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This study examined abusive supervision as a predictor of workplace deviance (organizational, interpersonal, and supervisor-directed) and employee health (depression and anxiety). Based on the threatened egotism hypothesis, I examined narcissism as a moderator of the relationship between abusive supervision and deviance. Based on the within-domain stress exacerbation hypothesis, I also examined supervisor support as a moderator of the relationship between abusive supervision and health. Data from 199 employees in HR/Organizational Psychology-related occupations supported the main effect hypotheses between abusive supervision and interpersonal deviance, supervisor-directed deviance, and depression. Narcissism moderated the relationship between abusive supervision and organizational deviance, while supervisor support moderated the relationship between abusive supervision and anxiety. Moreover, I conducted additional analyses in order to more fully investigate the relationships among the main study variables. I discuss the study’s implications for future research and practice.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Experiencing mistreatment at work is an unfortunate reality for many employees. While research shows that the majority of abuse is received from angry and dissatisfied customers (Schat, Frone, & Kelloway, 2006), there is also substantial empirical and anecdotal evidence to suggest that employees often deal with tyrannical and abusive supervisors. Abusive supervision refers to “subordinate’s perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact” (Tepper, 2000, p. 178). Examples of behaviors described by this definition include invasion of privacy, public ridicule, angry tantrums, shouting, and coercion.

Consequences of abusive supervision are substantial for organizations and employees alike. For instance, abusive supervision has been associated with decreased job satisfaction and organizational commitment (e.g., Schat, Desmarais, & Kelloway, 2006; Tepper, 2000), decreased productivity (e.g., Harris, Kacmar, & Zivnuska, 2007), and increased turnover and absenteeism (Tepper, 2000). Previous research has also linked abusive supervision to subordinates’ deviant behavior (e.g., Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007; Tepper, Henle, Lambert, Giacalone, & Duffy, 2008) and poor psychological well-being (e.g., Tepper, 2000; Yagil, 2006). So overall, employees who work for abusive supervisors tend to be less happy, productive, and healthy, and consequently organizations perform less effectively.

The purpose of this study is to first investigate additional outcomes of abusive supervision, namely employee deviance, depression, and anxiety. Further, I will investigate two moderators of these relationships. I will examine the role of narcissism in the relationship between abusive supervision and deviance. I expect that employees high in narcissism will respond more negatively to abusive supervision by engaging in more deviant behaviors.
Individuals characterized by narcissistic thoughts and behaviors (e.g., grandiose sense of self-importance, low empathy toward others) tend to react very strongly and aggressively to mistreatment (e.g., Baumeister, Smart & Boden, 1996). As a result, I expect that these individuals would react most negatively to abusive supervision by engaging in more deviant workplace behaviors. I will also investigate the role of supervisor support in the relationship between abusive supervision and employee health outcomes. I expect that the relationship between abusive supervision and health outcomes will be stronger for employees who also receive support from their supervisor. Inconsistent interactions from a supervisor (i.e., abuse and support) should be especially stressful because the employee would lack certainty regarding this relationship and they would be unable to predict future interactions (Major, et al., 1997). Please see Appendix A for a visual depiction of these proposed relationships.

This study adds to a small but growing stream of research that focuses on destructive supervisor behaviors. This research contributes to the literature by investigating two novel boundary conditions that may exacerbate the consequences of abusive supervision. Narcissism and supervisor support have yet to be investigated in the abusive supervision literature as moderator variables, and the results of this study may help explain why some employees react and respond differently to abuse in the workplace.

This study is also directly applicable to industry. To begin with, employee theft alone is estimated to cost U.S. retailers $15.9 billion per year (Hollinger & Davis, 2008). Depression is also estimated to cost organizations between $90 and $100 billion annually (Stewart, Ricci, Chee, Hahn, & Morgenstein, 2003). Further, workers’ compensation costs increased from $20 billion in 1982 to $60 billion in 1990, and these costs have continued to rise (Bordwin, 1996). Predicting and preventing these outcomes, perhaps through the design and implementation of
supervisor communication training programs, can result in substantial benefits to employers at large. Organizations that are wishing to reduce their disability and compensation claims and health care costs while also improving working conditions for employees should pay close attention to the behaviors of supervisors.

*Abusive Supervision and Subordinate Deviance*

When employees feel as though they have been treated unfairly in the workplace they will likely experience feelings of anger which will lead to feelings of retribution (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Employees who receive abuse from their supervisors may then, not surprisingly, respond quite negatively to the mistreatment. For instance, the employee may respond by seeking to retaliate against the organization, its employees, or the perpetrating supervisor. Retaliation involves the desire to punish a wrongdoer for unwarranted malevolent acts (Averill, 1982). Research has shown that interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace promotes direct retaliation against the perpetrator of the injustice as well as promotes aggression displaced on other targets. One way that employees may retaliate against abuse from their managers is by engaging in deviant workplace behaviors.

Workplace deviance is defined as purposeful negative behavior that violates organizational norms, and is intended to harm the organization, its employees, or both (Bennett & Robinson, 2003). Robinson and Bennett (1995) developed a typology that classified these behaviors as being either directed at members of the organization (interpersonal deviance) or at the organization (organizational deviance). Examples of interpersonal deviant behaviors include acting rude toward others, making fun of someone, or playing a mean prank on someone at work, while deviant behaviors directed toward the organization can include withholding effort, stealing company property, and taking longer breaks (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Mitchell and Ambrose
(2007) later, however, recognized that deviance may also be directed toward the supervisor (supervisor-directed deviance) and expanded the typology to include these behaviors. These behaviors are similar to those of interpersonal deviance, but are measured by asking about negative behaviors directly solely at the supervisor.

When employees can retaliate directly, they should be expected to engage in supervisor-directed deviance. For example, Bies and Tripp (1998) found that victims of abusive supervision would directly undermine their bosses in private as well as openly ridicule them in public. A meta-analysis by Hershcovis et al. (2007) also found that unjust treatment by supervisors was related to supervisor-targeted deviance.

In many circumstances, however, direct retaliation against a supervisor is not possible or optimal (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, & Sears, 1939; Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007). Instead, employees may exhibit displaced aggression where they retaliate against more readily available targets. For example, employees who are ridiculed by their boss may displace their aggression by making fun of other colleagues or acting rudely toward a coworker. These employees may also steal company property or waste their time at work in an attempt to ‘get back’ at their supervisor.

Dollard et al. (1939) provide two reasons to explain why employees may displace their aggression. First, the supervisor may not be available to retaliate against. In many organizations, especially highly structured and formal organizations, it is not possible to disrespect supervisors or superiors. A Corporal in the U.S. Army, for instance, would simply have no capacity to act rudely toward their Captain. Second, the employee may be concerned with further retaliation from the supervisor. For example, the employee may fear that the supervisor will continue the abuse or provide a negative performance evaluation. Aggression in these cases would instead be
displaced on less powerful or more convenient targets, like the organization itself or other employees.

Several studies have found support for this displaced aggression explanation of abusive supervision. For instance, Hoobler and Brass (2006) found that the families of employees who were abused by their bosses at work reported higher incidence of undermining at home. In terms of organizational deviance, Detert, Treviño, Burris, and Andiappan (2007) found that abusive supervision was significantly related to food loss (i.e., employees wasting and stealing food) in a longitudinal study of several restaurants. In addition to the organization, abusive supervision has also been found to predict interpersonal forms of counterproductive behaviors directed at other coworkers (e.g., Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007). This type of workplace deviance, like organizational deviance, may also be a way to retaliate against abusive supervision without directly involving the supervisor.

In the current study, I first intend to replicate these previous findings by investigating the relationship between abusive supervision and deviance (i.e., organizational, interpersonal, and supervisor-directed deviance). I will also use coworker reports of deviance in order to examine whether the relationships hold with coworker reports as well as to minimize the problems with using all self-report data (e.g., common method bias; Fox, Spector, Goh, & Bruusema, 2007).

All three forms of workplace deviance are detrimental for organizations, employees, and important stakeholders. As mentioned above, employee theft (only one indicator of workplace deviance) is extremely costly to organizations, and overall workplace deviance has been negatively associated with objective and subjective measures of business-unit performance (Dunlop & Lee, 2004). Additionally, an organization characterized by frequent occurrences of workplace deviance would undoubtedly be a negative working environment. Identifying abusive
supervision as a predictor of these behaviours, and consequently eliminating the abuse, may be an effective way to develop a more positive and ethical climate at work.

*Hypothesis 1a:* Abusive supervision will be positively related to organizational deviance.

*Hypothesis 1b:* Abusive supervision will be positively related to interpersonal deviance.

*Hypothesis 1c:* Abusive supervision will be positively related to supervisor-directed deviance.

*Moderating Role of Narcissism*

The Narcissus myth by Ovid describes the story of a young man who falls in love with his own reflection in a pool of water. The term, *narcissism*, was later coined by Freud (1914) to refer to excessive self-love and was based on the relationship between the libido and the ego. Narcissism has since been used to describe those with a grandiose sense of self-importance, an inflated sense of entitlement, low empathy toward others, and to those having fantasies of personal greatness and uniqueness (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Although the study of narcissism began in clinical psychology, it has since been applied to personality and social psychology, and to a lesser extent, industrial-organizational psychology (Judge, LePine, & Rich, 2006). While there is a more severe, clinical form of the trait, known as narcissistic personality disorder (NPD) which is rare and affects less than 1% of the population (American Psychiatric Association, 2000), it has been argued that all individuals differ in their narcissistic tendencies and that these differences can be measured in a typical population (Raskin & Hall, 1981). The degree to which a person is narcissistic is thought to be relatively fixed and enduring, but like other personality traits, susceptible to some change as a result of life experiences and environments (Campbell, Foster, and Finkel, 2002; Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007). Also, there
appear to be gender differences in narcissism, where males exhibit more frequent and consistent narcissistic behaviors (e.g., Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001).

The heightened research interest surrounding this variable may be due to the contention that society is becoming more narcissistic over time. For instance, Twenge and Foster (2010) conducted a nationwide meta-analysis of college student’s scores on a narcissism personality inventory and found a significant increase in narcissism scores from years 1982-2008. The authors cite cultural shifts in parenting, media, and education as possible reasons for this trend. Regardless of the explanation of this shift, narcissism has been linked with several maladaptive variables, such as trait anger, poor cooperation skills, and lack of integrity (Blair, Hoffman, & Helland, 2008; Penney & Spector, 2002).

By definition, narcissism appears similar to the concept of high self-esteem. People with high self-esteem are characterized as having global feelings of self-worth, goodness, worthiness and self-respect (Rosenberg, 1965). It has generally been found that people high in narcissism do also have high self-esteem. However, according to the research, narcissism and high self-esteem differ in an important way. Narcissists think they are better looking, smarter, and more important than others but not necessarily more moral, caring or compassionate (Bleske-Rechek, Remiker & Baker, 2008; Campbell et al, 2007). People merely with high self-esteem, however, have positive self-views, but also see themselves as more loving and moral. For instance, Campbell, Rudich and Sedikides (2002) found that narcissits rated themselves better than their romantic parnters on a series of 20 traits, while high self-esteem individuals rated themselves only as more moral than the *average* person. The authors argue that the people with high self-esteem were able to temper their positive self-views when the comparison was a close other and that these differences in self-conceptions have implications for the interpersonal strategies that the two groups use.
Narcissists express their positive self-views through efforts to win admiration and attention, often by comparing themselves with others and through competition. In other words, narcissists are willing to defend their competence interpersonally. On the other hand, high self-esteem individuals report having positive self-views but also positive moral views. Therefore, high self-esteem individuals should want to express both their egoistic and communal traits, and should not want to inflate one at the expense of the other. To simplify the difference, narcissists want to be admired while high self-esteem individuals want to be popular.

Another intuitive proposition is that narcissists are actually insecure and have low self-esteem. In other words, the self-importance of narcissists is actually a cover for deep-seated doubts of themselves and narcissism is a mask for low self-worth (Twenge & Campbell, 2009). This proposition is known as the ‘doughnut theory’ of narcissism where hidden behind a veneer of grandiosity are deeper feelings of insecurity (like a doughnut with an empty hole in the middle; Thomaes & Bushman, 2010). However, the research does not provide support for this idea. For one, people who score high on narcissism self-report scales also score high on self-esteem scales, as a meta-analysis indicated ($r = .29$, $k = 11$, $n = 2963$, $p < .001$; Campbell, 2001). Next, researchers have also adapted the Implicit Association Test (IAT), a test designed to measure people’s automatic and uncontrolled responses, to show that narcissists really do like themselves privately. Using a computer-based IAT, Campbell, Bosson, Goheen, Lakey, and Kernis (2007) asked participants to pair keys for ‘me’ and ‘not me’ with both positive and negative words. The results revealed that people high in narcissism found it easier (i.e., were faster) to hit the key for ‘me’ when they saw words like ‘wonderful’, ‘great’, and ‘good’ compared to people low in narcissism. Also, people high in narcissism found it more difficult (i.e., took longer) to press the key for ‘me’ for words like ‘terrible’, ‘awful’ and ‘bad’. These results provide support for the
idea that narcissists have similar views of themselves internally and externally, and that narcissists really do like themselves “deep down inside”.

Another concern when considering narcissism as a personality trait is that perhaps narcissists truly are more talented, better looking, and smarter than others. In this sense, their extreme positive self-views are justified. However, there is little evidence to suggest that narcissists really are better than average. For instance, research has found that narcissists do not score any higher on intelligence tests or tests of general knowledge (Campbell, Goodie, & Foster, 2004). Regarding behaviors in the workplace, Judge, LePine, & Rich (2006) investigated the relationship between narcissism and self- and other- ratings of job performance criteria and found that narcissism was related to enhanced leadership self-perceptions but negatively related to other-ratings of leadership. Also, narcissism was related to more favorable ratings of contextual performance compared to supervisor ratings. In other words, narcissism seemed to differentially influence self- and other- perceptions of behavior, where people high in narcissism tended to have more favorable self-views. Brunell et al. (2008) found that narcissism predicted a participants’ likelihood to emerge as a leader during a leaderless discussion group, but that narcissism was not related to performance on other tasks. Narcissists are also not rated as being better looking than others. For instance, Bleske-Rechek and colleagues (2008) asked men and women to evaluate their own attractiveness and then asked two separate panels of judges to view and rate pictures of these men and women. They found that more narcissistic men and women rated themselves as more attractive compared to less narcissistic people, but that the outside judges did not rate more or less narcissistic people any differently in attractiveness. Overall, these results suggest that narcissists truly do have biased evaluations of themselves and their
performance. Additionally, it has been suggested that narcissism may play a crucial role in how people respond to ego-threats, including those experienced in the workplace.

Baumeister, Smart and Boden (1996) conducted an extensive review of the narcissism and self-esteem literature in several different domains (e.g., criminal psychology, clinical psychology) and found most support for the view that inflated self-views were associated with increased aggression, especially when people suffer a blow to their ego. These authors proposed that highly favorable self-opinions will likely lead to violence or aggression when this favorable self-view is threatened, challenged, or put in jeopardy. In other words, aggression is exacerbated when there is a favorable self-view and an external appraisal that is much less favorable. This theory, known as threatened egotism theory, suggests that people with big egos become angry and aggressive when others threaten their inflated egos. Narcissists in particular care fervently about being superior to others (Penney & Spector, 2002). When faced with criticism, narcissists should be most likely to respond with aggression because they are particularly concerned with convincing others of their superior abilities. And as mentioned earlier, they are not as concerned with prosocial norms while convincing others of their superiority (Twenge & Campbell, 2009). Aggression is therefore a rejection of esteem-threatening evaluations received from others and is a strategy to regulate the distress associated with receiving criticism (Thomaes & Bushman, 2010). In this sense, anger may serve as a self-protective function for those high in narcissism.

There is considerable research evidence to support the threatened egotism theory. Using an experimental design, Bushman and Baumeister (1998) asked participants to rate themselves on a narcissism scale and then write a one-paragraph essay. The participants were told that their essay would be given to another participant to be scored, although this participant was actually a
confederate. Participants in the ego-threat condition received their essay back with negative ratings and comments such as “This is the worst essay I have ever read!” Next the participant was told that they would play a game with the participant (confederate) in the other room and for each round they won they could choose to deliver a blast of noise. The researchers found that the highest levels of aggression (i.e., delivering the highest intensity and longest lasting blasts of noise) were found among people who scored highest in narcissism. In a related study, researchers found that in a laboratory setting narcissists were more likely than people scoring lower in narcissism to be aggressive with confederates who had previously provided social rejection (Twenge & Campbell, 2003). Further, they found that these participants took the opportunity to aggress against an innocent third party (i.e., someone who did not provide the rejection but was still a university student). Therefore, participants high in narcissism were most likely to retaliate directly as well as show displaced aggression following the social rejection (i.e., ego-threat).

In one study applied to the workplace, Penney and Spector (2002) found that narcissism moderated the relationship between experiencing job constraints and engaging in counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs). The authors argue that job constraints (e.g., poor equipment, constant interruptions) represent a threat to one’s ego because they prevent an employee from demonstrating effective job performance. The authors found that people high in narcissism reacted more negatively to these job constraints by engaging in more CWBs (e.g., insulting coworkers, purposely doing work improperly). Two studies in particular also found this relationship, but with self-esteem rather than narcissism as a moderator (Burton, Mitchell, and Lee, 2005; Shaubhut, Adams, & Jex, 2004). Given that people high in narcissism react more negatively to ego-threats than those just high in self-esteem (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998), it should be expected that this relationship would be stronger with narcissism as a moderator.
In the current study, I propose that abusive supervision will also serve as a threat to an employee’s ego. For instance, if a supervisor were to ridicule an employee in front of their coworkers, the employee’s ego or esteem would likely be threatened. Further, a poor supervisor will prevent an employee from performing effectively, similar to the job constraints argument cited above. I propose that people high in narcissism who also encounter this ego-threat (i.e., abusive supervision) will be most likely to react negatively by engaging in forms of workplace deviance. I only expect this relationship with deviance outcomes (i.e., not with psychological health outcomes) because people high in narcissism tend to react with hostility to an ego threat, rather than having internalized reactions (e.g., anxiety; Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). Overall, understanding narcissism in this relationship may help to identify an individual difference that can help explain why some may engage in more deviance in response to mistreatment. People high in narcissism should be most likely to retaliate directly against their supervisor, perhaps by spreading rumors or telling mean jokes about the supervisor. People high in narcissism should also be more likely to displace their aggression by engaging in interpersonal and organizational deviance. Therefore, I propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2a: Narcissism will moderate the relationship between abusive supervision and organizational deviance. The relationship between abusive supervision and organizational deviance will be strongest for those high in narcissism.

Hypothesis 2b: Narcissism will moderate the relationship between abusive supervision and interpersonal deviance. The relationship between abusive supervision and interpersonal deviance will be strongest for those high in narcissism.
Hypothesis 2c: Narcissism will moderate the relationship between abusive supervision and supervisor-directed deviance. The relationship between abusive supervision and supervisor-directed deviance will be strongest for those high in narcissism.

Abusive Supervision and Psychological Well-Being

For the most part, paid employment is beneficial to the well-being of individuals. For instance, working men and women have higher quality of life and slower declines in perceived health and physical functioning (Ganster & Murphy, 2000). However, imagine going to work every day for a manager who makes fun of you, puts you down, and lies to you. In this case, it is probable that your psychological health would suffer. For instance, you would most likely experience more symptoms of depression and anxiety, like feeling hopeless, irritable, and restless.

Indeed, research on job stress has generally concluded that prolonged exposure to stressful events at work is associated with harmful outcomes, including physical and psychological disorders (Ganster & Schaubroeck, 1991). Stress can be conceptualized as “an environmental stimulus that initiates a chain of responses that ultimately leads to pathological ends” (Ganster & Schaubroeck, p. 245). Abusive supervision, then, can be considered to be a stressor at work as it would undoubtedly be stressful for an employee to experience humiliation and degradation from their supervisor. Therefore, it is likely that this stimulus (i.e., abusive supervision) would be related to psychological strain.

Research has demonstrated verbal abuse at work to be related to psychological distress. For example, studies with medical students demonstrated that verbal abuse at work was very common and was related to poor psychological health, like experiencing symptoms of depression (Richman, Flaherty, Rospenda, & Christensen, 1992; Sheehan, Sheehan, White, Leibowitz, &
Abusive supervision, in particular, has also been related to manifestations of psychological distress such as emotional exhaustion (Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al, 2008), and employee burnout (i.e., experiencing emotional exhaustion and depersonalization; Harvey, Stoner, Hochwarter, & Kacmar, 2007; Yagil, 2006; Wu & Hu, 2009).

Theories of chronic stressors can help explain why abusive supervision should be related to symptoms of psychological distress. Chronic stressors are defined as 1) being persistent, 2) lasting a long time, 3) having an onset that is difficult to identify, and 4) not having a clear offset (Gottlieb, 1997; Hepburn, Loughlin, & Barling, 1997). Abusive supervisor behaviors could then be described as chronic stressors because abusive supervision is defined as being sustained and enduring, and will only cease if the employee or the supervisor terminates the relationship or the supervisor changes their behavior (Tepper, 2000). The theory of chronic stressors explains that consistently experiencing these uncivil events creates a “socially noxious environment” (Gottlieb, p. 5) that eventually elicits mental and physical health problems for employees. Therefore, according to this theory, constantly being ridiculed, degraded, and humiliated by a supervisor should be related to poor psychological health.

Employees’ poor health has significant social and financial costs for organizations. For instance, employee depression alone is estimated to cost U.S. organizations $50 billion annually for medical treatments as well as $44 billion in costs for reduced performance and absences (Stewart, Ricci, Chee, Hahm, & Morganstein, 2003). Also, as mentioned above, psychological distress in the form of depression and anxiety is implicated in the etiology of physical disorders, like gastrointestinal disorders and coronary heart disease (e.g., Cohen & Hebert, 1996; Ganster & Murphy, 2000; Martin, et al., 1995). Therefore, the negative impact of abuse at work may be compounded and is certainly pervasive, resulting in especially negative outcomes for employees.
ABUSIVE SUPERVISION

and increased health care costs and compensation claims for employers. It is clearly important to understand what factors in the workplace lead to these costly outcomes. Given the research cited above and the theory of chronic stressors, I propose the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 3a:** Abusive supervision will be positively related to employee depression.

**Hypothesis 3b:** Abusive supervision will be positively related to employee anxiety.

**Moderating Role of Social Support**

The benefits of supportive relationships in the workplace for the psychological well-being of employees have been well documented (e.g., Ganster, Fusilier, & Mayes, 1998). In contrast to abusive supervision, social support refers to the “social resources that persons perceive to be available or that are actually provided to them by nonprofessionals in the context of both formal support groups and informal helping relationships” (Gottlieb & Bergen, in press). In other words, social support refers to behaviors that are meant to develop positive relationships. Different types of social support have been identified, including emotional, instrumental, informational, companionate, and esteem support, and these types can be received from different sources in the workplace including supervisors, coworkers, customers, and organizational policies (e.g., diversity policies). Social support in the workplace has been associated with increased job satisfaction and decreased job strain (Ganster, et al., 1998; Gant et al, 1993). In other domains of life, social support has also been related to reductions in problems associated with asthma, difficulties in adjusting to widowhood, and even reduced mortality (e.g., Bankoff, 1983; Berkman & Syme, 1979; Gallant, 2003).

The absence of abusive supervision, however, does not necessarily imply social support is received from a supervisor. In fact, people may experience high amounts of support and conflict from the same person (e.g., Gottlieb & Wagner, 1991). For example, imagine an
employee who is ridiculed by their boss in the morning meeting and who is later granted time off by the supervisor so they can attend to a nonwork matter. Further, Duffy and colleagues (2002) found that social undermining from a supervisor (i.e., behaviors intended to hinder work-related success) was empirically distinct from support from a supervisor. But what are the effects of receiving both abuse and support from a supervisor at work?

It has been suggested that receiving conflict as well as support from the same target is particularly stressful. Referred to as the within-domain exacerbation hypothesis, research has shown that negative behaviors, like abuse or conflict, from a specific person who also provides support can actually exacerbate distress. For example, Major, Zubek, Cozzarelli, and Richards (1997) surveyed women who were undergoing an abortion and found that women who perceived high conflict from their mothers were more distressed (i.e., had poorer postabortion adjustment) if they also perceived their mothers to be a source of high support. They found this relationship with highly supportive and conflictive friends of the woman as well. Hobman, Restubog, Bordia, and Tang (2009) investigated this relationship in an educational setting with a group of students and their project advisors. These researchers found that students had poor psychological well-being, more project anxiety, and diminished self-esteem when they concurrently received emotional support and conflict from their project advisors. In a related study, Duffy, Ganster, and Pagon (2002) found that among police officers, high levels of social undermining and support from the same source in the workplace (i.e., coworkers and supervisors) was associated with negative outcomes including somatic complaints and diminished self-efficacy.

Inconsistent interactions and responses from a supervisor should be especially taxing because the employee would most likely have feelings of insecurity regarding the relationship (Major, et al., 1997). Receiving supportive and conflictive responses from the same individual
would make future interactions difficult to predict. For example, the employee would not know whether the supervisor will belittle or encourage them when they start work everyday. This lack of predictability and control then is likely to result in psychological health problems.

Furthermore, it requires more personal resources to deal with people who are inconsistent in their provision of abusive and supportive behaviors (Duffy, et al., 2002). According to the conservation of resources theory, people constantly want to obtain, retain, and protect their resources (Hobfall, 1989). If it takes more resources to deal with inconsistent interactions, even more so than consistent negative interactions, then it is expected that employees receiving abuse and support from a supervisor will experience the most negative psychological outcomes.

Although not previously investigated, another possible explanation is that employees dealing with inconsistent supervisors cannot develop an effective coping strategy to deal with their boss. For example, an employee with a supervisor who is abusive but not supportive may cope by learning to avoid the supervisor altogether or by keeping conversations to a minimum. An employee with a supportive and abusive supervisor, however, would not develop this same strategy given that their supervisor sometimes treats them with consideration and respect.

In order to extend the previously cited research to the domain of abusive supervision, I predict that social support from a supervisor who also abuses an employee will actually magnify the detrimental psychological effects of the abusive behaviors. I only expect this relationship with the psychological health outcomes (i.e., not with deviance outcomes) because the conflicting behavior from a supervisor should result in internal tension rather than greater need for retaliation. Also, Hobman et al. (2009) found support for this moderated relationship only with psychological variables, including well-being, anxiety, and self-esteem. Examining this relationship is important because many supervisors who are abusive to their employees may
attempt to compensate by also being supportive of the employee. For example, the supervisor may feel guilty after making fun of their employee and later compensate by praising the employee in front of others (Duffy et al., 2002). According to the previously cited research, however, the support should not counteract the abuse. Instead, the highest levels of psychological distress for employees should occur under conditions of high abusive supervision and high supervisor support. Given this reasoning, supervisors should not be advised to simply incorporate supportive behaviors without first eliminating their abusive behaviors. Rather, organizations may consider training supervisors to provide consistent and supportive interactions with their employees.

*Hypothesis 4a*: Supervisor support will moderate the relationship between abusive supervision and employee depression. The relationship between abusive supervision and depression will be strongest for those with high supervisor support.

*Hypothesis 4b*: Supervisor support will moderate the relationship between abusive supervision and employee anxiety. The relationship between abusive supervision and anxiety will be strongest for those with high supervisor support.
CHAPTER II. METHOD

Participants

Participants in this study were adult employees working in Human Resources (HR) and Organizational Psychology occupations and organizations. Example occupational titles were HR Project Manager, Evaluation Specialist, Consultant, and Professor. 199 employees completed the employee survey and 50 coworkers completed the coworker survey. The employee response rate is unknown given the listserv method of data collection, although previous research has estimated response rates for this method to be roughly 5 – 10% (e.g., Fraught, 2004; Lyons, Cude, Lawrence, & Gutter, 2005). The coworker response rate was 25%. Of the employee respondents, 69% were female and 31% were male, with a mean age of 37.1 years ($SD = 11.02$). Employee participants worked on average 44.7 hours per week ($SD = 9.08$) with an average tenure of 5.7 years ($SD = 7.92$), and were employed mostly in nonacademic occupations (78.4%). Approximately 56% of the employee participants had at least 10 hours of direct contact/communication with their supervisors on a weekly basis. Of the coworker respondents, 42% were female and 58% were male, with a mean age of 38.4 years ($SD = 11.59$). Coworker participants worked on average 45.5 hours per week ($SD = 13.65$) with an average tenure of 6.3 years ($SD = 5.66$), and were also employed mostly in nonacademic occupations (84%).

Procedure

Participants were recruited via email messages sent through listprocs and discussion forums related to the occupations cited above. Table 1 displays the listservs/sources used in the current study. Please see Appendix B for the recruitment message used for employees. Interested participants clicked on a link to the online survey where they read an informed consent letter prior to completing the survey. The survey took approximately 20-25 minutes to complete and
respondents were entered into a random drawing for one of 16 Amazon.com gift certificates worth $25 each. Following the completion of this survey, participants were asked to provide the name and email address of a coworker who may have also been interested in completing a corresponding survey. I then emailed the coworker with information about the survey. The coworker was asked to read an informed consent letter and the survey took approximately 10 minutes to complete. Coworkers who participated were entered into a random drawing for one of eight Amazon.com gift certificates worth $25 each.

Measures

The target employees in this study were asked to complete items regarding abusive supervision, deviance, depression, anxiety, narcissism, supervisor support, demographics, and control variables. Please see Appendix C for a list of measures completed by the target employees. Coworkers of the target employees were asked to respond to items regarding the target employee’s level of workplace deviance and control variables. Please see Appendix D for a list of measures completed by the coworker.

Abusive Supervision. I assessed abusive supervision using Tepper’s (2000; \( \alpha = .93 \)) Abusive Supervision Measure. This is a 15-item scale where respondents indicated the frequency with which their supervisors engaged in the behaviors listed, such as “Invades my privacy” and “Tells me I’m incompetent.” Questions were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale which ranges from 1 (I cannot remember him/her ever using this behavior with me) to 5 (He/she uses this behavior very often with me). Higher scores represented higher perceived levels of abusive supervision.

Organizational Deviance. I assessed organizational deviance by using Bennett and Robinson’s (2000; \( \alpha = .66 \)) measure of workplace deviance. There are 12 items in the original
self-report scale, but I used only seven items that could be directly observable to coworkers. The scale asked participants to indicate the frequency with which they believed their co-worker engaged in organization-directed deviant behaviors. Example items include “He/she has taken property from work without permission” and “Littered the work environment”. Items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Never) to 7(Daily). Higher scores represent higher perceived levels of organizational deviance. Target employees also rated their own levels of organizational deviance (α = .74).

Interpersonal Deviance. Interpersonal deviance (not directed toward supervisors) was assessed by the remaining seven items of Bennett and Robinson’s (2000; α = .71) measure of workplace deviance. These questions asked participants to indicate the frequency with which they believed their co-worker engaged in interpersonally deviant behaviors directed toward coworkers such as “He/she has acted rudely toward someone at work” and “He/she has said something hurtful to someone at work”. Like the other items in this scale, these items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1(Never) to 7(Daily). Higher scores represent higher perceived levels of interpersonal deviance. Target employees also rated their own levels of interpersonal deviance (α = .76).

Supervisor-Directed Deviance. Interpersonal deviance directed toward supervisors was measured using Mitchell and Ambrose’s (2007; α = .64) measure. This is a 10-item scale that adapted language from the Bennett and Robinson (2000) and Aquino, Lewis, and Bradfield (1999) measures to create a supervisor-directed deviance scale. Example items include “Made fun of his/her supervisor at work” and “Swore at his/her supervisor”. Items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1(Never) to 7(Daily). Higher scores represent higher
perceived levels of supervisor-directed deviance. Target employees also rated their own levels of
supervisor-directed deviance ($\alpha = .83$).

*Depression.* Employees’ depressive symptoms were measured via Zung’s (1965; $\alpha = .79$)
Self-Rating Depression Scale. This scale is intended to measure symptoms of depression in a
nonclinical sample and consists of 10 items. Example items include “I feel down-hearted and
blue” and “I still enjoy the things I used to do”. Items were rated on a 4-point Likert-type scale
ranging from 1(A little of the time) to 4(Most of the time). Higher scores represent higher severity
of self-reported depression.

*Anxiety.* Employees’ level of anxiety was assessed using the Self-Rating Anxiety Scale
(SAS; Zung, 1971; $\alpha = .75$). This scale is 12 items in length. Example items include “I feel afraid
for no reason at all” and “I feel like I’m falling apart and going to pieces”. Items were rated on a
4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1(A little of the time) to 4(Most of the time).

*Narcissism.* Narcissism was measured with the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI;
Raskin & Hall, 1979; Raskin & Terry, 1988; $\alpha = .89$). This measure was developed using the
DSM-III behavioral criteria as a template to measure individual differences in narcissism in non-
clinical populations. This is a 40-item scale that is composed of seven interrelated factors:
Authority (e.g., I am a born leader); Self-sufficiency (e.g., I am more capable than other people);
Vanity (e.g., I like to look at my body); Exploitativeness (e.g., I can read people like a book);
Superiority (e.g., I am an extraordinary person); Exhibitionism (e.g., I really like to be the center
of attention); and Entitlement (e.g., If I ruled the world it would be a much better place). Items
were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1(Very Inaccurate) to 5(Very Accurate).
Higher scores on the NPI represent higher levels of narcissism.
Supervisor Support. Social support received from the supervisor was measured using the Personal and Esteem Support subscale of the Inventory of Supportive and Unsupportive Managerial Behaviors (Rooney & Gottlieb, 2007; $\alpha = .96$). This is a 9-item scale which asks participants to rate the extent to which their supervisor’s behaviors are esteem enhancing and convey regard for their personal well-being. Example items include “Thanks me for things I do” and “Shows interest in what’s going on in my life outside of work”. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Almost Never) to 5 (Always). Higher scores represent higher perceived levels of supervisor support.

Demographic and Control variables. In order to decrease the likelihood that any observed relationships between abusive supervision and employee outcomes were confounded by individual differences, I controlled for the following variables: negative affectivity (NA), age, gender, and frequency of contact between employee and supervisor. NA is a potentially confounding third variable as it may influence the perception of social interactions at work and outcomes like health symptoms (e.g., Lakey & Cassady, 1990). I assessed NA using items from the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988; $\alpha = .90$). The PANAS consists of 10 negative adjectives (e.g., distressed). Items were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Very slightly or not at all) to 5 (Extremely). Age and gender were controlled because previous studies have demonstrated that these variables affect employees’ responses to interpersonal abuse (Aquino & Douglas, 2003). Frequency of contact was controlled because employees who interacted with their supervisors more per week may have had more opportunities to experience abusive or supportive behaviors. Additional demographic variables that were measured can be viewed in Appendices C and D.
CHAPTER III. RESULTS

Note about analyses

The following scale analyses and hypothesis tests were conducted with self-report measures due to the low response rate ($N = 50$) from coworkers.

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations

Descriptive statistics and internal-consistency reliability estimates (coefficient alphas) were first calculated for all variables, and are displayed in Table 2. The observed range compared to possible range in responses to the scales was: abusive supervision (observed: 1 – 3.80; possible: 1 - 5), narcissism (observed: 1 – 4.20; possible 1 - 5), supervisor support (observed: 1 – 5; possible: 1-5), deviance (observed: 1 – 5.8; possible 1 – 7), depression (observed: 1 – 4; possible: 1 – 4), and anxiety (observed: 1-4; possible: 1-4), suggesting that range restriction was not a problem.

Table 3 displays the intercorrelations among the self-report variables. The majority of the correlations were in the expected direction. As expected, abusive supervision was significantly related to self-reported organizational deviance ($r = .21, p < .05$), interpersonal deviance ($r = .21, p < .05$), and supervisor-directed deviance ($r = .42, p < .05$). Also, abusive supervision was significantly related to the mental health outcomes including depression ($r = .28, p < .05$) and anxiety ($r = .16, p < .05$). Abusive supervision was strongly negatively related to supervisor support ($r = -.64, p < .05$). Supervisor support was also negatively related to health outcomes including depression ($r = -.31, p < .05$) and anxiety ($r = -.16, p < .05$) as well as self-report supervisor-directed deviance ($r = -.26, p < .05$). All of the control variables (i.e., age, sex, negative affectivity and frequency of contact with supervisor) were significantly related to the major study variables and were controlled for in all analyses. I also included investigated the
relationship between self-esteem and the main study variables. Self-esteem was not significantly related to narcissism \((r = .11, p > .05)\). 

**Analysis of deviance scales**

In order to more fully understand responses to the deviance-related items in this study, I calculated correlations between self-report and coworker-report responses as well as means and standard deviations for each of the items and scales. Table 4 displays the intercorrelations among the self- and coworker-report deviance scales. All of the self-report deviance variables were significantly related to the respective coworker-report deviance variables (organizational deviance, \(r = .53, p < .05\); interpersonal deviance, \(r = .59, p < .05\); supervisor-directed deviance, \(r = .64, p < .05\)). Table 5 displays the means, standard deviations, ranges and percentages of endorsement for the self-report organizational, interpersonal, and supervisor-directed deviance items and scales. Participants reported on average engaging in more organizational deviance \((M = 2.01, SD = .90)\) compared to interpersonal deviance \((M = 1.52, SD = .73; t(198) = 8.62, p < .05)\) and supervisor-directed deviance \((M = 1.36, SD = .61; t(198) = 11.20; p < .05)\). For organizational deviance, participants reported taking longer breaks most frequently \((M = 3.18, SD = 1.93)\) while the item with the lowest mean concerned consuming illegal drugs or alcohol in the workplace \((M = 1.12, SD = .63)\). For interpersonal deviance, the item with the highest mean asked about making fun of a coworker \((M = 2.64, SD = 1.84)\) while the item with the lowest mean asked about playing a mean prank on a co-worker \((M = 1.09, SD = 0.65)\). Finally, for supervisor-directed deviance, participants reported gossiping about their supervisor most frequently \((M = 2.48, SD = 1.74)\) while playing a mean prank on their supervisor least frequently \((M = 1.06, SD = 0.37)\).

I conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with AMOS 16.0 (Arbuckle, 2006) to examine the distinctiveness of the deviance variables in the study. The first model was a single
factor model that specified that all 24 items would load on a single deviance factor. This model produced an extremely poor fit. The Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) was .27, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) was .39, and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) was .20. I also conducted a 3-factor model with 7 items loading on an organizational deviance factor, 7 items loading on an interpersonal deviance factor and 10 items loading on a supervisor-directed deviance factor. The fit for this model was better than the one-factor model (TLI = .34, CFI = .45, RMSEA = .23). Therefore, there was more support for using separate scales for organizational, interpersonal, and supervisor-directed deviance. Upon investigating the factor structure of each scale, it appeared as though items loaded on one of two factors for each scale: one factor more severe behaviors (e.g., making ethnic remarks) and one factor for less severe behaviors (e.g., gossiping behind someone’s back).

Analysis of mental health scales

Next I conducted a CFA to examine the distinctiveness of the mental health variables (i.e., depression and anxiety) in the study. The first model was a single factor model that specified that all 22 items would load on a single health factor. This model produced poor fit (TLI = .54, CFI = .62, RMSEA = .11). I then conducted a 2-factor model with 10 items loading a depression factor and 12 items loading on an anxiety factor. The fit for this model was better than the one-factor model (TLI = .58, CFI = .66, RMSEA = .10). Therefore, there was support for using two separate measures for depression and anxiety.

Analysis of narcissism scale

Table 6 displays the means, standard deviations, and coefficient alphas for the seven facets of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (i.e., Authority, Exhibitionism, Superiority, Entitlement, Exploitativeness, Self-sufficiency, and Vanity). Table 6 also displays the
correlations between each of these facets and organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, and supervisor-directed deviance. Table 7 displays the intercorrelations among subscales as well as the total narcissism scale. The overall alpha for the scale was .89 and all of the subscales correlated with the total narcissism scale at .66 or above. All of the subscales were correlated .23 or above with most correlating .40 or above, thus providing support for creating a composite score.

The Authority facet showed the highest mean ($M = 3.76, SD = .68$) while the Entitlement facet showed the lowest mean ($M = 1.87, SD = .66$). The facets with consistent relationships with deviance outcomes were Entitlement, Exploitativeness, and Self-sufficiency.

**Hypothesis testing**

As stated previously all of the study hypothesis tests were first conducted with self-report data ($N = 199$) due to the very low response rates from coworkers ($N = 50$). Hierarchal regression was used to test hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c (i.e., that abusive supervision would be positively related to organizational, interpersonal, and supervisor-directed deviance) as well as Hypotheses 3a and 3b (i.e., that abusive supervision would be positively related to depression and anxiety). The control variables were entered into the first step and abusive supervision was entered into the second step. Abusive supervision was significantly related to interpersonal deviance ($B = .15, p < .05; R^2 = .12, p < .05$) and supervisor directed deviance ($B = .39, p < .05; R^2 = .22, p < .05$), providing support for hypotheses 1b and 1c. Abusive supervision was not, however, significantly related to organizational deviance ($B = .09, p > .05; R^2 = .23, p < .05$). In terms of the mental health hypotheses, abusive supervision was significantly related to depression ($B = .21, p < .05; R^2 = .33, p < .05$) but not significantly related to anxiety ($B = .06, p > .05; R^2 = .40, p < .05$), thus providing support only for hypothesis 3a.
I followed the ordinary least-squares regression procedures recommended by Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2003) in order to test the moderating hypotheses. I began by standardizing my independent variable (abusive supervision) and moderating variables (narcissism and supervisor support). Next, I multiplied each pair of standardized variables to create interaction terms. I then conducted a hierachal regression analysis predicting deviance and health from the independent variable, moderating variables, and interaction terms. I entered the control variables, independent variable, and moderators in the first step and the interaction term in the second step.

There was support for hypothesis 2a, as there was a statistically significant interaction between employees’ ratings of abusive supervision and narcissism in predicting organizational deviance, and the form of the interaction was consistent with my hypothesis. The results of these analyses are demonstrated in Table 8. The interaction term accounted for an additional 2% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .02, p < .05$) in predicting organizational deviance. This level of explained variance is within the expected range based on moderator effects in field studies and is comparable to previous research on abusive supervision (Champoux & Peters, 1987; Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al., 2007). The results of this finding are depicted in Figure 1 which showed that the relationship between abusive supervision and organizational deviance was stronger for those high in narcissism compared to those low in narcissism. Simple slopes analysis supported this, showing that the high narcissism slope (+1 SD) was significant ($t(195) = 2.79, p < .05$) and the low narcissism slope (-1 SD) was not significant ($t(195) = -.16, p > .05$). Hypotheses 2b and 2c, however, were not supported as there was not a significant interaction between abusive supervision and narcissism in predicting interpersonal and supervisor-directed deviance.
There was support for hypothesis 4b, as there was a significant interaction between abusive supervision and supervisor support in predicting ratings of anxiety. The results of these analyses are demonstrated in Table 9. The interaction term accounted for an additional 2% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .02, p < .05$) in predicting anxiety. This finding is depicted in Figure 2, which showed that the relationship between abusive supervision and anxiety was stronger for those reporting high support from their supervisor compared to those reporting low support. Simple slopes analysis supported this, showing that the high support slope (+1 $SD$) was significant ($t(195) = 2.96, p < .05$) and the low support slope (-1 $SD$) was not significant ($t(195) = .01, p > .05$). Hypothesis 4a, however, was not supported as there was not a significant interaction between abusive supervision and support in predicting depression.

Post Hoc Analyses

I conducted a series of additional analyses in order to further investigate the relationship between the main study variables. Despite the low response rate, I calculated analyses using matched coworker data. As with self-report data, I found a significant main effect for abusive supervision predicting supervisor-directed deviance ($B = .36, p < .05$) as well as interpersonal deviance ($B = .31, p < .05$). None of the other hypotheses, including the moderator hypotheses, were supported with the coworker matched data.

Given the differences in means and correlations among the different narcissism facets, I recalculated the moderator hypotheses separating for all of the facets. For most facets, the results were the same as those using the complete narcissism scale. The Exhibitionism facet however, had a significant moderator effect for the abusive supervision-organizational deviance relationship ($B = .23, p < .05$), interpersonal deviance relationship ($B = .13, p < .05$) and supervisor-directed deviance relationship ($B = .13, p < .05$). Simple slopes analyses revealed that
the high exhibitionism slope (+1 SD) was significant \((t(195) = 3.30, p < .05)\) and the low exhibitionism slope (-1 SD) was not significant for organizational deviance\((t(195) = 1.64, p > .05)\), the high exhibitionism slope was significant \((t(195) = 3.04, p < .05)\) and the low exhibitionism slope was not significant for interpersonal deviance \((t(195) = -.50, p > .05)\), and the high exhibitionism slope was significant \((t(195) = 5.40, p < .05)\) and the low exhibitionism slope was not significant for supervisor-directed deviance \((t(195) = 1.14, p > .05)\).

I conducted a series of t-tests in order to test possible differences among participants who spent more time with their supervisors compared to participants who spent less time with their supervisors. I categorized participants into one of two categories: one category if they worked 10 hours or less with their supervisor per week and another category if they worked over 10 hours per week with their supervisor. There were 86 participants who reported working 10 hours or less with their supervisor and 108 participants who reported over 10 hours. T-tests revealed significant difference in means among abusive supervision \((t(192) = -3.26, p < .05)\), narcissism \((t(192) = -3.19, p < .05)\), and supervisor-directed deviance \((t(192) = -2.16, p < .05)\). Participants who worked more hours with their supervisors reported more abusive supervision \((M = 1.62, SD = .72)\), narcissism \((M = 3.02, SD = .45)\), and supervisor-directed deviance \((M = 1.45, SD = .77)\) compared to participants who worked less than 10 hours with their supervisor \((M = 1.31, SD = .51\) for abusive supervision; \(M = 2.90, SD = .46\) for narcissism; \(M = 1.26, SD = .30\) for supervisor-directed deviance). Although the differences were not significant, the means for all other main study variables were also higher for employees working more hours with their supervisors.

As a result of these differences, I recalculated analyses for all hypotheses while selecting out employees who work less than 10 hours with their supervisor. The conclusions for main
effect hypotheses were the same as for the entire sample (i.e., significant main effects for abusive supervision predicting interpersonal deviance, supervisor-directed deviance, and depression). However, additional moderator hypotheses were supported when selecting out employees who work few hours with their supervisor. In particular, narcissism was a significant moderator of the abusive supervision-organizational deviance relationship \((B = .27, p < .05)\) and abusive supervision-interpersonal deviance relationship \((B = .20, p < .05)\). The interaction term accounted for an additional 7% of the variance \((\Delta R^2 = .07, p < .05)\) in predicting organizational deviance and an additional 5% of the variance \((\Delta R^2 = .05, p < .05)\) in predicting interpersonal deviance. Please see Table 10 for complete results of these analyses. The forms of these interactions were primarily the same as those for the entire sample. Simple slopes analysis showed that the high narcissism slope (+1 \(SD\)) was significant \((t(195) = 3.33, p < .05)\) and the low narcissism slope (-1 \(SD\)) was not significant \((t(195) = -1.7, p > .05)\) for organizational deviance. For interpersonal deviance, the high narcissism slope (+1 \(SD\)) was significant \((t(195) = 3.07, p < .05)\) and the low narcissism slope (-1 \(SD\)) was not significant \((t(195) = -.52, p > .05)\).

Also, supervisor support was a significant moderator of both the abusive supervision-depression relationship \((B = .10, p < .05)\) and the abusive supervision-anxiety relationship \((B = .11, p < .05)\). The interaction term accounted for an additional 4% of the variance \((\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .05)\) in predicting depression and an additional 5% of the variance \((\Delta R^2 = .05, p < .05)\) in predicting anxiety. Please see Table 11 for complete results of these analyses. The forms of these interactions were the same as those for the entire sample. For depression, the high support slope (+1 \(SD\)) was significant \((t(195) = 2.84, p < .05)\) and the low support slope (-1 \(SD\)) was not significant \((t(195) = .89, p > .05)\). For anxiety, the high support slope (+1 \(SD\)) was significant \((t(195) = 3.25, p < .05)\) and the low support slope (-1 \(SD\)) was not significant \((t(195) = -.31, p > .05)\).
.05). These findings are depicted in Figures 3 through 6. Therefore all of the hypotheses, save
hypothesis 2c, were supported in this subsample of participants.
CHAPTER IV. DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to first understand the negative outcomes of working for an abusive supervisor. Also, I investigated the moderating role of narcissism in the relationship between abusive supervision and deviance, as well as the moderating role of supervisor support in the relationship between abusive supervision and health. Previous research has demonstrated the deleterious effects of working for a bad boss, but the current study further helps explain why certain employees may react more negatively to abuse or may experience poorer health outcomes.

Main Effect Hypotheses

For the main effect hypotheses, I found that abusive supervision significantly predicted interpersonal and supervisor-directed deviance. Specifically, employees who received more abuse from their supervisor also reported more deviant behaviors like making fun of other coworkers and their supervisors. These results were also true when using coworker-reports of the target employee’s interpersonal and supervisor-directed deviance. These two forms of deviance are similar in nature (i.e., they both refer to behaviors directed at people in organizations), but their targets differ. The result for interpersonal deviance provides support for the displaced aggression hypothesis, which states that employees receiving mistreatment, like abusive supervision, will retaliate against readily available targets without directly involving the instigator of the mistreatment. Fellow employees are examples of these readily available targets. Also, the result regarding supervisor-directed deviance suggests that employees may also directly retaliate against the abusive supervisor. This finding is in line with previous research on retaliation (Folger, 1993; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997).
Abusive supervision, however, was not significantly related to organizational deviance. This result is in contrast to previous studies that have found a significant relationship between the two variables (e.g. Schaubhut et al., 2004; Tepper et al., 2008). This disparate finding may be possibly due to the fact that I separated supervisor-directed deviance from the other two forms of deviance. Most research on abusive supervision and deviance on the other hand only asks about interpersonal deviance in general and does not specify the target (i.e., questions refer to ‘others’ at work as opposed to specifying the coworker or the supervisor). In other words, the precision in the specification of the target of deviance may partially account for why I did not find a significant result similar to previous studies. Also, investigation of the factor structure of each deviance scale showed that two factors may exist for each, where items load on either factor depending on the severity of the behavior indicated. For instance, items asking about ethnic or gender remarks loaded on one factor whereas items asking about gossiping loaded on another factor. Therefore, perhaps abusive supervision is more highly related to more or less severe forms of deviance in the workplace, which may account for why I did not find a significant main effect with overall organizational deviance. Future research may consider investigating the factor structure of these scales in order to determine their differential relationships with abusive supervision.

Overall, these findings support the notion that perceived mistreatment may result in retribution against the instigator, and they also suggest that displaced aggression is possible when employees receive abuse from their supervisors. Given that these two forms of retaliation may be occurring simultaneously, the consequences of abusive supervision are significant. Abusive supervision is extremely costly because it may result in employees behaving counterproductively in the workplace which is detrimental to fellow employees as well as the productivity of the
organization. Additionally, these findings underscore the importance of measuring deviance precisely, given that the results differed as a function of the target of the deviance.

In terms of health outcomes, abusive supervision significantly predicted an employees’ level of depression. Therefore, participants who received more abuse from their supervisors also reported more symptoms like feeling down-hearted, despondent and apathetic. Abusive supervision, however, did not significantly predict anxiety with the full sample of participants. Overall though, these results and past research suggest that receiving abuse at work from one’s supervisor is extremely detrimental to an employee’s overall physical and mental health. This study is one of the first to link abusive supervision to subordinate employee health, and these results provide support for theories of chronic stress. More specifically, chronic stressors in the workplace, like abusive supervision, can create an unpleasant work environment that eventually leads to mental and physical health problems among employees (Gottlieb, 1997; Hepburn, Loughlin, & Barling).

Interaction Hypotheses

For the interaction effects, I found that narcissism significantly moderated the relationship between abusive supervision and organizational deviance, and the form of this interaction was consistent with my hypothesis. The relationship between abusive supervision and organizational deviance was stronger for employees high in narcissism compared to employees low in narcissism. Also, narcissism was a significant moderator of the abusive supervision-interpersonal deviance relationship among participants who work 10 or more hours with their supervisor per week (i.e., employees with sufficient exposure to their supervisors). Again, the relationship between abusive supervision and interpersonal deviance was stronger for employees high in narcissism. These results are consistent with the ‘threatened egotism’ hypothesis, which
states that people high in narcissism react negatively, often times with aggression, to threats against the inflated view they hold of themselves (Baumeister et al., 1996). These results are also consistent with several studies which looked at ego-threats in an experimental setting (e.g., Bushman & Baumeister, 1998).

However, unlike these previous studies, narcissism did not moderate the relationship between abusive supervision and supervisor-directed deviance. This runs counter to previous experimental studies which have found that people high in narcissism directly retaliate against the perpetrator of the ego-threat (e.g., Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). It is possible that the main effect of abusive supervision on supervisor-directed deviance accounted for so much variance that detecting an interaction effect in this sample was not possible. It is also conceivable that the design of this study was somehow substantively different than previous research. For instance, past research has examined the effects of peers providing an ego-threat, whereas in the current study, I looked at supervisors providing the ego-threat, and supervisors would have a higher status than peers. To this point, past research has found that narcissists value and emphasize social status more than those low in narcissism. For example, they fantasize about status and power (Raskin & Novacek, 1991) and believe they are superior to others on status-related dimensions, like agency (Campbell, Rudich, & Sedikides., 2002). Other research has shown that the more important an attribute is to the self, the more likely people will be to look for information about a target on that attribute (Balcetis & Dunning, 2005). Therefore, people high in narcissism may be more likely to differentiate between high-status and low-status persons, and may respond differently to feedback from these different sources. Of course this explanation is speculative, and future research should further investigate the differences in the status of the person delivering an ego-threat.
Overall, this study is unique in that I found evidence for the threatened egotism hypothesis when predicting actual deviance in an organizational setting, rather than intentions to retaliate in an experimental setting (Burton et al., 2005). Therefore, employees high in narcissism may in reality lash out more frequently than employees low in narcissism in response to abuse from their supervisors. These findings suggest that this personality trait in particular may be an effective predictor of counterproductive workplace behaviors, like deviance, under frustrating or threatening situations.

I also found that supervisor support significantly moderated the relationship between abusive supervision and anxiety. The relationship between abusive supervision and anxiety was stronger for those reporting more support from their supervisors compared to those reporting less support. Therefore, the combination of support and abuse was particularly harmful for participants, at least in terms of their anxiety levels, most likely due to the uncertainty it brings. Although not significant with the full sample of participants, supervisor support was a significant moderator of the abusive supervision-depression relationship among participants who work over 10 hours with their supervisors per week. The form of this interaction was similar to that of anxiety. These results are consistent with the within-domain stress exacerbation hypothesis and with past research which has also found an interaction between support and abuse from the same individual (e.g., Hobman et al, 2009). Overall, these findings suggest that managers should not just use supportive behaviors in order to compensate for their occasional abusive behaviors. Instead, they should consistently demonstrate supportive behaviors in the workplace in order to help protect the mental health of their employees.

Post Hoc Analyses
Although all of the facets of the narcissism scale were highly correlated, I examined the moderator hypotheses for each dimension separately. These analyses showed that exhibitionism was the only facet that was a significant moderator of the relationship between abusive supervision and all types of deviance. Example items from this facet include “I am apt to show off if I get the chance”, “I like to be the center of attention”, and “Modesty doesn’t become me”. Raskin and Terry (1988) investigated the relationship between each of the narcissism facets and numerous personality variables and found that the exhibitionism facet was strongly related to sensation seeking and lack of impulse control, whereas other facets were more strongly related to leadership, assertiveness, and independence. This relationship to a trait-level lack of control makes sense in light of the current findings, given that people high in this facet were more likely to react to abusive supervision by engaging in deviant workplace behaviors. Perhaps people high in exhibitionism (i.e., those concerned with showing off) are especially sensitive to ego-threats, especially ones that are public in nature like a boss making negative comments in front of coworkers. Future research may benefit from specifically examining exhibitionism in other ego-threat situations.

Finally, the differential results found when analyzing data only for those who work 10 or more weekly hours with their supervisors suggests the importance of measuring frequency of contact in future research. Those participants who reported working more weekly hours with their supervisors reported more abusive supervision and more supervisor support. These variables may be more salient to participants who work longer hours with their supervisors and so they may find it easier to remember examples of abuse and support when completing a self-report survey. It is also possible that supervisors who display abusive and supportive behaviors are simply present more often among their employees. Perhaps more laissez-faire supervisors are
absent or out of sight more frequently, and as a result, display abusive or supportive behaviors less often. Overall these results suggest that future research in this domain should focus on employees who have sufficient contact with their supervisors and that the current results may be tenuous for employees working less often with their supervisors (e.g., remote workers).

Practical Implications

The findings from the current study have important implications for organizations and their policies. To begin with, these findings emphasize the profuse and negative effects that abusive managerial behaviors can have in the workplace. As a result, companies may consider the possibility of using indices of abusive supervision when making promotion decisions. Hogan and Hogan (2001), for example, have developed a tool (i.e., the Hogan Development Survey; HDS) to assess the ‘dark side’ of leadership in organizations. This tool has been used for selection, development and coaching purposes and many of the items in this scale overlap with items from the abusive supervision scale. For example, the HDS item “My manager yells at people when they make mistakes” corresponds closely to “My supervisor puts me down in front of others” and the HDS item “My manager is rude” corresponds to the abusive supervision item “My supervisor is rude to me”. The HDS can be used in a 360° assessment where subordinates would have the opportunity to rate the behaviors of their supervisors. My results suggest that more companies should consider using a tool like the HDS in making hiring decisions if it predicts costly employee behaviors like deviance, as well as poor employee health.

Regarding the narcissism findings, intervention techniques that could reduce the psychological impact of ego threatening experiences may be considered by organizations. Given the current findings that people high in narcissism were more deviant in response to abusive supervision, these types of techniques may reduce deviance in the workplace. One such
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technique teaches an individual how to reaffirm their sense of self by teaching them that one’s overall sense of self is based on multiple domains of functioning, and that a threat to one particular domain can be compensated by reflecting on the achievements of another domain (Sherman & Cohen, 2002; Thomaes & Baumeister, 2010). For example, Thomaes, Bushman, Orobio de Castro, Cohen & Denissen (2009) conducted a self-affirmation intervention with middle school children. In this field experiment, they had one group of children write about their most important values and why those values were important to them. The participants in the control condition wrote about their least important values. The intervention was administered on a Monday and aggressive incidents were measured on a Friday through peer reports. They also obtained a measure of ego-threats that the child had experienced during the past week. The researchers found that in the control condition, children high in narcissism were more likely to be aggressive when they experienced high levels of ego-threat. The children in the experimental condition, however, did not show this pattern of results, presumably because the self-affirmation intervention reduced narcissistic aggression for at least one week. Perhaps a similar type of intervention can be implemented in the workplace, ideally on a somewhat regular basis. The effectiveness of this self-affirmation technique in defending people’s self-views against ego-threats, however, has yet to be shown in an adult working population.

In terms of social support, the results suggest that it is difficult for employees to cope with conflicting messages about their relationship with their supervisor. In other words, coping with a supervisor who has erratic behavior may be especially difficult for employees, resulting in increased symptoms of anxiety. As a result, supervisors should not simply mask abusive behaviors with supportive behaviors, as the combination appears to be detrimental to employees. Instead, supervisors should focus on consistently behaving in a supportive manner toward their
employees, as social support from a supervisor alone has been related to job satisfaction, intentions to remain, and organizational commitment among subordinates (e.g., Duffy et al., 2002). Organizations may consider offering interpersonal and communication training for managers and supervisors, in order to teach skills like communicating with diplomacy and tact.

Study Limitations

Although the present study has shed light on the abusive supervision literature, it is not without limitations. Limitations of the current study include the sole use of self-report measures. The use of self-report measures raises concern for altering the relationships among variables due to common method bias and 3rd variable bias. For instance, deviance-related measures, like the ones included in this study, may be especially prone to socially desirable responding as respondents may not want to admit the extent to which they are deviant in the workplace (Fox, Spector, Goh, & Bruusema, 2007). However, the high correlations between self- and other-reports of deviance suggest that employees are not severely underestimating their own deviance in the workplace. The problem of common method bias is also attenuated due to the interactions detected, as common-method bias has the effect of decreasing the sensitivity of tests of moderators (Evans, 1985). Further, the use of objective measures of the study variables may not have been appropriate because the respondents’ perception was of interest (e.g., abusive supervision, deviance).

Next, data on all study variables were collected concurrently, and this cross-sectional design does not allow for any conclusions to be made regarding causality. One could make a persuasive argument, for example, that workplace deviance and employees’ complaints about their poor health causes supervisors to be abusive. Only with longitudinal studies will researchers be able to determine with more certainty the outcomes of abusive supervision. However,
considerable theory supported my outcome interpretation and previous longitudinal research suggests that abusive supervision precedes – not follows – employee well-being and deviance (e.g., Tepper et al., 2008).

Another limitation of the current study is the fact that the data were collected by listerservs, which could have introduced a self-selection bias. It may be possible that the current sample differs in some way to the larger HR/Organizational Psychology employee population. For example, people who accessed the link to this online survey may be more or less satisfied with their employer and therefore may be more likely to agree to survey opportunities where they can discuss or disclose these feelings. It is also possible that this group of employees may have known more about the topic compared to other employees, even though the nature of the study was kept vague in recruitment messages. However, the use of this method of data collection rather than the use of employees from a single organization had the benefit of greater participant anonymity which is critical when asking questions about counterproductive workplace behaviors (Fox et al., 2007). For example, if all participants were recruited through one single organization, they may have been less likely to respond honestly in fear of their supervisors/employers somehow having access to their responses.

Future directions

There are several avenues of future research that would significantly contribute to our understanding of the effects of abusive supervision in the workplace. To begin with, virtually all research on self-views (i.e., self-esteem, narcissism) and aggression has been conducted in individualist countries like the United States, Great Britain, Canada and Australia. Recent research, however, suggests that self-views may play a different motivational role in the lives of people from more collectivistic cultures (Thomaes & Bushman, 2010). For example, people from individualistic cultures tend to be more concerned with sustaining and enhancing favorable self-
views compared to people in collectivistic cultures. People from collectivist cultures rather tend to view themselves in terms of the relationships they have with others. Interestingly, it has been argued that self-esteem itself is a Western phenomenon, where positive self-views in collectivistic cultures develop from satisfaction in the role one plays in a social environment rather than standing out as an exceptional individual (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). As a result, it is possible that different self-construals have different affects on aggressive behavior in the workplace. Also, the types of experiences that are perceived to be ego-threatening may differ as a function of culture. For instance, a threat to a person’s social standing rather than to their own personal worth may be deemed as more threatening in a collectivistic culture.

Given the results found for narcissism, future research may want to investigate more specific aspects of one’s self-view that could better predict deviance in response to an ego-threat. For instance, perhaps it is the stability of one’s self-view that is most important in explaining how a person reacts to a negative event. Stability in a person’s self-view can be conceptualized as the “magnitude of the short-term fluctuations in one’s global self-evaluations” (Kernis, Grannemann, & Barclay, 1989, p. 1013). People with stable high self-views are secure in their positive feelings whereas people with unstable high self-views have more fragile self-feelings and are more easily threatened. Self-esteem instability, for instance, has been associated with greater sensitivity to evaluative feedback (Kernis, 1993). People with unstable high self-esteem are not necessarily masking low self-esteem, but instead experience more day-to-day fluctuations in their self-views. Self-esteem stability is usually measured via the Experience Sampling Method where participants are prompted various times during a given time period to complete a self-report measure. This method may be applied to future organizational research in order to investigate the stability of narcissism as a moderator of the abusive supervision-deviance
relationship. It would be expected that those with high unstable narcissism would react most negatively to abusive supervision.

In terms of health outcomes, future research may benefit from using objective measures of health as an outcome of abusive supervision. Possible objective measures include cortisol levels and blood pressure of employees. Further, it is likely that the various outcomes investigated in this study are interrelated which can worsen their impact for employees and the organization. For instance, abusive supervision may be initially associated with poor psychological health followed by an increase in physical symptoms such as headaches and backaches. Employees with poor psychological and physical health may then be more likely to behave deviantly in the workplace, perhaps as a coping mechanism. This coping mechanism, however, is extremely unproductive for all parties involved. In support of this idea, I found that psychological health, physical symptoms, and workplace deviance were generally all correlated significantly with each other (see Table 3). Future research would profit from using a longitudinal design to investigate the possible sequential process of how abusive supervision can lead to poor psychological health followed by an increase in physical symptoms and subsequently an increase in deviant behaviors. Perhaps having organizational health and fitness programs to improve psychological and physical health would also ultimately help prevent deviant behaviors.

Future research may also examine different types of support received from a supervisor in order to reveal which types interact more or less with abusive supervision. For example, there may be differential relationships with emotional support (i.e., actions that convey caring and empathetic understanding), instrumental support (i.e., provision of tangible goods and service) or informational support (i.e., provision of information and advice). In the current study, the
measure of social support lacked specificity in terms of the exact kind of support given by the supervisor (Rooney & Gottlieb, 2007). Perhaps the stress exacerbation hypothesis occurs only when the supervisor provides emotional support, where there would presumably be a higher perception of conflicting behavior with abusive supervision, given that abuse is emotionally-laden.

Finally, it would be worthwhile for future research to investigate more functional methods of dealing with abusive supervision. Given that abusive supervision is associated with such negative outcomes, it would be interesting to understand more productive ways to deal with a bad boss, rather than retaliating by engaging in deviant behaviors. Perhaps it is beneficial for employees to use problem-focused coping where they aim to reduce or eliminate the stressor (Lazarus, 1993). For example, some employees who are abused by their supervisors may attempt to file formal complaints, seek relocation to a different department or manager, or directly ask the supervisor to refrain from the negative behaviors. It is possible that employees who engage in this type of coping may be less likely to engage in deviant behaviors or experience negative health outcomes.

Conclusions

Overall, organizational deviance and employee health are extremely costly to organizations and society, and organizations need to be aware of the widespread negative effects of abusive supervision for both targets and nontargets. This study demonstrated possible harmful outcomes of abusive supervision and suggests that organizations must actively discourage these destructive behaviors. Following Pearson, Andersson, and Porath (2000), I propose that management should clearly state expectations of civility in mission statements, new employee orientations, and policy manuals in order to minimize the harmful consequences of this form of
injustice. Hopefully research in this domain will continue which will provide insights for how to diminish these negative behaviors in the workplace.
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Table 1. List of listservs/sources used for recruitment in the current study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listserv/Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIOP Student Listserv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Occupational Health Psychology Listserv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues Listserv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Management Student Listserv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-O Practitioners Discussion Group - LinkedIn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD Network Listserv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR DIV Network Listserv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of Human Resource Management Listserv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Deviance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Deviance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Deviance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affectivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Intercorrelations among Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Deviance</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interpersonal Deviance</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervisor Deviance</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Depression</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Anxiety</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Narcissism</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Supervisor Support</td>
<td>-.64**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05, **p < .01. N = 199.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational Deviance (E)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Deviance (C)</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interpersonal Deviance (E)</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interpersonal Deviance (C)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervisor Deviance (E)</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisor Deviance (C)</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Observed Range</th>
<th>% of endorsement at least some of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Taken an additional or longer break than is acceptable at your workplace.</td>
<td>Org. Dev.</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Come in late to work without permission.</td>
<td>Org. Dev.</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Littered the work environment.</td>
<td>Org. Dev.</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Neglected to follow your boss’s instructions.</td>
<td>Org. Dev.</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intentionally worked slower than you could have worked.</td>
<td>Org. Dev.</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Used an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job.</td>
<td>Org. Dev.</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Put little effort into your work.</td>
<td>Org. Dev.</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Made fun of a co-worker at work.</td>
<td>Int. Dev</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Said something hurtful to a co-worker at work.</td>
<td>Int. Dev</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1 – 6</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work.</td>
<td>Int. Dev</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cursed at a co-worker at work.</td>
<td>Int. Dev</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Played a mean prank on a co-worker.</td>
<td>Int. Dev</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1 – 6</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Acted rudely toward a co-worker at work.</td>
<td>Int. Dev</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Publicly embarrassed a co-worker at work.</td>
<td>Int. Dev</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Made fun of your supervisor at work.</td>
<td>Sup. Dev</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Played a mean prank on your supervisor.</td>
<td>Sup. Dev</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Made an obscene comment or gesture toward your supervisor.</td>
<td>Sup. Dev</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Acted rudely toward your supervisor.</td>
<td>Sup. Dev</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1 – 6</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Gossiped about your supervisor.</td>
<td>Sup. Dev</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1 – 6</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Made an ethnic, religious or racial remark against your supervisor.</td>
<td>Sup. Dev</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Publicly embarrassed your supervisor.</td>
<td>Sup. Dev</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Swore at your supervisor.</td>
<td>Sup. Dev</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Refused to talk to your supervisor.</td>
<td>Sup. Dev</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1 – 6</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Said something hurtful to your supervisor at work.</td>
<td>Sup. Dev</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1 – 6</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Deviance Total** 2.01 0.90

**Interpersonal Deviance Total** 1.52 0.73

**Supervisor-Directed Deviance Total** 1.36 0.61
Table 6. Descriptive statistics and correlations of narcissism subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Org. deviance r</th>
<th>Int. deviance r</th>
<th>Sup. Deviance r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitativeness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficiency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01.
Table 7. Intercorrelations among Narcissism Subscales and Total Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Authority</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exhibitionism</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Superiority</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Entitlement</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Exploitativeness</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-sufficiency</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vanity</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Total Scale</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01.
Table 8. Results of Moderated Regression Analyses for Abusive Supervision Regressed on Organizational, Interpersonal, and Supervisor-Directed Deviance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Deviance</th>
<th>Interpersonal Deviance</th>
<th>Supervisor-Directed Deviance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
<td>-.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.19 †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked with Supervisor</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14 †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision * Narcissism</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Regression weights are unstandardized. *p < .05, **p < .01, †p < .10
Table 9. Results of Moderated Regression Analyses for Abusive Supervision Regressed on Depression and Anxiety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Depression</th>
<th></th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked with Supervisor</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14†</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision * Supervisor Support</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R²                   | .35**      | .36*   | .40**   | .42**  |
| ΔR²                  | .35**      | .01    | .40**   | .02*   |

Note. Regression weights are unstandardized. *p < .05, **p < .01, †p < .10
Table 10. Results of Moderated Regression Analyses for Abusive Supervision Regressed on Organizational, Interpersonal, and Supervisor-Directed Deviance for Employees Working 10 hours or More per Week with their Supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Deviance</th>
<th>Interpersonal Deviance</th>
<th>Supervisor-Directed Deviance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.03**</td>
<td>-.04**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.31†</td>
<td>-.29†</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*R* Narcissism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Regression weights are unstandardized. *p < .05, **p < .01, †p < .10
Table 11. Results of Moderated Regression Analyses for Abusive Supervision Regressed on Depression and Anxiety for Employees Working 10 hours or More per Week with their Supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Depression</th>
<th></th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22*†</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision * Supervisor Support</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 \]

\[ \Delta R^2 \]

Note. Regression weights are unstandardized. *p < .05, **p < .01, †p < .10
Figure 1

Interaction of Narcissism and Abusive Supervision on Organizational Deviance.
Figure 2

Interaction of Supervisor Support and Abusive Supervision on Anxiety
Figure 3

Interaction of Narcissism and Abusive Supervision on Organizational Deviance for Employees Working Over 10 Hours with their Supervisors.
Figure 4

Interaction of Narcissism and Abusive Supervision on Interpersonal Deviance for Employees Working Over 10 Hours with their Supervisors.
Figure 5

Interaction of Support and Abusive Supervision on Depression for Employees Working Over 10 Hours with their Supervisors.
Figure 6
Interaction of Support and Abusive Supervision on Anxiety for Employees Working Over 10 Hours with their Supervisors.
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Good morning,

I am writing in regards to a study I am conducting at Bowling Green State University for my dissertation research. This study focuses on people’s behaviors and feelings surrounding their work and consists of surveys that are posted online. It requires minimal time to participate (roughly 20 minutes). At the end of the online survey, participants will also be asked to provide the name and email address of a co-worker/colleague who may be interested in completing a corresponding survey. All information collected is kept completely confidential and secure.

In exchange, each participant will be entered into a draw for one of 16 $25 gift certificates from Amazon.com. Also, all of the coworkers/colleagues who complete the corresponding survey will be entered into another draw for one of 8 $25 gift certificates from Amazon.com.

If you would like to receive more information and/or are interested in participating, please respond to this email or feel free to call me at the number listed below.
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A. Abusive Supervision (Tepper, 2000)

*My boss...*
1. Ridicules me
2. Tells me my thoughts or feelings are stupid
3. Gives me the silent treatment
4. Puts me down in front of others
5. Invades my privacy
6. Reminds me of my past mistakes and failures
7. Doesn’t give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of effort
8. Blames me to save himself/herself embarrassment
9. Breaks promises he/she makes
10. Expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason
11. Makes negative comments about me to others
12. Is rude to me
13. Does not allow me to interact with my coworkers
14. Tells me I’m incompetent
15. Lies to me

(1 = I cannot remember him/her ever using this behavior with me, 5 = He/she uses this behavior very often with me)

B. Narcissism (Raskin & Terry, 1988)

*Please rate the extent to which each of the following statements applies to you.*

1. I would prefer to be a leader.
2. I see myself as a good leader.
3. I will be a success.
4. People always seem to recognize my authority.
5. I have a natural talent for influencing people.
6. I am assertive.
7. I like to have authority over other people.
8. I am a born leader.
9. I rarely depend on anyone else to get things done.
10. I like to take responsibility for making decisions.
11. I am more capable than other people.
12. I can live my life in any way that I want to.
13. I always know what I am doing.
14. I am going to be a great person.
15. I am an extraordinary person.
16. I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so.
17. I like to be complimented.
18. I think I am a special person.
19. I wish somebody would someday write my biography.
20. I am apt to show off if I get the chance.
21. Modesty doesn’t become me.
22. I get upset when people don’t notice how I look when I go out in public.
23. I like to be the center of attention.
24. I would do almost anything on a dare.
25. I really like to be the center of attention.
26. I like to start new fads and fashions.
27. I can read people like a book.
28. I can make anybody believe anything I want them to.
29. I find it easy to manipulate people.
30. I can usually talk my way out of anything.
31. Everybody likes to hear my stories.
32. I like to look at my body.
33. I like to look at myself in the mirror.
34. I like to display my body.
35. I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve.
36. I expect a great deal from other people.
37. I want to amount to something in the eyes of the world.
38. I have a strong will power.
39. I insist upon getting the respect that is due to me.
40. If I ruled the world it would be a much better place.

(1 = Very Inaccurate, 5 = Very Accurate)

C. Depression (Zung, 1965)

Please read each statement and decide how much of the time this statement describes how you feel.

1. I feel down-hearted and blue.
2. Morning is when I feel the best.
3. I have crying spells or feel like it.
4. I have trouble sleeping at night.
5. I eat as much as I used to.
6. I still enjoy sex.
7. I notice that I am losing weight.
8. I have trouble with constipation.
9. My heart beats faster than usual.
10. I get tired for no reason.
11. My mind is as clear as it used to be.
12. I find it easy to do the things I used to.
13. I am restless and can’t keep still.
15. I am more irritable than usual.
16. I find it easy to make decisions.
17. I feel that I am useful and needed.
18. My life is pretty full.
19. I feel that others would be better off if I were dead.
20. I still enjoy the things I used to do.

(1 = A little of the time, 4 = Most of the time)

D. Anxiety (Zung, 1971)

*For each item below, please rate how it describes how you feel or behave.*

1. I feel more nervous and anxious than usual.
2. I feel afraid for no reason at all.
3. I get upset easily or feel panicky.
4. I feel like I am falling apart and going to pieces.
5. I feel like everything is all right and nothing bad will happen.
6. My arms and legs shake and tremble.
7. I am bothered by headaches, neck and back pain.
8. I feel weak and get tired easily.
9. I feel calm and can sit still easily.
10. I can feel my heart beating fast.
11. I am bothered by dizzy spells.
12. I have fainting spells or feel like it.
13. I can breathe in and out easily.
14. I get feelings of numbness and tingling in my fingers and toes.
15. I am bothered by stomach aches or indigestion.
16. I have to empty my bladder often.
17. My hands are usually dry and warm.
18. My face gets hot and blushes.
19. I fall asleep easily and get a good night’s rest.
20. I have nightmares.

(1 = A little of the time, 4 = Most of the time)

E. Supervisor Support (Rooney & Gottlieb, 2007)

*Below is a list of things supervisors/managers may do or say to their employees. Please read every item carefully and indicate how frequently your supervisor does this.*

1. When I am experiencing difficulties, he or she sympathizes with me.
2. Smiles/Appears happy to see me.
3. Gives me positive feedback when deserved.
4. Encourages me to take on work that will help me to develop professionally.
5. Thanks me for the things I do.
6. Goes to bat for me at work when I need it.
7. Asks me how I’m doing and means it.
8. Praises my work in front of others.
9. Shows interest in what’s going on in my life outside of work.

(1 = Almost never, 5 = Always)

F. Trait anger (Spielberger, 1983)
1. I have a fiery temper
2. I am quick-tempered
3. I am a hotheaded person
4. It makes me furious when I am criticized in front of others
5. I get angry when I’m slowed down by others’ mistakes
6. I feel infuriated when I do a good job and get poor evaluation
7. I fly off the handle
8. I feel annoyed when I am not given recognition for doing good work.
9. When I get mad, I say nasty things.
10. When I get frustrated, I feel like hitting someone.

(1 = Not at all, 2 = Somewhat, 3 = Moderately, 4 = Very much so)

G. Physical Symptoms (Spector & Jex, 1998)
1. An upset stomach or nausea
2. A backache
3. Trouble sleeping
4. A skin rash
5. Shortness of breath
6. Chest pain
7. Headache
8. Fever
9. Acid indigestion or heartburn
10. Eye strain
11. Diarrhea
12. Stomach cramps (Not menstrual)
13. Constipation
14. Heart pounding when not exercising
15. An infection
16. Loss of appetite
17. Dizziness
18. Tiredness or fatigue

(1 = Very infrequently, 5 = Very frequently)

H. Self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965)
1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
2. At times, I think I am no good at all.
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
6. I certainly feel useless at times.
7. I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
(1 = Strongly agree, 5 = Strongly disagree)
I. Demographic and Control Variables
1. How old are you? ______ (years)
2. How many hours do you work per week? ______ (hours)
3. Are you: ____ Male _____ Female
4. What is your current job title? ______________
5. How many hours per week do you have contact with your supervisor? _______ (hours)
6. How long have you worked with the same organization? ________ (months)

PANAS (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988)

*This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then circle the appropriate answer next to that word. Indicate to what extent you feel this way.*

1. Interested
2. Distressed
3. Excited
4. Upset
5. Strong
6. Guilty
7. Scared
8. Hostile
9. Enthusiastic
10. Proud
11. Irritable
12. Alert
13. Ashamed
14. Inspired
15. Nervous
16. Determined
17. Attentive
18. Jittery
19. Active
20. Afraid

(1 = Very slightly or not at all, 5 = Extremely)
A. Organizational Deviance (Bennett & Robinson, 2000)

Please rate the extent to which you think this coworker has engaged in each of the following behaviors in the last year.
1. Taken property from work without permission.
2. Spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working.
3. Falsified a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than they spent on business expenses.
4. Taken an additional or longer break than is acceptable at your workplace.
5. Come in late to work without permission
6. Littered the work environment.
7. Neglected to follow your boss’s instructions.
8. Intentionally worked slower than he/she could have worked.
9. Discussed confidential company information with an unauthorized person.
10. Used an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job.
11. Put little effort into his/her work.
12. Dragged out his/her work in order to get overtime.

(1 = Never, 7 = Daily)

B. Interpersonal Deviance (Bennett & Robinson, 2000)

Please rate the extent to which you think this coworker has engaged in each of the following behaviors in the last year.
1. Made fun of a co-worker at work.
2. Said something hurtful to a co-worker at work.
3. Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work.
4. Cursed at a coworker at work.
5. Played a mean prank on a coworker at work.
6. Acted rudely toward a coworker at work.
7. Publicly embarrassed a coworker at work.

(1 = Never, 7 = Daily)

D. Supervisor-directed Deviance (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007)

Please rate the extent to which this coworker has engaged in each of the following behaviors in the last year.
1. Made fun of his/her supervisor at work.
2. Played a mean prank on his/her supervisor.
3. Made an obscene comment or gesture toward his/her supervisor.
4. Acted rudely toward his/her supervisor.
5. Gossiped about his/her supervisor.
6. Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark against his/her supervisor.
7. Publicly embarrassed his/her supervisor.
8. Swore at his/her supervisor.
9. Refused to talk to his/her supervisor.
10. Said something hurtful to his/her supervisor at work.

(1 = Never, 7 = Daily)

E. Demographic

1. How old are you? ______ (years)
2. How many hours do you work per week? ______ (hours)
3. Are you: _____ Male _____ Female
4. What is your current job title? ______________
5. How many hours per week do you have contact with this coworker? ___________ (hours)
6. How long have you worked with the same organization? ________ (months)