

INFLUENCE OF ABUSIVE SUPERVISION ON EMPLOYEES' MORALE AT WORK: EVIDENCE FROM THE MANUFACTURING ORGANISATIONS

Folake Olubunmi LANRE-BABALOLA¹, Babalola Oluwayemi
OGINNI², Mobolaji Omotayo OBIDIYA³ & Joseph Adeyinka
ADEWOLE⁴

¹*Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences
Osun State University Osogbo, Okuku Campus*

E-mail: folake.lanre-babalola@uniosun.edu.ng; +234 8084427587

²*Department of Human Resource Development, Faculty of Management
Sciences*

Osun State University Osogbo, Okuku Campus

E-mail: babalola.oginni@uniosun.edu.ng; +234 8028122512

³*Department of Geography, Faculty of Social Sciences
Osun State University Osogbo, Okuku Campus*

E-mail: mobolaji.obidiya@uniosun.edu.ng; +234 8067454200

⁴*Department of Banking and Finance, Faculty of Management Sciences
Osun State University Osogbo, Okuku Campus*

E-mail: joseph.adewole@uniosun.edu.ng; +2348030672138

How to cite: Lanre-Babalola , F.O., Oginni, B.O., Obidiya, M.O., & Adewole, J.A. (2024). "Influence of Abusive Supervision on Employees' Morale at Work: Evidence from The Manufacturing Organisations". *Annals of Spiru Haret University. Economic Series*, 24(1), 312-328, doi: <https://doi.org/10.26458/24118>

Abstract: *Organization is structured in such a way that people work together wherein some would be superiors and others would be subordinates which makes supervision a natural phenomenon while the quality of supervision will determine the result of operational activities daily. The study focused on the influence of abusive supervision on employee morale using the*

manufacturing sector as the unit of analysis, it identified the level of abusive supervision, the causes of abusive supervision, and the relationship between abusive supervision and employee morale. Yamane's sample size formula was used to get the sample size of 310 while a multistage sampling technique was used to select the sample and administer the questionnaire. it was found that abusive supervision is high, caused by leadership styles, absence of an alternative job, and family demands and there exists an inverse relationship between abusive supervision, and employee morale with implications on employee and behavioural outcomes and concluded that high abusive supervision heralds low job satisfaction, low commitment, and low loyalty thus, leading to decreased productivity, increased grievances, and increased turnover as well as hindering innovation and collaboration. Training was recommended to focus on supervision with empathy to improve interpersonal relationships and feelings of belongingness.

Keywords: *Abusive supervision, employee morale, training, employee, and behavioural outcomes, empathy*

JEL Classification: M12; M54; O14; O15

1. Introduction

The 21st Century organizations are characterized by a network of relationships on account of the significance of teamwork which is the bedrock of successful organizations, thus, buttressing the essence of cooperation and unity in the workplace (Oginni, Afolabi & Erigbe, 2014). The implication of this in the workplace is that there would be a kind of interaction between and among members of the team (s) within and across the entire organization wherein a supervisor oversees the activities of the team which revolves around planning, organising, controlling, and coordinating as well as leading without prejudice. This has made organizations increasingly concerned about the impact of supervision on employees (Oginni, et al, 2014; Cortina, Kabat-Farr, Magley. & Nelson, 2017). The position of Mullen, Fiset, and Rheaume (2018) also supported this concern and opined that organizations should be more concerned about destructive supervision which carries more negative implications on employee morale and behaviour at work especially where there is close contact in the network of their relationships. The earlier work of Oginni, et al (2014) revealed that abusive supervision was a form of destructive leadership in the workplace manifesting in the form of

emotional depletion, fatigue, procrastination, chronic stress, and low job satisfaction and similar to this, was that of the earlier work of Schyns and Schilling (2013) where it was postulated that abusive supervision is negative and has no economic benefit to the employee and organization, rather damaged employee morale and harm organizational profitability because of its impact on the employee and behavioural outcomes which has implication on absenteeism, excessive stress, emotional exhaustion, intention to quit, and low initiatives. In the end, it will affect employee job satisfaction, commitment, and loyalty to the organization thus, leading to decreased productivity, increased grievances, and increased turnover while Khoreva and Wechsler (2020) believed that employees under abusive supervision are prone to hindering innovation and collaboration as well as hoarding knowledge and expertise.

Abusive supervision emerged in the workplace because every business organization without an exemption is structured in such a way that people are going to work together wherein some would be superior while others would be subordinates (Oginni, et al. 2014; Oginni & Lanre-Babalola, 2020). Thus, the two parties are expected to work together and ensure that the objectives of the organizations are achieved i.e. the activities of both parties complement each other, one gives directives (order), and the other carries out the order (directives) within the legal framework approved by the management of the organization (Zhu & Zhang, 2019; Oginni & Ogunyomi, 2012). To this extent, supervision becomes the engine oil and hallmark for the growth of every business organization irrespective of the nature, scope, or size. Oginni and Faseyiku (2012) opined that compassionate or benevolent supervision benefitted organizations in many ways such as it supports growth, unites teams, gives room for excellent performance, enhances accountability, helps in verifying potentials, instils independence through delegation of responsibilities, reinforces relationships and improves communication. It is also an avenue that facilitates the proper evaluation of individual contributions towards achieving organizational goals (Hershcovis, Ogunfowora, Reich & Christie, 2017).

This predisposes the supervisor to control subordinates' roles, assignments, activities, and rewards towards the attainment of organizational objectives. Thus, implies that supervisor operates within the available legal framework to use their discretion on how best to perform a given task or a routine assignment. With this belief, there is a temptation on the part of the superior to display power over the work processes and work environment of the subordinates which has empowered

the superior to pick and channel abuse on employees or groups of employees in the name of getting things done (Oginni, Ajibola & Olaniyan, 2022; Zhu & Zhang, 2019). However, despite these highlighted benefits, some supervisors justify their actions of abusing their subordinates under the pretext of scrutinizing the work performed by subordinates to ensure compliance with the acceptable standard while some believe that abusive supervision is the best model to apply and practice regardless of their education, orientation, and work philosophy why?

There had been a consensus among scholars that abusive supervision in the workplace has a negative impact on the physical and psychological well-being of the victims and other people around them although it manifests in varying degrees depending on the nature of the industry (Oyewunmi & Oyewunmi, 2022; cc; Mullen et al, 2018; Tepper, Simon & Park, 2017; Samantha, 2016; Oginni, et al, 2014; Tepper, 2007). Most of the research on abusive supervision had concentrated on the Educational, Information Technology, and Service sectors with few in the manufacturing sectors highlighting the impact on the work behaviour of employees, consequences on the work atmosphere, employee's personality, and productivity while there is a dearth of such especially in the area of employee morale in the manufacturing sector where the nature of the network is structured like that of a cobweb. Therefore, this study seeks to investigate the degree/level of abusive supervision, identify causes of abusive supervision despite the understanding of its negative impact on the morale of employees, examine which of these factors affects the morale of employees more than the rest, and examine the relationship between abusive supervision and morale of employees at work in the manufacturing sector.

2. Literature Review

Abusive supervision as a concept in the modern-day work relationship has a legion of definitions and some of these were considered in line with the focus of the study. In the views of Tepper, Simon & Park, 2017; Tepper, 2007), abusive supervision was described as the display of hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviours, excluding physical contact towards the subordinates while Oginni and Faseyiku (2012) described exertion of power by a superior over subordinates in an awkward manner to instil fear. Hershcovis et al. (2017) opined that abusive supervision is an expression of any form of maltreatment from the superior to subordinating causing humiliation of any kind. c, et al (2019), described abusive supervision from the subordinates' perception to mean the extent to which they

perceived their supervisors engaging in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviours while the views expressed by Williams (2020) and Adegoke (2021) agreed with this and opined that abusive supervision is the degree of derogatory comments about an individual to other members of the organization. It is therefore not out of place to say that abusive supervision is the use of language that depletes an individual personality at work or any act capable of undermining the ego of an individual at the workplace (Oyewunmi & Oyewunmi, 2022; Khoreva & Wechsler, 2020)).

Tepper (2000) observed that the consequences of abusive supervision are numerous ranging from the intention to quit their jobs to low job satisfaction, conflict between work and family as well as psychological distress. Hershcovis et al. (2017) maltreatment from supervisors' which often arises because of power tussles or differences and asserted that it has a significant negative effect on the performance of employees while Mullen et al, (2018) believed that employees with the perception of abuse from their supervisors tend to engage in counterproductive work behaviours aimed at both the supervisor and the organization. Oginni and Faseyiku (2012) linked deviant behaviour to abusive supervision as one of the many counterproductive activities in the workplace. Phulpoto, Hussian, Brohi and Memon (2021) revealed that abusive supervision impacts negatively on employees in terms of their behaviours, attitudes, and psychological health and concluded that there exists a negative relationship between abusive supervision and organizational commitment although it examined the possibility of a subordinate's hostility towards a supervisor as the factor impelling supervisors to exhibit abusive acts towards poor-performing subordinates. The earlier work of Nwani, Ofoke, Eze and Udechukwu (2017) was built upon by Phulpoto, et al. (2021) where it was opined that the victims of abusive supervision tend to emulate such behaviour and display the same towards their colleagues. Adegoke (2021) asserted that abusive supervision leads to absenteeism, excessive stress, depletion of dignity, and emotional exhaustion (Oyewunmi & Oyewunmi, 2022).

Williams (2020) observed that abusive supervision has many negative consequences on the organization and employees but believed it is a result of power abuse by supervisors wherein supervisor abuse their role as leader, mentor, and role model thus arrogating or wielding enormous power has not envisaged by the legal framework of the organization to suppress subordinates (Khoreva & Wechsler, 2020). Nwani et al (2017) and Adegoke (2021) presented the same views on the use of power by supervisors to suppress subordinates and posited that

where subordinates could not avoid suppression, subordinates are willing to accept abuses and suppression from their supervisors but over time devised means to cope with the abuse and suppression by manifesting dissatisfaction behaviour such as intention to quit, absenteeism, deviance behaviour, work accident, and poor productivity as well as disaffection among employees and low commitment (Masindi, Onojaefe, Tengeh & Ukpere, 2023) while Oginni, Ayantunji, Awolaja, Adesanya, and Ojodu. (2023) noted that sometimes, interpretation of policies often made supervisors to be abusive. Lawal and Benson (2022) also posited that abusive supervision imposes psychological stress on the subordinates and has a negative impact on the performance of the subordinates at work on account of work alienation. Therefore, abusive supervision affects employees' personalities, mindsets, self-esteem, and relationships with others whether at work or home with consequences on performance at work.

The works of Kimberly, Barbara, and Birgit (2021) on abusive supervision provided comprehensive insight into why abusive supervision has continued to thrive in the workplace not only in this direction but also why subordinates continue to stay under abusive supervision. They used the onion approach to argue that the prolonged nature of abuse cannot be understood within the limits of leader-follower dynamics alone but instead involves societal, organizational, dyadic, and intra-individual factors that should be taken into account and considerations i.e. the larger society context (societal culture, economy, job market, and law), organizational context (norms and values, corporate social responsibility, policies, and practices, team solidarity, and support), dyadic context (preventing employees from leaving, social isolation, the impact of abusive supervision, and coping with abusive supervision) and intra-individual context (social identification, conservation values, implicit leadership theories, personality).

The earlier works of Mackey et al., (2017) and that of Tierney and Farmer (2017) were in line with the classification of causes of abusive supervision in the workplace. Before the work of Kimberly, et al. (2021) some researchers have identified some reasons such as malicious supervisors, environmental factors, and individual factors as well as supervisors' rigidity or hostile intentions, followers' attribution styles, the interaction of several organization-level and individual-level factors (Felps, Mitchell & Byington, 2006; Tepper, 2007; Martinko, Harvey, Sikora, and Douglas, 2011; Oginni, et al, 2014). It can therefore be summarised that abusive supervision is not only caused by the characteristics of the supervisor but also by the followers'/subordinates' attributes and the characteristics of the

organization while Oyewunmi and Oyewunmi (2022) posited that abusive supervision results in decreased job satisfaction for the employee thus, lower job satisfaction which invariably leads to decreased productivity. It also leads to increased grievances and increased turnover. In the views of Masindi et al (2023), the degree of employee happiness at work depends on the competence and relationship of their supervisor, their remuneration, and their working circumstances.

2.1 Underpinning Theory

Many theories have been linked to abusive supervision such as social exchange theory, conservation of resources theory, self-regulation theory, self-efficacy theory (social learning theory), and social identity theory. Based on the content and context of this study, social self-efficacy theory was considered appropriate as the underpinning theory. Social self-efficacy theory was propounded by Albert Bandura in 1977 in an article published by the Journal Psychological Review titled “Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioural Change”. The theory was anchored on the belief that a person's feeling that their thoughts and actions influence a given outcome i.e. an individual's belief in his or her capacity to execute behaviours necessary to produce specific performance attainments. It emphasizes the importance of the individual and the individual's perceptions of his/her capabilities as key determinants of successful outcomes. The theory is deeply rooted in the concept of triadic reciprocal determinism in which there is a constant interplay between personal factors, behavioural, and environmental factors although a premium is placed on the relative importance of personal factors, at the same time acknowledged that behavioural and environmental factors have profound effects on outcomes. It further reinforces the idea that if the effects of the environment are consistent, then self-efficacy beliefs will take on an even greater role in determining human behaviour, and ultimately shaping outcomes concerning mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, emotional, physical, and psychological states, and verbal persuasion.

Tierney and Farmer (2017) and Bui and Baruch (2011) supported the construct of the theory by positing that the perception of individual employees and relationships in the work environment plays a significant role in shaping employee's behavioural outcomes although the theory has been criticized by some scholars on account of disregarded or ignoring the role of the environment on an individual (Eastman & Marzillier, 1984; Biglan; 1987; Lewis, 2018). Despite its

criticism, self-efficacy is significantly beneficial in understanding various life aspects, ranging from relationships and the psychology of employees in the workplace. It provides a reliable framework and avenue to explain how the relationship between the superior and subordinates will have a bearing on individuals, especially feeling about themselves in terms of mental, physical, and psychological health and positivism oozing from their perceptions.

3. Methodology

The study was situated in Ogun state which is one of the 36 States in Nigeria, and it has three Senatorial Districts namely Ogun West, Ogun East, and Ogun North, however, Ogun West was chosen as the unit of analysis out of the three Senatorial Districts because more than 60% of the manufacturing industries were located in this Senatorial District to include Cable, Plastic, Pharmaceutical, Beverages organizations. In all, seventeen (17) organizations were selected within the manufacturing industries wherein Cable organizations (3), Plastic organizations (5), Pharmaceutical organizations (5), and Beverage organizations (4) through purposive sampling technique. Yamane's sample size formula was used to get the sample size from the population study of 1375 to get 310 as the sample size and a proportional sampling technique was used to select the sample size from the selected organizations i.e. cable organization (63), Plastic organizations (95), Pharmaceutical organizations (78), and Beverage organizations (74) while random sampling was employed to administer 310 copies of questionnaire to the research respondents wherein 286 copies of the questionnaire were found useful for analysis.

The study made use of a structured questionnaire which was designed in line with the Likert 5-point rating scale and was influenced by the earlier 15-item measurement scale of Tepper (2000) and a 5-item scale developed by Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) on abusive supervision. Before the administration of the structured questionnaire, a mixture of an open-ended and closed questionnaire was administered to 50 respondents chosen from the manufacturing organizations between September and November 2023 for pretest study purposes. The respondents were to tick among options of factors found to be responsible for abusive supervision in the workplace, the respondents were asked to add if there is any outside the options provided. Based on the responses from the respondents, factors with 80% occurrence frequency were used for the study. The administration of the questionnaire to the respondents was between the period of three months

(December 2023 and February 2024). Data collected were analyzed by using descriptive (Percentage, Mean, and Kendall's W test) and inferential statistics (Pearson correlation coefficient and linear regression methods).

4. Results

4.1 Objective 1: to investigate the degree/level of abusive supervision among employees in the selected manufacturing sector

Table 1: Abusive Supervision Degree/Level of the Respondents

Variables	Low N (%)	Moderate N (%)	High N (%)	Total N (%)
Gender				
Male	29(14.2)	51(25)	124(60.8)	204(100)
Female	17(20.7)	30(36.6)	35(42.7)	82(100)
Total	46(16.1)	81(28.3)	159(55.6)	286(100)
Age				
Below 36yrs	17(19.8)	24(27.9)	45(52.3)	86(100)
Above 36yrs	57(28.5)	45(22.5)	98(49)	200(100)
Total	74(25.9)	69(24.1)	143(50)	286(100)
Marital Status				
Single	28(40)	19(27.1)	23(32.9)	70()
Married	23(12.7)	48(26.7)	109(60.6)	180()
Others	20(55.6)	9(25)	7(19.4)	36()
Total	71(24.8)	76(26.6)	139(48.6)	286(100)
Work Experience				
Below 10 yrs	24(20.5)	16(13.7)	77(65.8)	117(100)
Above 11 yrs	40(23.7)	38(22.5)	91(53.8)	169(100)
Total	64(22.4)	54(18.9)	168(58.7)	286(100)
Cadre Category				
Management	7(28)	6(24)	12(48)	25(100)
Senior staff	38(43.2)	30(34.1)	20(22.7)	88(100)
Junior staff	12(6.9)	35(20.3)	126(72.8)	173(100)
Total	57(19.9)	71(24.8)	158(55.2)	286(100)

Source: Field Survey, 2024

Table 1 shows the level of abusive supervision in the manufacturing sector which was rated on a 3-point rating scale i.e. low, moderate, and high levels. Out of a total of 286 employees sampled for the study, 159 respondents had high abusive supervision representing 55.6%, 81 respondents experienced moderate abusive supervision representing 26.3% while 46 of the respondents had low abusive supervision which represented 16.1%. This shows that the majority of the respondents experienced abusive supervision at a high level wherein the male gender experienced this more than the female gender. The age of the respondents indicates that there is a high level of abusive supervision among the respondents with 143 (50%) where respondents who aged above 36 years experiencing this more than those whose age is below 36 years. However, the marital status shows that the respondents also experienced a high level of abusive supervision with 139 (48.6%) although the married respondents (60.6%) experienced this more while the work experience shows a high level of abusive supervision among the respondents with 168 representing 58.7% especially those who had spent more than 11 years in their respective organizations, the cadre in the organization which was categorized into three had the same high-level abusive supervision with 158 of the respondents representing 55.2% wherein the junior staff had the lion share of the abusive supervision percentage i.e. 72.8.

4.2 Objective 2: to identify causes of abusive supervision in the manufacturing sector

Table 2: Kendall's W test and Mean Rank Statistics of the Causes of Abusive Supervision

<i>Abusive Supervision Variables</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean Rank</i>	<i>Kendall's W</i>	<i>Chi-Square</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>Asymp. Sig.</i>	<i>Rank Score</i>	<i>Remark</i>
<i>Subordinate provocative attitude</i>	286	3.567	0.816	75.327	8	0.000	8	A
<i>Work Demands</i>	286	3.672					7	A
<i>Absence of Alternative Job</i>	286	4.328					2	A
<i>Leadership Styles</i>	286	4.335					1	A

<i>Abusive Supervision Variables</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean Rank</i>	<i>Kendall's W</i>	<i>Chi-Square</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>Asymp. Sig.</i>	<i>Rank Score</i>	<i>Remark</i>
<i>Justice Perception</i>	286	3.112					9	A
<i>Family Demands</i>	286	4.101					3	A
<i>Emotional Instability</i>	286	3.942					4	A
<i>Inferiority Complex</i>	286	3.670					6	A
<i>Power Obsession</i>	286	3.843					5	A
<i>Intention to quit</i>	286	2.562					10	D

Source: Field Survey, 2024

Remark: where Agreement (A) is ≥ 3.0 and Disagreement (D), is ≤ 3.0

Table 2 has the information extracted from extant literature and the outcome of the pilot study which showed that ten (10) different items were identified as the major causes of abusive supervision in the manufacturing sector. Data were analyzed using Kendall's W test, a statistical tool used to measure the extent of agreement among raters wherein the result obtained from the data analysis provided information to understand the extent of agreement among the employees on the factors causing abusive supervision in the manufacturing sector. It was found that the statistical value of Kendall's W coefficient of concordance (where $W = 0.816$, $X^2 = 75.327$, $Df. = 8$, $Sig. = 0.000$) confirmed the high level of agreement among the respondents i.e. subordinate provocative attitude, work demands, absence of an alternative job, leadership styles, justice perception, family demands, emotional instability, inferiority complex, and power obsession represents the major causes of abusive supervision while the mean score of intention to quit has a remark indicating disagreement among the employees which implies nonunanimous decision on intention to quit as a major cause of abusive supervision in the manufacturing sector.

4.3 Objective 3: to examine which of the abusive supervision factors affect employees at work more than the others

Table 3: Coefficient Value of Factors Responsible for Abusive Supervision

<i>Variables</i>	β	<i>Sig</i>	<i>Potency</i>
<i>Subordinate provocative attitude</i>	0.188	0.001	6
<i>Work Demands</i>	0.221	0.004	4
<i>Absence of Alternative Job</i>	0.345	0.000	2
<i>Leadership Styles</i>	0.512	0.000	1
<i>Justice Perception</i>	0.111	0.000	9
<i>Family Demands</i>	0.215	0.000	5
<i>Emotional Instability</i>	0.287	0.001	3
<i>Inferiority Complex</i>	0.178	0.002	7
<i>Power Obsession</i>	0.138	0.000	8
<i>Intention to quit</i>	0.043	0.002	10

Source: Field Survey, 2024

Table 3 provides information on the degree of potency of each of the cause variables of abusive supervision wherein it shows that leadership styles were found to be the most potent variable of all the factors responsible for abusive supervision in the workplace followed by the absence of an alternative job. Emotional stability was next to the absence of an alternative job after which work demands, family demands, subordinate provocative attitude, inferior complex, power obsession, and justice perception. The implication is that leadership styles have more contribution to abusive supervision than the rest i.e. $\beta = 0.512$, $p = 0.000$ to imply 51.2% of the variation in the factors responsible for different forms of abusive supervision, followed by the absence of an alternative job with $\beta = 0.345$, $p = 0.000$ to represent 34.5% of contribution in abusive supervision, next was emotional instability which has $\beta = 0.287$, $p = 0.001$ implying 28.7% variation in the factors causing abusive supervision and work demands was ranked as among factors with strong potency of $\beta = 0.221$, $p = 0.004$ signifying 22.1% contributory effect in abusive supervision and was followed by family demands that $\beta = 0.215$, $p = 0.000$ indicating 21.5% of the variation in abusive supervision while subordinate provocative attitude shows 18.8% potency in abusive supervision, while inferiority complex has 17.8% and power obsession has a variation of 13.8% of the factors responsible for abusive supervision in the workplace while justice perception has 11.1% to indicate the

variation contributed to abusive supervision. However, the intention to quit as one of the causes of abusive supervision was not a unique contributor with a statistical value of $\beta = -0.043$, $p = 1.002$. Therefore, objective 2 which seeks to know which of the abusive supervision factors that affect the morale of employees at work more than the rest was achieved.

4.4 Objective 4: examine the relationship between abusive supervision and employee morale towards behavioural and employee outcomes at work.

Table 4: Correlation between Abusive Supervision and Employee Morale

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Abusive Supervision</i>	<i>Employee Morale</i>
<i>Abusive Supervision</i>	1	- 678*
<i>Employee Morale</i>	- 678*	1

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2 - tail)

Table 4 shows the correlation between abusive supervision and employee morale which indicates that there is a strong negative correlation between the independent and dependent variables. The negative correlation connotes an inverse relationship between abusive supervision and employee morale where $r = - 0.678$, $p < 0.05$ to imply that, as abusive supervision increases, employee morale decreases i.e. lower abusive supervision will herald higher employee morale, thus leading to positive behavioural and employee outcomes which invariably will yield higher organizational productivity.

Many researchers have posited that abusive supervision is prevalent in most organizations especially where there is an intertwin network of relationships where there is a presence of superiors and subordinates working together to achieve organizational objectives. The result of this present study confirmed the findings of other researchers before this study (Oyewunmi & Oyewunmi, 2022; Williams, 2020; Oginni & Lanre-Babalola, 2020; Zhu & Zhang, 2019; Hershcovis, Ogunfowora, Reich & Christie, 2017; Oginni, et al. 2014; Oginni & Ogunyomi, 2012) that abusive supervision evolved from a network of relationship in the workplace on account of attaining organizational objectives. It also buttressed the belief of supervisors that abusive supervision is a way to justify the actions of abusing subordinates under the pretext of scrutinizing the work performed and the best model to apply (Zhu & Zhang, 2019).

The results of the study are consistent with the studies conducted by different researchers on the causes of abusive supervision as highlighted including Oyewunmi and Oyewunmi (2022); Kimberly, Barbara, and Brrgit (2021); Mackey et al., (2017); Tierney and Farmer (2017); Oginni, et al, (2014); Martinko, Harvey, Sikora, & Douglas (2011); Tepper (2007); Felps, Mitchell, and Byington (2006) although the results singled out intention to quit as not unique or a strong contributor to the causes of abusive supervision in the manufacturing sector. The study also confirmed the positions of Lawal and Benson (2022), Adegoke (2021), Williams (2020), Tepper, (2000) and Nwani, et al (2017) where it was asserted that abusive supervision has many negative consequences on the organization and employees. The present study showed that there exists an inverse relationship between abusive supervision and employee morale with implications on employee and behavioural outcomes wherein the organizational productivity is being determined concerning employee job satisfaction, commitment, and loyalty to the organization.

5. Conclusion

The purpose of the study was to investigate the impact of abusive supervision on employee morale wherein the level of abusive supervision was examined, evaluate the causes of abusive supervision, and examine the relationship between and impact of abusive supervision and employee morale. From the results, it was evident that there is a high level of abusive supervision in the workplace of the manufacturing sector with males, married, and employees with more than eleven (11) years of experience feeling the abusive supervision more than the rest. Aside from this, causes of abusive supervision were identified which were found to be consistent with that of previous studies although the intention to quit was never considered dominant while the result of the study revealed further that an inverse relationship exists between abusive supervision and employee morale with implications on employee and behavioural outcomes. A high level of abusive supervision would imply low job satisfaction, low commitment, and low loyalty which invariably would result in decreased productivity, increased grievances, and increased turnover as well as hindering innovation and collaboration within the business environment while hoarding knowledge and expertise would be a common practice.

6. Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion of the study, it has been established that abusive supervision is prevalent and evident in the manufacturing sector wherein the performances of employees have been hindered by abusive supervision on account of employee and behavioural outcomes which affects productivity. Therefore, there is a need to institute training in the form of workshops with a focus on supervision with empathy to foster cooperation, improve interpersonal relationships, and feeling of belongingness in superior and subordinate relationships. The training should be for all, irrespective of the cadre in the organization although the training could be broken into three different levels to address the training needs of each individual along their respective cadres. The expectations of individuals in the supervisory role should be made known to them and the implication of abusive supervision in both the short and long run should be emphasized while attention should also be drawn to the health of the organization and that of the employee. There should be a high level of commitment from the management to ensure the success of the training program and provide a mechanism to monitor the result of the training whether the objective is achieved or otherwise.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adegoke, M. L (2021). Consequences of abusive supervision on employee performance in the Nigerian Tertiary Institution, *Journal of Management Sciences*, 4(6),167 - 181
- [2] Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioural change *Journal of Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215
- [3] Bui, H. & Baruch, Y (2011) Universities are learning organizations? An empirical evaluation within an international context. The 18th International Conference on Learning, Mauritius, Republic of, Mauritius.
- [4] Biglan, A (1987). A behaviour-analytic critique of Bandura's self-efficacy theory, *Behavioural Anal*, Spring 10(1), 1-15
- [5] Cortina, L.M., Kabat-Farr, D., Magley, V.J. & Nelson, K. (2017), "Researching rudeness: the past, present, and future of the science of incivility", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22 (3), pp. 299-313,
- [6] Eastaman, C & Marzillier, J. S (1984). Theoretical and Methodological difficulties in Bandura's self-efficacy theory, *Cognitive theory research*, 8, 213-229
- [7] Felps, W., Mitchell, R., &Byington, E. (2006). How, when, and why bad apples spoil the barrel: Negative group members and dysfunctional groups. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 27, 175-222.

- [8] Hershcovis, M.S., Ogunfowora, B., Reich, T. & Christie, A. (2017). Targeted workplace incivility: the roles of belongingness, embarrassment, and power, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 38, (7), pp. 1057-1075,
- [9] Kimberly, B., Barbara, W., & Birgit, S. (2021). Trapped at work: The barriers models of abusive supervision, *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 36 (3), 1-53.
- [10] Khoreva, V., & Wechtler, H. (2020). Exploring the consequences of knowledge hiding: an agency theory perspective, *Journal of Management Psychology*, 35, 71-84
- [11] Lawal, K. H & Benson, M. M (2022). Influence of abusive supervision on employee emotional stability, *Journal of Public Administration*, 6(7), 78 -93
- [12] Lewis, M. C. (2018). I think I can!” the influences of the four sources of self-efficacy upon the development of vocal performance belief in nine classical collegiate vocalists, Ph. D Thesis submitted to the College of Fine Arts, Boston University, published by ProQuest LLC, USA.
- [13] 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
- [14] Martinko, M., Harvey, P., Sikora, D., & Douglas, S. (2011). Perceptions of abusive supervision: The role of subordinates’ attribution styles. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 751-764.
- [15] Masindi, T., Onojaefe D.P., Tengeh R., & Ukpere W.I. (2023). “Influence of Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment on Employee Turnover Intention in the Chemical Industry in South Africa”. *Annals of Spiru Haret University. Economic Series*, 23(4), 77-92, doi: <https://doi.org/10.26458/2342>
- [16] Mitchell, M.S. & Ambrose, M.L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1159-1168
- [17] Mullen, J., Fiset, J., & Rhéaume, A. (2018). Destructive forms of leadership: The effects of abusive supervision and incivility on employee health and safety. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-06-2018-0203>
- [18] Nwani, B. E., Ofoke S. M, Eze O. E, & Udechukwu C. D (2017). Abusive supervision and work tension as predictors of counterproductive work behaviour among Nigerian police, *Journal of Psychology and Sociology Studies*, 1(1), 42 – 61
- [19] Oginni B. O, Ajibola K. S & Olaniyan T. S (2022). A Study of the Effects of Occupational and Safety and Work Environment on Employee Job Performance in a Manufacturing Organisation of Lagos Metropolis, Lagos, Nigeria, *Annals of Spiru Haret University, Economics Series*, 22(1), 183-193, doi: <https://doi.org/10.26458/22100>
- [20] Oginni, B.O., Ayantunji, I.O., Awolaja, A., Adesanya, A.S. & Ojodu, H.O. (2023). A Study of Human Resource Management Policies, Practices and Employee Commitment: Evidence from Nigerian Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs)”. *Annals of Spiru Haret University. Economic Series*, 23(2), 254-277, doi: <https://doi.org/10.26458/23214>

- [21] Oginni, B. O. & Lanre-Babalola (2020). Literature review on the sociological implication of Psychological Contract on Employees' Satisfaction, *Journal of Banking and Finance Research*, 7(2), 120-129
- [22] Oginni, B. O. Afolabi G. V & Erigbe P (2014). A Study of Superior-Subordinate Relationship and Employees' Commitment to the Core Beliefs of Organisation in Public Universities of Southwest, Nigeria, *American Journal of Business and Management*, 3(1), 28-38
- [23] Oginni, B. O & Faseyiku, I. O (2012). *Dynamics of Industrial Relations*, Lagos, Mankore print.
- [24] Oginni, B. O & Ogunyomi, P. O (2012). The roles of employment processes in organizational image in insurance organizations in Nigeria: Employees and community perspectives, *Australian Journal of Business and Management*, 2(5), 52- 57
- [25] Oyewunmi, A. E., & Oyewunmi, O. A. (2022). Speaking Silence: Abusive Supervision, Subordinates' Citizenship Behavior, and Whistleblowing Intention. *Sage Open*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221079912>
- [26] Phulpoto, K., Hussian, N., Brohi, M. A, & Memon, S. (2021). Abusive supervision and its influence on employee silence and organisational productivity, *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management, and Innovation* 3(2), 335-384
- [27] Samantha, K. (2016). Abusive supervision in the workplace: An examination of current research and a proposal for preventive measures. University Honors Thesis paper 303.<https://doi.org/10.15760/honors.248>
- [28] Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 138–158.
- [29] Tepper, B. J., Simon, L., & Park, H. M (2017). Abusive supervision. *Annual Review of Organisational Psychology and Organisational Behaviour* 4, 123-152
- [30] Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33(3), 261–289
- [31] Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178-190
- [32] Tierney, P. & Farmer, S. M. (2017). Considering Creative Self-Efficacy: Its Current State and Ideas for Future Inquiry, Edited by Karwowski, M &. Kaufman, J. C, In *Explorations in Creativity Research, The Creative Self*, Academic Press,
- [33] Williams, J. S (2020). Supervision and interpersonal relationship are two sides of the same coin, *Journal of Management Sciences*, 4(6),198 - 216.
- [34] Zhu, J., & Zhang, B. (2019). The double-edged sword effect of abusive supervision on subordinates' innovative behaviour. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 66. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00066>