Abusive Supervision and Job Tension: Mediating Role of Interactional Justice

Muhammad Ishaq
Lahore Business School, The University of Lahore, Pakistan.

Asma Noreen
Lahore Business School, The University of Lahore, Pakistan.

Muhammad Tayyeb Khalil
Directorate General Accounts Works, Lahore, Pakistan.
Email: tayyebkhalil100@gmail.com

Abstract

Recently abusive leadership behaviors have arisen as a significant concern in management research. The objective of this study is to observe the impact of abusive supervision on job tension through the mediating role of interactional justice. Psychological contract theory is used in this research. It is based on data collection from 187 working employees in the service sector (Accounts & Audit public sector organization) in Lahore. The results are analyzed using SPSS version 21. The result displays that abusive supervision has a positive relationship with job tension. One mediating variable interactional justice is used in this study. Interactional justice partially mediates the association between abusive supervision and job tension. This study helps formulate different policies and decrease the job tension of the employees by improving the attitude of the leaders and supervisors. This study also recommends that minimizing abusive behavior and increasing sympathetic behavior in an organization can improve positive outcomes.

Keywords: Abusive supervision, Job tension, Interactional justice, Psychological contract theory

Introduction

Leaders and supervisors play an important role in any organization. In particular, leaders are reflected as role models in the organization (Burton & Hoobler, 2011; Lian, Ferries & Brown, 2012). Since almost the initiation in the subject of organizational behavior, investigators have been attentively authenticating the positive characteristics and influence of decent leaders. Yet for not less than a decade, the emphasis of alternative research has been on the "dark side" of leadership, that is, depressed and even abusive leadership (Tepper, 2007). On one side from such positive features, certain negative features of supervision influence subordinates and the organization's whole performance in a harmful way. A profusion of abusive supervision studies has proved that it has detrimental influences on the subordinates' individual organizational consequences (Martinko, Harvey, Brees & Mackey, 2013). Abusive supervision is defined as "subordinates' 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). Abusive supervision is interconnected to many negative outcomes i.e., turnover, job dissatisfaction, job tension, supervisor-directed deviance, emotional and performance (Bamberger & Bacharach, 2006; Martinko et al., 2013; Khan, 2015; Peng & Schaubroeck, 2014). Tepper (2000) explained that abusive supervision is the basis of unfairness in the workplace that influences the employee's behaviors. Amongst many outcomes of abusive leadership, one is employee-job tension (McAllister, Mackey & Perrewe, 2018). Job tension is a mental state of dissatisfaction caused by work-related stressors; it is the psychological strain that employees experience when they are disturbed in their workplaces (Rineer, 2012).

Abusive supervision is one of the prime stressors in the workplace (Burton, Hoobler, & Scheuer, 2012) that can cause job tension in victims (McAllister et al., 2018). McAllister et al. (2018) called for investigating the variables that link abusive supervision to negative employee outcomes. Moving ahead from the use of self-regulation as a linking variable in the above-mentioned relationship, this research clarifies the link between abusive supervision and job tension by proposing interpersonal justice as an intervening variable. Interactional justice focuses on the degree to which subordinates are treated with respect and dignity i.e., interpersonal and informational (Bies & Moag, 1986). The psychological contract theory (Rousseau, 1989) is used to explain the relationship among variables of this research.

The job tension has received substantial research attention for its role in the organization. Job tension is the collective outcome of due to work overload, due to role ambiguity, and lack of adequate information. Antecedents like personal differences (Lusch & Serpkenci, 1990), justice and procedural justice (Andrews, Kacmar, &

Kacmar, 2015), workplace rudeness, dysfunctional co-worker behavior, incivility (Johnson & Indvik, 2001), culture (Hobfoll, 2001), loyalty and inter-professional dysfunction (Rice et al., 2017) have been investigated. Leadership is an important predictor of job tension and autocratic style was linked to increased job tension (Omolayo, 2007), but very few studies examined this association such as Khan (2015) investigated the association of abusive supervision with job tension, turnover intention and emotional exhaustion through intimidation.

Research Gap and Problem Statement

In the present era, service sector companies are facing high competition where the performance of employees and their retention is much more important (Izogo, 2017; Raza et al., 2017). In service sector companies the employees are the main source of success and failure (Raza et al., 2017). Leadership behavior is an important factor in deciding how an employee behaves, where inefficient management can cause serious problems to organizational success (Tao et al., 2017). One of the leadership styles that are having a negative impact on organizational outcomes is abusive supervision. Since the past decade, organizations have been facing high incidents of abuse by leadership (Martinko et al., 2013). A study by Matos (2018) indicated more than half of employees complain about poor leadership behavior. It is a distressing issue because negative leadership behavior like abusive supervision can cause low performance, tension, workplace deviance, and distress in employees (Tepper et al., 2009).

Effective leaders are those who work for the interest of their organization and subordinate's interest beyond the concern of their own interests (Tao et al., 2017). According to Saleem et al. (2018), public sector organizations are facing abusive supervision and its negative impacts in the form of psychological distress. Malik et al. (2017) indicated that South Asian countries having more acceptance of power distance have chances of mistreatment in the workplace.). Such behavior often leads to subordinate tension, particularly when there is no belief in the leader or the employees feel psychological distress and report undesirable workplace behaviors (Kwan, Tuckey, & Dollard, 2014).

Past research usually examined positive leadership styles like transformational (Rowold, & Rohmann, 2009), ethical (Belschak, Den-Hartog, & De-Hoogh, 2018), authentic (Ofori, 2008), and servant (Gandolfi, & Stone, 2018). However, few studies examined the relationship between abusive supervision and job tension. McAllister et al. (2018) investigated the relationship between abusive supervision and job tension through the role of self-regulation. The role of interactional justice is examined as a mediator in abusive supervision and aggression (Burton & Hoobler, 2011). Abusive supervisors are negative and assumed to have a low level of integrity and interactional justice (Tepper, 2000). Previously, it has been examined that behavioral integrity and

interpersonal justice can impact job tension (Andrews et al., 2015). Thus, on call of McAllister et al. (2018) further extend the association between abusive supervision and job tension through the role of self-regulation. As abusive leaders lack interactional justice, thus, we suggest job tension as a potential linking mechanism between abusive supervision and employee negative outcomes that are still unexplored. In the end, its effect on employee job-related outcomes has been broadly explored. However, its effect on negative employee outcomes such as job tension has previously been ignored in the present abusive supervision literature.

Given these facts, the researcher's objective is to explore the negative outcomes of abusive leadership in the public sector of Pakistan which are the major players in the service sector. Mostly in public sector organizations, human resource management, leadership effectiveness, and training are not given adequate importance, which ultimately affects working employees in the form of anxiety, tension, and stress. A few studies are available on the negative outcome of abusive supervision on job tension. Thus, the present is designed to investigate the impact of abusive supervision on job tension and the mediating role of interactional justice.

After describing the motivation for this study in Section 1, Based on the review of prior studies, hypotheses are developed in Section 2. The methodology used to investigate the problem is specified in Section 3. The results of the analysis are reported in Section 4. In section 5, the results of the analysis are discussed and the findings of the study are concluded.

Literature Review and Hypotheses Development

The psychological theory came to be identified in 1960 by Argyris. Later on, Rousseau worked in-depth on the detail and perspective of the psychological agreement. Psychological contract theory concentrates on the mutual association between subordinates and the organizations (Rousseau, 1989). The psychological contract is an undeclared promise that occurs between a subordinate and a manager. This promise sets reciprocal expectations that managers expect from subordinates and vice versa. The organization is expected to treat subordinates impartially, offer suitable working conditions, openly announce what is reasonable days' work, and provide feedback on how well a subordinate is performing. Employees are anticipated to react by showing a good attitude, following instructions, and displaying loyalty to the association (Rousseau, 2001*)*.

Psychological contract theory may also be used to deliver the description of these associations. Psychological contract theory also emphasizes the mutual association between parties (Rousseau, 1989). The employees must provide their capability to the business and in return organization provides the opportunities for

promotion and skill enhancement. In case when a psychological contract is breached employees have poor outcomes and their stress and tension increase. Wei and Si (2013) exclaimed that abusive supervisors breach psychological contracts by having unfair treatment that is shown in low behavioral integrity where the followers are not treated with the espoused values of trust and compassion rather, they are billeted and made a victim of hostile verbal and nonverbal attitudes. Moreover, abusive supervisors do not treat employees with dignity and respect which constitutes poor interpersonal treatment. When the psychological contract is broken employees face negative outcomes like job tension, as unfulfilled obligations in a psychological contract lead to strain (Gakovic & Tetrick, 2003).

Abusive Supervision

Abusive supervision has created significant attention in the organization (Tepper, 2007). There are numerous significant studies on abusive supervision expressing that abusive supervision is a consequence of expatriate or triggered by experienced inequality, psychological contract violation, anxiety, strain, tension, or clashes with colleagues (Breevaart & Vries, 2017). A variability of abusive supervision activities has been acknowledged, including humiliating employees, concealment of secret information, use of abusive language, anxiety, and threats (Zellars et al., 2002). The existing literature on abusive supervision demonstrates that it has many harmful outcomes for the employees as well as the organization (Martinko et al., 2013; Tepper, 2007).

Job Tension

Job tension is the expression of perceived anxiety in the workstation grounded on the range of nervousness. Tension originates undesirable behavioral reactions and considers that various persons practice aggressive behavior (Coleman Gallagher, Harris, & Valle, 2008). Generally, we can consider the form of hostile workplace behaviors, like stress, and job tension (Coleman et al., 2008). Job tension has a significant role because it has connected too many outcomes such as creativity, psychological distress, working efficiency, health problems, and increased levels of absenteeism, bitterness and turnover (Dunk, 1993). Tension is often created when an employee is allocated a main responsibility without appropriate power and designation of authority. Therefore, the communications with the supervisors and their actions can also have an influence on job tension at the workplace (Yasarathne et al., 2018). Hence, it is explored that there is an impression of management supervisory behavior on subordinate job tension environment in public sector organizations of Pakistan.

Interactional Justice

Greenberg (1987) initiated the idea of organizational justice; he explained two dimensions' subordinates' perception of fairness and the perception of the organization linked to behaviors and actions. The term "organizational justice" refers to three different perceptions of fairness such as procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice (Colquitt et al., 2001; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Interactional justice is an important dimension that is thoroughly related to the mutual relationship with one's manager (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Prior research demonstrated that employees feel high interactional justice from managers are more answerable as representative of other employees and indicate more admiration among themselves (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

Interactional justice is the feature of interactive behavior employees perceive when practices are executed and outcomes are disseminated (Bies & Moag, 1986). Interactional justice is considered the substantial predictor of job behavior and theoretical justice (Leung, Wang, & Smith, 2001). Interactional fairness can validate the temperament basis of personal individual perception in reaction to psychological torture that impacts their work attitude (Stecher & Rosse, 2005).

Abusive Supervision and Job Tension

All the leaders are not involved in optimistic behaviors towards their subordinates (Martinko et al., 2013). A developing literature discovers that abusive supervision; is physically nonexistent in the forms of aggression committed by supervisors in contradiction of their gossip. We may observe that discouraging the adverse influence of abusive supervision, that is not only increases complications but also becomes extra significant for executives in the organizations. The researchers normally used different terms to determine the relationship the abusive supervision and job tension do not decentralize from a combined hypothetical context (Tepper, 2007). Past study shows that these kinds of abusive behaviors transmit many negative outcomes such as anxiety, stress, and job tension (Breaux et al., 2010).

Certain supervisors treat their employees using behaviors such as overlooking, ridiculing, hostility, public criticism, taking credit for employees' achievements, and creating job tension in the organization (Luu, 2018). This supervisory mistreatment can cause psychological suffering and a few favorable approaches lead to job tension in the organization (Tepper, 2000). Psychological contract theory describes the people reciprocate the benefits to describe why and how relations improve between employees and organizations (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). This theory delivers a valuable lens for observing the relationship between abusive supervision and job tension. From a Psychological contract viewpoint, when an individual undergoes surprising behavior

from the manager it creates job tension. As Skarlicki and Folger (1997) described supervision that does not fulfill an adequate standard of demeanor creates job tension. Moreover, McAllister et al. (2018) demonstrated that abusive supervision is a significant predictor of job tension. From the above arguments, suggest the below hypothesis:

H1: Abusive supervision has a positive relationship with job tension.

Abusive Supervision and Interactional Justice

Past studies have revealed that abusive supervision reduces the subordinates' perceptions of justice (Burton & Hoobler, 2011; Tepper, 2000) and it breaches the belief in impartial treatment such as dignity and respect (Bies & Moag, 1986). Interactional injustice is created when subordinates are dealt with unfairly and disrespectfully when individual feelings are ignored. Interactional justice shares the person's perceptions of the quality of behavior practice when managerial techniques are applied (Bies & Moag, 1986). Tepper (2000) explained that abusive supervision adversely influences the observation of fairness including procedural justice, distributive and interactional justice. From the perspective of psychological contract theory, the theoretical framework builds the association of interactional justice and abusive supervision. The psychological contract creates the expectation that the supervisor would be behaving with dignity in their communicating interactions such as their communication style and behavior without improper justification or prejudicial statements. When abusive leaders engage in unjust behaviors and don't treat subordinates with respect, the violation of the psychological contract occurs, creating injustice inception. That is in line with psychological contract theory where breach of contract results in negative perceptions (Lo & Aryee, 2003). Few studies have investigated the association between abusive supervision and interactional justice. Tepper (2000) explained that employees experience interactional justice when their supervisors behave them and are suitable according to the definition of abusive supervision. In an organization, subordinates perceive their association with the manager as the origin of their perceived mistreatment. In these circumstances, while subordinates may observe a supervisor's behavior that breaches the psychological contract and perceive interactional injustice, responsibility is directly neither to the subordinates nor to the manager (Burton, Taylor, & Barber, 2014). Thus, it is proposed that:

H2: Abusive supervision has a negative relationship with interactional justice.

Interactional Justice and Job Tension

A belief is that manager injustice can give rise to dissatisfaction with the employee and interactional injustice ultimately creates job tension (Simons et al., 2008). Interactional justice is the perception that subordinates are treated with respect and have good-quality relationships. According to researchers, interactional justice influences employee behavior and interactional injustice promotes violence, and encounters and creates job tension in the organization (Cropanzano & Baron, 1991). For instance, Tepper (2007) and Hoobler (2013) recognized that interactional justice predicted abusive supervision and as a consequence created job tension. Abusive supervisors don't treat the employees with respect and dignity, which is an essential part of the organizational psychological contract and creates a perception of reduced interactional injustice (Andrews et al., 2015). In an organization, when the subordinate has an abusive supervisor, he feels mental dissatisfaction such as job tension, anxiety, and stress. A belief is that a supervisor's injustice creates job tension among the employees of the organization. Ladebo et al. (2008) found that interactional justice from both side supervisor and subordinates were negatively associated with hostile behavior and job distress and subordinates reacted with dissatisfaction to injustice from their manager. Hence, we propose the following hypothesis:

H3: Interactional justice is negatively associated with job tension.

Interactional Justice as a Mediator

This study has exposed that interactional justice is intensely linked with negative assessment of abusive supervision (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, & Porter, 2001; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). According to Holtz and Harold, (2013) a leader who treats and communicates with subordinates in a friendly manner would likely inspire an auspicious perception of interactional justice. Employees' observations of a manager's honesty affect other behaviors in the organization, including their sense of fair supervision, behavioral integrity, and job tension. Tepper (2000) explained the related significance of interactional justice, is the degree to which organizational members are treated with respect and dignity. According to Bies and Moag (1986), employees feel interactional injustice when the supervisors are more aggressive and this kind of injustice mediates the relationship between abusive supervision and job tension. This perception of unfair treatment is the mechanism that influences the abusive supervision's behavior on subordinate outcomes. Aryee, Chen, Sun, and Yaw, (2007) found the mediating model, explaining the employees' interactional injustice described the association between abusive supervision and employees' organizational citizenship behavior and commitment. So, the direct influence of abusive supervision on employee tension may be described through the employee perception of

interactional justice. As Aryee et al. (2007) explain when abusive supervision is technically elucidated interactional injustice does arouse irritation and frustration.

Positive judgment of managers' actions and decisions may be persuaded between employees and the perception of injustice reduced. Moreover, it is suggested that the mediating impact of interactional justice between abusive supervision and job tension in their succeeding behavior (Burton et al., 2014). Supervisor exploitation can cause a low level of organizational justice that creates job tension emotional suffering, and unfavorable attitudes regarding to the job and the organization (Tepper, 2000). Past study shows subordinates' perception of justice influence the effects of abusive supervision on employee behaviors (Tepper, 2007). Further, explaining this by Martinko et al. (2004) that the perception of interactional justice mediates the association between abusive supervision and the outcomes of the behavior. Similarly, the perception of interactional justice serves as a mechanism by which abusive supervision has a relationship with job tension. Thus, interactional injustice stemming from abusive supervision and ultimately lead to job tension (Wang, Mao & Liu, 2012). Interactional justice has a direct relationship with the supervisor and correlates with the subordinate's outcomes; hence it can be found that interactional justice mediates the relationship between abusive supervision and job tension. Thus, the following hypothesis is developed.

H4: There is a mediating role of interactional justice between abusive supervision and job tension in the organization.

Methodology

This research study is based on the fundamental philosophy of positivism because this is a quantitative study. The logic behind using this approach is to accumulate descriptive and quantifiable data. Positivists usually prefer quantitative research such as structured questionnaires, surveys, and official statistics. Positivism states that knowledge is perceived from sensory sources and perceived through reason and logic (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009). Positivism is determined by quantifiable interpretations that lead to statistical analysis. These hypotheses are verified and definite which can be used for future study. Another feature of this philosophy is that the positivist investigator follows an extremely systematized procedure according to simplify the hypotheses. Further, in this study deductive approach is used as the hypotheses stem from the source of existing theory and are tested using statistical methods (Kelle, & Erzberger, 2004). The deductive approach depends on tools like investigations and analysis. The deductive approach is associated with "developing hypothesis or (hypotheses) based on existing theory, and then designing a research strategy to test the hypothesis" (Wilson, 2014, p.7).

The present research is considered quantitative research and cross-sectional technique. This research is explanatory as the aim is to explain the occurrence of events based on testing the existing theory (Saunders et al., 2009). The present research investigates the impacts of Abusive supervision on job tension of employees in the work setting of Pakistani public sector organizations.

Population and Sampling

The population in this research comprises the employees of the public sector (Audit & Accounts departments) organizations in Lahore. In this research, the unit of analysis is individual employees. In this study, the purposive sampling method is used due to time constraints. There are two types of sampling probability and nonprobability. The purposive sampling is a non-probability sampling that is designated based on the individualities of the employees and the goal of the study. Purposive sampling is also known as critical, discerning, or particular sampling. The key objective of purposive sampling is to emphasize specific features of the people that are of attention. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), sample size criteria are used $N > 50 + 8m$, ($N > 50 + 8*3 = 74$) where N=number of participants and m all the predictors. According to Hair et al. (2006), the appropriate sample must be 175 respondents. The primary data were collected through designed self-administrated questionnaires and all questionnaires were filled by the employees. 200 questionnaires were distributed among employees and 187 complete filled-in questionnaires were received back forming a response rate of 93%.

Measures

A 12-item scale in this study is used to measure abusive supervision adopted from Harris et al. (2007). All items were measured using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree. For example, the question is, "My boss reminds me of my previous mistakes and failures". Interactional justice 6-item scale was developed by Zoghbi, (2006). All items were measured using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree. A sample question is "My boss provides me timely feedback about decisions and implications".

Job tension scale was organized by House and Rizzo, (1972) using 7-item measures. This degree designates an employee's mental and emotional signs related to job tension at workplace (Rineer, 2012). All items were measured using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree. A sample item is "My job tends to directly my health".

Data Analysis and Results

According to the profile of respondents, ninety-three percent of total employees completed questionnaires and 187 valid and full completely responses were obtained out of 200. The researcher selected both gender males and females for the collection of data. Male respondents were 166 (88.8%) and female respondents were 21 (11.2%). Of the respondent's age, 62 percent were 20 to 30, 31 to 40 (27.3%), and 41 and above 10.7 percent years old employees.

Reliability Analysis

SPSS was used for conducting the reliability analysis. The researcher examines the construct of reliability analysis by calculation of Cronbach's alpha. Cronbach's alpha value for twelve items of abusive supervision is =0.903 and this value is reliable and consistent > 0.70. Cronbach's alpha value for eight items of behavioral integrity is = 0.804. This value is reliable and consistent at > 0.70. Cronbach's alpha value = 0.823 for six items used to measure interactional justice. This value is reliable and consistent at > 0.70. Cronbach's alpha value=0.851 for 7 items to measure job tension. This value is reliable and consistent at > 0.70. Table 4 depicts the reliability of each item and the overall reliability of all variables.

Table 1:

Reliability Analysis

Variable	No of items	Reliability
Abusive supervision	12	0.903
Interactional Justice	6	0.823
Job tension	7	0.851

Descriptive Statistics

In this section, SPSS version 21 was used for statistical analyses to examine the descriptive statistics. The consequences of descriptive statistics of all constructs are shown in Table 6. A low standard deviation shows that the data is very close to the mean indicating a reliable and a high standard deviation means that data points are spread out over a large range of values and thus not reliable. Mean of abusive supervision (AS) 2.3810, Std. deviation 0.77742. The mean of behavioral integrity (BI) 3.6283, Std. deviation .62331. Mean of interactional justice (IJ) 3.7683, std. deviation 0.79917 while the mean of job tension is 2.5726 and std. deviation is 0.98330.

Normality Test

To evaluate the data normality researcher ran the skewness and kurtosis analysis. Normality tests explain the normal distribution of data. Table 4.5 also shows the normality tests of mean values. The acceptable range of skewness and kurtosis is from -1.96 to +1.96. According to the results, the skewness of abusive supervision, behavioral integrity, interactional justice, and job tension is 0.458, -0.833, -.845, and 0.323 respectively., the results of kurtosis for abusive supervision, behavioral integrity, interactional justice, and job tension is   -0.995, 0.893, -0.205 and -0.696 respectively that is within the threshold limit and indicate data is normal.

Table 2:

Normality Test

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Skewness	Std.	Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Error	Statistic	Std. error
AS	187	1.33	4.25	.458	.18	-.995	.354
IJ	187	2.00	5.00	-.845	.178	-.205	.354
JT	187	1.00	5.00	.323	.178	-.696	.354

AS=Abusive Supervision, IJ=interactional justice, JT=job tension

Correlation Analysis

Correlation explains the relationship between the two variables. By default, SPSS creates a full correlation matrix. Each correlation appears twice above and below the main diagonal. R measures the strength of the Correlation coefficient and direction of a linear association between two variables. The value of r is at all times between +1 and -1. If the consequence value is very low (less than 0.05) at that time the relationship is significant and both variables are linearly correlated.

Table 6 shows the correlation between the variables of this study. Abusive supervision is negatively related to behavioral integrity, Abusive supervision is negatively associated with interactional justice, and abusive supervision is positively associated with job tension (r =-.210**, p=.004), (r=-.422**, p=.000) and (r=.373**, p=.000) respectively. Behavioral integrity is negatively related to job tension, interactional justice values (r=-.122, p=.097) and (r=.690**, p=.000) and Interactional justice is negatively associated with job tension (r =-.312**, p=.000).

Table 3:

Correlations, Mean and Standard Deviation

Construct	Mean	S.D.	AS	IJ	JT
AS	2.3810	.77742	1		
IJ	3.7683	.79917	-.422**	1	
JT	2.5726	.9833	.373**	-.312**	1

** Significant level 0.01.*Significant level 0.05 (2-tailed).

Regression Analysis

Correlation shows the non-directional relationship between the variables and does not explain the effect of change between the variables. Correlation analysis only supports the hypothesis but for testing the hypothesis need to run regression analysis. Table 4 explains the rate of change of variables. R square explains how much the independent variable explains the dependent variable. Basically, it examines do the independent variable predicts the outcome (dependent variable) and which variable is the significant predictor of the independent variable. This study found the effect of abusive supervision on job tension with the mediation of behavioral integrity and interactional justice.

Regression of Abusive Supervision and Job Tension (path c)

In this step, we found the association between abusive supervision and job tension in the Table. Abusive supervision was taken as the independent variable and job tension was taken as the outcome as the result described (β=0.373, p=.000, t=5.468) and R square is 0.139. The results indicate there is a positive and significant relationship between AS and JT and H1 is supported.

Table 4: Impact of AS on JT

Dependent variable JT					N=187
Step 3	β	*P*	T	R	R^2
AS	0.373	0.000	5.468	.373	.139
Model Summary					
Mode	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	0.373a	0.139	0.134	0.91479	

a. Predictors: (Constant), AS

ANOVAᵃ

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	25.022	1	25.022	29.900	.000ᵇ
	Residual	154.816	185	.837		
	Total	179.838	186			

a. Dependent Variable: JT

b. Predictors: (Constant), AS

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	1.449	.216		6.708	.000
	AS	.472	.086	.373	5.468	.000

a. Dependent Variable: JT

Regression of abusive supervision and interactional justice

In this step, we found the association between abusive supervision and interactional justice. AS is the independent variable and Interactional justice is the outcome variable as described in H4. So, there is a significant association between AS and IJ, as described in Table 5. (β=-0.422, p=.000, t=-6.327) and R square is 0.178. The results indicate a negative and significant relationship between AS and IJ thus proving the H4.

Table 5: Impact of AS on IJ

Dependent variable IJ				N=187	
Step 2	β	*P*	T	R	R²
AS	-0.422	.000	-6.327	.422	.178

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.422ᵃ	.178	.173	.72656

a. Predictors: (Constant), AS

ANOVAᵃ

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.

Regression	21.132	1	21.132	40.030	.000[b]
Residual	97.660	185	.528		
Total	118.792	186			

a. Dependent Variable: IJ;

b. Predictors: (Constant), AS

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.801	.172		27.976	.000
	AS	-.434	.069	-.422	-6.327	.000

a. Dependent Variable: IJ

Interactional Justice as a Mediator between Abusive Supervision and Job Tension (path c')

In this step, we found the association between abusive supervision and job tension after controlling for interactional justice to examine the mediating impact as shown in Table 6. After observing a simple regression relationship, interactional justice is added as mediation between abusive supervision and job tension. The mediating variable acts as a bridge between two variables. Whether mediation is partial or full depends upon the level of significance between IV and DV in the presence of mediation. If it is significant, partial mediation exists. If it is insignificant, full mediation exists. As shown in Table 6, the relationship between AS and JT is significantly reduced (β=.371, p=0.000, t=3.9) after controlling for the mediator, therefore we conclude that interactional justice partially mediates the association between abusive supervision and job tension as described in H4.

Table 6:

Mediating effect of IJ on AS and JT (path c')

Dependent variable IJ   N=187

Step 6	Coeff.	S.E	T	P
AS	.371	.094	3.961	.000
IJ	-.231	.091	-2.536	.012

SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis	Relationship description	Status
H1	Abusive supervision and Job tension	Accepted
H2	Abusive supervision and interactional justice	Accepted
H3	Interactional justice and Job tension	Accepted
H4	The mediating role of interactional justice	Accepted

Discussion and Conclusion

The main purpose of conducting the research is to take the answers to the questions regarding the influence of abusive supervision and job tension in the context of Pakistan. In this study first, the researcher investigated how abusive supervision affects employee job tension through the mediating effect of behavioral integrity and secondly how abusive supervision affects subordinate job tension via the mediating role of interactional justice. This research helps to deepen the researcher's understanding of why and how abusive supervision exercise influences job tension.

Abusive supervision has a positive relationship with job tension. So, hypothesis H1 is accepted that both have a positive and significant relationship with each other. If the manager has an abusive attitude and aggressive behavior, it creates a problem among the employees in the form of job tension. So, the psychological theory supports hypothesis H1 that if leaders have abusive behavior, then affects the behavior of employees. This finding is also supported by previous studies that found job tension to be one of the negative outcomes of abusive supervision (McAllister et al., 2018; Xu et al., 2012). Abusive supervision is negatively associated with interactional justice. So, hypothesis H2 is accepted and has a negative and significant relationship with each other. According to Tepper (2000), abusive supervision is negatively associated with interactional justice because the manager's abusive attitude leads to injustice in the organization. Breaux et al., (2010) explained that abusive supervision was negatively associated with interactional justice.

Interactional justice is negatively related to job tension. The hypothesis H3 is supported and has a negative and significant relationship with each other. When employee perceives injustice and unfair treatment in the organization as a result job tension is created. This confirms the previous studies indicating a negative relationship between interactional justice and job tension (Wang, Mao, & Liu, 2012). Enhanced perception of interactional justice, in turn, may decrease the job tension.

It is observed that interactional justice acts as a mediator between abusive supervision and job tension. Hence hypothesis H4 is accepted. This also confirms the past results that indicate that abusive supervisors create a low level of justice perception in employees. Employees believe that abusive supervisors are unfair and do not deal with their subordinates with justice (Burton & Hoobler, 2011; Tepper, 2000). Furthermore, the low perception of justice is linked to stress-related outcomes such as job tension (Hochwarter et al., 2005). Negative outcomes of abusive leadership occur when employees perceive this behavior to be unjust, interactional justice has been found to be a mediator between abusive supervision and employee negative outcomes such as aggression (Burton & Hoobler, 2011).   This exposure helps to extend our understanding of how abusive supervision influences employees and creates job tension.

This research contributes to psychological contract theory which explains the mutuality, an unwritten agreement between the employers and employees. This was strengthened by the conclusion in the current study that organizational defacement to accomplish the responsibilities towards its employees was related to increased job tension. Therefore, the perception of psychological contract can be empirically and theoretically integrated with the strain literature and also suggests that an employment mutual relationship demonstrates a significant role in employee passion for job stress (Gakovic et al., 2003). Daft (2015) explored that old area management focused only on profit but nowadays main focus is on employee-leader relationships. So, the result has focused on the association between supervisors and employees in the organization and how it impacts organizational outcomes. Abusive supervision has wide effects on subordinate behavior, psychological distress, and job tension when they have no possible means of escape (Tepper, 2000). The psychological contract theory relates abusive supervision, behavioral integrity, interactional justice, and job tension, this research is required to understand a complex in the (outcome) job tension literature. In contrast to the much-studied positive side of leadership, this study has indicated the dark side (Liu, Liao, & Loi, 2012).   Furthermore, this study adds to the abusive supervision literature by displaying that abusive supervision increases job tension through the mediating role of behavioral integrity and interactional justice. This research has responded to the call of Mackey et al., (2017) to take justice perceptions in understanding the perception of abusive supervision.

This study suggests numerous contributions in the literature, but this research has limitations that may be described. First, data were collected through cross-sectional technique due to time constraints, so this study can be done through longitudinal technique. Secondly, this research was conducted in the public sector (service sector) organization in Lahore. Because working environments are different for abusive supervision, the private sector may be used for this research. Thirdly, we investigated only one outcome i.e., job tension, and only one mediator. Fourth, the purposive sampling method is used in this research, which is not as generalizable as random sampling. This research can be expanded for abusive supervision by including further outcomes (variables) in this study (Harris et al., 2007).

The objective of the present research was to observe the association between abusive supervision and job tension through the mediating effect of interactional justice. Leadership plays a significant role in every organization and has a great influence on the subordinate's performance in the organization. The psychological contract theory is used to examine the dark side of leadership that the abusive supervisor behavior, injustice, and negative outcomes lead to employee psychological distress, anxiety, and job tension. It is proposed that managers and supervisors should concentrate on controlling their emotions and behaviors that are beneficial for the organization and employees. This commitment is considered very important for the success and progress of the organization and its subordinates. Such an attitude and behavior result in positive feedback toward the employees and subordinates (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Harris et al., 2007). This study consists of four hypotheses, which were tested and analyzed according to the context of Pakistan. The result of this study showed that interactional justice partially mediates the association between abusive supervision and job tension.

References

Andrews, M. C., Kacmar, K. M., & Kacmar, C. (2015). The interactive effects of behavioral integrity and procedural justice on employee job tension. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *126*(3), 371-379.

Argyris, C. (1960). *Understanding organizational behavior*. Oxford, England: Dorsey.

Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L. Y. & Yaw, D. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(1), 191-201.

Bamberger, P. A., & Bacharach, S. B. (2006). Abusive supervision and subordinate problem drinking: Taking resistance, stress and subordinate personality into account. *Human Relations*, *59*(6), 723-752.

Belschak, F. D., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. (2018). Angels and demons: The effect of ethical leadership on Machiavellian employees' work behaviors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*, 1082.

Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional communication criteria of fairness. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *9*, 289-319.

Breaux, D. M., Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., & Folger, R. G. (2010). An attributional analysis of employees' responses to abusive supervision. *The Dark Side of Management, 4,* 69-92.

Breevaart, K., & de Vries, R. E. (2017). Supervisor's hexaco personality traits and subordinate perceptions of abusive supervision. *The Leadership Quarterly, 28*(5), 691-700.

Burton, J. P., & Hoobler, J. M. (2011). Aggressive reactions to abusive supervision: The role of interactional justice and narcissism. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *52*(4), 389-398.

Burton, J. P., Hoobler, J. M., & Scheuer, M. L. (2012). Supervisor workplace stress and abusive supervision: The buffering effect of exercise. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 27*(3), 271-279.

Burton, J. P., Taylor, S. G., & Barber, L. K. (2014). Understanding internal, external, and relational attributions for abusive supervision. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *35*(6), 871-891.

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *86*(2), 278-321.

Coleman Gallagher, V., Harris, K. J., & Valle, M. (2008). Understanding the use of intimidation as a response to job tension: Career implications for the global leader. *Career Development International*, *13*(7), 648-666.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the Millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 424-445.

Cropanzano, R., & Baron, R. A. (1991). Injustice and organizational conflict: The moderating effect of power restoration. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *2*(1), 5-26.

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 874-900.

Daft, R. L. (2015). *Organization theory and design* (12th ed). Cengage learning.

Dunk, A. S. (1993). The effects of job-related tension on managerial performance in participative budgetary settings. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *18*(7-8), 575-585.

Gakovic, A., & Tetrick, L. E. (2003). Psychological contract breach as a source of strain for employees. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *18*(2), 235-246.

Gandolfi, F., & Stone, S. (2018). Leadership, leadership styles, and servant leadership. *Journal of Management Research*, *18*(4), 261-269.

Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*(1), 9-22.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.) (pp. 751–53) London: Pearson.

Harris, K. J., Kacmar, K. M., & Zivnuska, S. (2007). An investigation of abusive supervision as a predictor of performance and the meaning of work as a moderator of the relationship. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*(3), 252-263.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(2), 268-279.

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested self in the stress process: advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology*, *50*(3), 337-421.

Hochwarter, W. A., Perrewé, P. L., Hall, A. T., & Ferris, G. R. (2005). Negative affectivity as a moderator of the form and magnitude of the relationship between felt accountability and job tension. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *26*(5), 517-534.

Holtz, B. C., & Harold, C. M. (2013). Effects of leadership consideration and structure on employee perceptions of justice and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*(4), 492-519.

Hoobler, J. M., & Hu, J. (2013). A model of injustice, abusive supervision, and negative affect. *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*(1), 256-269.

House, R. J., & Rizzo, J. R. (1972). Role conflict and ambiguity as critical variables in a model of organizational behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *7*(3), 467-505.

Izogo, E. E. (2017). Customer loyalty in the telecom service sector: The role of service quality and customer commitment. *The TQM Journal*, *29*(1), 19-36.

Johnson, P. R., & Indvik, J. (2001). Slings and arrows of rudeness: Incivility in the workplace. *Journal of Management Development*, *20*(8), 705-714.

Kelle, U., & Erzberger, C. (2004). *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods. A companion to qualitative research.* London. Sage*, 172-177.

Khan, S. (2015). Abusive supervision and negative employee outcomes: the moderating effects of intimidation and recognition. *Journal of General Management, 41*(1), 61-81.

Kwan, S. S. M., Tuckey, M. R., & Dollard, M. F. (2014). Dominant Culture and Bullying; Personal Accounts of Workers in Malaysia. *In Psychosocial factors at work in the Asia Pacific* (pp. 177-200). Springer, Dordrecht.

Ladebo, O. J., Awotunde, J. M., & AbdulSalaam-Saghir, P. (2008). Coworkers' and supervisor interactional justice: Correlates of extension personnel's job satisfaction, distress, and aggressive behavior. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, *9*(2), 206-226.

Leung, K., Wang, Z., & Smith, P. B. (2001). Job attitudes and organizational justice in joint venture hotels in China: The role of expatriate managers. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 12*(6), 926-945.

Lian, H., Ferris, D. L., & Brown, D. J. (2012). Does power distance exacerbate or mitigate the effects of abusive supervision? It depends on the outcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(1), 107.

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

Lo, S., & Aryee, S. (2003). Psychological contract breach in a Chinese context: An integrative approach. *Journal of Management Studies*, *40*(4), 1005-1020.

Lusch, R. F., & Serpkenci, R. R. (1990). Personal differences, job tension, job outcomes, and store performance: A study of retail store managers. *Journal of Marketing*, *54*(1), 85-101.

Luu, T. (2018). Discretionary HR practices and proactive work behavior: the mediation role of affective commitment and the moderation roles of PSM and abusive supervision. *Public Management Review, 20*(6), 789-823.

Mackey, J. D., Frieder, R. E., Brees, J. R., & Martinko, M. J. (2017). Abusive supervision: A meta-analysis and empirical review. *Journal of Management*, *43*(6), 1940-1965.

Malik, O. F., Sattar, A., Shahzad, A., & Faiz, R. (2017). Personal bullying and nurses' turnover intentions in Pakistan: A mixed methods study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 01-21

Martinko, M. J., Douglas, S. C., Ford, R. C., & Gundlach, M. J. (2004). Dues paying: A theoretical explication and conceptual model. *Journal of Management*, *30*(1), 49-69.

Martinko, M. J., Harvey, P., Brees, J. R., & Mackey, J. (2013). A review of abusive supervision research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*(S1), S120-S137.

Matos, K., O' Neill, O., & Lei, X. (2018). Toxic leadership and the masculinity contest culture: How "win or die" cultures breed abusive leadership. *Journal of Social Issues*, *74*(3), 500-528.

McAllister, C. P., Mackey, J. D., & Perrewé, P. L. (2018). The role of self-regulation in the relationship between abusive supervision and job tension. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39*(4), 416-428.

Ofori, G. (2008). Leadership for the future construction industry: Agenda for authentic leadership. *International Journal of Project Management*, *26*(6), 620-630.

Omolayo, B. (2007). Effect of leadership style on job-related tension and psychological sense of community in work organizations: A case study of four organizations in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology, 4*(2), 30-37.

Peng, A. C., Schaubroeck, J. M., & Li, Y. (2014). Social exchange implications of own and coworkers' experiences of supervisory abuse. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*(5), 1385-1405.

Raza S., Kanwal, R., Rafique, M. A., Sarfraz, U., & Zahra, M. (2017). The Relationship between HRM practice, Workplace Communication and Job Performance of service Industries employees In Vehari, Pakistan. *International Journal of Information, Business and Management*, *9*(2), 122-140.

Rice, B., Knox, K., Rice, J., Martin, N., Fieger, P., & Fitzgerald, A. (2017). Loyal employees in difficult settings: The compounding effects of inter-professional dysfunction and employee loyalty on job tension. *Personnel Review, 46*(8), 1755-1769.

Rineer, J. R. (2012). *Social job characteristics and older workers: Effects on job satisfaction and job tension.* (Unpublished Master theses*)*, Portland State University, Portland, USA.

Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 2*(2), 121-139.

Rousseau, D. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding Written and Unwritten Agreements*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Rousseau, D. M. (2001). Schema, promise, and mutuality: The building blocks of the psychological contract. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *74(*4), 511-541.

Rowold, J., & Rohmann, A. (2009). Transformational and transactional leadership styles, followers' positive and negative emotions, and performance in German nonprofit orchestras. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 20*(1), 41-59.

Saleem, S., Yusaf, S., Sarwar, N., Raziq, M. M., & Malik, O. F. (2018). Linking abusive supervision to psychological distress and turnover intentions among police personnel: the moderating role of continuance commitment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 1-21.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). Research methods for business students. *Pearson education.*

Simons, T. L., Friedman, R., Liu, L. A., & McLean Parks, J. (2008). The importance of behavioral integrity in a multicultural workplace. *Cornell Hospitality Report*, *8*(17), 1-18.

Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*(3), 434.

Stecher, M. D., & Rosse, J. G. (2005). The distributive side of interactional justice: The effects of interpersonal treatment on emotional arousal. *Journal of Managerial Issues*,*17*, 229–246.

Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S., & Ullman, J. B. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (Vol. 5). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Tao, J., Jiang, W., Liu, C., Yang, X., Zhang, W., & Zhang, H. (2017). New employee intention to leave and consequent work performance: Does leadership style matter? *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 45*(10), 1707-1721.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of management journal, 43*(2), 178-190

Tepper, B. J. 2007. Abusive Supervision in Work Organizations: Review, Synthesis, and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management 33* (3), 261-289.

Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., Breaux, D. M., Geider, S., Hu, C., & Hua, W. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *109*(2), 156-167.

Wang, W., Mao, J., Wu, W., & Liu, J. (2012). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance: The mediating role of interactional justice and the moderating role of power distance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 50*(1), 43-60.

Wei, F., & Si, S. (2013). Psychological contract breach, negative reciprocity, and abusive supervision: The mediated effect of organizational identification. *Management and Organization Review*, *9*(3), 541-561.

Wilson, J. (2014). *Essentials of business research: A guide to doing your research project* (2nd ed). Sage.

Xu, E., Huang, X., Lam, C. K., & Miao, Q. (2012). Abusive supervision and work behaviors: The mediating role of LMX. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(4), 531-543.

Yasarathne, K. H. V. P., Nishanthi, H. M., & Mendis, M. V. S. (2018). The impact of job tension on job satisfaction: a study on executive level employees of the Apparel Industry in Anuradhapura District of Sri Lanka. *Kelaniya Journal of Human Resource Management, 13*(1), 10-20.

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

Zoghbi Manrique de Lara, P. (2006). Fear in organizations: Does intimidation by formal punishment mediate the relationship between interactional justice and workplace internet deviance? *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(6), 580-592.