. 03, pp. 277-300, doi: [10.1017/beq.2016.30](https://doi.org/10.1017/beq.2016.30).
- Lin, A.H., Ma, J. and Johnson, R.E. (2016), "When ethical leader behavior breaks bad: how ethical leader behavior can turn abusive via ego depletion and moral licensing", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 101 No. 6, pp. 815-830, doi: [10.1037/ap10000098](https://doi.org/10.1037/ap10000098).
- Lin, C.C. and Peng, T.K. (2010), "From organizational citizenship behavior to team performance: the mediation of group cohesion and collective efficacy", *Management and Organization Review*, Vol. 6 No. 01, pp. 55-75, doi: [10.1111/j.1740-8784.2009.00172.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2009.00172.x).
- Mackey, J.D., Frieder, R.E., Brees, J.R. and Martinko, M.J. (2017), "Abusive supervision: a Meta-analysis and empirical review", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 43 No. 6, pp. 1940-1965, doi: [10.1177/0149206315573997](https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315573997).
- Matta, F.K., Scott, B.A., Koopman, J. and Conlon, D.E. (2015), "Does seeing 'eye to eye' affect work engagement and organizational citizenship behavior? A role theory perspective on LMX agreement", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 58 No. 6, pp. 1686-1708, doi: [10.5465/amj.2014.0106](https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0106).
- Mawritz, M.B., Mayer, D.M., Hoobler, J.M., Wayne, S.J. and Marinova, S.V. (2012), "A trickle-down model of abusive supervision", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 65 No. 2, pp. 325-357, doi: [10.1111/j.1744-6570.2012.01246.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2012.01246.x).
- Morrison, E.W. (2011), "Employee voice behavior: integration and directions for future research", *The Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 373-412, doi: [10.1080/19416520.2011.574506](https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2011.574506).
- Nahrgang, J.D., Morgeson, F.P. and Hofmann, D.A. (2011), "Safety at work: a Meta-analytic investigation of the link between job demands, job resources, burnout, engagement, and safety outcomes", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 96 No. 1, pp. 71-94, doi: [10.1037/a0021484](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021484).
- Organ, D.W. (1988), *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. and Podsakoff, N.P. (2012), "Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 65, pp. 539-569, doi: [10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452).
- Podsakoff, P.M. and Organ, D.W. (1986), "Self-reports in organizational research: problems and prospects", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 531-544, doi: [10.1177/014920638601200408](https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638601200408).

- Preacher, K.J. and Hayes, A.F. (2004), "SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models", *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, Vol. 36, pp. 717-731, doi: [10.3758/BF03206553](https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03206553).
- Raudenbush, S.W., Bryk, A.A., Cheong, Y.F. and Congdon, R.T. Jr (2004), *HLM 6: Hierarchical Linear and Nonlinear Modeling*, Scientific Software International, Chicago.
- Reis, H.T. and Gable, S.L. (2000), "Event-sampling and other methods for studying everyday experience", in Reis, T.H. and Judd, M.C. (Eds), *Handbook of Research Methods in Social and Personality Psychology*, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, pp. 190-222.
- Rich, B.L., LePine, J.A. and Crawford, E.R. (2010), "Job engagement: antecedents and effects on job performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 53 No. 3, pp. 617-635, doi: [10.5465/AMJ.2010.51468988](https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2010.51468988).
- Schaufeli, W.B. and Taris, T.W. (2014), "A critical review of the job demands-resources model: implications for improving work and health", in Bauer, G. and Hämmig, O. (Eds), *Bridging Occupational, Organizational and Public Health*, Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 43-68, doi: [10.1007/978-94-007-5640-3_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5640-3_4).
- Scheuer, M.L., Burton, J.P., Barber, L.K., Finkelstein, L.M. and Parker, C.P. (2016), "Linking abusive supervision to employee engagement and exhaustion", *Organization Management Journal*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 138-147, doi: [10.1080/1416518.2016.1214063](https://doi.org/10.1080/1416518.2016.1214063).
- Schmitt, A., Den Hartog, D.N. and Belschak, F.D. (2016), "Transformational leadership and proactive work behaviour: a moderated mediation model including work engagement and job strain", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 89 No. 3, pp. 588-610, doi: [10.1111/joop.12143](https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12143).
- Schyns, B. and Schilling, J. (2013), "How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A Meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 138-158, doi: [10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.001).
- Sonnentag, S. (2003), "Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: a new look at the interface between nonwork and work", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 3, pp. 518-528, doi: [10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.518](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.518).
- Sonnentag, S., Dormann, C. and Demerouti, E. (2010), "Not all days are created equal: the concept of state work engagement", in Bakker, A.B. and Leiter, M.P. (Eds), *Work Engagement: Recent Developments in Theory and Research*, Psychology Press, New York, NY, pp. 25-38.
- Sonnentag, S., Mojza, E.J., Demerouti, E. and Bakker, A.B. (2012), "Reciprocal relations between recovery and work engagement: the moderating role of job stressors", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 97 No. 4, pp. 842-853, doi: [10.1037/a0028292](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028292).
- Tepper, B.J. (2000), "Consequences of abusive supervision", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43, pp. 178-190, doi: [10.2307/1556375](https://doi.org/10.2307/1556375).
- Tepper, B.J. (2007), "Abusive supervision in work organizations: review, synthesis, and research agenda", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 261-289, doi: [10.1177/0149206307300812](https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300812).
- Tepper, B.J., Simon, L. and Park, H.M. (2017), "Abusive supervision", *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 123-152, doi: [10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-041015-062539](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-041015-062539).
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L.L. and Parks, J.M. (1995), "Extra-role behaviors: in pursuit of construct and definitional clarity", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 17, pp. 215-285.
- Xanthopoulou, D. and Bakker, A.B. (2012), "State work engagement: the significance of within-person fluctuations", in Bakker, A.B. and Daniels, K. (Eds), *A Day in the Life of a Happy Worker*, Psychology Press, Hove, pp. 25-40.

Young, R.L. (2011), "Engagement: defining and measuring the construct", Doctoral dissertation, Florida Institute of Technology, FL, Melbourne.

Zhang, Y. and Liao, Z. (2015), "Consequences of abusive supervision: a meta-analytic review", *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 959-987, doi: [10.1007/s10490-015-9425-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-015-9425-0).

Further reading

Van Dyne, L., Kamdar, D. and Joireman, J. (2008), "In-role perceptions buffer the impact of low LMX on helping and enhance the impact of high LMX on voice", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 93 No. 6, pp. 1195-1207, doi: [10.1037/0021-9010.93.6.1195](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.6.1195).

Corresponding author

Szu-Chi Lu can be contacted at: ray5202002@gmail.com

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm

Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com