**Third Party Reactions to Supervisor Abuse: The Roles of
Perceived Responsibility and Moral Intensity**

by

Lemuel S. Toledano

MA (*With High Distinction*), De La Salle University, 2008

**A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
of The Australian National University**

July 2013

Signed Statement of Originality

The work presented in this thesis, is to the best of my knowledge my own work, except as acknowledged in the text. The material has not been submitted, either in whole, or in past, for a degree at this or any other university.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "L. Toledano", is written over a solid horizontal line.

Lemuel S. Toledano

Acknowledgments

THANK YOU

Thank you for being there,
through every laugh, through every tear.
You helped me not to be scared,
about the things that I feared.
Thank you for the love that you have shown,
when you knew I would have blown.
You are an important person in my life,
You've helped me deal with my strife.
From time to time you always listened,
and when you did so your eyes always glistened.
You never put me down,
and you always knew how to turn my frown upside-down.
Thank you for being there for me,
and letting me be **who I want to be**.

A Poem by Stacy Arruda

My PhD journey has been meaningful and my sincerest appreciation to those who have made this endeavor possible:

God Almighty, for the strength and wisdom
Daddy Leo and Mommy Angelina, for the unconditional love and care
Prof. Simon Lloyd D. Restubog, for the academic direction and guidance
Prof. Prashant Bordia, Prof. George Chen,
and Dr. Alessandra Capezio, for the valuable advice and feedback
ANU and UNSW fellow PhD students and friends, for the moral support and encouragement
My Siblings (Abigail, Arvin, Leynard, and Laarni), for the help and generosity
Leila, Avril, and Leitham, for the affection and appreciation
Francis, Kaye, Jude Franco, and Kyler Moreno, for the kindness and assistance
Val, Joi, and Vernon Quimno, for the warmth and thoughtfulness
Dr. Michaela Munoz, for the trust and motivation
Dr. Alfred Presbitero and Raymond Regalia, for the friendship and optimism
Rajiv Amarnani and Jennifer Lajom, for the fraternity and self-assurance
Jennifer Ramos and Chloe Wong, for the understanding and compassion
Joanne Carreon and Abigail Puno, for the diversion and laughter
Dahlia Somani and Jonalyn Villasante, for the companionship and concern
Prof. Allan Bernardo, Prof. Maricar Prudente, Dr. Jesusa Marco, and Dr. Roberto Borromeo, for the recommendation and confidence
Filipino Community in Canberra, for the camaraderie and enthusiasm
D' Kydz and Alipusteros, for the bonding and reinforcement
Research participants, assistants, and editors, for the patience and hard work
ELMD and CED-De La Salle University, for the constant support and inspiration
and *Research School of Management- Australian National University*, for the opportunity and experience.

“My PhD journey does not only speak of the degree/title that comes with it, more importantly this PhD stands for P(assion), H(ardwork), and D(edication)”

-Lemuel Sollano Toledano (2013)-

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to Mr. Leo and Mrs. Angelina Toledano. I have been blessed with loving and supportive parents.

Publication Arising From the Thesis

Conference Paper

Toledano, L.S., Restubog, S.L.D., Garcia, P.R.J.M, Chan-Serafin, S. (2012, August). *Third party reactions to supervisor abuse: The roles of perceived responsibility and moral intensity*. Paper presented at 2012 Annual Meeting of The Academy of Management, Boston, U.S.A.

Abstract

Third Party Reactions to Supervisor Abuse: The Roles of Perceived Responsibility and Moral Intensity

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The Australian National University, 2013

Committee Chair: Professor Simon Lloyd D. Restubog

Committee Members: Professor Prashant Bordia, Professor George Chen, and Dr. Alessandra Capezio

Guided by attribution (Weiner, 1986, 1995) and moral intensity (Jones, 1991) theories, this dissertation develops and tests a moderated mediation model that accounts for third parties' emotional reactions (anger and sympathy) and dispositional factors (negative reciprocity and moral identity) in the relationship between cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) and behavioural reactions (retaliation and emotional support) to supervisor abuse. It is proposed that upon witnessing supervisor abuse, third parties engage in cognitive evaluations in the form of assessing supervisor's responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus. These cognitive evaluations result in anger and retaliatory behaviours directed at the supervisor and sympathy and emotional support towards the target of abuse. Furthermore, these relationships are strengthened by negative reciprocity beliefs and moral identity. The proposed model was tested using scenario-based experiment (Study 1) and field survey studies (Studies 2 and 3).

The primary objective of Study 1 was to test the relationship between perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus (independent variables), and third parties' emotional response towards the abusive supervisor (anger) and abused subordinate (sympathy). Results of the study among 217 non-academic staff showed that perceptions of supervisor responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus had a significant main effect on anger towards the supervisor. Similarly, perceived responsibility and magnitude of consequence resulted in sympathy towards the target of abuse.

Study 2 aimed to extend Study 1 by testing the full model of third parties' reactions to supervisor abuse and accounting for individual differences using 241 part-time graduate students. In Study 2, the conditional indirect effects of cognitive evaluations (both first and second stage moderation) in predicting retaliatory actions via anger were stronger for those with high as opposed to low moral identity (symbolization). Moreover, the conditional indirect effects of cognitive evaluations (first stage moderation) in predicting emotional support via sympathy were stronger for those with high as opposed to low moral identity (symbolization).

Study 3 had two main objectives. First, it aimed to test the influence of both symbolization and internalization dimensions of moral identity on third party reactions to supervisor abuse. Results among 182 professional employees showed a differential moderating effects for the two sub-dimensions of moral identity within the cognitive evaluation—emotional response—behavioural reactions relationships. Second, examine the influence of negative reciprocity beliefs on the strength of the cognitive evaluations—anger—retaliation relationship. Results showed that the conditional indirect effects of

cognitive evaluations in predicting retaliatory actions via anger were stronger for those with high as opposed to low negative reciprocity beliefs.

This research program contributes to the abusive supervision literature in three important ways. First, it extends our understanding of supervisor abuse beyond the typical supervisor-subordinate dyads. Specifically, third party observers of abusive supervision can also be emotionally and behaviourally affected. Second, abusive supervision was examined using a moral perspective. Third, it considered how personality factors (moral identity and negative reciprocity beliefs) can predict third parties' reactions to supervisor abuse. Implications for research and practice are also discussed.

Table of Contents

Signed Statement of Originality	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Dedication	v
Publication Arising From the Thesis.....	vi
Abstract.....	vii
List of Tables.....	5
List of Figures	6
CHAPTER 1.....	8
 Third Party Reactions to Supervisor Abuse: The Roles of Perceived Responsibility and Moral Intensity.....	8
Review of Literature.....	18
Consequences of Abusive Supervision	18
Employees' attitudes.....	18
Employees' behaviours.....	19
Employees' health, well-being, and family functioning.....	23
Antecedents of Abusive Supervision.....	24
Third Parties in Abusive Supervision.....	26
Theoretical Framework and Hypothesis Development.....	28
Perceived Responsibility, Retaliation, and Support	30
Perceived responsibility and retaliation.....	32
Perceived responsibility and support.....	33
Magnitude of Consequence, Retaliation, and Support	34
Perceived magnitude of consequence and retaliation.....	34
Perceived magnitude of consequence and support	35
Social Consensus, Retaliation, and Support.....	36
Perceived social consensus and retaliation.....	36
Perceived social consensus and support.....	37
Emotional Responses to Abusive Supervision	38
Perceived responsibility and anger.	38

Perceived responsibility and sympathy.	39
Perceived Magnitude of Consequence, Social Consensus, and Anger	40
Perceived Magnitude of Consequence, Social Consensus, and Sympathy	42
The Mediating Role of Anger and Sympathy	43
The Moderating Effects of Moral Identity and Negative Reciprocity	45
Moral identity as a moderator	46
Negative reciprocity as a moderator	52
CHAPTER 2.....	56
Study 1.....	56
Impact of Third Parties' Cognitive Evaluations of Supervisor Abuse on Their Emotional Response towards the Supervisor and Subordinate: An Experimental Test.....	56
Introduction and Hypotheses	56
Design.....	59
Manipulation checks.....	62
Anger towards the supervisor	62
Sympathy towards the subordinate.....	63
Control variables.....	63
Results	64
Manipulation checks.....	64
Hypothesis testing.....	64
Discussion	67
Summary	69
CHAPTER 3.....	70
Study 2.....	70
The Role of Moral Identity on Third Parties' Emotional and Behavioural Reactions to Supervisor Abuse	70
Introduction and Hypotheses	70
Participants and Procedures	74
Establishing a Context.....	74
Perceived responsibility	76
Perceived magnitude of consequences	76

Perceived social consensus.....	76
Anger towards the supervisor	77
Sympathy towards the subordinate.....	77
Retaliation against the supervisor.....	77
Support towards the subordinate.....	77
Moral identity.....	78
Control variables.....	78
Results	78
Discussion	95
Summary	97
CHAPTER 4.....	98
Study 3.....	98
The Role of Moral Identity and Negative Reciprocity on Third Parties' Emotional and Behavioural Reactions to Supervisor Abuse	98
Introduction and Hypotheses	98
Participants and Procedure.....	103
Measures	104
Co-worker perceived responsibility.....	104
Co-worker perceived magnitude of consequences	105
Co-worker perceived social consensus.....	105
Co-worker anger towards the supervisor.....	105
Co-worker sympathy towards the subordinate	105
Co-worker negative reciprocity	106
Co-worker moral identity	106
Target employee-rated co-worker retaliation towards the supervisor.....	106
Target employee-rated co-worker emotional support	107
Control variables.....	107
Results	107
Discussion	135
Summary	137
CHAPTER 5.....	139

General Discussion of Key Findings and Conclusions 139

 Main Effects of Cognitive Evaluations to Emotional Reactions 140

 Moderating Role of Moral Identity (Symbolization and Internalization)..... 144

 Moderating Role of Negative Reciprocity 147

 Theoretical and Practical Implications 152

 Methodological Limitations and Strengths of the Research 155

 Directions for Future Research 158

 Overall Conclusion 163

References..... 164

Appendix A..... 176

Participant Information Sheets, Consent Form, and Debriefing Sheets 176

Appendix B..... 182

Materials for Study 1 182

Appendix C..... 187

Materials for Study 2 187

Appendix D..... 197

Materials for Study 3 197

List of Tables

Table 1	Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for Anger and Sympathy in Study 1	66
Table 2	Descriptive Statistics, Zero-order Correlations, and Reliability of the Study Variables in Study 2	80
Table 3	Path Analytic Results: Indirect Effects at Low and High Levels of Moral Identity Symbolization	93
Table 4	Confirmatory Factor Analyses of Final Measurement Model and Alternative Models in Study 2	84
Table 5	Descriptive Statistics, Zero-order Correlations, and Reliability of the Study Variables in Study 3	109
Table 6	Path Analytic Results: Indirect Effects at Low and High Levels of Co Worker Moral Identity (Symbolization and Internalization)	126
Table 7	Path Analytic Results: Indirect Effects at Low and High Levels of Co-Worker Negative Reciprocity	132
Table 8	Overview of Hypotheses and Findings across Studies	149

List of Figures

Figure 1	Third Party Reactions to Abusive Supervision	17
Figure 2	The Predicted Relationships Between Perceived Responsibility, Magnitude of Consequence, and Social Consensus, and Emotional response	58
Figure 3	The Role of Moral Identity on Third Parties' Emotional and Behavioural Reactions to Supervisor Abuse	73
Figure 4	Simple Slope Analysis for Perceived Magnitude of Consequence and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Anger towards the Supervisor	87
Figure 5	Simple Slope Analysis for Anger towards the Supervisor and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Retaliation	87
Figure 6	Simple Slope Analysis for Perceived Magnitude of Consequence and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Anger towards the Supervisor	88
Figure 7	Simple Slope Analysis for Perceived Social Consensus and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Anger towards the Supervisor	88
Figure 8	Simple Slope Analysis for Perceived Responsibility and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Sympathy towards the Subordinate	91
Figure 9	Simple Slope Analysis for Sympathy towards the Subordinate and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Support	91
Figure 10	Simple Slope Analysis for Perceived Magnitude of Consequence and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Sympathy towards the Subordinate	92
Figure 11	Simple Slope Analysis for Perceived Social Consensus and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Sympathy towards the Subordinate	92
Figure 12	The Role of Moral Identity and Negative Reciprocity Beliefs on Third Parties' Emotional and Behavioural Reactions to Supervisor Abuse	102
Figure 13	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Perceived Responsibility and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Co-worker rated Anger towards the Supervisor	113
Figure 14	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Target Employee Rated Co-worker Retaliation	113
Figure 15	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Perceived Responsibility and Moral Identity (Internalization) Predicting Co-worker rated Anger towards the Supervisor	114
Figure 16	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor and Moral Identity (Internalization) Predicting Target Employee Rated Co-worker Retaliation	114
Figure 17	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Magnitude of Consequence and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Co-	116

	worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor	
Figure 18	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Magnitude of Consequence and Moral Identity (Internalization) Predicting Co-worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor	117
Figure 19	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Social Consensus and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Co-Worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor	118
Figure 20	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Social Consensus and Moral Identity (Internalization) Predicting Co-Worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor	119
Figure 21	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Perceived Responsibility and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Co-worker rated Sympathy towards the Subordinate	120
Figure 22	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Perceived Responsibility and Moral Identity (Internalization) Predicting Co-worker rated Sympathy towards the Subordinate	121
Figure 23	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Sympathy towards the Subordinate and Moral Identity (Internalization) Predicting Target Employee Rated Co-worker Support	122
Figure 24	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Magnitude of Consequence and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Co-worker Rated Sympathy towards the Subordinate	124
Figure 25	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Magnitude of Consequence and Moral Identity (Internalization) Predicting Co-worker Rated Sympathy towards the Subordinate	124
Figure 26	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Perceived Responsibility and Negative Reciprocity Predicting Co-worker rated Anger towards the Supervisor	133
Figure 27	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Magnitude of Consequence and Negative Reciprocity Predicting Co-worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor	133
Figure 28	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Social Consensus and Negative Reciprocity Predicting Co-Worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor	134
Figure 29	Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor and Negative Reciprocity Predicting Target Employee Rated Co-worker Retaliation	134

CHAPTER 1

Third Party Reactions to Supervisor Abuse: The Roles of Perceived Responsibility and Moral Intensity

A man we will call Tony worked as an assistant manager for four years in a grocery store which was part of a small chain. He was above average in the performance of his administrative duties and was, in many respects, an exceptional employee and a hard worker. However, the head office noticed that there was a very high turnover rate among employees at Tony's store. In order to identify the problem, they circulated a questionnaire and asked employees to fill them out on a voluntary and confidential basis. The survey had employees identify concerns or problems in the workplace. When the survey results came in, the top five answers on the board all had Tony's name on them. A number of people said that Tony did not treat employees with respect and gave them little, if any, positive feedback. He spoke to them in a negative and belittling manner, including telling them repeatedly that they could easily be replaced. His use of vulgar language was directed at them (rather than at a situation). It would appear that Tony was also in the habit of making derogatory comments about employees in their absence (Canning, 2007).

Regrettably, tales of abusive supervision in the workplace such as the one previously cited are far from uncommon. In fact, the Australian Council of Trade Unions survey in 2000 found that nearly 70 percent of employees have been mistreated by their supervisors (Pollard, 2004). Similarly, a survey of 2,146 Australian employees showed that almost half (44%) have witnessed their co-workers being mistreated at work (Gettler, 2008). In the US, it is estimated that 10 to 15 percent of employees are subjected to supervisor abuse (Namie & Namie, 2000; Schat, Frone, & Kellaway, 2006). In a recent study in the Philippines, 34 percent of respondents representing various nursing occupations (e.g., educators, clinical practitioners) reported that they have experienced verbal abuse at work (Fujishiro, Gee, & de Castro, 2011). The figures stated clearly

suggest that supervisor abuse transcends cultural and national boundaries and these increasingly frequent reports of the destructive side of supervisory behaviour have prompted a growing number of organisational researchers to investigate this phenomenon (Tepper, 2007). Indeed, Tepper, Moss, and Duffy (2011) noted that “despite its low base-rate, abusive supervision is a costly workplace phenomenon in terms of lost productivity, absenteeism, turnover, and health-care expenditures” (p. 291).

Scholars have noted that much of the aggression that takes place at work is verbal and non-physical (Baron & Neuman, 1996; Braverman, 1999; Keashly, Trott, & Mclean, 1994). In this dissertation, I focus on abusive supervision, formally defined as “subordinates’ perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviors, excluding physical contact” (Tepper, 2000, p. 178). Examples of abusive supervision include belittling, yelling, invading the subordinates’ privacy, and embarrassing subordinates in front of others (Tepper, 2000; 2007).

Prior work on abusive supervision has focused on three lines of research. The first line of research has examined the consequences of abusive supervision on a wide-range of employee attitudinal (e.g., organisational commitment; Tepper, Duffy, & Shaw, 2001; job satisfaction; Tepper, 2000); behavioural (e.g., organisational deviance; Thau, Bennett, Mitchell, & Marrs, 2009; weak team member creativity; Liu, Liao, & Loi, in-press); and psychological outcomes (e.g., somatic complaints, psychological distress; Restubog, Scott, & Zagenczyk, 2011). Compared to non-abused employees, subordinates who experience abusive supervision report higher turnover, less favourable attitudes toward

their job, life and organisation, and are more likely to reciprocate with supervisor-targeted aggression and behave in counterproductive ways.

A second line of research has examined the moderating (e.g., personality and cultural factors) and mediating (e.g., affective commitment and organisational justice) variables that link abusive supervision and work outcomes (Lian, Ferris, & Brown, 2012; Liu, Kwan, Wu, & Wu, 2010; Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al., 2001; Tepper, Henle, Lambert, Gicalone, & Duffy, 2008). For example, Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) found that negative reciprocity beliefs (e.g., when someone mistreats them, it is acceptable to retaliate in return) moderate the positive relationship between abusive supervision and deviance. Abused employees with high as opposed to low negative reciprocity beliefs are more likely to engage in deviance directed towards their supervisor.

Finally, an emerging line of work has explored the dispositional and contextual factors that contribute to the occurrence of abusive supervision. These studies suggested that abusive supervision is a resulting outcome of how supervisors perceive themselves as being unjustly treated by their organisation (e.g., organisational injustices; Aryee, Chen, Sun, Debrah, 2007; Rafferty, Restubog & Jimmieson, 2010; Tepper, Duffy, Henle, Lambert, 2006) and its agents (e.g., psychological contract violation; Hoobler & Brass, 2006). More recently, there has been evidence to suggest that abusive supervision is influenced by supervisors' previous family experiences (e.g., family undermining; Kiewitz et al., 2012), personality characteristics (e.g., Machiavellianism; Kiazad, Restubog, Zagenczyk, Kiewitz, & Tang, 2010), and the broader organisational environment (e.g., aggressive organisational culture; Restubog et al., 2011).

To date, much of the research on abusive supervision has focused on the dyadic relationship between the supervisor and subordinate, overlooking the fact that individual employees are embedded within a range of formal and informal relationships (Emerson, 1976). Previous studies have emphasised the need to expand the examination of interpersonal processes beyond the dyadic relationship (i.e., supervisor-subordinate) because it is likely that incidents of abusive supervision can potentially affect individuals who are not directly involved in this relationship (Bordia, Restubog, Bordia, & Tang, 2010; Emerson, 1976). Justice theories suggest that co-workers can make judgments on how others are treated and react emotionally and behaviorally (Colquitt, 2004; Skarlicki & Rupp, 2005; van den Bos & Lind, 2001). Observing how others are being treated unjustly can trigger emotions, which can drive individuals to intervene with the situation (Bies & Shapiro, 1987; Turillo, Folger, Lavelle, Umphress, & Gee, 2002).

Third parties refer to “individuals who are neither the direct target of an injustice nor the perpetrator of the act” (O’Reilly & Aquino, 2011, p. 526). In this research, third parties refer to co-workers who have observed supervisors engage in hostile behaviours directed toward their subordinates. This dissertation focuses on co-workers as third parties for several reasons. First, compared to other third parties such as labour arbitrators and family members, co-workers spend a considerable amount of time with other employees in the workplace. As such, co-workers are more knowledgeable with the experiences of an abused subordinate given the likelihood of witnessing the abuses perpetrated by the supervisor (Gyekye & Salminen, 2006). Second, co-workers are more likely to feel that they might be subjected to similar harm (Low, Radhakrishnan, Scanerder, & Rounds, 2007). Prolonged exposure to workplace mistreatment leads co-

workers to feel frustrated and think that the organisation cannot curtail the negative behaviours of abusive supervisors. For these reasons, co-workers can be considered as the most affected third parties in the context of abusive supervision.

Accordingly, the overarching goal of the current research program is to examine the resulting cognitive evaluations and emotional and behavioural reactions to abusive supervision. Thus, I ask the question: how do third parties assess and respond upon witnessing supervisor abuse? Drawing upon Weiner's (1986, 2000) attribution theory, I develop and test a novel research model in which third parties' perception of an unfavorable event (e.g., abusive supervision) leads to an affective reaction, which in turn influences their behaviours. Third parties engage in a cognitive sense-making process to determine the extent to which the supervisor is responsible for the event. Building on attribution theory, I also integrate Jones' (1991) moral intensity framework to argue that an assessment of the magnitude of consequences and social consensus of the "badness" of the supervisor abuse results in a more comprehensive evaluation of the observed event. Altogether, perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequences, and perceived social consensus result in anger and sympathy. This, in turn, results in retaliatory behaviours directed at the supervisor and support towards the subordinate.

Attribution theory (Weiner, 1986; 1995) also acknowledges that third parties' reactions as a result of attribution process may vary from one individual to another. To this end, I propose that the strength of third parties' reactions to supervisor abuse is also contingent upon dispositional factors. Specifically, it is proposed that dispositional characteristics such as moral identity and negative reciprocity will play a major role in the proposed relationships. Moral identity and negative reciprocity were considered as

these two personal factors have been found to be relevant in moral decision making (Eisenberger, Lynch, Aselage, & Rohdieck, 2004; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987).

Moral identity refers to the degree that the moral self is salient to an individual's identity and self-concept (Aquino & Reed, 2002). A high moral identity person is someone "for whom moral schemas are chronically available, readily primed, and easily activated for information processing" (Lapsly & Lasky, 2001, p. 347). The social-cognitive perspective posits that individuals whose moral identity occupies greater centrality within self-concept are more likely to place importance on being a moral person across different situations (Aquino, Freeman, Reed, Lim, & Felps, 2009). Thus, the moral identity literature suggests that individuals whose morals are central to their identity are more likely to translate these beliefs into action. Empirical evidence has shown that moral identity exerts strong influence on individual's emotions and behaviours related to moral functioning (Aquino et al., 2009; Aquino, Reed, Thau, & Freeman, 2007; Reynolds & Ceramic, 2007; Skarlicki, Van Jaarsveld, & Walker, 2008; Winterick, Mittal & Ross, 2009). For example, Skarlicki et al (2008) found that employees with high as opposed to low moral identity are more inclined to engage in customer-directed sabotage in response to customer interpersonal injustice. In light of these findings, I theorise that moral identity can exert a strong influence on third parties' emotional and behavioural reactions upon witnessing abusive supervision.

According to the view of internalized norm of reciprocity (Perugini, Galluci, Presaghi, & Ercolani, 2003), individuals who endorse negative reciprocity beliefs (e.g., belief that people who treat others poorly should be treated poorly in return) pay more attention and respond favourably to negative interpersonal behaviour. This perspective

further posits that individuals who hold high negative reciprocity beliefs are more sensitive to hostile behaviours espoused by others. As such, individuals high in negative reciprocity beliefs are more inclined to react negatively when they believe that the perpetrator should have behaved otherwise. For example, previous research has shown that individuals with high as opposed to low negative reciprocity beliefs reported greater anger and demonstrated more retaliation after experiencing interpersonal mistreatment (Eisenberger, Lynch, Aselage, & Rohdieck, 2007; Garcia, Restubog, Denson, 2010).

Taken together, this dissertation proposes a moderated mediation model that accounts for third parties' emotional reaction (e.g., anger and sympathy) and dispositional factors (negative reciprocity and moral identity) in the relationship between cognitive evaluations and behavioural reactions (retaliation and support) to supervisor abuse (see Figure 1). By testing these proposed relationships, this dissertation contributes to both the management and abusive supervision literatures in several important ways.

First, with a few exceptions (e.g., studies on abusive supervision and family undermining and relationship tension; Carlson, Ferguson, Perrewe, Whitten, 2011; Hoobler & Brass, 2006; Restubog et al. 2011;), research and theory on abusive supervision literature generally fall within the confines of the typical supervisor-subordinate relationship. This research further extends our knowledge on this phenomenon by examining the cognitive appraisals and reactions of third parties – who are not direct targets of supervisor hostility – but serve as bystanders or witnesses to such an event. A systematic examination of third parties' reactions is important because witnesses can be instrumental in both retaliating to the perpetrator and assisting the victim (O'Reilly & Aquino, 2011; Simmons, Umphress, Folger, Bobocel, & Ren, 2011;

Skarlicki & Rupp, 2010). For example, third parties may use indirect strategies to retaliate against the supervisor. Third parties also get involved by reporting the mistreatment to organisational authorities for the supervisor to be sanctioned or reprimanded (Bowes-Sperry & Powell, 1999; Near & Miceli, 1996) as well as providing support to the victim (Bowes-Sperry & Powell, 1999). Although considerable theoretical and empirical work has been done on bystander interventions (Bowes-Sperry & Powell, 1999; Hegtvedt, et al., 2010; O’Leary-Kelly, Tiedt, & Bowes-Sperry, 2004; Parzefall & Salin, 2010; Rupp & Bell, 2010; Skarlicki, Ellard, & Kelln, 1998; Skarlicki & Rupp, 2010; Vartia, 2001; Williams, Brown, Less-Haley, & Price, 1995), studies have offered an incomplete examination on why and how third parties react to negative organisational events. Most empirical studies (Skarlicki & Rupp, 2010; Skarlicki et al., 1998) on third parties’ reactions to organisational justice have only captured the relationship between cognitive perceptions and behavioural intentions (e.g., retributive intentions) without considering the role of affective responses. Thus, the proposed research program contributes to the literature by bringing together third parties’ cognitive sense making, emotional response, and behavioural reactions to supervisor abuse, all of which have not been integrated in one study.

Second, prior work on abusive supervision has been examined from the lens of social exchange (e.g., Harris, Kacmar, & Zivnuska, 2007), justice (e.g., Tepper, 2000), displaced aggression (e.g., Hoobler & Brass, 2006), transactional theory of stress and coping (Restubog et al., 2011), and organisational support (Shoss, Eisenberger, Restubog, & Zagenczyk, in press) theories. While these theories have provided a platform for explaining the underlying mechanisms of abusive supervision, it did not capture its moral

dimension. Why is it important to frame abusive supervision from a moral perspective? Labelling supervisor abuse as a moral issue clarifies our understanding of how third parties are likely to exhibit consistency between their moral principles and moral emotions, and moral behaviours. In examining moral intensity dimensions, I offer issue-based moral mechanisms that can explain third parties' response to abusive supervision. Thus, this paper provides a broader understanding of morally-motivated response to abusive supervision.

Lastly, considering that abusive supervision is a subjective phenomenon (Martinko, Harvey, Sikora, & Douglas, 2011; Martinko, Sikora, & Harvey, 2012; Tepper, 2007), it is expected that there would be vast empirical research focusing on individual differences and perceptions of abuse. Surprisingly, Martinko et al. (2012) reported that there is limited research (e.g. Burton & Hoobler, 2006; subordinates' self-esteem and perceptions of supervisor abuse; Wu & Hu, 2009; affectivity and perceptions of supervisor abuse) that directly examined the link between individual differences and perceptions of supervisor abuse. Most of these studies have focused on its negative ramifications to employees and organisations, in general (Tepper, 2007). Although this line of work has been useful in understanding the cost of supervisor abuse, this study intends to uncover a fundamental yet relatively less explored area which is how employees generally perceive and interpret abusive behaviours. Specifically, this research contributes to the literature by exploring the role of third parties' perceptions of abusive supervision in shaping their emotions and behaviours.

Figure 1. Third party reactions to abusive supervision.

Review of Literature

Consequences of Abusive Supervision

Abusive supervision refers to subordinate's perceptions of verbal and non-verbal hostile behaviours of supervisors, excluding physical contact (Tepper, 2000). It has three key characteristics. First, abusive supervision entails a continuing display of hierarchical mistreatment (Tepper, 2007), and not just an isolated outburst of negative supervisory behaviours (Harris et al., 2007). Second, it is based on the subordinate's perspective and his/her assessment of the supervisor's behaviour (Tepper, 2007). Lastly, although abusive supervision is considered as a volitional behaviour, the supervisor's intended outcome is not inherent in the definition mentioned (Tepper, 2007). Thus, supervisors may engage in abusive behaviours as a means to achieve organisational goals and not necessarily to inflict harm towards subordinates.

Extant research has identified numerous outcomes of abusive supervision. The succeeding section provides an in-depth discussion on the impact of abusive supervision in terms of the following: (1) employees' attitudes, (2) employees' behaviours, and (3) employees' health and well-being.

Employees' attitudes. In his seminal work, Tepper (2000) shed light on various attitudinal outcomes of abusive supervision. He found that abusive supervision has negative ramifications on employees' organisational commitment and job satisfaction. This suggests that abused subordinates are more likely to experience less sense of attachment towards the company. Moreover, subordinates who perceived their supervisors as abusive are less satisfied with their job. In addition, the negative effect of abusive supervision on job satisfaction was more pronounced for subordinates who feel

that they have limited employment alternatives. Thus, abused subordinates who do not have the means to leave their organisation are less contented with their current work. In another study, Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, and Ensley (2004) found that abusive supervision can result in pessimistic attributions of their co-worker's positive behaviours. Specifically, the organisational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) performed by co-workers were seen in a negative light by employees who work in an abusive environment. OCBs are discretionary behaviours related to cooperation and helpfulness to others that support organisational effectiveness (Organ, 1988). In this regard, abused employees perceived co-workers' OCBs to be self-serving, which in turn also negatively influenced their job satisfaction (Tepper et al., 2004). In sum, these studies suggest that abusive supervision has severe negative effects on employees' work attitudes. Compared to their non-abused counterparts, subordinates who experience abusive supervision tend to have unfavourable attitudes toward the organisation in general and their job, in particular.

Employees' behaviours. Much of what is written on abusive supervision has explored its consequences on employees' work behaviours. Specifically, considerable research has examined abusive supervision and its impact on employees' in-role performance (i.e., work behaviours that are formally reflected in the employment contract; Williams & Anderson, 1991) and OCBs (i.e., work behaviours that go beyond their job description; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000).

The study of Harris et al. (2007) reported a negative relationship between abusive supervision and in-role performance. From a social exchange perspective (Blau, 1964), behavioural reactions to abusive supervision have been explained as an outcome of negative reciprocity; that is, unfavourable supervisor treatment may be reciprocated with

lower levels of performance. Drawing on social learning theory (Bandura, 1973), Liu and colleagues (in press) demonstrated the cascading effect of abusive supervision on employee creativity. Department leader abusive supervision was negatively related to team member's performance in terms of developing novel and innovative ideas, through its influence on team leader abusive behaviours. Similarly, recipients of abusive supervision are less likely to engage in OCBs (Aryee et al., 2007; Aryee, Sun, Chen, Debrah, 2008; Tepper et al., 2004; Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002). For example, in a study of 373 National Guard members and their military supervisors, Zellars and her colleagues (2002) found that abused subordinates were more likely to withhold OCBs such as helping co-workers, expressing loyalty to the organisation, and behaving politely to other members of the organisation. However, the study emphasised that abused subordinates may still engage in OCBs when these are perceived by the employees as part of their job requirements. In another study, employees who feel stressed as a result of supervisor abuse had less personal initiative such as solving problems and engaging in cooperative activities (Aryee et al., 2008). Collectively, these findings suggest that abusive supervision has deleterious effects on both formal task performance and discretionary work behaviours that promote organisational effectiveness.

Another important outcome of abusive supervision that has caught the interest of organisational scholars is workplace deviance, defined as “voluntary behaviours of organisational members that violate significant organisational norms and in doing so threatens the well-being of an organisation, its members, or both” (Robinson & Benett, 1997, p. 556). In a sample of individuals called for jury duty, Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) found that abusive supervision is associated with various types of deviant

behaviours (e.g., supervisor-directed deviance, interpersonal deviance, and organisational deviance). Subordinates who experienced supervisor abuse are most likely to retaliate against their supervisor by making fun of the supervisor, gossiping about the supervisor, and acting rudely towards the supervisor. Guided by the displaced aggression framework, they also argued that aggression can be displaced from the original foci to other targets, particularly when the original transgressor is not available or more powerful and likely to be feared (Marcus-Newhall, Pederson, Carlson, & Miller, 2000). In support of this, they found that employees who experienced abusive supervision engage in deviant behaviours directed towards the organisation and other organisational members.

In another study, Tepper et al. (2008, study 1) proposed that organisational deviance can be considered as a direct form of retaliation. Employees resort to deviant acts because they blame the organisation for its failure to manage the hostile behaviours of their supervisors. For this reason, the authors argued that the organisation is accountable for a supervisor's hostility. In addition, they found that affective commitment mediated the relationship between abusive supervision and organisational deviance – and that the link between commitment and deviance was stronger when employees perceived that deviance was an acceptable norm within the organisation.

Research linking abusive supervision and deviance is influenced by several dispositional and situational variables. For instance, abused as opposed to non-abused employees who have high negative reciprocity beliefs (when someone mistreats them, it is acceptable to retaliate in return; for review see Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005) were more inclined to engage in supervisor-directed deviance (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007). Using a power-dependence approach, Tepper and his colleagues (2009) argued that

intentions of quitting explain employees' less dependence on the organisation, thereby predisposing them to retaliate by engaging in deviant acts. When employees' intention to leave the organisation is high, abusive supervision is more strongly related to both organisational and supervisor directed deviance (Tepper et al., 2009). Contextual factors such as management styles also influenced the relationship between abusive supervision and organisational deviance (Thau et al., 2009). Drawing on uncertainty management theory, Thau and colleagues (2009) found that authoritarian management style which espouses strict rules and a more predictable environment curtails the effect of abusive supervision on organisational deviance.

More recently, research has explored how abusive supervision affects employees' behaviours outside the work context. In particular, studies have demonstrated that abused subordinates direct their work resentment and frustration to other convenient targets (Hoobler & Brass, 2006; Restubog et al., 2011). This represents a downhill pattern of abuse, in which an abused subordinate's feeling of displeasure is vented out to family members. This occurs because direct retaliation is not a feasible option for an abused subordinate given its unwanted consequences such as job loss. Building on this research, Restubog and his colleagues (2011) clarified the role of gender in influencing the relationship between psychological distress and spouse undermining. They found a stronger positive relationship between psychological distress and spouse undermining for men as opposed to women. Altogether, this body of work has shown that employees, in some cases, are likely to retaliate against supervisors who are perceived as abusive, and in other cases, that employees will direct their aggression via spouse undermining.

Employees' health, well-being, and family functioning. Research on abusive supervision has also investigated its relationship to employees' health and well-being. For example, abusive supervision was positively associated with emotional exhaustion (Harvey, Stoner, Hochwarter, & Kacmar, 2007; Wu & Hu, 2009; Yagil, 2006). Drawing upon the conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 2002), mistreatment from supervisors can be viewed as an interpersonal stressor. Abused subordinates exert psychological effort in order to manage this negative event, and in so doing, psychological resources are gradually depleted. This in turn results in emotional exhaustion. The impact of abusive supervision on emotional exhaustion also varies given certain conditions. High levels of emotional exhaustion were observed among abused subordinates who refrain from ingratiation (i.e., promoting social networks and close relationship with other members of the organisation; Harvey et al., 2007), and when subordinates perceive that they have less employment opportunities outside their current organisation (Tepper, 2000).

There has also been evidence to suggest that abusive supervision induces psychological distress; that is, employees are more likely to experience fear, anxiety, and depression as a result of supervisor abuse (Restubog et al., 2011; Tepper, 2000; Tepper, Moss, Lockhart, & Carr, 2007). Moreover, Rafferty et al. (2010) found that psychological distress arising from experiences of supervisor abuse resulted in insomnia as reported by the employees' spouse. Additionally, affective and psychological reactions are likely to ensue when abused subordinates fail to speak up and communicate their grievances toward their supervisors (Tepper et al., 2007). Problem drinking has also been identified as an outcome of abusive supervision. Bamberger and Bachrach (2006) reported that subordinates working in divisions managed by an abusive supervisor were more likely to

report a drinking problem. However, the relationship between abusive supervision and alcohol consumption was weaker for employees who are high as opposed to low in agreeableness (i.e., good-natured, emphatic, and courteous individuals) and conscientiousness (i.e., dependable and self-disciplined individuals). In a recent study (Carlson et al., 2011), it was found that abusive supervision can spill over to the employee's overall family well-being. The authors reported that abused subordinates tend to experience relationship tensions with their partners which ultimately result in poor family well-being. Collectively, these studies demonstrate that abusive supervision has damaging consequences on employees' physical and psychological health.

Antecedents of Abusive Supervision

Factors that predict the occurrence of abusive supervision has also captured the interest of organisational scholars. Previous research has investigated contextual variables, dispositional characteristics, and early life experiences that predict the occurrence of abusive supervision in the workplace.

In relation to contextual conditions, studies point to perceptions of organisational fairness as an antecedent to supervisor abuse (Aryee et al., 2007; Hoobler & Brass, 2006; Tepper et al., 2006). As set forth by the justice literature (Aquino, Lewis, & Bradfield, 1999; Cropanzano & Prehar, 2001; Krehbel & Cropanzano, 2000), employees who observed unfair procedures and decision-making in the organisation generally elicit negative feelings such as anger and frustration. Consistent with this proposition, Tepper and colleagues (2006) reported that supervisors who experience procedural injustice are more likely to suffer from depression, which in turn, results in perceived supervisor abuse. Building on these findings and anchored on victim precipitation theory (Aquino &

Bradfield, 2000; Aquino, Grover, Bradfield, & Allen, 1999), organisational scholars suggested that abusive behaviours are more likely to be expressed only to those targets deemed as vulnerable such as those subordinates with high negative affectivity (Tepper et al., 2006). Individuals with high negativity turn out to be an ideal target because of the general perception that they are weak and most of the time stressed out. Thus, they are not likely to engage in counter-retaliation (Aquino et al., 1999). Abusive supervisory behaviours are also shaped when frustration and resentment are influenced by interactional injustice (Aryee et al., 2007), which refers to the quality of interpersonal interaction between individuals and how decisions are communicated to employees (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). The negative relationship between interactional justice and abusive supervision is significantly greater when supervisors hold an authoritarian leadership style (Aryee et al., 2007). Integrating psychological contract theory and abusive supervision, Hoobler and Brass' (2006) research findings revealed that supervisors' perception of psychological contract violation is positively related to subordinates' perception of abusive supervision. In sum, these studies suggest that experiences of inequity and injustice serve as a precursor of supervisory abuse.

Extending beyond justice explanations, Restubog and his colleagues (2011) demonstrated that supervisors entrenched in aggressive work environments are likely to engage in abusive acts as perceived by their subordinates. In another study, Kiazad and his colleagues (2010) explored the role of supervisor's Machiavellianism as an antecedent to abusive supervision. They found a positive relationship between the supervisor's high Machiavellianism orientation and abusive supervision and this relationship was mediated by authoritarian leadership behaviours. Supervisors with high

levels of Machiavellian orientation are perceived abusive by their subordinates because they use controlling and punishment tactics in order to achieve employee compliance (Kiazad et al., 2010). Adopting a social learning perspective, Kiewitz and colleagues (2012) found that early life experiences of family undermining can increase the likelihood of an individual to engage in abusive supervisory behaviours. Supervisors who experienced hostile family treatment are more likely to be abusive in the workplace. This relationship was weaker for supervisors with high as opposed to low self control.

In summary, previous work on abusive supervision has examined its antecedents and consequences on various work and non-work-related outcomes (see Figure 2 for a schematic diagram of abusive supervision literature). Undoubtedly, abusive supervision is a negative experience for employees, and it can potentially result in increased attributional processing even for non-targets (Weiner, 1995). Hostile supervisor behaviours such as belittling and ridiculing can threaten other employees and lead them to wonder why these situations occur (Hastie, 1984; Weiner, 1985). To date, very little is known how third parties perceive and respond to abusive supervision. The succeeding section provides a detailed discussion on the different types of third parties, in what ways are they affected, and their reactions to supervisor abuse.

Third Parties in Abusive Supervision

Third party observers are individuals who are neither the direct target of supervisor abuse nor the person responsible for the act (O'Reilly & Aquino, 2011). They can generally be classified into two groups: (1) informal (e.g., co-workers, family members, and friends); and (2) formal observers (e.g., judges, labour arbitrators; Skarlicki & Rupp, 2010). Moreover, other stakeholders of the organisation including the

general public, investors, customers, and government officials can also be regarded as third parties. Third parties may gain information about abusive supervision through direct and in-direct means (Skarlicki & Kulik, 2005). For example, a co-worker witnessing a supervisor belittling another employee or being aware of supervisor abuse by listening to stories narrated by other observers and/or victims. This research specifically focuses on co-workers who have firsthand knowledge about supervisor abuse directed towards a subordinate. Trevino (1992) emphasised that extreme awareness such as personally observing abusive supervision is critical to initiate cognitive appraisals and reactions among third parties.

The impact of supervisor abuse among third parties should be given importance in organisational research for several reasons. First, prior studies have shown that observing supervisor mistreatment directed towards a fellow employee have detrimental consequences to third parties (Christian, Christian, Garza, & Ellis, 2012; Glomb, Richman, Hulin, & Drasgow, 1997; Lutgen-Sandvik, Tracy, & Alberts, 2007; Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2007; Porath & Erez, 2009; Vartia, 2001). For instance, Miner-Rubino and Cortina (2007) found that witnessing supervisor hostility has negatively impacted third parties' organisational commitment. Similarly, direct witnesses of abuse reported higher levels of negativity (e.g., fear), stress reactions, and reduced job satisfaction (Cartia, 2001; Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2007). Moreover, observing supervisor rudeness resulted in a reduction of third parties' task performance and citizenship behaviours (Porath & Erez, 2009). Scholars argued that even though third parties are not the direct victims, they are affected upon observing supervisor abuse given the apprehension of becoming the next target of hostility (Frijda, 1993; Truss, 2005; Weiss & Cropanzano,

1996). Collectively, these studies show that the consequences of supervisor abuse extend beyond the target and negatively affect third parties' attitudes, behaviours, and psychological well-being.

Second, third parties can influence victims' attitudinal and behavioural reactions (Skarlicki & Kulik, 2005). For example, third parties can persuade the victim to believe that his/her experience is a violation of human rights (Barley, 1991) and encourage them to file a case against perpetrators (Goldman, 1999). Lastly, third parties can be pro-active and take corrective actions to address supervisor abuse. For example, third parties may engage in direct strategies to punish the offender such as threatening or harming the supervisor (Porath & Erez, 2009). They may also offer indirect intervention by informing authorities about the supervisor's abusive behaviours and persuading other employees to be indifferent towards the supervisor or provide emotional support and assistance to the victim (Bowes-Sperry & Powell, 1999; Granrose, Parasuraman, & Greenhaus, 1992; Hegtvedt et al., 2009; Near & Miceli, 1996).

Theoretical Framework and Hypothesis Development

Events considered immoral draw out attribution processing to a greater extent compared to positive events (Weiner, 1995). This is because people have a strong tendency to engage in causal search (i.e., asking why and how it occurred) and imagine "what might have been" when an event results in unfavorable outcomes (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001). An event qualifies as a moral issue based on two important criteria (Jones, 1991; Velasquez & Rostankowski, 1985); first, if the event involves a person's freely chosen actions and second, if these actions can potentially cause harm to others. Abusive supervision meets the first criterion given that it has been conceptualised as

willful behaviour (Tepper, 2000); that is, supervisors voluntarily engage in hostile behaviour for a specific purpose (i.e., to improve performance or cause harm; Tepper, 2007). In line with the second criterion, previous research has shown that abusive supervision is strongly associated with negative outcomes, such as poor subordinates' health and well-being (e.g., psychological distress and emotional exhaustion; Grandey, Kern, & Frone, 2007; Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007; Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al., 2004; Yagil, 2006), and negative employee work attitudes and performance (Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al., 2009). Because abusive supervision is conceptualised as a conscious and deliberate act taken by the supervisor to achieve a specific goal (e.g., increase productivity, inflict harm) and that it has the potential to harm subordinates, supervisor abuse can be regarded as a moral issue.

Weiner's (1986, 2000) attribution theory provides an explanatory framework on how third parties respond to moral events such as abusive supervision. It proposes that cognitive evaluations or inferences made about a moral event elicit emotional responses, which in turn guides an individual's behavioural reactions (Weiner, 1995). When third parties witness supervisor abuse, they are more likely to take on the role of moral vigilantes, prompted to interpret the event and assign responsibility to the individual (e.g., supervisor) perpetrating the mistreatment. Aside from inferences of responsibility, third parties also consider the nature of the moral event before they arrive at a decision to engage in a particular course of action. To this end, I draw on moral intensity theory (Jones, 1991), which highlights the importance of assessing the characteristics of the moral event. It consists of six dimensions: (1) the magnitude of consequences (i.e., collective harm done to victims); (2) social consensus (i.e., societal agreement about the

goodness or badness of an act); (3) the probability of effect (i.e., a joint function of the likelihood that the event and perceived consequences of the act are to happen in the future); (4) temporal immediacy, (i.e., length of time between the act and its consequences); (5) proximity (i.e., degree to which an individual can relate to potential victims or beneficiaries); and (6) concentration of effect (i.e., the number of people affected by the act). As the intensity of each dimension increases, the perception that an event is construed as a moral issue also increases (Jones, 1991).

I focus on magnitude of consequences and social consensus because the presence of harm and perceived violation of social norms are the most vivid and salient factors that foster recognition of moral issues (Reynolds, 2006; Singhapakdi, Vitell, & Kraft, 1996). In addition, magnitude of consequence and social consensus have been reported as the best predictors of an individual's behavioural intentions (Davis, Johnson, & Ohmer, 1998; Goels, White, Beebe, Dorantes, & Hewitt, 2006; Singhapakdi et al., 1996). In the following sections, I review the literature on each of the key variables and formally propose the hypotheses.

Perceived Responsibility, Retaliation, and Support

In evaluating events associated with moral transgressions, individuals are concerned whether the perpetrator can be held responsible for their actions (Weiner, 1995). Responsibility refers to the “judgment made about a person—he or she should or ought to have done otherwise” (Weiner, 1995, p. 8). Hence, appraisal of responsibility entails holding a person accountable for his/her choice and freedom of action (Weiner, 1995; 2000). Attribution theory posits that appraisal of responsibility is derived from perceptions of controllability and intentionality (Betancourt & Blair, 1992; Gundlach,

Douglas, & Martinko, 2003; Ho & Venus, 1995; Weiner, 1995). Controllability refers to whether or not the event is subject to personal influence, while intentionality deals with engaging in a socially-inappropriate behaviour with foresight and knowledge of its consequences (Weiner, 1995).

In the context of the present study, appraisal of responsibility is directed to the source of harm—the abusive supervisor. Third parties will assess the extent to which the witnessed event (i.e., abusive supervision) is controllable and intentional. Controllability becomes salient when third parties attribute the hostility of the supervisor to situations he or she has full control of rather than originating from uncontrollable factors (Breux, Tepper, Carr, & Folger, 2010). For instance, Kiazad and colleagues (2010) theorised and found support that supervisors are perceived to be abusive when they engage in authoritarian leadership behaviours (e.g., being controlling and using punishment tactics). Third parties are therefore inclined to regard the supervisors' leadership behavior as within his/her power and control. In addition, one of the distinct features of abusive supervision is that it is a sustained display of hierarchical mistreatment and not a one-off outburst of verbal or non-verbal hostility (Tepper, 2000). Thus, witnessing abusive supervision for extended periods of time enables third parties to infer that these are volitional acts on the part of the supervisor. However, we should note that intention is not an inherent definition of abusive supervision; that is, the purpose in engaging in such an act (whether to directly harm another or improve performance) is relatively unknown. Nevertheless, abusive supervision is primarily based on subjective perceptions (Tepper, 2000). Even if third parties do not have an absolute knowledge of the supervisor's true intention, what is important is how third parties perceive it *per se*.

Perceived responsibility and retaliation. Attribution theory and related research on moral transgressions (Allred, 1999; Betancourt & Blair, 1992; Ho & Venus, 1995; Ryan & Wessel, 2012; Williams et al., 1995) suggest that when perpetrators are held responsible, third parties are more likely to engage in negative actions against the perpetrator (e.g., retaliation). Retaliation is aimed at preventing harmful behaviours (e.g., supervisor abuse) from happening in the future (Allred, 1999). If the supervisor's harmful behaviour is perceived as within his/her control and intentional, third party retaliation becomes more meaningful and is expected to deter the likelihood of supervisor abuse from occurring again (Martinko, Gundlach & Douglas, 2002; Weiner, 1995).

Retaliation is defined as a behaviour that intends to “make the wrongdoer pay” for moral transgression or event that harms or jeopardises the victim (Skarlicki & Folger, 2004, p. 374). Accordingly, employees can engage in both direct and indirect forms of retaliation (Baron & Neuman, 1998). Direct forms of retaliation are exhibited face-to-face (e.g., screaming, cursing), while indirect forms are expressed in a more subtle manner (e.g., gossiping or spreading rumours about the supervisor; Green, Richardson, & Lago, 1996; Richardson & Green, 1999). I focus on indirect forms of retaliation as previous research suggests that direct aggression against supervisors is relatively rare due to the power asymmetry in supervisor-subordinate relationships (Bies & Tripp, 1996). Indirect retaliation appears to be the most viable option for subordinates to achieve their goals of seeking retribution and rectifying wrongdoings in the organisation while reducing the risk of being identified and becoming targets of counter-retaliation from the supervisor (Jahawar, 2002). When the supervisor is perceived as responsible, third parties are more likely to engage in indirect retaliation towards the supervisor.

Perceived responsibility and support. Attribution theory also posits that when a perpetrator is seen as responsible, third parties are more likely to exhibit altruistic behaviours towards the victim (Weiner, 1986; 2000). When the perpetrator is considered as fully aware of the consequences of his/her behavior, the act is more likely to be perceived as unjustified and unfair. As such, altruistic behaviours such as providing support to a person in need are most likely to be performed by third parties (Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Shumaker & Brownell, 1984). For example, Sperry (1999) found that observers are more willing to support a rape victim when the offender is judged as responsible for his/her actions.

I focus on third parties' emotional support as a type of assistance extended to an abused subordinate. Emotional support refers to the third parties' willingness to listen to the abused subordinate's feelings about the situation, expressing concern about the abused subordinate's welfare, and affirmation of understanding and support (Granrose et al., 1992). Emotional support is the most viable form of assistance for several reasons. First, emotional support is more likely to be exhibited by third parties as it involves less resources (e.g. time, possessing knowledge and expertise) compared to non-affective support such as helping the abused subordinate to file a complaint. Second, third parties are more likely to think that abused subordinates may not have the opportunity to directly express their grievances to the supervisor (Tepper et al., 2007). As such, emotional support is likely to be offered in order to communicate availability and willingness to listen to the problems of the abused subordinate. Lastly, emotional support is expected to be given by third parties as they personally witness how co-workers suffer from psychological distress as a result of supervisor abuse (Aryee et al., 2008; Harvey et al.,

2007; Wu & Hu, 2009; Yagil, 2006). In sum, when the supervisor is seen as responsible, third parties are more likely to provide emotional support towards the abused subordinate.

Magnitude of Consequence, Retaliation, and Support

Moral intensity theory (Jones, 1991) suggests that third parties' cognitive evaluation of a moral event is contingent upon one's perceived magnitude of consequence, defined as the aggregated harm resulting from the moral issue in question. Related research on social influence proposed that the social environment provides cues in which individuals use to construct and interpret events, as well as offer information about people's resulting judgment and action (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). This suggests that victims and the immediate environment can influence third parties' perception about the severity of the negative impact that has occurred. For example, the emotional struggles of abused subordinates as manifested by fear, anxiety, and depression (Restubog et al., 2011; Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al., 2007) provide third parties with information they can use to evaluate the severity of the victim's experience. Third parties are also more susceptible to experience distress if they witness the victim burst into tears as a result of abusive supervision (Skarlicki & Kulik, 2005). To this end, it is important to account for how third parties appraise the impact of abusive supervision, as perceptions of the magnitude of consequences may also vary from one individual to another (Bowes-Sperry & Powell, 1999; Jones, 1991).

Perceived magnitude of consequence and retaliation. Moral intensity theory asserts that when an event is perceived to cause serious consequences, the more individuals are motivated to engage in moral behaviour. Observers are more likely to

believe that events with serious harm are not chance events, thus a more punitive response against the offender is appropriate (Trevino, 1992). This is also consistent with the view of just deserts perspective that “let the punishment fit the crime,” which means that the punishment should be commensurate to the harm caused by the perpetrator (Carlsmith, Darley, & Robinson, 2002; Wenzel & Thielman, 2006). Related research on criminology and behavioural ethics suggest that outcome severity influences an individual to prefer a retaliatory response in order to restore the moral balance (Bowes-Sperry & Powell, 1999; Davis, et al., 1977; Feigunson, Park, & Salovey, 1997; Myers, Lynn, & Arbthnot, 2002; Skarlicki, Barclay, & Pugh, 2008). In line with this reasoning, when supervisor’s actions are perceived as detrimental to the victim, third parties are more likely to engage in retaliatory behaviours directed to the supervisor.

Perceived magnitude of consequence and support. As previously discussed, moral intensity theory suggests that observing the severe consequence of perpetrator’s behaviours motivates a third party to engage in moral behaviour. Providing support is the most plausible moral response to alleviate the observed suffering of the victim (Batson & Coke, 1991; Eisenberg et al., 1989). Third parties are more motivated to respond to a victim by providing support when they observe that the consequence of transgression is severe (Jones, 1991). When a victim appears to be severely affected, perpetrator’s behaviour (e.g., supervisor abuse) becomes more salient and intensely felt by a third party (Tornblom & Kazemi, 2010). Indeed, Bowes-Sperry and Powell’s (1999) study of sexual coercion demonstrated that when witnesses perceive the perpetrator’s act as severely harming the victim, it results in third party’s intention to help the victim. Given these theoretical and empirical considerations, when supervisor’s actions are perceived as

detrimental to the victim, third parties are more likely provide emotional support towards the victim.

Social Consensus, Retaliation, and Support

A second source of cognitive evaluation is social consensus or the extent to which people agree that an event is bad. This dimension of moral intensity is associated with social expectations of behavioural norms (Jones, 1991). Norms provide a shared frame of reference of what behaviour is (un)acceptable in different social situations (Bierstedt, 1963). Given that abusive supervision is influenced by norms (Tepper, 2000; 2007), it is also important to consider how abusive supervision is generally perceived by the employees in the broader organisation. Related research on social influence suggests that an individual's understanding of acceptable beliefs can be shaped by social cues or messages from others (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). In an experimental study, Jones and Skarlicki (2005) found that prior information about a researcher's reputation (e.g., being unfair) given by one of the research participants biased another participant's reaction to the researcher's subsequent behaviours. Individuals form their judgment on events based on the availability of information provided by their peers. In line with this reasoning, a social validation that abusive supervision is wrong should decrease ambiguity and facilitate behavioural reaction among third parties (Davis et al., 1998; Jones, 1991).

Perceived social consensus and retaliation. Moral intensity theory suggests that when there is societal agreement that an action is inappropriate, it should facilitate third parties to act morally. Individuals oftentimes use attitudes and behaviours of other people as a cue to determine what actions are appropriate in a given situation (Cialdini, 2001; Cialdini & Trost, 1998). Logically, it is difficult to act morally (e.g. retaliate against the

perpetrator) if an individual does not know what type of response is acceptable and appropriate. Consensus among the majority that an observed moral transgression (e.g., supervisor abuse) is wrong reduces uncertainty and justifies third parties' intentions to rectify the wrongdoing. As such, social consensus (e.g., among fellow employees) about the "badness" of an act is associated with negative reactions against the perpetrator (Bowes-Sperry & Powell, 1999; Jones, 1991). For example, it was found that perceived level of social consensus that social sexual behaviours are unwarranted influenced third parties' decision to call an anonymous ethics hotline and report the perpetrator (Bowes-Sperry & Powell, 1999). Thus, when third parties perceive that abusive behaviors are not endorsed by the majority, they are more likely to engage in retaliatory behaviors against the supervisor.

Perceived social consensus and support. As previously noted, social influence is a powerful force for people to determine how to morally act in a given context (Cialdini, 2001; Cialdini & Trost, 1998). Although, support is expected to be given to victims, ambiguity of the situation (e.g., if abusive supervision is generally seen as acceptable or not by majority) could potentially hinder third parties to assist the victim (Brown & Testa, 2008). Thus, acquiring information that supervisor abuse is not endorsed by the majority drives third parties to be more involved in the situation. In this vein, Bowes-Sperry and O'Leary-Kelly (2005) argued that third parties are more confident and willing to assist victims of harassment when it is clear that the circumstances are wrong and inappropriate. Given these, I expect that social consensus that abusive supervisory behaviours are wrong motivates third parties to offer emotional support towards the victim.

Emotional Responses to Abusive Supervision

Attribution theory proposes that cognitive evaluation of an event leads to emotional response (Weiner, 1986; 2000). Roseman, Spindel, and Jose (1990) corroborated this assertion by stating that “evaluation and interpretation of events and its agents, rather than events per se, determine whether an emotion will be felt and which emotion it will be” (p. 899). Appraisal theories of emotion (Lazarus, 1991; Roseman, 1991; Roseman et al., 1990; Weiner, 1986) posits that distinct moral emotions, defined as “emotional response motivating support for actions that benefit the interest and welfare of other individuals or of society as a whole” are evoked depending on the dimension of focus: self versus others (Haidt, 2003; Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007). Self-conscious moral emotions include shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride, while other focused moral emotions take into account anger, elevation, gratitude, and sympathy (Eisenberg, 2000; Tangney, et al., 2007). In this paper, I focus on two other-focused moral emotions. Anger is negatively valenced outward emotion which is felt towards a perpetrator who intentionally harms another individual while sympathy is positively valenced outward emotion which is felt towards a victim who suffers from the harmful behaviours of the perpetrator (Eisenberg, 2000; Tangney, et al., 2007).

Perceived responsibility and anger. Anger is an emotional response to other people’s negative actions (Averill, 1982; Eisenberg, 2000). It arises from “an appraisal of responsibility for wrongdoing by another person and often includes the goal of correcting the perceived wrong” (Gibson & Callister, 2010, p. 68). Appraisal theories suggest that when another person is seen responsible for a negative behaviour such as supervisor abuse, third parties are more likely to experience anger (Averill, 1982; Roseman et al.,

1990; Weiner, 1995). This is because anger is elicited among observers following a belief that an individual “could and should have done otherwise” (Weiner, 1995). Thus, judging an individual accountable for a negative event which he or she can prevent or avoid would elicit anger among third parties. Scholars have provided convincing empirical evidence that anger is the dominant emotion felt when third parties perceive that an individual is responsible for a negative event or state (Allred, 1999; Betancourt & Blair, 1992; Ho & Venus, 1995; Neuman, 2000; Williams et al., 1995). For example, a study among 242 employees confirmed that judging another person responsible for a harmful organisational behaviour arouses anger (Allred, Chiongbian, & Parlamis, 1998). In line with these theoretical reasoning and empirical findings, when the supervisor is perceived as responsible for his or her abusive actions, anger is likely to be experienced by third parties toward the abusive supervisor.

Hypothesis 1a: Perceived responsibility will be positively associated with anger towards the abusive supervisor.

Perceived responsibility and sympathy. Another focused emotion relevant to moral sphere is sympathy (Eisenberg, 1986; Tangney et al., 2007). Sympathy is defined as an affective response that consists of feeling sorrow or concern for the emotional condition of another (Eisenberg, 1986; 1990). Appraisal theories (Roseman, 1991; Weiner, 1986; 1995) imply that sympathy is an emotion felt by third parties for victims of moral transgressions. Sympathy or feeling of concern for the plight of a victim is induced among observers due to the perception that a perpetrator has volitionally and intentionally brought harm upon that individual (Weiner, 1995; 2000). This idea has been empirically validated on a wide array of research related to moral transgressions (e.g., domestic

violence; Coleman & Smith, 1997; hate crime victims and offenders; Lyons, 2006; and sexual harassment; Williams et al., 1995). For instance, high ratings of sympathy towards victims were evident among observers of sexual assaults in the organisation when the perpetrator is perceived as responsible for his actions (Williams et al., 1995). Thus, it is expected that witnessing another co-worker suffer from the hands of an abusive supervisor would elicit sympathy among third parties.

Hypothesis 1b: Perceived responsibility will be positively associated with sympathy towards the abused subordinate

Perceived Magnitude of Consequence, Social Consensus, and Anger

Attribution theory also posits that anger is elicited when a moral code is broken (Weiner, 1995). Anger is felt by third parties when perpetrator's behaviours represent a violation of moral standards (Tangney et al., 2007). The Contempt-Anger-Disgust (CAD) Triad Hypothesis (Shweder, Much, Mahapatra, & Park, 1997) asserts that different types of emotions are evoked depending on the nature of immoral actions caused by others. In particular, events that are violations of the morals of divinity (e.g., sanctity of the soul) are more likely to elicit disgust while violations of the morals of individual rights and freedom (e.g., unfairness, interpersonal mistreatment) are likely to result in anger (Rozin, Lowery, Imada, & Haidt, 1999; Shweder et al., 1997). In a study among American and Japanese students, anger towards perpetrators was associated with events which can directly hurt another individual or violate one's rights and freedom (Rozin et al., 1999). Accordingly, supervisor abuse such as belittling, yelling, and embarrassing a subordinate in front of others can be regarded as a moral violation of the subordinates' individual rights to be respected and treated well as a human being. Perceived magnitude of

consequence to the victim and social consensus about the badness of the act represents higher moral intensity (Jones, 1991). This means that when third parties perceive that the supervisor has severely harmed the victim and that there is a general agreement that the supervisor's actions are wrong, it is more likely that abusive supervision will be regarded as a violation of moral standards. It follows, then, that perceiving abusive supervision as actions violating moral standards would elicit anger towards the perpetrator (Shweder et al., 1997; Tangney et al., 2007)

Furthermore, Jones (1991) suggested that some consequences of a negative event can be trivial in nature. For example, most people are unlikely to become agitated when a supervisor simply denies a fellow employee a vacation leave. On the other hand, third parties are more likely to be emotionally outraged towards a supervisor who is verbally abusing a subordinate, given its potential severe consequences to the individual. This conveys that third parties are more likely to pay attention and be emotionally affected by events which they believe are more detrimental to the well-being of the victim (e.g., abused subordinate).

Hypothesis 2a: Perceived magnitude of consequences will be positively associated with anger towards the abusive supervisor.

Third parties are also motivated to form impressions based on how other people view the situation (Brown & Testa, 2008). The social information processing perspective posits that the social environment prompts an individual on how to properly respond to organisational events (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). This occurs as the immediate environment provides information if a particular event is socially acceptable which then guides employees in choosing the appropriate response. As such, social validation from

other employees that supervisor abuse is not acceptable serves as a cue for third parties to negatively respond towards the perpetrator. Specifically, if a third party observes that majority of employees denounce supervisor abuse based on their verbal and emotional reactions (e.g., cursing the supervisor), this social information would be influential on how they should be feeling as well (Barsade, 2002). Thus, perceived social agreement about the inappropriateness of abusive supervision as conveyed by negative emotional reactions in the immediate environment (e.g., among other employees in the organisation) will result in anger towards the supervisor. Given this, I propose:

Hypothesis 2b: Perceived social consensus will be positively associated with anger towards the abusive supervisor.

Perceived Magnitude of Consequence, Social Consensus, and Sympathy

Following the tenets of sympathy perspective (Lyons, 2006), third parties are more sensitive to the immoral event when there is an imbalance of power between the perpetrator and the victim. Given that the supervisor has a higher position and authority over the subordinate, the latter is considered as a minority-status individual (Lyons, 2006). This conveys the idea that the abused subordinate is in a vulnerable situation. Third parties are more likely to be sympathetic to those victims with less social power like an abused subordinate. This is because of the perception that abused subordinates are helpless and lack the resources to cope with the situation. Hence it is argued here that, severity of impact of abusive supervision to the subordinate as espoused by his/her strong attitudinal, emotional, and behavioural displays (e.g., reduced self-worth, being sad at work, crying, etc.) can strongly impact third parties' emotional state, enabling them to

share the feelings of the victim. (Eisenberg, 2000; Tangney et al., 2007). Therefore, it is predicted:

Hypothesis 3a: Perceived magnitude of consequences will be positively associated with sympathy towards the abused subordinate.

Consistent with the social information processing theory, when there is a consensus among the majority that abusive supervision is wrong, it is more likely that observers can relate to the emotional state of the victim and express sympathy. This is because the abused subordinate's plight is more justified when people come to an agreement that cause (e.g., supervisor abuse) is unacceptable. Thus, I predict:

Hypothesis 3b: Perceived social consensus will be positively associated with sympathy towards the abused subordinate.

The Mediating Role of Anger and Sympathy

Attribution theory asserts that emotions serve as a bridge between cognitive evaluations and behavioural reactions. As such, I expect that anger will mediate the relationship between cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility and perceived moral intensity) and retaliatory behaviours toward the abusive supervisor. Similarly, it is proposed that sympathy will mediate the relationship between cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility and perceived moral intensity) and emotional support towards the abused subordinate

Several lines of reasoning point to these patterns of relationships. First, anger is a main driver to engage in retaliation in response to interpersonal mistreatment (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Averill, 1983). Attribution theory (Weiner, 1995; 2000) asserts that when third parties experience anger, they may hold less positive regard towards the

perpetrator and may engage in retaliation in order to stop the perpetrator's harmful behaviour or prevent further abuse (Allred, 2000). In a study among MBA students (based on their personal work experience), anger which resulted from holding the perpetrator responsible led to heated verbal confrontations and malicious acts against the perpetrator (Allred, 1999). Moreover, in a meta-analytic study consisting of 64 studies on aggression, Rudolph, Roesch, Greitemeyer, and Weiner (2004) reported that anger was positively associated with retaliation (Rudolph, 2004). Second, the deontic justice literature (Cropanzano, Goldman, & Folger, 2003; Folger, 2001) suggests that third parties experience emotionally-charged reactions to events that they perceive as violations of moral principles. Anger serves as a mechanism to retaliate against the perpetrator in order to uphold their moral standards (Folger, 2001). This can be viewed as a means for third parties to fulfill their moral obligation and seek justice to the sufferings of the abused subordinate.

The empathy-altruism hypothesis (Batson & Coke, 1991) claims that sympathy evokes altruistic motivation directed towards other people. Sympathy enables an individual to understand the perspective of another in need, which in turn increases the observer's motivation to reduce the needy person's suffering by engaging in pro-social behaviours (Eisenberg et al., 1989). For example, Sperry (2009) found that sympathy is significantly related to the observer's willingness to provide support for victims of rape. In a similar vein, unfair organisational practices and mistreatment elicited sympathy among third parties, influencing them to support the advocacies of victims to correct the misconduct of the perpetrators (Leung, Chiu, & Au, 1993). Third parties' feeling of

sympathy is anticipated to lead to expressions of emotional support in order to alleviate the suffering abusive supervision might bring to the affected subordinate.

The Moderating Effects of Moral Identity and Negative Reciprocity

The extent to which third parties would feel anger and retaliate against the abusive supervisor and feel sympathy and provide emotional support towards the abused subordinate are likely to be influenced by dispositional factors. Attribution theory (Weiner, 1986; 2000) stresses that an attributional activity does not only depend on perceptions per se. Personal characteristics of third parties are also critical in predicting how individuals react in a given context or situation.

In moral-decision making situations, previous theorising and empirical research claim that the positive relationships between cognitive evaluation, moral emotions, and moral behaviours were only moderate (Blasi, 1980; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Hardy & Carlo, 2005; Rest, 1983). As such, moral cognitive-emotional sources of motivation cannot, on its own, explain individual's moral intentions and behaviours (Hardy & Carlo, 2005). An individual still decides what cognitive and emotional motives are to be translated into actions. Indeed, scholars have emphasised that moral identity "serves as a supplemental source of motivation that provides a boost beyond the motivation available from moral reasoning and moral emotion alone" (Hardy & Carlo, p.234). Therefore, moral identity is a useful variable to predict consistency in the link between moral reasoning, emotional response, and behavioural reactions. Moral identity is expected to exert influence on the proposed mediated relationships.

This study also considers the endorsement of negative reciprocity beliefs as this personality factor sheds light on how individuals interpret the moral appropriateness of

their response to interpersonal mistreatment (Eder, Aquino, Turner, & Reed, 2006; Eisenberger, et al., 2004; Gouldner, 1960). This individual factor helps us understand why some individuals consider negative emotion and retaliation towards the perpetrator as justifiable reactions to moral transgressions. Therefore, negative reciprocity is specifically relevant to the link between cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus)—anger towards the supervisor—retaliation towards the supervisor.

In this section, I discuss the moderating roles of moral identity and negative reciprocity beliefs in the proposed model.

Moral identity as a moderator. Moral identity has been conceptualised as the degree to which being moral is central to one's self. It is based on social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), which posits that individuals may hold different identities including nationality, gender, group affiliation, and status in the community (Skarlicki et al., 2008). Thus, moral identity is just one of the possible components of a person's social schema and presentation (Aquino & Reed, 2007). The more central moral identity is to a person, the more it is expected that moral traits are vital to one's self-concept (Aquino & Reed, 2002; 2007; Lapsley & Narvaez, 2004).

Drawing on moral identity theory (Aquino & Reed, 2002), I predict that moral identity will moderate the proposed relationships on third party reactions to supervisor abuse: cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus)—anger towards the supervisor—retaliation towards the supervisor and cognitive evaluations—sympathy towards the subordinate—support towards the subordinate. The moral identity theory suggests that self-conception of being moral

influences an individual to respond and act in accordance with his/her moral beliefs. Empirical research (Aquino et al., 2007; Aquino et al., 2009; Reynolds & Ceramic, 2007; Skarlicki et al., 2008; Winterick et al., 2009) has shown that moral identity can predict individuals' cognitions, emotional response, and behavioural reactions to varied moral issues and dilemmas. Generally, these studies suggest that individuals with high moral identity are more likely to engage in morally-relevant emotions and behaviours.

Moral identity has two dimensions: (1) symbolization described as “the degree to which reactions to moral issues are expressed publicly through an individual’s actions” and (2) internalization defined as the “degree to which a set of moral traits is central to one’s self-concept” (Skarlicki et al., 2008, p. 1338). Symbolization and internalization dimensions will have differential moderating effects in the cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus)—anger towards the supervisor—retaliation towards the supervisor relationship.

Symbolization or the public aspect of moral identity has been associated with an individual’s tendency to engage in self-presentation behaviours. Skarlicki et al (2008) argued that symbolization dimension can be viewed in light of the theory on symbolic self-completion (Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1982). This theory posits that people are inclined to make their self-identity a social reality. In situations in which an individual feels that his/her identity relevant goals (e.g., being a person who would like to stop mistreatment) are in jeopardy, another’s (e.g., perpetrator) interest might be of less importance. As such, to uphold their moral beliefs, third parties high in symbolization are more inclined to consider anger and retaliatory behaviours towards the abusive supervisor as reasonable counter response. Moral identity theory suggests that individuals high in

moral identity are more sensitive and inclined to respond to events when the perpetrator is deemed responsible. It is expected that when the abusive supervisor is viewed as accountable for his or her actions, third parties high in symbolization are expected to respond negatively and retaliate towards the supervisor. Individuals high as opposed to low in symbolization are more likely to view that intentionally harming another person is not congruent to their personal moral standards on how people should be treated (Moshman, 2005). Moreover, third parties high in symbolization whose moral schemas are easily activated are expected to be more susceptible to violations of moral standards (Aquino & Reed, 2002). They are likely to express their dismay through anger when faced with a morally-intense issue (based on magnitude of consequence and social consensus), and ultimately retaliate as a counter-attack to an observed moral violation. As such, individuals high in symbolization experience anger and engage in retaliatory acts towards the abusive supervisor with the intention of preventing further mistreatment. Given this, it is predicted that the positive relationship between perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus and retaliation via anger will be more pronounced for those individuals who are high as opposed to low in symbolization.

Hypothesis 4a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization)

Hypothesis 4b: The conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger

will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization)

Hypothesis 4c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization)

The internalization dimension or the private aspect of moral identity has been associated with introspective awareness of one's moral thoughts and feelings (Aquino & Reed, 2002). Based on the moral circle hypothesis (Singer, 1981), individuals high as opposed to low in internalization are more likely to expand their circle of moral regard and feel more obligated to show concern for the interest of others, even to those who belong to the out-groups. As such, high as opposed to low internalization moral identifiers have a strong tendency not to inflict harm even on those who are considered as enemies (Reed & Aquino, 2003). Empirical research shows that the internalization dimension is positively related to lower inclination to feel negative and endorse harm towards perpetrators (Aquino et al., 2007; Reed & Aquino, 2003). In a study conducted among college students, it was found that high as opposed to low internalisation moral identifiers are more likely to endorse forgiveness and less likely to perceive killing the perpetrators of World Trade Center bombing as a morally- suitable response (Reed & Aquino, 2003). Similarly, Skarlicki and his colleagues' (2008) study suggested that internalization suppresses the positive relationship between mistreatment and retaliatory tendencies. High internalizers have the tendency to show more compassion even to those individuals who have the potential of inflicting harm on other people. Despite observing a

moral violation (based on perceived magnitude of consequence and social consensus), individuals high in internalization are less likely to punish the perpetrator as they deem these counter-reactions as immoral in itself. Therefore, these theoretical and empirical considerations point to the direction that the relationship among perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus and retaliatory behaviours through anger will be stronger for those third parties low as opposed to high in internalization. Following these arguments, I propose:

Hypothesis 5a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with low as opposed to high levels of moral identity (internalization)

Hypothesis 5b: The conditional indirect effect of magnitude of consequence in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with low as opposed to high levels of moral identity (internalization)

Hypothesis 5c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with low as opposed to high levels of moral identity (internalization)

Moral identity theory posits that individuals whose moral identity is central to one's self-definition are more inclined to have favourable attitudes and behaviours towards other people (Aquino & Reed, 2002; Aquino et al., 2007). As such, it is expected that individuals high in symbolization (public aspect of the moral self) or internalization

(private aspect of the moral self) are more likely to express concern for those people in need (e.g., victims of supervisor abuse). Given this, I expect similar moderating effects for both symbolization and internalization dimensions of moral identity.

Individuals who are high as opposed to low in symbolization have the tendency to translate their moral beliefs into actions (Aquino & Reed, 2002). The positive link between cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus)—sympathy—support towards the subordinate will be more pronounced to those third parties high in symbolization as these individuals are more likely to express their moral identity publicly by showing positive emotion and behaviour towards the abused subordinate. Showing sympathy and concern for the welfare of the victim is a means for individuals high in symbolization to express their moral stand upon witnessing intentional mistreatment and violation of moral principles (based on magnitude of consequence and social consensus). Given this, I propose the following:

Hypothesis 6a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

Hypothesis 6b: The conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

Hypothesis 6c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

When the perpetrator is perceived as responsible and there is awareness that a moral violation (based on magnitude of consequence and social consensus) has been committed, those third parties high as opposed to low in internalization are more likely to express sympathy and ultimately provide emotional support towards the victims. This is because high internalizers are more sensitive to events that violate the core moral principles they believe in. In order to be consistent with their self-definition as moral person, they are more likely to sympathise and show emotional support as these are the appropriate moral reactions due the victims of mistreatment such as supervisor abuse. Therefore, it is predicted:

Hypothesis 7a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (internalization).

Hypothesis 7b: The conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (internalization).

Hypothesis 7c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (internalization).

Negative reciprocity as a moderator. It is predicted that the strength of the cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus)—anger towards the supervisor—retaliation towards the supervisor relationships will also be contingent upon the third parties' negative reciprocity beliefs. Negative reciprocity orientation involves the endorsement of the belief that those who

engage in negative treatment should be treated negatively in return (Gouldner, 1960). This principle has been illustrated in the biblical injunction “A life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth... bruise for bruise” (Exodus 21:23-25). Indeed, Eisenberger and colleagues (2004) emphasised that harm returned for harm received is a justifiable moral principle that provides social approval for retaliation and serves as a means to deter mistreatment from happening in the future.

I draw on the view of internalized norm of reciprocity (Perugini et al., 2003) to argue that negative reciprocity will moderate the proposed relationships on third party reactions to supervisor abuse: cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility and moral intensity)—anger towards the supervisor—retaliation against the supervisor. According to the view of internalized norm of reciprocity, individuals who endorse negative reciprocity beliefs have the tendency to focus on negative interpersonal behaviours. Thus, individuals who hold high negative reciprocity beliefs are more responsive to other people’s hostile behaviours. More importantly, individuals high in negative reciprocity beliefs are more inclined to react negatively when they believe that the perpetrator is accountable for his or her actions. For instance, Eisenberger and colleagues’ (2004) study found that individuals who have high levels of negative reciprocity beliefs exhibited higher levels of anger and retaliatory actions in response to perpetrators who were seen as personally responsible for engaging in unfavourable treatment of others. This supports the proposition that the positive relationships between intended and voluntary mistreatment, anger, and retaliatory behaviours are more pronounced among individuals who have high as opposed to low in negative reciprocity beliefs. In the context of the present study, it is my contention that the positive relationship between assignment of

responsibility and retaliation towards the abusive supervisor through anger will be stronger for third parties who endorse negative reciprocity beliefs. Based on these arguments, I propose the following:

Hypothesis 8a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of negative reciprocity beliefs.

The internalized norm of reciprocity also proposes that individuals reciprocate based on one's internalized values or expectations of appropriate (i.e., respectful and fair) behaviours (Perugini & Galluci, 2001; Perugini et al., 2003). Individuals who endorse negative reciprocity beliefs are more responsive to negative treatment when they consider it a violation of personal moral standards. Evidence suggests that the extent to which endorsing negative reciprocity results in negative reactions against the perpetrator is influenced by the actual perception that a wrongdoing has occurred (Eder et al., 2006; Eisenberger et al., 2004). Perceptions of magnitude of consequence and social consensus constitute a recognition that moral principles of interpersonal treatment have been violated. Thus, we expect that individuals with high negative reciprocity beliefs are likely to perceive supervisor abuse as morally intense (based on perceived magnitude of consequence and social consensus) and, as a result, are more likely to feel anger towards the supervisor. Furthermore, individuals who endorse negative reciprocity beliefs are more motivated to reciprocate feelings and behaviours of highly comparable value (Gouldner, 1960; Sahlins, 1972). These beliefs are likely to fuel one's anger towards the supervisor and ultimately drive them to engage in retaliatory acts. It also provides a strong justification to engage in retaliatory actions against individuals perceived as

socially threatening (Eder et al., 2006). Given these lines of reasoning, I offer the following predictions:

Hypothesis 8b: The conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of negative reciprocity beliefs.

Hypothesis 8c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of negative reciprocity beliefs.

CHAPTER 2

Study 1

Impact of Third Parties' Cognitive Evaluations of Supervisor Abuse on Their Emotional Response towards the Supervisor and Subordinate: An Experimental Test

Introduction and Hypotheses

As presented in Chapter 1, attribution theory and related empirical studies supported the link between an individual's cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility and moral intensity) of an event and the resulting emotional response (Allred et al, 1998; Betancourt & Blair, 1992; Tangney et al, 2007; Weiner, 1995; 2000). However, this relationship has never been tested in the context of abusive supervision. Using a scenario-based experiment, the aim of Study 1 was to empirically test the relationship between perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus (independent variables), and third parties' emotional response towards the abusive supervisor (anger) and abused subordinate (sympathy). Scenario-based vignettes have been previously used in organisational research to examine subjective responses to work events and procedures (Ho, Weingart, & Rousseau, 2004). This approach is appropriate because it helps eliminate ethical problems associated with manipulating a secondary account of supervisory abuse (Greenberg & Folger, 1988). It also enables greater control of the context because it can help isolate and manipulate key constructs while maintaining constancy of other variables (Burstin, Douglass, & Raphaeli, 1980).

In this chapter, it is predicted that evaluations of perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus on supervisor abuse is positively related

to anger towards the abusive supervisor and sympathy towards the abused subordinate (see Figure 2 for a schematic presentation of hypotheses).

Hypothesis 1a: Perceived responsibility will be positively associated with anger towards the abusive supervisor.

Hypothesis 1b: Perceived responsibility will be positively associated with sympathy towards the abused subordinate.

Hypothesis 2a: Perceived magnitude of consequences will be positively associated with anger towards the abusive supervisor.

Hypothesis 2b: Perceived social consensus will be positively associated with anger towards the abusive supervisor.

Hypothesis 3a: Perceived magnitude of consequences will be positively associated with sympathy towards the abused subordinate.

Hypothesis 3b: Perceived social consensus will be positively associated with sympathy towards the abused subordinate.

Figure 2. The predicted relationships between perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus, and emotional response.

Design

A 2 x 2 x 2 between-subject experimental design was used in the present study. Conditions of perceived responsibility (low and high) and the two moral intensity dimensions: magnitude of consequence (low and high), and social consensus (low and high) were manipulated using a short vignette.

Participants and Procedure

A total of 217 non-academic staff from a large university in the Philippines was randomly assigned to one of the eight experimental conditions. Ninety-two were males, 124 were females, and one did not report his/her gender. Average age and organisational tenure were 31.79 years (SD= 8.17) and 2.58 years (SD= 1.40), respectively.

Questionnaires were administered to the participants in two stages, approximately 1 week apart. At stage 1, a questionnaire was administered to assess personality (i.e., neuroticism) and control variables (e.g., gender, age, and tenure) to reduce and control for any priming effect that may potentially occur (Ho et al., 2004). In the second stage, a questionnaire describing the actual vignette and associated questions about the vignette was administered. In both stages of the data collection, participants were provided with an information sheet describing the purpose of the study, and the voluntary and anonymous nature of their participation in the experiment.

Participants were asked to imagine that they are one of the staff members who have witnessed an abusive event. After reading the vignette, participants were prompted to respond to a series of questions pertaining to their emotional reactions to the abusive supervisor and abused subordinate. In order to match the first and second questionnaires, participants created a unique code identifier. Out of 280 questionnaires distributed at

stage 1, 242 were retrieved yielding a response rate of 86.42%. Out of the 280 questionnaires distributed at stage 2, 225 were retrieved representing a response rate of 80.35%. A total of 217 valid questionnaires from stages 1 and 2 were matched, with a response rate of 77.50%. Participants received a coffee voucher as a token of appreciation for participating in the study.

Materials

A vignette was designed by the researcher to manipulate the key independent variables: perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus. The vignette depicted a scenario on abusive supervision. Following Tepper's (2007) conceptualisation, the scenario portrayed a supervisor's sustained display of verbal and non-verbal abuse directed towards a subordinate. Perceived responsibility was manipulated in a statement related to controllability and intentionality of the dean's actions.

High perceived responsibility was represented by high controllability and intentionality (*"The Dean intentionally inflicts this kind of treatment on his secretary. This negative behaviour is his way of asserting his authority."*) or low controllability and intentionality (*"Last year, Dean Gomez was diagnosed with severe hypertension which makes him impatient and irritable. He does not intentionally hurt his secretary. But the prescribed medicine he is taking causes erratic mood swings and hostile behaviours. Unconsciously, he is venting his irritation towards Janet."*).

Magnitude of consequence was manipulated in a statement related to the immediate reactions of the secretary to the Dean’s abusive behaviours.

High magnitude of consequence was represented by a more severe impact on the secretary’s reactions (*“Janet got red in the face and burst into tears. Crying uncontrollably, she ran away from the office, hysterically screaming that she will resign immediately.”*), while low magnitude of consequence was represented by a less severe impact on the secretary’s reactions (*“Janet breathed a heavy sigh, poured herself a cup of coffee and proceeded with her work as if nothing happened.”*).

Social consensus was manipulated in a statement related to the immediate reactions of other staff members who have witnessed the Dean’s abusive behaviours toward the secretary.

High social consensus was represented by a unanimous agreement among other staff members (*“They all agreed that Dean Gomez’s actions were wrong and unacceptable.”*), while low social consensus was represented by a varied perception among other staff members (*“Some of them remarked that Dean Gomez’s actions were wrong and unacceptable. While some of them defended the Dean’s behaviour as his way of maintaining the department’s high standards.”*).

The vignettes were developed based on several rounds of pilot testing among university employees who completed manipulation checks and provided verbal and written feedback about the vignette's realism.

Measures

Previously established scales were used to measure the study variables. Questionnaires were prepared in English because this language is spoken by a vast majority of the Filipino population (Bernardo, 2004). The coefficient alphas for the variables are reported in the succeeding paragraphs.

Manipulation checks. To ensure that participants accurately perceived the manipulations, they were asked to respond on a seven-point scale (1= strongly agree; 7 = strongly disagree). The manipulation check for perceived responsibility was assessed using two items (Betancourt & Blair, 1992). A sample item is "*Dean Gomez is fully responsible for his actions towards Janet.*" The manipulation check for magnitude of consequences was assessed using two items (May & Pauli, 2002). An example item is, "*Janet was severely affected by Dean Gomez's treatment.*" The manipulation check for social consensus was assessed using 2 items (May & Pauli, 2002). A sample item is "*There is a/an consensus/agreement among other staff members that Dean Gomez's actions are unacceptable.*" Cronbach's alpha for perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus manipulation checks were .96, .93, and .96, respectively.

Anger towards the supervisor. Anger was measured using an eight-item scale developed by Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell, and Crane (1983). Prior research reported high internal consistency estimates ranging from .93 to .95 (Foa, Riggs, Massie &

Yarczowa, 1995; Goldman, 2003). Participants rated the extent (seven point scale, ranging from not at all to very much) to which they felt the following emotions towards the supervisor: angry, mad, irritated, furious, annoyed, frustrated, aggravated, and resentful. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .96.

Sympathy towards the subordinate. Sympathy was measured using three items adapted from the situational sympathy scale developed by Batson, Fultz, and Schoenrade (1987). Participants rated the extent (seven point scale, ranging from not at all to very much) to which they felt the following emotions towards the subordinate: sympathetic, grieved, and compassion. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .88.

Control variables. Consistent with research on abusive supervision and moral transgressions, this study also controlled for demographic variables (e.g., gender, age, and tenure). Gender was controlled to account for the gender differences in responding to situations related to moral transgressions (Williams et al., 1995). Gender was coded 0 for males and 1 for females. Age was controlled because prior research found that it is related to emotional reactions and retribution tendencies (Aquino & Reed, 2002). Tenure was controlled for as research suggested that it has an influence on employee's response to their supervisor's behaviours (Bauer & Green, 1996; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997). Finally, employee neuroticism was controlled because individuals with high as opposed to low levels of neuroticism tend to experience greater anxiety and negative emotional states (McCrae & John, 1992). Neuroticism was measured using an eight-item scale by John and Srivastava (1999). Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .88.

Results

Manipulation checks. Participants in the high perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus condition rated the manipulation checks significantly higher than participants in low perceived responsibility ($M_{\text{High perceived responsibility}} = 6.28$, $SD=1.09$ versus $M_{\text{Low perceived responsibility}} = 3.59$, $SD=1.47$), magnitude of consequence ($M_{\text{High magnitude of consequence}} = 6.24$, $SD=.89$ versus $M_{\text{Low magnitude of consequence}} = 3.62$, $SD=1.33$), and social consensus ($M_{\text{High social consensus}} = 6.28$, $SD=1.05$ versus $M_{\text{Low social consensus}} = 3.35$, $SD=1.44$). Overall, the manipulations were effective and in the expected direction.

Hypothesis testing. The hypotheses were tested using multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) with anger and sympathy as dependent variables, and perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus as independent measures. Gender, age, tenure, and neuroticism were entered as covariates (see Table 1). With the exception of gender ($F=6.39$; $p < .05$), neuroticism ($F=.95$, *n.s.*), age ($F=.003$, *n.s.*), and tenure ($F=.77$, *n.s.*) did not have a significant influence on third parties' anger towards the abusive supervisor. Results indicated that perceived responsibility (high = 5.28 and low = 4.36; $F= 27.81$; $p < .001$), magnitude of consequence (high = 5.13 and low 4.51; $F= 12.75$; $p < .001$), and social consensus (high = 5.15 and low = 4.49; $F=14.43$; $p<.001$) had a significant main effect on anger providing support for Hypotheses 1a, 2a, and 2b.

As for sympathy, all control variables, gender ($F=2.89$, *n.s.*), neuroticism ($F=.10$, *n.s.*), age ($F=.96$, *n.s.*), and tenure ($F=.24$, *n.s.*) did not have a significant influence on third parties' sympathy towards the abused subordinate. Results also indicated that

perceived responsibility (high = 5.13 and low = 4.67; $F = 6.22$; $p < .05$) and magnitude of consequence (high = 5.13 and low 4.51; $F = 9.11$; $p < .05$) had a significant main effect on sympathy. However, social consensus (high = 4.99 and low = 4.81; $F = .975$; *n.s.*) had no main effect on third parties' sympathy towards the abused subordinate. Thus, only Hypotheses 1b and 3a were supported.

Table 1
Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for Anger and Sympathy in Study 1

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender	Anger	9.46	1	9.46	6.39	.05
	Sympathy	4.88	1	4.88	2.89	ns
Age	Anger	.01	1	.01	.003	ns
	Sympathy	1.63	1	1.63	.96	ns
Years in Organisation	Anger	1.14	1	1.14	.77	ns
	Sympathy	.41	1	.41	.24	ns
Neuroticism	Anger	1.14	1	1.14	.95	ns
	Sympathy	.17	1	.17	.10	ns
Perceived Responsibility (PR)	Anger	41.22	1	41.22	27.81	.001
	Sympathy	10.50	1	10.50	6.22	.05
Magnitude of Consequence (MC)	Anger	18.98	1	18.98	12.75	.001
	Sympathy	15.37	1	15.37	9.11	.05
Social Consensus (SC)	Anger	21.40	1	21.40	14.43	.001
	Sympathy	1.65	1	1.65	.975	ns
Error	Anger	302.41	204	302.41		
	Sympathy	344.37	204	344.37		
Total	Anger	5614.88	216	5614.88		
	Sympathy	5644.87	216	5644.87		
Corrected Total	Anger	358.04	215	358.04		
	Sympathy	390.35	215	390.35		

Overall, this experimental study suggests that third parties’ anger towards the perpetrator is influenced by the extent to which the supervisor is perceived as responsible and accountable for his/her actions (i.e., perceived responsibility), the impact of the supervisor’s actions to the target (i.e., magnitude of consequence), and the extent to

which other observers agree that the actions of the supervisor were wrong and unacceptable (i.e., social consensus). Perceptions on responsibility and magnitude of consequence are the factors which influenced third parties' emotional response towards the victim. Social consensus did not influence third parties' sympathy towards the abused subordinate.

Discussion

The objective of Study 1 was to examine the impact of cognitive evaluations of supervisor abuse in terms of perceptions of responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus on third parties' emotional response towards the abusive supervisor and abused subordinate. The findings of this study supported the theoretical propositions derived from attribution (Weiner, 1995) and moral intensity (Jones, 1991) perspectives. Study 1 demonstrated that third parties' cognitive evaluation of perpetrator's responsibility, severity of impact to the abused subordinate, and social consensus about the "badness" of abusive supervision result in negative emotion, specifically anger, towards the abusive supervisor. Furthermore, perceptions of responsibility and severity of impact resulted in positive emotion specifically sympathy towards the abused subordinate. These findings are consistent with previous research on moral transgressions which stated that when a perpetrator is seen as responsible and when there is violation of moral standards, two other focused emotions are more likely to be elicited among witnesses: anger towards the perpetrator and sympathy towards the victim (Allred, 1999; Betancourt & Blair, 1992; Williams et al., 1995). However, it is important to discuss why social validation that abusive supervision is wrong did not significantly influence third parties' emotional response towards the abused subordinate. It is possible that in this

case, social consensus among other employees about the “badness” of supervisor abuse was not a strong factor that would influence third parties to sympathise with the victim. This is because whether the majority agrees that supervisor abuse is wrong or not, the fact remains that the victim has suffered from the mistreatment and it is but natural to show concern and sorrow for the plight of a co-worker. Indeed, results of the study showed that at both high and low levels of social consensus, third parties reported considerably high ratings (e.g., mean ratings ranging between 4.81 to 4.99) of sympathy.

Moreover, research on social influence also highlights the importance of specificity to influence an individual’s response (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004). An accurate portrayal of social consensus in the vignette about the “badness” of supervisor abuse might yield a different set of results. For example, a more detailed explanation of why fellow employees do not endorse supervisor abuse (e.g., supervisor abuse is wrong because it violates company policies and standards) could potentially influence their emotional response.

The present study addressed the call for a greater methodological diversity in abusive supervision research (Tepper, 2007) as prior studies have been conducted using survey designs. The use of an experimental design makes it possible to infer cause and effect relationships, identify factors, and rule out alternative explanations (Cook & Campbell, 1979; Grant & Wall, 2009). This study is not without limitation. Although this study was able to examine emotional response to abusive supervision, it did not account for third parties’ behavioural reactions. As such, it is important to determine how emotions would influence third parties’ intervention strategies to rectify the observed supervisor abuse.

Summary

In summary, this study presents how emotional response towards the abusive supervisor and abused subordinate is affected by two types of cognitive evaluations: (1) perceived responsibility, and (2) moral intensity (magnitude of consequence and social consensus). The results suggest that third parties' perceptions of supervisor's responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus lead to anger towards the supervisor and third parties' perceptions of supervisor's responsibility and magnitude of consequence lead to sympathy towards the abused subordinate.

CHAPTER 3

Study 2

The Role of Moral Identity on Third Parties' Emotional and Behavioural Reactions to Supervisor Abuse

Introduction and Hypotheses

Findings of Study 1 suggest that third parties' cognitive evaluations of supervisor abuse in the form of perceived responsibility and moral intensity (magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) impact their emotional response towards the abusive supervisor and abused subordinate. In particular, holding the supervisor responsible for his/her actions, perceptions of magnitude of consequence to the victim, and social consensus about the "badness" of supervisor abuse were positively related to anger towards the abusive supervisor. Moreover, perceived responsibility and magnitude of consequence result in sympathy towards the abused subordinate. A limitation of Study 1 was that it did not account for the third parties' behavioural reactions to abusive supervision. Attribution theory (Weiner, 1986; 1995) and empirical research on moral transgression (Allred, 1999; 2000; Rudolph et al., 2004) imply that emotions play an important role in the relationship between third parties' cognitive evaluation of an event (e.g., supervisor abuse) and corresponding behavioural reactions. Study 2 aims to extend Study 1 by testing the full model of third parties' reactions to supervisor abuse and accounting for individual differences.

Using a critical incident technique method, Study 2 aimed to incorporate in the model and examine third parties' behavioural reactions in a field setting. Previous research has found this method useful in examining employees' response to interpersonal mistreatment (Aquino, Tripp & Bies, 2001; 2006; Bradfield & Aquino, 1999).

Specifically, this study considered retaliatory behaviours and emotional support espoused by third parties towards the abusive supervisor and abused subordinate, respectively, as response to supervisor abuse.

Attribution theory (Weiner, 1986; 1995) also recognises that third parties' emotional and behavioural reactions to an event, which in this case is abusive supervision, also depends on individual characteristics. Prior work (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007) suggested that individual characteristics influence how individuals interpret and react to negative work events. In this chapter, I examined a moderated mediation model that accounts for third parties emotional reaction (anger and sympathy) and dispositional factor (moral identity- symbolization dimension) in the relationship between cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility and moral intensity) and behavioural reactions (retaliation and emotional support) to abusive supervision (see Figure 3 for a schematic presentation of hypotheses).

Hypothesis 4a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

Hypothesis 4b: The conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

Hypothesis 4c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger

for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

Hypothesis 6a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

Hypothesis 6b: The conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

Hypothesis 6c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

Figure 3. The role of moral identity on third parties' emotional and behavioural reactions to supervisor abuse.

Participants and Procedures

The hypothesised model was tested among a sample of 241 part-time graduate students at a large university in the Philippines. One hundred thirty six were female, and 105 were male. The average age of participants was 28.15 years ($SD=.497$), and most of them (64.3%) have been working in the organisation between one to five years.

A total of 337 part-time Masters in Business/Masters in Business Administration students received a scenario-based survey. Only those students who were currently employed by an organisation were included in the study. Two hundred seventy-five surveys were received, yielding a response rate of 81.60%. Thirty-four surveys were excluded because of a) a large number of missing responses ($n=21$), and b) participant was not working full-time ($n=13$). Thus, after the removal of these surveys, the final sample resulted in 241 valid cases (71.51%).

Establishing a Context

In line with previous research (e.g., Aquino, et al., 2001, 2006; Cohen-Charash & Mueller, 2007), this study used a critical incident technique to enable participants to recall and describe a time when they have witnessed a colleague/co-worker experience supervisor abuse. Critical incident technique has several advantages. First, it is useful to gather a more detailed and accurate account of participants' experiences (Flanagan, 1954; Gremler, 2004). Second, the subjective input of the researcher is minimised as real world examples and behaviours are directly elicited (Kain, 2004; Stano, 1983).

The specific instructions are as follows:

“Sometimes supervisors/bosses engage in sustained display of hostile/aggressive verbal (e.g., belittling subordinates, yelling at subordinates, embarrassing subordinates in front of others, etc.) and non-verbal behaviours (e.g., giving subordinates the silent treatment, banging the door, etc.). Think back over the last six months as an employee in your present organisation. Please describe (in Filipino or in English) a specific situation or event in which you witnessed/observed a supervisor/boss directed hostile verbal and non verbal behaviours towards his/her subordinate (a co-worker).”

Participants were asked to report an observed supervisor abuse within the last six months in order to capture abusive supervision’s sustained characteristic (Tepper, 2007). The six-month time frame was also given to increase recall accuracy (Aquino et al., 2001). If they could not recall a situation or event in the past six months, they were instructed to report the most recent one that they can remember. If they have not witnessed such situation or event in their present organisation, they were instructed to recall an experience from their previous organisation. Participants were asked to answer questions related to their cognitive evaluation, emotional response, and behavioural reactions in reference to the event or situation they have reported.

Measures

Unless otherwise specified, a seven-point Likert was used to assess the study variables (1= strongly agree; 7 = strongly disagree), with items coded such that a higher

score represented a greater amount of the focal construct, with the exception of reverse-coded items.

Perceived responsibility. Perceived responsibility was measured using four items adapted from the relationship attribution scale developed by Fincham and Bradbury (1992). Items were slightly modified to fit the context of supervisor-subordinate relationship. Fincham and Bradbury (1992) reported a reliability coefficient ranging from .91 to .93. Sample items include “I believe that the actions/behaviours of the supervisor/boss are intentional” and “I believe that the actions/behaviours of the supervisor/boss are motivated by selfish rather than unselfish concerns.” Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .85.

Perceived magnitude of consequences. Magnitude of consequences was measured using a four-item scale developed by May and Pauli (2002). Prior research reported reliability coefficient ranging between .71 to .81 (May & Pauli, 2002). Sample items include “The actions/behaviours of the supervisor/boss were detrimental to my co-worker” and “The actions/behaviours of the supervisor/boss caused harm to my co-worker.” Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .81

Perceived social consensus. Social consensus was measured using a two-item scale developed by May and Pauli (2002). A sample item is “Most employees working in other organisations would agree that the actions/behaviours of this supervisor/boss are wrong.” Previous research reported reliability coefficient ranging from .72 to .79 (May & Pauli, 2002). In addition to these two items, one item (“Most people, in general, would agree that the actions of the supervisor/boss are wrong”) was adapted from the social

consensus measure used by Singhapakdi et al. (1999). Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .94.

Anger towards the supervisor. As in Study 1, anger was measured using an eight-item scale developed by Spielberger et al (1983). Participants rated the extent to which they felt the following emotions towards the supervisor: angry, mad, irritated, furious, annoyed, frustrated, aggravated, and resentful. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .94.

Sympathy towards the subordinate. As in Study 1, sympathy was measured using three items from the state sympathy scale developed by Batson et al (1987). Participants rated the extent to which they felt the following emotions towards the subordinate: sympathetic, grieved, and compassion. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .76.

Retaliation against the supervisor. Retaliation was measured using the 10 indirect retaliation items adapted from Green et al. (1996). Richardson and Green (2003) reported that RCRQ's internal consistency reliability has ranged from .80 to .84 for indirect aggression across 10 studies. Participants rated the extent to which they engaged in retaliatory behaviours towards the supervisor. Sample items include "I asked my other co-workers to be indifferent to the supervisor/boss" and "I spread rumours about the supervisor/boss." Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .95.

Support towards the subordinate. Support was measured using three items adapted from the emotional support scale developed by Parasuraman, Greenhaus, and Granrose (1992). Prior work (Purohit, 1999) reported a reliability estimate of .84 for this scale. Participants rated the extent to which they provided emotional support towards the

subordinate. Sample items include “I showed concern about his/her welfare” and “I listened to his/her feelings regarding the way s/he has been treated by the supervisor.” Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .96.

Moral identity. Moral identity was measured using five items adapted from the moral identity (symbolization dimension) scale developed by Aquino and Reed (2002). Previous studies reported reliability coefficient ranging from .83 to .85 (Aquino & Reed, 2002; Reed & Aquino, 2003; Reynolds & Ceramic, 2007). Participants were asked to visualise in their mind the kind of person who has following characteristics: caring, compassionate, fair, friendly, generous, helpful, hardworking, honest, and kind. They were asked to imagine how that person would think, feel, and act. Once, they have a clear image of that person, they were prompted to answer a series of items. Sample items include “The kinds of books and magazines that I read identify me as having these characteristics” and “I am actively involved in activities that communicate to others that I have these characteristics.” Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .87.

Control variables. As in Study 1, the following variables were controlled in the analysis: age, gender, and tenure. Moreover, closeness to both supervisor and subordinate were controlled for as level of closeness may affect an observer’s emotional and behavioural reactions to both perpetrator and victim in the context of moral transgression (Jones, 1991).

Results

Descriptive statistics, bivariate correlations, and internal consistency reliabilities for all the variables are presented in Table 2. The SPSS macro designed by Preacher, Rucker, and Hayes (2007) was utilised to test the moderated mediation hypotheses

(Hypotheses 4a, 4b, 4c, 6a, 6b, and 6c). Following Preacher and colleagues' (2007) approach, I examined the conditional indirect effects of cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) in predicting behavioural reactions to supervisor abuse (retaliation and support) via emotions (anger and sympathy) at high and low levels of moral identity (symbolization). Because I proposed that moral identity will serve as a first and second stage moderator, I expect two significant interaction terms—between a) cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) and symbolization, and b) emotions (anger and sympathy) and symbolization. To test this, I examined the first and second stage moderating effects of symbolization within the proposed relationships (See Table 3).

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics, Zero-order Correlations, and Reliability of the Study Variables in Study 2.

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Gender		4.98													
2. Age	28.15	5.69	-.10												
3. Tenure	1.89	.63	-.14*	.41**											
4. Closeness to Supervisor		.77	-.12	-.03	-.03										
5. Closeness to Subordinate		.84	-.07	-.11	.02	.39**									
6. Perceived responsibility	4.67	1.46	-.05	.13*	.11	-.17**	-.07	(.85)							
7. Perceived magnitude of consequence	4.65	1.59	.13*	.06	.13*	-.16*	-.10	.81**	(.81)						

8. Perceived social consensus	4.61	1.83	.07	.11	.12	-.15*	-.01	.70**	.72**	(.94)					
9. Anger	4.21	1.54	.01	.12	.13*	-.12	-.04	.53**	.61**	.61**	(.94)				
10. Sympathy	4.19	1.46	.06	-.10	.01	-.11	.04	.41**	.51**	.38**	.57**	(.76)			
11. Retaliation	2.01	1.26	-.13	.01	.01	.05	.03	.04	.09	.08	.24**	.22**	(.95)		
12. Support	4.41	1.76	.06	.04	.07	.05	.16*	.33**	.34**	.39**	.29**	.34**	.12	(.96)	
13. Moral Identity (Symbolization)	1.31	1.30	.03	.11	.23**	-.03	-.04	.31**	.29**	.31**	.32**	.23**	.07	.25**	(.87)

Note:

1. N= 241

2. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted and the final model was compared against several alternative models. Model 1 incorporated all eight constructs into one factor, χ^2 (119, N=219) = 522.42, $p < .000$, $\chi^2/\text{df} = 4.39$, CFI = .89, TLI = .87, SRMR = .16, RMSEA = .12. Model 2 combined measures on cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) and symbolization into Factor 1, measures on emotional response (anger and sympathy) into Factor 2, and behavioural reactions (retaliation and support) into Factor 3, χ^2 (99, N=219) = 338.26, $p < .000$, $\chi^2/\text{df} = 3.42$, CFI = .93, TLI = .91, SRMR = .11, RMSEA = .10. (Model 1 vs Model 2, χ^2 diff (5) = 184.16, $p < .000$). Model 3 combined moral intensity measures (magnitude of consequence and social consensus) into Factor 1, measures on emotional response (anger and sympathy) into Factor 2, measures on behavioural reactions (retaliation and support) into Factor 3, perceived responsibility as Factor 4, and symbolization as Factor 5, χ^2 (94, N=219) = 270.35, $p < .000$, $\chi^2/\text{df} = 2.88$, CFI = .95, TLI = .93, SRMR = .10, RMSEA = .09. (Model 2 vs Model 3, χ^2 diff (4) = 67.91, $p < .000$). Model 4 combined moral intensity measures (magnitude of consequence and social consensus) into Factor 1, measures on emotional response (anger and sympathy) into Factor 2, perceived responsibility as Factor 3, symbolization as Factor 4, retaliation as factor 5, and support as Factor 6, χ^2 (93, N=219) = 246.26, $p < .000$, $\chi^2/\text{df} = 2.65$, CFI = .96, TLI = .94, SRMR = .08, RMSEA = .08. (Model 3 vs Model 4, χ^2 diff (3) = 24.09, $p < .001$). Model 5 moral intensity measures (magnitude of consequence and social consensus) into Factor 1, perceived responsibility as Factor 2, symbolization as Factor 3, anger as Factor 4, sympathy as Factor 5, retaliation as Factor 6, and support as Factor 7, χ^2 (92, N=219) = 243.85, $p < .000$, $\chi^2/\text{df} = 2.65$, CFI = .96, TLI = .94, SRMR = .08,

RMSEA = .08. (Model 4 vs Model 5, χ^2 diff (2) = 24.09, *ns*). Results of the chi square difference test between the final measurement model (eight-factor model) and the best fitting Model 5 (seven-factor model) suggested that the former had the best fit (Final measurement model vs. Model 5, χ^2 diff (1) = 47.60, $p < .000$). Table 4 shows a summary of the measurement models tested in the present study.

Table 4

Confirmatory Factor Analyses of Final Measurement Model and Alternative Models in Study 2

Model	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	SRMR	RMSEA	$\chi^2\text{diff}$
Model 1: one-factor	522.42	119	4.39	.89	.87	.16	.12	-
Model 2: three-factor	338.26	99	3.42	.93	.91	.11	.10	184.16***
Model 3: five-factor	270.35	94	2.88	.95	.93	.10	.09	67.91***
Model 4: six-factor	246.26	.93	2.65	.96	.94	.08	.08	24.09**
Model 5: seven-factor	243.85	92	2.65	.96	.94	.08	.08	2.41, <i>ns</i>
Final Model: eight-factor	193.24	91	2.16	.97	.96	.03	.07	47.60***

*** $p < .000$, ** $p < .001$, ns, not significant

Hypothesis 4a proposed that the conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting retaliation via anger would be stronger for third parties with high as opposed to low symbolization. Results revealed that the conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility to retaliation via anger was significant for first stage moderation at both high (*indirect effect* = .14, SE = .05, $z = 3.01$, 95% CI: .04 to .24, $p < .01$) and low levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .07, SE = .03, $z = 2.50$, 95% CI: .01 to .15, $p < .05$). In support of this, Figure 4 shows that at high levels of symbolization, there was a stronger positive relationship between perceived responsibility and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta = .66$, $t(229) = 7.68$, $p < .001$. In contrast, at low levels of symbolization, there was a weaker positive relationship between perceived responsibility and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta = .32$, $t(229) = 3.67$, $p < .001$. For the second stage moderation, I only found support for high (*indirect effect* = .16, SE = .04, $z = 3.62$, 95% CI: .09 to .25, $p < .001$) but not at low levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .07, SE = .05, $z = 1.38$, 95% CI: -.06 to -.19, *ns*). Figure 5 shows that at high levels of symbolization, there was a stronger positive relationship between anger and retaliation towards the supervisor, $\beta = .24$, $t(229) = 3.61$, $p < .001$ but non-significant at low levels of symbolization, $\beta = .14$, $t(229) = 2.14$, *ns*. Thus, Hypothesis 4a was supported.

Hypothesis 4b proposed that the conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting retaliation via anger would be stronger for third parties with high as opposed to low symbolization. I found support for the first stage moderation at both high (*indirect effect* = .15, SE = .05, $z = 2.80$, 95% CI: .04 to .25, $p < .01$) and low levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .09, SE = .03, $z = 2.61$, 95% CI: .02 to .17, $p < .01$). Figure 6 reveals that at high level of symbolization, there was a

stronger positive relationship between perceived magnitude of consequence and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta=.71$, $t(229)=10.30$, $p<.001$. In contrast, at low level of moral symbolization, there was a weaker positive relationship between perceived magnitude of consequence and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta=.41$, $t(229)=5.96$, $p<.001$. However, for the second stage moderation, it was only significant at high levels (*indirect effect* = .17, $SE = .05$, $z = 3.23$, 95% CI: .08 to .26, $p < .05$) but not at low levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .10, $SE = .05$, $z = 1.96$, 95% CI: -.02 to .21, *ns*). Thus, Hypothesis 4b was supported.

Hypothesis 4c proposed that the conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting retaliation via anger would be stronger for third parties with high as opposed to low symbolization. Similar to Hypotheses 4a and 4b, results were significant for the first stage moderation at both high (*indirect effect* = .14, $SE = .05$, $z = 3.05$, 95% CI: .04 to .24, $p < .01$) and low levels of symbolization (.08, $SE = .03$, $z = 2.82$, 95% CI: .02 to .15, $p < .01$). As depicted in Figure 7, at high level of moral identity (symbolization), there was a stronger positive relationship between perceived social consensus and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta=.61$, $t(229)=13.95$, $p<.001$. In contrast, at low level of moral identity (symbolization), there was a weaker positive relationship between perceived social consensus and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta=.35$, $t(229)=8.05$, $p<.001$. Moreover, for the second stage moderation, it was significant at high levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .15, $SE = .04$, $z = 3.24$, 95% CI: .06 to .23, $p < .05$) but not for low levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .09, $SE = .04$, $z = 1.97$, 95% CI: -.02 to .19, *ns*). Thus, Hypothesis 4c was supported.

Figure 4 Simple Slope Analysis for Perceived Magnitude of Consequence and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Anger towards the Supervisor

Figure 5 Simple Slope Analysis for Anger towards the Supervisor and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Retaliation

Figure 6 Simple Slope Analysis for Perceived Magnitude of Consequence and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Anger towards the Supervisor

Figure 7 Simple Slope Analysis for Perceived Social Consensus and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Anger towards the Supervisor

Hypothesis 6a proposed that the conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting emotional support via sympathy would be stronger for third parties with high as opposed to low symbolization. The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility to emotional support via sympathy was significant for the first stage moderation at both high (*indirect effect* = .14, SE = .05, $z = 2.79$, 95% CI: .04 to .27, $p < .01$) and low levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .07, SE = .03, $z = 2.23$, 95% CI: .01 to .17, $p < .05$). As seen in Figure 8, there was a stronger positive relationship ($\beta = .52$, $t(229) = 6.03$, $p < .001$) and weaker positive relationship ($\beta = .24$, $t(229) = 2.76$, $p < .01$) at high and low levels of symbolization, respectively between perceived responsibility and sympathy towards the subordinate. For the second stage moderation, I found support for low levels (*indirect effect* = .13, SE = .05, $z = 2.64$, 95% CI: .02 to .26, $p < .05$) but not at high levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .07, SE = .05, $z = 1.63$, 95% CI: -.04 to .20, *ns*). Figure 9 shows that at low levels of symbolization, there was a weaker positive relationship between sympathy and emotional support towards the subordinate ($\beta = .39$, $t(229) = 3.73$, $p < .001$). Thus, Hypothesis 6a was partially supported.

Hypothesis 6b proposed that the conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting emotional support via sympathy would be stronger for third parties with high as opposed to low symbolization. Similar to Hypothesis 7, the moderated mediation effect was significant for the first stage at both high (*indirect effect* = .12, SE = .05, $z = 2.47$, 95% CI: .02 to .27, $p < .05$) and low levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .08, SE = .03, $z = 2.27$, 95% CI: .01 to .18, $p < .05$). Figure 10 shows that at high level of symbolization, there was a stronger positive

relationship between perceived magnitude of consequence and sympathy towards the subordinate, $\beta=.55$, $t(229)=7.97$, $p<.001$. In contrast, at low levels of symbolization, there was a weaker positive relationship between perceived magnitude of consequence and sympathy towards the subordinate, $\beta=.37$, $t(229)=5.34$, $p<.001$. Results also revealed that for the second stage moderation, it was significant only at low (*indirect effect* = .08, SE = .05, $z = 1.57$, 95% CI: -.04-.21, $p < .05$) but non-significant at high levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .08, SE = .05, $z = 1.57$, 95% CI: -.04 to .21, *ns*). Thus, Hypothesis 6b was partially supported.

Hypothesis 6c proposed that the conditional indirect effect of social consensus in predicting emotional support via sympathy would be stronger for third parties with high as opposed to low symbolization. Results suggested that the first stage moderation was significant at both high (*indirect effect* = .08, SE = .03, $z = 2.45$, 95% CI: .01 to .19, $p < .05$) and low levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .04, SE = .02, $z = 1.88$, 95% CI: .01-.11, $p < .05$). Figure 11 shows that at high levels of symbolization, there was a stronger positive relationship between perceived social consensus and sympathy towards the subordinate, $\beta=.38$, $t(229)=5.50$, $p<.001$. On the other hand, the positive relationship between perceived social consensus and sympathy towards the subordinate was weaker at low levels of symbolization ($\beta=.17$, $t(229)=2.51$, $p<.05$). The second stage moderation was only significant at low (*indirect effect* = .09, SE = .04, $z = 2.50$, 95% CI: .01 to .18, $p < .05$) but non-significant at high levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .04, SE = .03, $z = 1.51$, 95% CI: -.02 to .14, *ns*). Thus, Hypothesis 6c was partially supported.

Figure 8 Simple Slope Analysis for Perceived Responsibility and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Sympathy towards the Subordinate

Figure 9 Simple Slope Analysis for Sympathy towards the Subordinate and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Support

Figure 10 Simple Slope Analysis for Perceived Magnitude of Consequence and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Sympathy towards the Subordinate

Figure 11 Simple Slope Analysis for Perceived Social Consensus and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Sympathy towards the Subordinate

Table 3

Path Analytic Results: Indirect Effects at Low and High Levels of Moral Identity Symbolization

	IE	SE	Z	CI
Hypothesis 4a				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.07	.03	2.50	.04 to .24
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.14	.05	3.01	.17 to .54
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.07	.05	1.38	-.06 to -.19
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.16	.04	3.62	.09 to .25
Hypothesis 4b				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.09	.03	2.61	.02 to .17
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.15	.05	2.80	.04 to .25
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.10	.05	1.96	-.02 to .21
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.17	.05	3.23	.08 to .26
Hypothesis 4c				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.08	.03	2.82	.02 to .15
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.14	.05	3.05	.04 to .24
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.09	.04	1.97	-.02 to .19
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.15	.04	3.24	.06 to .23

	IE	SE	Z	CI
Hypothesis 6a				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.07	.03	2.23	.01 to .17
Simple paths for high moral identity-symbolization	.14	.05	2.79	.04 to .27
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.13	.05	2.64	.02 to .26
Simple paths for high moral identity-symbolization	.07	.05	1.63	-.04 to .20
Hypothesis 6b				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.08	.03	2.27	.01 to .18
Simple paths for high moral identity-symbolization	.12	.05	2.47	.02 to .27
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.08	.05	1.57	.04 to .21
Simple paths for high moral identity-symbolization	.08	.05	1.57	-.04 to .22
Hypothesis 6c				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.04	.02	1.88	.01 to .11
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.08	.03	2.45	.01 to .19
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.09	.04	2.50	.01 to .18
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.04	.03	1.51	.02 to .14

Discussion

The objective of Study 2 was to test the full hypothesised model of third party reactions to abusive supervision. Specifically, Study 2 examined the interplay among cognitive evaluations, emotional response, behavioural reactions to supervisor abuse, and moral identity (symbolization). Results suggested that third parties' cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) of abusive supervision were indirectly related to their retaliatory behaviours against abusive supervisors via anger. Moreover, third parties' cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) of abusive supervision were indirectly related to providing emotional support towards the subordinate via sympathy. Overall, this study supports attribution theory (Weiner, 1995; 2000) which proposed that an individuals' emotion has a significant function in the link between their cognitive evaluations of an event (supervisor abuse) and behavioural reactions.

Study 2 also suggested the importance of considering dispositional factors when examining third parties' appraisal and reactions to abusive supervision. In particular, overall pattern of results suggested that symbolization exerts a strong influence between third parties' cognitive appraisals of supervisor abuse and resulting emotions towards the supervisor and subordinate. I found support for Hypotheses 4a, 4b, and 4c, which predicted that the conditional indirect effects of perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus in predicting retaliation via anger will be stronger for third parties with high as opposed to low moral identity. Similarly, I also found partial evidence for Hypotheses 6a, 6b, and 6c, which predicted that the conditional indirect effects of perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus in

predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for third parties with high as opposed to low moral identity. According to moral identity theory, individuals high in symbolization seek consistency with their moral beliefs and how they publicly present themselves. This study has provided empirical support for this proposition. In the context of supervisor abuse, this study conveys that third parties high in symbolization respond more negatively (anger) towards the perpetrator and positively (sympathy) towards the subordinate upon perceiving that abusive supervision violates their moral standards. Likewise, third parties are more emotionally affected when they perceive that the mistreatment was intentionally carried out by the supervisor. Based on these findings, third parties' negative and favourable response towards the abusive supervisor and abused subordinate, respectively become more pronounced for those individuals whose moral identity is critical to their self-definition. The role of moral identity was also evident in the relationship between emotional response (anger) and behavioural reactions (retaliation) to supervisor abuse. This posits that moral identity does not only influence how third parties feel but also how they behave towards the perpetrator upon witnessing supervisor abuse.

This study has several strengths. First, it provided a more comprehensive understanding of third parties' reactions to supervisor abuse by integrating cognitive appraisals, emotional responses, and behavioural reactions within one study. Second, using a critical incident technique, the study was able to elicit responses from third parties based on their personal experience rather than through hypothetical situations. Critical incidents have been found as appropriate method in examining a phenomenon which is relatively unexplored such as third parties' reactions to abusive supervision

(Kain, 2004). As such, anchoring this study on the employees' personal circumstances paved the way to gather more in-depth perspectives among third party observers of supervisor abuse.

A major limitation of Study 2 is the cross-sectional nature of the design. Although we cannot infer cause and effect associations in the process model I proposed, prior theory (e.g. attribution theory) provides a basis on the logical flow of the constructs presented in this study. Another limitation of this study concerns the use of self-report (same source) data for both independent and dependent variables. Because the data were obtained from self-reports, I conducted a common latent factor test to examine the influence of common method variance (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff 2003; Williams, Cote, & Buckley 1989). The average variance explained in the items in this study was 9.61%, which is below the 25% median reported by Williams et al. (1989) for studies using self-reported variables. Thus, the result was acceptable. Nevertheless, it is highly recommended for future studies to collect data from multiple sources such as supervisor and target of abuse.

Summary

In summary, this study presents a moderated mediation model that accounts for third parties' emotional response and moral identity in the relationship between cognitive evaluations and behavioural reactions to abusive supervision. It found support for the moderating effect of moral identity-symbolization within the cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, social consensus)—anger—retaliation, and cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, social consensus)—sympathy—emotional support relationships.

CHAPTER 4

Study 3

The Role of Moral Identity and Negative Reciprocity on Third Parties' Emotional and Behavioural Reactions to Supervisor Abuse

Introduction and Hypotheses

Findings of Study 2 suggest that the strength of the indirect effects of cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) to third parties' behavioural reactions (retaliation towards the supervisor and emotional support towards the subordinate) via emotional response (anger and sympathy) was contingent upon one's moral identity (symbolization dimension). Specifically, those with high as opposed to low in symbolization were more emotionally and behaviourally affected as manifested by their anger and retaliation towards the supervisor. Moreover, third parties with high as opposed to low in symbolization react more positively by showing sympathy and emotional support towards the subordinate. A limitation of Study 2 was that it only focused on the public aspect of one's moral identity. Study 3 aims to extend the previous study by accounting for both the public (symbolization) and private (internalization) aspects of one's moral identity. The internalization dimension captures a more reflective discernment of one's inner moral beliefs (Aquino & Reed, 2002).

The main objective of Study 3 was to test the differential effect of symbolization and internalization dimensions of moral identity on third parties' emotional and behavioural reactions to supervisor abuse. In particular, I propose that the indirect effect of cognitive evaluations to retaliation via anger will be stronger for those third parties' high in symbolization and low in internalization. As previously discussed, the moral identity theory posits that those high in symbolization are more likely to

express negative feelings and endorse retaliation towards perpetrators while those high in internalization are more inclined to forgive and not to endorse harm (Reed & Aquino, 2003; Skarlicki et al., 2008). On the other hand, I do not expect differential effects on the two dimensions in predicting reactions towards the subordinate because sympathy and emotional support are positive emotion and behaviour, respectively. Thus, the conditional indirect effects of cognitive evaluations to emotional support towards the subordinate via sympathy will be stronger for those who are both high in symbolization and internalization dimensions.

Hypothesis 4a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

Hypothesis 4b: The conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

Hypothesis 4c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

Hypothesis 5a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger

for individuals with low as opposed to high levels of moral identity (internalization).

Hypothesis 5b: The conditional indirect effect of magnitude of consequence in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with low as opposed to high levels of moral identity (internalization).

Hypothesis 5c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with low as opposed to high levels of moral identity (internalization).

Hypothesis 6a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

Hypothesis 6b: The conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

Hypothesis 6c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

Hypothesis 7a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (internalization).

Hypothesis 7b: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (internalization).

Hypothesis 7c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (internalization).

I also test the influence of negative reciprocity beliefs on the strength of the cognitive evaluations—anger—retaliation relationship. Specifically, it is expected that the relationship will be stronger for third parties high as opposed to low in negative reciprocity beliefs (see Figure 12 for a schematic presentation of hypotheses).

Hypothesis 8a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of negative reciprocity beliefs.

Hypothesis 8b: The conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of negative reciprocity beliefs.

Hypothesis 8c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of negative reciprocity beliefs.

Figure 12. The role of moral identity and negative reciprocity beliefs on third parties' emotional and behavioural reactions to supervisor abuse.

Participants and Procedure

The hypothesised model was tested among a sample of 182 professional employees working in various business sectors in the Philippines such as information technology (13%), insurance (24%), shipping (15%) and property development (48%). All the participants completed surveys containing identity codes that enabled me to match co-worker (i.e., those employees who witnessed supervisor abuse) ratings with those of the corresponding target of the abuse (i.e., those employees who experienced supervisor abuse). They were also assured of confidentiality and that they could withdraw from the study at any point in time. Among co-workers who witnessed the abuse, 44.5 % were male and the average age was 31.49 years. Most of the co-workers (59.3%) have been working in the organisation between 1-5 years. Among the employee targets of abuse, 58 % were female and the average age was 31.40 years.

Two hundred forty employees received a survey kit containing a co-worker self-report questionnaire and a target employee questionnaire. The co-workers who received the self-report questionnaire were instructed to nominate a person with whom they have regularly interacted at work and who they have observed/witnessed to have been treated in an abusive manner by a supervisor. The specific instructions were as follows: *“Sometimes supervisors/bosses engage in sustained display of hostile/aggressive verbal (e.g., belittling subordinates, yelling at subordinates, embarrassing in front of other, etc) and non-verbal behaviors (giving subordinates the silent treatment, banging the door, etc). Please think of a fellow employee within your organisation who has experienced the aforementioned treatment from his/her supervisor over the past six months.”* Then, they were requested to answer a series of questions that capture perceived responsibility,

magnitude of consequence, and social consensus, and emotional reactions (anger towards the supervisor and sympathy towards the subordinate).

Upon completion of the self-report questionnaires, co-workers were asked to pass on a brief questionnaire to the target employee. The target rating form was completed by the subject of the abuse. The target employee assessed the extent to which s/he observed that his/her co-worker engaged in retaliatory acts directed to his/her immediate supervisor and provided him/her emotional support. Out of the 240 employee surveys distributed, we retrieved 217 co-worker self-report questionnaires and 193 target employee questionnaires. A total of 182 co-worker self-report questionnaires and target employee questionnaires were matched, yielding a response rate of 75.83%. Participation was voluntary and participants received a coffee voucher as a token of appreciation for participating in the study.

Measures

Unless otherwise specified, a seven-point Likert scale was used to assess the study variables (1= strongly agree; 7 = strongly disagree), with items coded such that a higher score represented a greater amount of the focal construct, with the exception of reverse-coded items.

Co-worker perceived responsibility. As in Study 2, perceived responsibility was measured using four items adapted from the relationship attribution scale developed by Fincham and Bradbury (1992). Items were slightly modified to fit the context of supervisor-subordinate relationship. Example items include: “I believe that the actions/behaviours of the supervisor/boss are intentional” and “I believe that the

actions/behaviours of the supervisor/boss are motivated by selfish rather than unselfish concerns.” Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .74.

Co-worker perceived magnitude of consequences. As in Study 2, magnitude of consequences was measured using a four-item scale developed by May and Pauli (2002). Example items include: “The actions/behaviours of the supervisor/boss were detrimental to my co-worker” and “The actions/behaviours of the supervisor/boss caused harm to my co-worker.” Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .92.

Co-worker perceived social consensus. As in Study 2, social consensus was measured using a two-item scale developed by May and Pauli (2002). An example item is “Most employees working in other organisations would agree that the actions/behaviours of this supervisor/boss are wrong.” In addition to these two items, one item (“Most people, in general, would agree that the actions of the supervisor/boss are wrong”) was adapted from the social consensus measure used by Singhapakdi et al. (1999). Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .93.

Co-worker anger towards the supervisor. As in Study 1 and Study 2, anger was measured using an eight-item scale developed by Spielberger et al. (1983). Participants rated the extent to which they felt the following emotions towards the supervisor: angry, mad, irritated, furious, annoyed, frustrated, aggravated, and resentful. Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .98.

Co-worker sympathy towards the subordinate. As in Study 1 and Study 2, sympathy was measured using three items from the state sympathy scale developed by Batson et al. (1987). Participants rated the extent to which they felt the following

emotions towards the subordinate: sympathetic, grieved, and compassion. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .73.

Co-worker negative reciprocity. Negative reciprocity was measured using six items from the scale developed by Eisenberger and colleagues (2004). Previous studies reported reliability coefficient ranging from .86 to .93 (Eder et al., 2006; Mitchell & Ambrose, 2008; Restubog et al., 2010). A sample item is "If someone says something nasty to you, you should say something nasty back." Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .94.

Co-worker moral identity. Moral identity was measured using 10 items from the moral identity (symbolization and internalization dimensions) scale developed by Aquino and Reed (2002). Participants were asked to visualise in their mind the kind of person who has following characteristics: caring, compassionate, fair, friendly, generous, helpful, hardworking, honest, and kind. They were asked to imagine how that person would think, feel, and act. Once, they have a clear image of that person, they were prompted to answer a series of items. Symbolization items include: "The kinds of books and magazines that I read identify me as having these characteristics" and "I am actively involved in activities that communicate to others that I have these characteristics." Internalization items include: "It would make me feel good to be a person who has these characteristics" and "Being someone who has these characteristics is an important part of who I am." Cronbach's alpha for the symbolization and internalization dimensions are .83 and .90, respectively.

Target employee-rated co-worker retaliation towards the supervisor. As in Study 2, retaliation was measured using the 10 indirect retaliation items adapted from

Green et al. (1996). Target employees reported the extent to which their co-worker engaged in retaliatory behaviours towards their immediate supervisor/boss. Example items include: “My co-worker spread rumors about my supervisor/boss” and “My co-worker asked other employees to be indifferent to my supervisor/boss.” Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .96.

Target employee-rated co-worker emotional support. As in Study 2, emotional support was measured using three items adapted from the emotional support scale developed by Parasuraman et al. (1992). Target employees reported the extent to which their co-worker extended emotional support towards them. Example items include: “My co-worker showed concern about my welfare” and “My co-worker listened to my feelings regarding the way I have been treated by the supervisor/boss.” Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .84.

Control variables. Similar to Study 1 and Study 2, co-worker age, gender, and organisational tenure were controlled for in the analyses.

Results

Descriptive statistics, bivariate correlations, and internal consistency reliabilities for all the variables are presented in Table 5. The SPSS macro designed by Preacher and colleagues (2007) was utilised to test the moderated mediation hypotheses (Hypotheses 4a, 4b, 4c, 5a, 5b, 5c, 6a, 6b, 6c, 7a, 7b, 7c, 8a, 8b, and 8c). Following Preacher and colleagues’ (2007) approach, I examined the conditional indirect effects of cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) in predicting behavioural reactions to supervisor abuse (retaliation and support) via emotions (anger and sympathy) at high and low levels of moral identity (symbolization

and internalization). Because I proposed that moral identity will serve as a first and second stage moderator, I expect two significant interaction terms—between a) cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) and moral identity; and b) emotions (anger and sympathy) and moral identity (See Table 6). For negative reciprocity, I only examined the effect for the cognitive evaluations—anger—retaliation relationship. Thus, I also expect two significant interaction terms—between a) cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) and negative reciprocity; and b) anger and negative reciprocity (See Table 7).

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics, Zero-order Correlations, and Reliability of the Study Variables in Study 3.

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Co-worker gender		.50													
2. Co-worker age	31.49	4.79	-.19*												
3. Co-worker tenure	2.25	.63	-.08	.34*											
4. Co-worker perceived responsibility	3.87	1.19	.06	-.08	-.13	(.74)									
5. Co-worker perceived magnitude of consequence	3.32	1.47	.05	.13	.07	.72**	(.92)								
6. Co-worker perceived social consensus	3.05	1.32	.11	-.01	-.03	.52**	.60**	(.93)							
7. Co-worker anger	1.60	.99	.11	-.18*	-.07	.52**	.44**	.42**	(.98)						
8. Co-worker sympathy	2.01	1.02	.90	-.09	-.10	.36**	.42**	.38**	.55**	(.73)					

9. Target employee rated retaliation	1.19	.52	.05	-.16*	-.05	.28**	.21**	.18**	.66**	.38*	(.96)		
10. Target employee rated support	4.22	1.26	-.10	.04	.01	.32**	.26**	.47**	.07	.27**	-.01	(.84)	
11. Co-worker Moral Identity (Symbolization)	4.02	.83	.15*	-.17*	-.14	.08	-.30**	-.17**	.15*	.07	.13	.12	(.83)
12. Co-worker Moral Identity (Internalization)	4.55	1.22	.02	-.16*	-.19*	-.20**	-.41**	-.19**	-.12	.01	-.18*	.04	.36** (.90)
13. Co-worker Negative Reciprocity	2.30	1.07	-.18*	.09	.06	.12	-.50	.18*	.19*	.12	.25**	.28**	-.06 -.27** (.94)

Note:

1. N= 182

2. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Hypotheses 4a and 5a proposed that the conditional indirect effect of co-worker reported perceived responsibility in predicting target employee rated retaliation via anger would be stronger for those third parties with high as opposed to low symbolization (Hypothesis 4a) and for those low as opposed to high internalization (Hypothesis 5a). I found support for the first and second stage moderation at both high (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .17, SE = .03, $z = 6.02$, 95% CI: .08 to .32, $p < .001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .16, SE = .03, $z = 6.03$, 95% CI: .05 to .27, $p < .001$) and low levels of symbolization (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .12, SE = .03, $z = 3.70$, 95% CI: .06 to .21, $p < .001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .15, SE = .03, $z = 4.59$, 95% CI: .06-.32, $p < .001$). In support of this, Figure 13 shows that at high levels of symbolization, there was a stronger positive relationship between perceived responsibility and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta=.53$, $t(175)=6.50$, $p<.001$. In contrast, at low levels of symbolization, there was a weaker positive relationship between perceived responsibility and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta=.37$, $t(175)=6.37$, $p<.001$. Moreover, Figure 14 reveals that at high levels of symbolization, there was a stronger positive relationship ($\beta=.34$, $t(175)=7.02$, $p<.001$). In contrast at low levels of symbolization, there was a weaker positive relationship ($\beta=.33$, $t(175)=6.82$, $p<.001$) between anger and retaliation towards the supervisor. For the internalization dimension, results revealed that the conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility to retaliation via anger was significant at the first and second stage moderation for both high (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .10, SE = .02, $z = 3.95$, 95% CI: .05 to .16, $p < .001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .09, SE = .03, $z = 3.06$, 95% CI: .03 to .21, $p < .01$) and low levels of moral identity (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* =

.23, SE = .04, $z = 6.28$, 95% CI: .11 to .41, $p < .001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .16, SE = .02, $z = 6.48$, 95% CI: .10 to .25, $p < .001$). Figure 15 shows that at low levels of internalization, there was a stronger positive relationship between co-worker reported perceived responsibility and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta = .73$, $t(175) = 8.25$, $p < .001$. Conversely, at high levels of internalization, there was a weaker positive relationship between co-worker reported perceived responsibility and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta = .35$, $t(175) = 6.42$, $p < .001$. Furthermore, Figure 16 shows that at low level of moral identity internalization, there was a stronger positive relationship between co-worker reported anger towards the supervisor and target employee rated retaliation, $\beta = .40$, $t(175) = 8.05$, $p < .001$. In contrast, at high levels of internalization, there was a weaker positive relationship between co-worker reported anger towards the supervisor and target employee rated retaliation, $\beta = .21$, $t(175) = 4.27$, $p < .001$. Thus, Hypotheses 4a and 5a were supported.

Figure 13 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Perceived Responsibility and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Co-worker rated Anger towards the Supervisor

Figure 14 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Target Employee Rated Co-worker Retaliation

Figure 15 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Perceived Responsibility and Moral Identity (Internal ization) Predicting Co-worker rated Anger towards the Supervisor

Figure 16 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor and Moral Identity (Internalization) Predicting Target Employee Rated Co-worker Retaliation

Hypotheses 4b and 5b proposed that the conditional indirect effect of co-worker reported magnitude of consequence in predicting target employee rated retaliation via anger would be stronger for those third parties with high as opposed to low symbolization (Hypothesis 4b) and for those low as opposed to high internalization (Hypothesis 5b). Results supported predictions for both symbolization and internalization dimensions. For the symbolization dimension, results showed that indirect effects of perceived magnitude of consequence to retaliation via anger was significant at the first and second stage moderation for both high (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .16, SE = .02, $z = 6.48$, 95% CI: .09 to .28, $p < .001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .12, SE = .02, $z = 5.60$, 95% CI: .06 to .20, $p < .001$) and low levels of symbolization (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .06, SE = .02, $z = 2.35$, 95% CI: .02 to .12, $p < .05$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .11, SE = .02, $z = 4.41$, 95% CI: .04 to .25, $p < .001$). As seen in Figure 17, at high levels of symbolization, there was a stronger positive relationship between co-worker reported magnitude of consequence and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta = .55$, $t(175) = 13.91$, $p < .001$. In contrast, at low levels of symbolization, there was a weaker positive relationship between co-worker reported magnitude of consequence and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta = .25$, $t(229) = 9.10$, $p < .001$. Similarly, I found support for the first and second stage moderation at both high (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .09, SE = .02, $z = 3.85$, 95% CI: .04 to .14, $p < .001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .07, SE = .02, $z = 3.15$, 95% CI: .03 to .17, $p < .01$) and low levels of internalization (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .16, SE = .03, $z = 5.57$, 95% CI: .06 to .29, $p < .001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .12, SE = .02, $z = 6.07$, 95% CI: .07 to .20, $p < .001$). Figure 18 shows that at low levels of

internalization, there was a stronger positive relationship between co-worker reported magnitude of consequence and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta=.49$, $t(175)=6.24$, $p<.001$. In contrast, at high levels of internalization, there was a weaker positive relationship between co-worker reported magnitude of consequence and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta=.28$, $t(175)=5.90$, $p<.001$. Thus, Hypotheses 4b and 5b were supported.

Figure 17 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Magnitude of Consequence and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Co-worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor

Figure 18 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Magnitude of Consequence and Moral Identity (Internalization) Predicting Co-worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor

Hypotheses 4c and 5c proposed that the conditional indirect effect of co-worker reported social consensus in predicting target employee rated retaliation via anger would be stronger for those third parties with high as opposed to low symbolization (Hypothesis 4c) and low as opposed to high internalization (Hypothesis 5c). Results revealed that the conditional indirect effect of social consensus to retaliation via anger was significant for first and second stage moderation at both high (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .16, SE = .02, $z = 6.48$, 95% CI: .08 to .28, $p < .001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .11, SE = .02, $z = 5.70$, 95% CI: .06 to .20, $p < .001$) and low levels of symbolization (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .06, SE = .02, $z = 2.35$, 95% CI: .02 to .12, $p < .05$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .11, SE = .02, $z = 4.41$, 95% CI: .04 to .25, $p < .001$). Figure 19 shows that there was a stronger positive relationship ($\beta = .45$, $t(175) = 5.99$, $p < .001$) at high levels of symbolization and weaker positive

relationship ($\beta=.29$, $t(175)=4.73$, $p<.001$) at low levels of symbolization between co-worker reported social consensus and anger towards the supervisor. Moreover, I also found support for the first and second stage moderation at both high (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .10, $SE = .02$, $z = 4.93$, 95% CI: .05 to .16, $p<.001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .06, $SE = .02$, $z = 2.49$, 95% CI: .02 to .16, $p < .05$) and low levels of internalization (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .16, $SE = .04$, $z = 4.25$, 95% CI: .02 to .35, $p<.001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .11, $SE = .02$, $z = 5.32$, 95% CI: .06 to .18, $p < .001$). Given this, Figure 20 shows that at low levels of internalization, there was a stronger positive relationship between co-worker reported social consensus and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta=.49$, $t(175)=4.47$, $p<.001$. In contrast, at high levels of internalization, there was a weaker positive relationship between co-worker reported social consensus and anger towards the supervisor, $\beta=.32$, $t(175)=6.37$, $p<.001$. Thus, Hypothesis 4c and 5c were supported.

Figure 19 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Social Consensus and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Co-Worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor

Figure 20 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Social Consensus and Moral Identity (Internalization) Predicting Co-Worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor

Hypotheses 6a and 7a proposed that the conditional indirect effect of co-worker reported perceived responsibility in predicting target employee rated emotional support via sympathy would be stronger for those third parties with high as opposed to low symbolization (Hypothesis 6a) and internalization (Hypothesis 7a). The prediction was supported for the first stage moderation at both high (*indirect effect* = .07, SE = .03, *z* = 2.09, 95% CI: .01 to .15, *p* < .05) and low levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .07, SE = .04, *z* = 1.99, 95% CI: .01 to .18, *p* < .05). Figure 21 reveals that at high levels of symbolization, there was a stronger positive relationship ($\beta=.28, t(175)=2.95, p<.01$) and at low levels of symbolization, there was a weaker positive relationship ($\beta=.31, t(175)=4.08, p<.01$) between co-worker reported perceived responsibility and sympathy. For the second stage moderation, I did not find support for high (*indirect effect* = .06, SE

= .04, $z = 1.64$, 95% CI: -.15 to .24, *ns*) and low levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .08, $SE = .04$, $z = 1.83$, 95% CI: .01 to .20, *ns*).

Figure 21 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Perceived Responsibility and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Co-worker rated Sympathy towards the Subordinate

Results also showed that the conditional indirect effect of co-worker reported perceived responsibility in predicting target employee rated emotional support via sympathy was significant for the first stage moderation at both high (*indirect effect* = .08, $SE = .03$, $z = 2.44$, 95% CI: .02 to .15, $p < .05$) and low levels of internalization (*indirect effect* = .15, $SE = .05$, $z = 3.20$, 95% CI: .06 to .30, $p < .01$). Figure 22 shows that at high levels of internalization, there was a stronger positive relationship between co-worker rated perceived responsibility and sympathy ($\beta=.27$, $t(175)=5.01$, $p<.01$). On the other hand, at low levels of internalization, I found a weaker positive relationship between co-worker rated perceived responsibility and sympathy ($\beta=.50$, $t(175)=4.44$, $p<.001$). But the second stage moderation was only significant at high (*indirect effect* = .22, $SE = .05$,

$z = 4.05$, 95% CI: .09 to .39, $p < .001$) but not at low levels of internalization (*indirect effect* = -.11, SE = .04, $z = -2.71$, 95% CI: -.20 to -.05, *ns*). Figure 23 shows that at high level of moral identity (internalization), there was a stronger positive relationship between co-worker reported sympathy towards the subordinate and target employee rated emotional support, $\beta = .62$, $t(175) = 6.55$, $p < .001$. In contrast, at low level of moral identity (internalization), there was a non-significant relationship between co-worker reported sympathy towards the subordinate and target employee rated emotional support, $\beta = .42$, $t(175) = 3.09$, *ns*. Hypotheses 6a and 7a were partially supported.

Figure 22 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Perceived Responsibility and Moral Identity (Internalization) Predicting Co-worker rated Sympathy towards the Subordinate

Figure 23 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Sympathy towards the Subordinate and Moral Identity (Internalization) Predicting Target Employee Rated Co-worker Support

Hypotheses 6b and 7b proposed that the conditional indirect effect of co-worker reported magnitude of consequence in predicting target employee rated emotional support via sympathy would be stronger for those third parties with high as opposed to low symbolization (Hypothesis 6b) and internalization (Hypothesis 7b). Results revealed that the conditional indirect effect of co-worker reported magnitude of consequence to target employee rated emotional support via sympathy was significant at the first stage moderation for high (*indirect effect* = .07, *SE* = .03, *z* = 1.99, 95% *CI*: .01 to .15, *p* < .001) but not at low levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .07, *SE* = .04, *z* = 1.92, 95% *CI*: .01 to .16, *ns*). As seen in Figure 24, at high levels of symbolization, there was a stronger positive relationship between co-worker reported magnitude of consequence and

sympathy ($\beta=.28$, $t(175)=2.95$, $p<.001$) but non-significant at low levels of symbolization ($\beta=.31$, $t(175)=4.08$, ns). The second stage moderation was not supported at both high (*indirect effect* = .05, $SE = .04$, $z = 1.39$, 95% CI: -.15 to .22, ns) and low levels of symbolization (*indirect effect* = .09, $SE = .05$, $z = 1.80$, 95% CI: .01 to .19, ns). As for the internalization dimension, I found support for the conditional indirect effect of co-worker reported magnitude of consequence to target employee rated emotional support via sympathy for both the first and second stage moderation only for high (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .07, $SE = .03$, $z = 2.06$, 95% CI: .01 to .16, $p < .05$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .23, $SE = .05$, $z = 4.52$, 95% CI: .11 to .37, $p < .001$) but not with low levels of internalization (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .06, $SE = .03$, $z = 1.96$, 95% CI: -.15 to -.02, ns ; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = -.23, $SE = .05$, $z = 4.51$, 95% CI: .12 to -.37, ns). In support of these results, Figure 25 shows that at high levels of internalization there was a stronger positive relationship between co-worker reported magnitude of consequence and sympathy ($\beta=.36$, $t(175)=8.11$, $p<.001$) but non-significant at low levels of internalization ($\beta=.31$, $t(175)=3.81$, ns). Thus, Hypotheses 6b and 7b were partially supported.

Figure 24 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Magnitude of Consequence and Moral Identity (Symbolization) Predicting Co-worker Rated Sympathy towards the Subordinate

Figure 25 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Magnitude of Consequence and Moral Identity (Internalization) Predicting Co-worker Rated Sympathy towards the Subordinate

Hypotheses 6c and 7c proposed that the conditional indirect effect of co-worker reported social consensus in predicting target employee rated emotional support via sympathy would be stronger for those third parties with high as opposed to low symbolization (Hypothesis 6c) and internalization (Hypothesis 7c). The predictions for the first and second stage moderation were not supported at both high (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .02, SE = .02, $z = 1.00$, 95% CI: -.01 to .11, *ns*; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .03, SE = .02, $z = 1.02$, 95% CI: -.14 to .21, *ns*) and low levels of symbolization (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .03, SE = .03, $z = 1.02$, 95% CI: -.03 to .12, *ns*; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .03, SE = .04, $z = .76$, 95% CI: -.04 to .13, *ns*). As for the internalization dimension, the first stage moderation was not significant at both high (*indirect effect* = .04, SE = .03, $z = 1.53$, 95% CI: -.01 to .11, *ns*) and low levels of internalization (*indirect effect* = .04, SE = .03, $z = 1.36$, 95% CI: -.01 to .17, *ns*). Although, I found support for the second stage moderation only for high (*indirect effect* = .17, SE = .05, $z = 3.66$, 95% CI: .07-.30, $p < .001$) but not at low levels of internalization (*indirect effect* = -.07, SE = .03, $z = -1.98$, 95% CI: -.14 to .01, *ns*). Thus, Hypothesis 6c was not supported and Hypothesis and 7c was partially supported.

Table 6

Path Analytic Results: Indirect Effects at Low and High Levels of Co-Worker Moral Identity (Symbolization and Internalization)

	IE	SE	Z	CI
Hypothesis 4a				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization				
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.12	.03	3.70	.06 to .21
	.17	.03	6.02	.08 to .32
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.15	.03	4.59	.06 to .32
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.16	.03	6.03	.05 to .27
Hypothesis 4b				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.09	.03	2.61	.02 to .17
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.06	.02	2.35	.02 to .12
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.11	.02	4.41	.04 to .25
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.12	.02	5.60	.06 to .20
Hypothesis 4c				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.06	.02	2.35	.02 to .12
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.16	.02	6.48	.08 to .28
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.11	.02	4.41	.04 to .25
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.11	.02	5.70	.06 to .20

	IE	SE	Z	CI
Hypothesis 5a				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- internalization	.23	.04	6.28	.11 to .41
Simple paths for high moral identity- internalization	.10	.02	3.95	.05 to .16
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- internalization	.16	.02	6.48	.10 to .25
Simple paths for high moral identity- internalization	.09	.03	3.06	.03 to .21
Hypothesis 5b				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- internalization	.09	.03	2.61	.02 to .17
Simple paths for high moral identity- internalization	.16	.03	5.57	.06 to .29
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- internalization	.12	.02	6.07	.07 to .20
Simple paths for high moral identity- internalization	.07	.02	3.15	.03 to .17
Hypothesis 5c				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- internalization	.16	.04	4.25	.02 to .35
Simple paths for high moral identity- internalization	.10	.02	4.93	.05 to .16
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- internalization	.11	.02	5.32	.06 to .18
Simple paths for high moral identity- internalization	.06	.02	2.49	.02 to .16

	IE	SE	Z	CI
Hypothesis 6a				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.07	.04	1.99	.01 to .18
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.07	.03	2.09	.01 to .15
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.08	.04	1.83	.01 to .20
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.06	.04	1.64	-.15 to .24
Hypothesis 6b				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.07	.04	1.92	.01 to -.16
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.07	.03	1.99	.01 to .15
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.09	.05	1.80	.01 to -.19
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.05	.04	1.39	-.15 to .22
Hypothesis 6c				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.04	.02	1.88	.01 to .11
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.03	.03	1.02	-.03 to .12
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- symbolization	.03	.04	.76	-.04 to .13
Simple paths for high moral identity- symbolization	.03	.02	1.02	-.14 to .21

	IE	SE	Z	CI
Hypothesis 7a				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- internalization	.15	.05	3.20	.06 to .30
Simple paths for high moral identity- internalization	.08	.03	2.44	.02 to .15
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- internalization	.11	.04	2.71	-.20 to .05
Simple paths for high moral identity- internalization	.22	.05	4.05	.09 to .39
Hypothesis 7b				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- internalization	.06	.03	1.96	-.15 to -.02
Simple paths for high moral identity- internalization	.07	.03	2.06	.01 to .16
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- internalization	.23	.05	4.51	.12 to .37
Simple paths for high moral identity- internalization	.23	.05	4.52	.11 to .37
Hypothesis 7c				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- internalization	.04	.03	1.36	-.01 to .17
Simple paths for high moral identity- internalization	.04	.03	1.53	-.01 to .11
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low moral identity- internalization	.07	.03	1.98	-.14 to .01
Simple paths for high moral identity- internalization	.17	.05	3.66	.07 to .30

Hypothesis 8a proposed that the conditional indirect effect of co-worker reported perceived responsibility in predicting target employee rated retaliation via anger would be stronger for those third parties with high as opposed to low in negative reciprocity beliefs. The prediction was supported at both high (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .33, SE = .05, $z = 6.30$, 95% CI: .17 to .57, $p < .001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .18, SE = .03, $z = 6.09$, 95% CI: .10 to .31, $p < .001$) and low levels of negative reciprocity beliefs (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .08, SE = .02, $z = 3.55$, 95% CI: .03 to .18, $p < .001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .10, SE = .03, $z = 3.44$, 95% CI: .01 to .25, $p < .001$). Thus, Hypothesis 8a was supported.

Hypothesis 8b proposed that the conditional indirect effect of co-worker reported magnitude of consequence in predicting target employee rated retaliation via anger would be stronger for those third parties with high as opposed to low in negative reciprocity beliefs. I found support for the first and second stage moderation at both high (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .16, SE = .03, $z = 5.17$, 95% CI: .08 to .31, $p < .001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .07, SE = .02, $z = 3.14$, 95% CI: .01 to .19, $p < .01$) and low levels of negative reciprocity beliefs (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .08, SE = .02, $z = 4.12$, 95% CI: .04 to .17, $p < .001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .07, SE = .02, $z = 3.14$, 95% CI: .01 to .19, $p < .001$). Thus, Hypothesis 8b was supported.

Hypothesis 8c proposed that the conditional indirect effect of co-worker reported social consensus in predicting target employee rated retaliation via anger would be stronger for those third parties with high as opposed to low in negative reciprocity beliefs. Similar to Hypotheses 8a and 8b, results revealed that the conditional indirect

effect of social consensus to retaliation via anger were significant at first and second stage moderation for both high (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .14, SE = .03, $z = 4.58$, 95% CI: .06 to .27, $p < .001$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .13, SE = .02, $z = 5.13$, 95% CI: .06 to .25, $p < .001$) and low levels of negative reciprocity beliefs (first stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .06, SE = .02, $z = 2.40$, 95% CI: .02 to .13, $p < .05$; second stage moderation: *indirect effect* = .07, SE = .02, $z = 3.41$, 95% CI: .01 to .17, $p < .001$). Thus, Hypothesis 8c was supported.

Simple slope analyses (see Figures 26, 27, 28, and 29) revealed that at high levels of negative reciprocity beliefs, there was a stronger positive relationship between perceived responsibility, $\beta = .93$, $t(175) = 8.99$, $p < .001$, magnitude of consequence, $\beta = .48$, $t(175) = 6.04$, $p < .001$, social consensus, $\beta = .41$, $t(175) = 5.19$, $p < .001$, and co-worker anger towards the supervisor. In contrast, in low levels of negative reciprocity beliefs, there was a weaker positive relationship between perceived responsibility, $\beta = .22$, $t(175) = 4.82$, $p < .001$, magnitude of consequence, $\beta = .24$, $t(175) = 5.21$, $p < .001$, social consensus, $\beta = .17$, $t(175) = 2.19$, $p < .001$, and co-worker anger towards the supervisor. Similarly, the positive relationship between co-worker anger towards the supervisor and target employee rated co-worker retaliation was stronger under high levels of co-worker negative reciprocity beliefs, $\beta = .40$, $t(175) = 8.70$, $p < .001$ and was weaker under low levels of co-worker negative reciprocity beliefs, $\beta = .20$, $t(175) = 4.38$, $p < .001$.

Table 7

Path Analytic Results: Indirect Effects at Low and High Levels of Co-Worker Negative Reciprocity

	IE	SE	Z	CI
Hypothesis 8a				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low negative reciprocity	.08	.02	3.43	.03 to .19
Simple paths for high negative reciprocity	.32	.05	6.25	.17 to .54
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low negative reciprocity	.10	.03	3.44	.01 to .24
Simple paths for high negative reciprocity	.18	.03	6.08	.11 to .33
Hypothesis 8b				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low negative reciprocity	.08	.02	3.80	.04 to .17
Simple paths for high negative reciprocity	.16	.03	5.14	.07 to .30
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low negative reciprocity	.07	.02	3.14	.01 to .20
Simple paths for high negative reciprocity	.13	.02	5.66	.07 to .24
Hypothesis 8c				
<u>First stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low negative reciprocity	.06	.03	2.39	.03 to .13
Simple paths for high negative reciprocity	.15	.03	4.59	.06 to .27
<u>Second stage moderation:</u>				
Simple paths for low negative reciprocity	.07	.02	3.41	.02 to .17
Simple paths for high negative reciprocity	.14	.02	5.14	.07 to .24

Figure 26 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Perceived Responsibility and Negative Reciprocity Predicting Co-worker rated Anger towards the Supervisor

Figure 27 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Magnitude of Consequence and Negative Reciprocity Predicting Co-worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor

Figure 28 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Social Consensus and Negative Reciprocity Predicting Co-Worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor

Figure 29 Simple Slope Analysis for Co-worker Rated Anger towards the Supervisor and Negative Reciprocity Predicting Target Employee Rated Co-worker Retaliation

Discussion

The objective of Study 3 was to test the full hypothesised model of third party reactions to abusive supervision and account for the role of two dispositional factors. In particular, Study 2 examined the interplay between cognitive evaluations, emotional response, behavioural reactions to supervisor abuse, moral identity, and negative reciprocity beliefs. Consistent with attribution theory (Weiner, 1995; 2000) and mirroring the results of Study 2, this study found that third parties' cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) of abusive supervision were indirectly related to their retaliatory behaviours directed towards the abusive supervisors and emotional support towards the abused subordinate via anger and sympathy, respectively.

This study provided an in-depth understanding of the differential effects of moral identity's two sub-dimensions on third parties' emotional and behavioural reactions to abusive supervision. Similar to Study 2, I found evidence that the conditional indirect effects of perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus in predicting retaliation via anger will be stronger for third parties with high as opposed to low in symbolization. Results of this study substantiate moral identity theory's (Aquino & Reed, 2002) assertion that third parties high in symbolization are more inclined to actualise and translate into actions their moral beliefs. As such, evaluations of perceived responsibility and inappropriateness of supervisor abuse resulted in negative feelings (anger) and retaliatory behaviours towards the supervisor. It is important to note that symbolization did not exert a significant influence on the link between sympathy and emotional support towards the abused subordinate. This

unexpected result might have been affected by the way emotional support was measured. In this study, emotional support was rated by the target of abuse. Thus, it is plausible that the level of moral identity (symbolization) as reported by third parties did not match the degree of support being expected by the victims (abused subordinate). The abused subordinate may be anticipating an intensive emotional support considering that their co-workers have personally witnessed his or her supervisor abuse experience.

Previous theorising and empirical studies on moral identity focusing on internalization dimension have shown that it is associated to the likelihood of forgiving and not endorsing harm towards the perpetrator as they consider it as immoral in itself (Reed & Aquino, 2003; Aquino et al., 2007). Results of the study supported this as those low as opposed to high in internalization dimension of moral identity are more likely to feel negative towards the supervisor and ultimately engage in retaliation as a result of their cognitive appraisals. Moreover, the link between sympathy and emotional support was also stronger for individuals high as opposed to low in internalization. Individuals high in internalization have the tendency to feel that they have an obligation to show compassion towards others. As such, it is not surprising that the sympathy they feel for the victim is translated to positive actions such as providing emotional support (Aquino & Reed, 2002; Reed & Aquino, 2003; Skarlicki et al., 2008).

Study 3 results also suggested that the links between cognitive evaluation (based on perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) and anger as well as anger and retaliatory behaviours are more pronounced for individuals high as opposed to low in negative reciprocity. Even if the cognitive sense-making variables are strong, the resulting emotional and behavioural reactions may still be contingent upon the

individual's personal beliefs about its appropriateness. In this case, third parties with high negative reciprocity beliefs perceive anger and retaliation as appropriate counter-response to supervisor abuse. For third parties high as opposed to low in negative reciprocity beliefs, anger and retaliation towards the supervisor are reasonable and can be considered as acceptable intervention strategies to decrease the likelihood of abuse from happening in the future.

This study has several strengths. First, moral identity was measured using both the symbolization and internalization dimensions. This led to a more robust test on how one's public and private aspect of moral self can influence emotional and behavioral reactions towards immoral acts such as abusive supervision. Second, data were collected from multiple sources decreasing the likelihood of common method variance. Cognitive appraisals and emotional responses were reported by co-workers who witnessed abusive supervision, while their behavioural reactions were rated by the target of abuse themselves. A limitation of this study was third parties' prior experience of supervisor hostility and emotional closeness to both perpetrator and target were not controlled. I acknowledge that prior exposure to hostility can potentially affect an individual's predisposition to engage in aggressive acts (Douglas & Martinko, 2001) and being personally acquainted with the supervisor and subordinate may affect one's judgment of the situation.

Summary

In summary, this study presents a moderated mediation model that accounts for third parties' emotional response, moral identity (symbolization and internalization dimensions), and negative reciprocity beliefs in the relationship between cognitive

evaluations and behavioural reactions to abusive supervision. The study found support for the differential moderating effects of moral identity (symbolization and internalization dimension) within the perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus—anger—retaliation relationship. Moreover, internalization moral identity acted as a second stage moderator within the cognitive appraisals (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus)—sympathy—emotional support relationship. Finally, Study 3 found support for the moderating effect (first and second stage) of negative reciprocity beliefs within the cognitive appraisals (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus)—anger—retaliation relationship.

CHAPTER 5

General Discussion of Key Findings and Conclusions

In the recent years, a plethora of organisational research has focused on destructive behaviours such as abusive supervision, defined as subordinate's perceptions of verbal and non-verbal supervisory hostile behaviours, excluding physical contact (Tepper, 2000). Interest in this field of study has been primarily influenced by increasingly frequent reports of supervisor mistreatment across different countries (Gettler, 2008; Pollard, 2004; Schat et al., 2006; Tepper, 2007). In general, previous studies have shown that abusive supervision results in negative workplace attitudes (e.g., reduced job satisfaction; Tepper, 2000), poor performance (Harris et al., 2007), and higher levels of stress and anxiety (e.g., psychological distress; Restubog et al., 2011). To date, with a few exceptions (Carlson et al., 2011; Hoobler & Brass, 2006; Restubog et al., 2011), considerable work has concentrated on the abusive supervisor and the target of abuse. Moving beyond this typical dyadic relationship, the overarching goal of this program of research was to investigate the cognitive, emotional, and behavioural reactions of third parties who are not the direct targets of supervisor hostility. Specifically, this research had two major objectives. First, this research developed and tested a novel theoretical model which accounts for third parties' cognitive appraisals (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus), emotional (anger towards the supervisor and sympathy towards the target), and behavioural reactions (retaliation against the supervisor and emotional support towards the target) to supervisor abuse. Second, this research examined the moderating role of moral identity

and negative reciprocity in the proposed relationships on third party reactions to abusive supervision.

This chapter summarises the major findings and theoretical contributions of this research program. The findings across three studies are reviewed, integrated, and discussed (See Table 8). First, the results of the main affects of third parties' cognitive evaluation of supervisor abuse to their emotional reactions towards the supervisor and the subordinate. Second, the moderating effects of moral identity and negative reciprocity in the proposed linkages between the cognitive, emotional reactions, and behavioural reactions to supervisor abuse are articulated. The practical and theoretical contributions, methodological limitations, and directions for future research are also discussed. Lastly, overall conclusions are offered.

Main Effects of Cognitive Evaluations to Emotional Reactions

Studies 1, 2, and 3 tested the relationship between third parties' cognitive evaluations in the form of perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus and emotional reactions towards the abusive supervisor and abused subordinate.

Across the three studies, results showed that when third parties perceive that the supervisor is responsible for his or her negative acts, they are likely to feel anger towards the supervisor and sympathy towards the target. Attribution theorists (Heider, 1958; Weiner, 1995) emphasised that the motives and the state of mind attributed to the offender significantly influences third parties' emotional reactions towards the harm-doer and victim. Perception of responsibility arises from the third parties' belief that the perpetrator's actions are voluntary and with the intention of harming another person

(Weiner, 1995). Attribution theory (Weiner, 1986; 2000) suggests that anger towards the perpetrator and sympathy towards the target are the resulting emotions caused by a judgment that the abusive supervisor's negative acts are within his or her control. Third parties experience anger because the supervisor had a free choice to engage in abusive behaviours and that these behaviours are not merely caused by uncontrollable factors (e.g., mood swings as a result of medication; Averill, 1982; Weiner, 1995). Stated differently, anger is elicited because third parties perceive that the supervisor has the ability to regulate his or her negative behaviours towards the target. As Averill (1982) pointed out, this negative emotion towards the perpetrator arises from the belief that the perpetrator could and should have done otherwise. Similarly, increases in perception of responsibility for the negative outcomes brought upon by the supervisor's actions leads to the desire for third parties to ease the suffering of the victim (Weiner, 1986; Williams et al., 1995). The desire to make up for the target's plight results in expressing sympathy (Williams et al., 1995).

Results also showed a consistent main effect of magnitude of consequence in predicting anger towards the abusive supervisor and sympathy towards the target. As posited by moral intensity theory (Jones, 1991), third parties' tendency to react towards the perpetrator and victim is dependent on whether they view the abusive event as morally intense. Specifically, one factor to consider is the magnitude of consequence or how severe the impact was to the victim. When third parties believe that the behaviour of the perpetrator severely harms the well-being of the victim, the more the act is regarded as a violation of moral standards, which ultimately lead third parties to be emotionally affected. Third parties experience emotional outrage towards the supervisor when they

perceive that supervisor abuse had detrimental impact on the subordinate. Given that magnitude of consequence represents higher moral intensity (Jones, 1991), when third parties perceive that the subordinate was severely affected, they are likely to believe that a moral code is broken. Perceiving abusive supervision as a moral violation prompts third parties to experience anger towards the abusive supervisor (Weiner, 1995). Indeed, Barling (1996) emphasised that perceived magnitude of consequence is typically associated with the severe psychological outcomes such as anxiety and depressive symptoms for the victim. As such, the more severe supervisor abuse is perceived, third parties are more likely to experience a sense of threat and suffering on the part of the abused subordinate which can agitate them, thereby prompting them to feel anger towards the perpetrator of the hostile act. Similarly, results across three studies showed that sympathy towards the subordinate was significantly influenced by perceived magnitude of consequence. This can be explained by emotional contagion, “a process in which a person or group influences the emotions of another person through the conscious or unconscious induction of emotional states and behavioural attitudes” (Schoenwolf, 1990, p. 50). Consistent with this perspective, third parties’ emotional states are influenced by the victim’s distress due to supervisor abuse. Third parties are likely to be sympathetic because the severity of the impact signals that target of abuse has experienced harm (Tangney et al., 2007).

Social consensus about the inappropriateness of supervisor abuse positively impacts third parties’ emotional reactions towards the perpetrator and the target of abuse. Results of the three studies were consistent and showed that social consensus about the “badness” of the hostile act resulted in anger. Similar to magnitude of consequence,

social consensus constitutes higher moral intensity (Jones, 1991). Moral intensity theory (Jones, 1991) posits that social validation among other employees that abusive supervision is inappropriate intensifies the perception that the act is immoral. The social information processing theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), which suggests that the social environment guides individuals on how to respond to organisational events, can also explain how perceptions of moral violations can result in anger. Social validation from other employees in the organisation that supervisor abuse is wrong and unacceptable, which therefore makes it immoral, provides a cue to third parties that anger is a justifiable emotional response towards the abusive supervisor. As previously discussed, anger is conceived as valid response in situations in which perpetrator's actions signify violations of moral principles (Tangney et al., 2007; Weiner, 1995). Furthermore, Studies 2 and 3 found that social consensus also significantly influences sympathy towards the target of abuse. Consistent with social information processing theory, it is likely for third parties to easily relate to the suffering of the abused subordinate given the agreement among other members in the organisation that the cause (e.g., supervisor abuse) is unacceptable, and ultimately perceive it as an immoral act. The plight of the target of abuse becomes more prominent and justified when third parties perceive that other employees in the organisation agree that supervisor abuse is wrong and unacceptable, leading them to express sympathy towards the target. While the proposed linkages between social consensus and sympathy were significant in Studies 2 and 3, this relationship was found non-significant in Study 1. One plausible explanation for the non-significant finding in Study 1 deals with the specificity of social consensus to influence third parties' response. In the vignettes used for Study 1, social consensus was only conveyed in the manner

whether most or few employees in the organisation believe that supervisor abuse is wrong and unacceptable. Based on social influence research (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004), a specific explanation for why the majority does not consider an event acceptable would significantly increase one's emotional response. Therefore, results would have been in line with the study's prediction if a clear justification of why most people in the organisation do not tolerate abusive supervision was adequately described.

Moderating Role of Moral Identity (Symbolization and Internalization)

As discussed in the theoretical framework and hypotheses development section, this dissertation proposed differential moderating effects of two sub-dimensions of moral identity (symbolization and internalization) in the relationship among cognitive evaluations—emotional reactions—behavioural reactions to supervisor abuse.

Studies 2 and 3 found that the indirect effects of perceived responsibility to retaliation towards the supervisor through anger were more pronounced for individuals with high as opposed to low in symbolization. This is in line with moral identity theory (Aquino & Reed, 2002), which suggest that individuals high in symbolization are expected to be more sensitive to events when the perpetrator is deemed responsible (Moshman, 2005). Individuals high in symbolization view anger and retaliation as appropriate actions to curtail hostility and in doing so get back at abusive supervisors who are considered accountable for their actions (Moshman, 2005). The perception that the perpetrator intentionally harms the target of abuse is also not congruent to the moral beliefs of third parties high in symbolization prompting them to negatively respond towards the supervisor. Furthermore, Studies 2 and 3 also found that the indirect effects of moral intensity variables (both magnitude of consequence and social consensus) to

retaliation towards the supervisor through anger were more pronounced for individuals with high as opposed to low in symbolization. Consistent with moral identity theory and related empirical research (Aquino & Reed, 2002; Skarlicki et al., 2008), third parties high in symbolization find anger and retaliation as acceptable counter reaction to events such as abusive supervision which constitute moral violations. Perceiving supervisor abuse as a morally-intense issue triggers displeasure among third parties high in symbolization resulting in retaliatory acts directed towards the supervisor.

Study 3 findings also revealed that the conditional indirect effects of perceived responsibility to retaliation towards the supervisor through anger were stronger for individuals low as opposed to high in internalization. This is in line with moral identity theory's (Aquino & Reed, 2002) proposition that the internalization dimension is positively related to higher inclination to forgive perpetrators. This means that individuals low in internalization are not likely to show concern for the interest of others who commit harm against others (Reed & Aquino, 2003). Low internalizers are not likely to include perpetrators perceived as responsible to their moral circle (Singer, 1991). Instead of showing compassion, third parties low in internalization are likely to feel negative (e.g., anger) and advocate harm (e.g., retaliation) towards supervisors accountable for his or her negative behaviours. Furthermore, internalization dimension inhibits individuals from endorsing negative counter reactions upon observing an immoral event as these can be deemed as immoral in itself. This proposition is also validated in Study 3 as the conditional indirect effects of moral intensity variables (magnitude of consequence and social consensus) to retaliation towards the supervisor through anger were stronger for individuals low as opposed to high in internalization. Despite observing moral violations,

the internalization dimension suppresses the tendency to actively punish perpetrators as these can be considered morally wrong. To this end, third parties who are low in internalization are likely to consider negative reactions as an acceptable counter response to immoral events, leading them to feel anger and ultimately engage in retaliatory behaviours towards the abusive supervisor.

A similar moderating effect of moral identity's two sub-dimensions (symbolization and internalization) was also proposed for the cognitive evaluations—sympathy—emotional support towards the subordinate relationship. Both symbolization and internalization dimensions speak of the individual's tendency to express concern and show positive behaviours towards victims of mistreatment. Studies 2 and 3 yielded consistent findings. The indirect effects of perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus (only for Study 2) to emotional support towards the abused subordinate through sympathy were more pronounced to individuals with high as opposed to low symbolization. Although, it should be noted that results in both studies were only significant at the first stage of moderation; that is, high symbolization only played a role in the link between cognitive evaluations and sympathy but not in the relationship between sympathy and emotional support towards the subordinate. This is consistent with moral identity theory's proposition that expressing sympathy towards an abused subordinate is a way for individuals high in symbolization to symbolically demonstrate their moral position that intentional mistreatment and violation of moral principles are not acceptable. Similarly, theoretical and empirical research on moral identity (Aquino & Reed, 2002; Skarlicki et al., 2008) emphasised that high internalizers are more inclined to show positive emotions and behaviours to victims of moral

violations. This is consistent with Study 3's findings. The indirect effects of perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus (second stage moderation only) to emotional support towards subordinate through sympathy were stronger for individuals high as opposed to low in internalization. This shows that internalization predisposes third parties to be more sensitive to the mistreatment of others and express sympathy and emotional support to be consistent with their self-definition as a moral person who should assist victims of moral transgressions.

Moderating Role of Negative Reciprocity

Drawing on internalized norm of reciprocity (Perguni & Galucci, 2001; Perugini et al., 2003), individuals high in negative reciprocity beliefs are more responsive to other people's negative behaviours. Specifically, individuals high in negative reciprocity are sensitive to those perpetrators who are deemed responsible for their actions (Eisenberger et al., 2004). These theoretical and empirical claims were supported in Study 3. Findings showed that the indirect effect of perceived responsibility to retaliation towards the abusive supervisor through anger was more pronounced to individuals high as opposed to low in negative reciprocity beliefs. This suggests that third parties' negative reciprocity beliefs strengthens the positive relationship between appraisals of voluntary and intended mistreatment of the abusive supervisor and corresponding counter negative reactions in the form of anger and retaliation. Individuals who endorse negative reciprocity consider counter negative reactions as justifiable means to let a wrongdoer perceived to be responsible to pay for his or her actions (Eder et al., 2006; Eisenberger et al., 2004). Harm in the form of anger and retaliation for a harm done (supervisor abuse) is a valid counter response for third parties high in negative reciprocity beliefs to possibly deter

future mistreatment. Moreover, the internalized norm of reciprocity also argues that perceptions of the event itself matter to those individuals high in negative reciprocity beliefs. In particular, they are more receptive to wrongdoings considered as moral violations. As previously discussed, magnitude of consequence and social consensus are factors that determine moral intensity. Scholars (Gouldner, 1960; Sahlins, 1972) have noted that individuals high in negative reciprocity beliefs are predisposed to reciprocate feelings and behaviours comparable to what they have observed or experienced. This is evident in Study 3 as third parties who endorse negative reciprocity beliefs considered anger and retaliation as appropriate reactions upon observing supervisor abuse. Overall, third parties' belief that returning harm for a harm done strengthens the positive links among the cognitive evaluations of perceived responsibility and moral intensity (magnitude of consequence and social consensus), anger, and retaliation towards the abusive supervisor. Third parties' personal belief on the appropriateness of counter-retaliation intensifies both negative emotional and behavioural reactions towards the abusive supervisor.

Table 8

Overview of Hypotheses and Findings across Studies

Hypotheses	Study 1	Study 2	Study 3
H1a: Perceived responsibility will be positively associated with anger towards the abusive supervisor.	✓	✓	✓
H1b: Perceived responsibility will be positively associated with sympathy towards the abused subordinate.	✓	✓	✓
H2a: Perceived magnitude of consequences will be positively associated with anger towards the abusive supervisor.	✓	✓	✓
H2b: Perceived social consensus will be positively associated with anger towards the abusive supervisor.	✓	✓	✓
H3a: Perceived magnitude of consequences will be positively associated with sympathy towards the abused subordinate.	✓	✓	✓
H3b: Perceived social consensus will be positively associated with sympathy towards the abused subordinate.	x	✓	✓
H4a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).		✓	✓
H4b: The conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).		✓	✓
H4c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).		✓	✓
H5a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with low as opposed to high levels of moral identity (internalization).			✓
			✓

H5b: The conditional indirect effect of magnitude of consequence in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with low as opposed to high levels of moral identity (internalization).

H5c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with low as opposed to high levels of moral identity (internalization).

H6a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

H6b: The conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

H6c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (symbolization).

H7a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (internalization).

H7b: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (internalization).

H7c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting emotional support via sympathy will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of moral identity (internalization).

H8a: The conditional indirect effect of perceived responsibility in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of negative reciprocity beliefs.

H8b: The conditional indirect effect of perceived magnitude of consequence in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of negative reciprocity beliefs.

*

*

*

*

*

X

*

*

*

H8c: The conditional indirect effect of perceived social consensus in predicting retaliation against the abusive supervisor via anger will be stronger for individuals with high as opposed to low levels of negative reciprocity beliefs.

Note: ✓ = supported; * = partially supported; X = not supported

Theoretical and Practical Implications

This dissertation contributes to the abusive supervision literature in several important ways. First, with a few exceptions (e.g., studies on abusive supervision and family undermining; Restubog et al., 2011), most studies have focused on the typical supervisor-subordinate dyads. As such, the literature has been heavily dominated by abusive supervision's impact on victims as well as the factors that predict its occurrence. However, supervisor abuse can also elicit reactions from employees outside this dyad (Skarlicki & Kulik, 2005). Results of the present research program provided preliminary evidence that even third party observers of supervisor abuse can be also emotionally and behaviourally affected. Specifically, the three studies provided some support that third parties experience anger towards the perpetrator and sympathy for the target. These emotional reactions are likely to drive them to engage in retaliatory acts towards the offender and extend emotional support to the victim.

Second, previous theorising and empirical research on abusive supervision primarily relied on social exchange (Harris et al., 2007), justice (Tepper, 2000), displaced aggression (Hoobler & Brass, 2006), stress (Restubog et al., 2011), and organisational support theories (Shoss et al., in press). Although these theories have been useful in examining the underlying mechanisms and negative repercussions of abusive supervision, it did not capture its moral dimension and ultimately how it generally influences employees' perceptions. Martinko et al. (2011, 2012) reported that very few studies have focused on how employees perceive abusive supervision per se. By integrating attribution and moral intensity theories, the current research program extended the theoretical underpinnings of this phenomenon by investigating supervisor abuse through a moral

perspective. Specifically, this dissertation demonstrates that perceptions of responsibility and moral intensity factors such as magnitude of consequence and social consequence are critical to non-target employees' assessment of abusive supervision.

Third, attribution theory emphasised that attributional activity does not only rely on perceptions per se (Weiner, 1986; 2000). Individual characteristics play an important role in predicting how third parties would react upon observing supervisor abuse. In this regard, this dissertation examined the moderating roles of moral identity and negative reciprocity. Moral identity sheds light on how third parties' moral beliefs strengthen the likelihood of reacting to supervisor abuse. Likewise, negative reciprocity provides an understanding why third parties consider anger and retaliation as morally appropriate reactions to observed interpersonal transgressions.

The findings of the research program have also implications for managerial practice. First, results of this dissertation can guide organisational leaders to develop training programs that can minimise supervisor abuse and its resulting counter-reactions. Specifically, organisations can develop and implement interpersonal justice training programs among supervisors. This training program should focus on educating supervisors on how to treat their subordinates with respect and dignity. The implementation of such programs also signal that hostile acts such as ridiculing, embarrassing, and belittling will not be tolerated by the organisation. There is research to suggest that organisations that train their supervisors on how to be fair towards their subordinates are more likely to lessen undesirable third party reactions and increase organisational member's fairness perceptions (Skarlicki & Kulik, 2005; Skarlicki & Latham, 1996). Similarly, justice-oriented programs can improve supervisor's ability to

be more sensitive and aware on how to properly treat their employees (Cropanzano, Rupp, Mohler, & Schminke, 2011; Greenberg, 2006; Skarlicki & Latham, 1997).

Second, findings of the research program also suggest the importance of establishing formal grievance committees, an appropriate communication channel by which employees' complaints and mistreatment can be systematically reported. An in-house grievance committee can have the following roles. First, it fosters an atmosphere that encourages disclosure of supervisory mistreatment (King & Hermodson, 2009). Second, it ensures that rules on how to report grievances against abusive supervisors are well-communicated among employees. This can be done through information dissemination. Third, it updates employees and parties involved about the progress of the case. It should be communicated to employees that the organisation takes incident reports seriously and fair investigation procedures are in place. Grievance procedures are established to promote justice and resolve conflicts at work (Bemmels & Folley, 1996; Nurse & Devonish, 2007). Indeed, prior studies have shown that having a grievance committee reduces the threat of counter retaliation and preserves the organisation's reputation against being branded as condoning mistreatment (Aram & Salipante, 1981; Bemmels and Foley, 1996; Konovsky, 2000)

Lastly, failure to respond to an observed mistreatment can aggravate employees' negative reactions (Vidmar, 2000). As such, organisations may encourage supervisors found to be abusive to seek apology. A written apology from the perpetrator admitting accountability and conveying honest repentance for the harm done should be directed to the target of abuse. An apology represents the perpetrator's effort to acknowledge wrongdoing and possibly change his or her behaviour, thereby pacifying employees'

outburst of negative emotions and attenuating the desire to engage in counter-retaliation (Jones, 2010; Ohbuchi, Kamida, & Agarie, 1989).

Methodological Limitations and Strengths of the Research

Although this research program made several contributions to the literature and organisational practice, there are a number of limitations that need to be acknowledged and discussed. First, data from both field studies (Study 2 and 3) were obtained at one point in time. Thus, causal relationships cannot be inferred. A longitudinal research design is suggested to provide a more robust examination of the influence of appraisals on third parties' reactions to supervisor abuse. For example, cognitive appraisals (i.e., perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) and emotional reactions (anger and sympathy) can be measured at Time 1 while the behavioural reactions (retaliation and emotional support) can be collected after a six-month time lag.

The second limitation concerns the scenario-based vignette used in the experiment. Scenario-based research is prone to the criticism of presenting stories in which inferences of respondent's behaviour or decision making are difficult to generalise (Weber, 1992). Specifically, Study 1 failed to build a systematic strategy for evaluating the differential responses as a function of the gender of the perpetrator and target of abuse. There is evidence to suggest that men and women have varied views about the acceptability of unethical behaviours (McNichols & Zimmerer, 1985). In the case of the present study, the main characters portrayed in the scenario were gender specific (i.e., a male abusive supervisor and a female target of abuse). Counter-balancing of gender roles (e.g., female abusive supervisor-male abused subordinate) can further determine whether emotional and behavioural responses are influenced by the gender of the perpetrator. It is

also important to note that men and women have distinct moral orientations (Gilligan, 1982). Females tend to be more sensitive to moral issues and are more inclined to show empathy and compassion (Arlow, 1991; Borkowski & Ugras, 1992; Ruegger & King, 1992). Additional analysis was conducted in order to examine whether the participants' gender had an effect on the outcome variables. Supplementary analyses in Study 1 revealed no significant variations between men and women in terms of anger at both low and high of perceived responsibility (male: low = 3.96 and high = 5.20 and female: low = 4.62 and high = 5.41, $F=1.42$; *n.s.*), magnitude of consequence (male: low = 4.01 and high = 5.15 and female: low = 4.76 and high = 5.27, $F=2.69$; *n.s.*), and social consensus (male: low = 4.11 and high = 5.06 and female: low = 4.72 and high = 5.32, $F=.80$; *n.s.*). Similarly, gender did not have a main effect on sympathy at both low and high of perceived responsibility (male: low = 4.60 and high = 4.98 and female: low = 4.79 and high = 5.30, $F=.11$; *n.s.*), magnitude of consequence (male: low = 4.35 and high = 5.23 and female: low = 4.74 and high = 5.37, $F=.35$; *n.s.*), and social consensus (male: low = 4.64 and high = 4.95 and female: low = 5.05 and high = 5.05, $F=.61$; *n.s.*).

A third limitation is that third party reactions captured in this dissertation were limited to two other-oriented emotions (anger and sympathy) and behaviours (retaliation and emotional support). Future research can incorporate additional third party emotions and behaviours.

Lastly, third parties' prior experience of supervisor hostility was not controlled in the analysis. Based on social learning theory of aggression (Bandura, 1973; 1983), aggressive behaviours are learned through the social context. Specifically, individuals exemplify aggressive actions if such behaviours are repeatedly observed (Bandura, 1973) or supported by the immediate environment (Berkowitz, 1993). Therefore, it is

acknowledged that previous exposure to hostility can potentially impact on individuals' predisposition to engage in aggressive acts

Despite these limitations, there are a number of strengths that should be noted. First, this research program addressed Tepper's (2007) call for greater methodological diversity in abusive supervision research. Experimental studies are rare in abusive supervision research. Scenario-based experiments allow researchers "to frame the research question to incorporate complex and multidimensional issues reflecting decision making in the real world" (Cavanagh & Fritzsche, 1985, p.14). This research tested various factors (e.g., perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) that can potentially impact third parties' reactions to supervisor abuse in a context that was tailor fitted to the participant's work background and environment. Second, findings supported the proposed model using replication and empirical extension. Each of the three studies builds on the preceding one using a different methodology and varied organisational samples. Implementing two different empirical approaches (experiment and survey methodologies) and considering that majority of the hypotheses were consistently supported, this research program provided a robust test of the proposed model on third party reactions to supervisor abuse. Third, Study 2 data were collected from two different sources. The cognitive evaluations (perceived responsibility, magnitude of consequence, and social consensus) and emotional responses (anger and sympathy) were reported by the co-workers while the retaliatory behaviours and emotional support were collected from employees who were targets of abuse. Studies using multiple data sources reduce same-source bias and make respondents' ratings more reliable (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986).

Directions for Future Research

Third party involvement is considered a relatively unexplored research area and warrants further empirical investigation. The present research program explored the impact of abusive supervision on organisational members who are not direct targets of the supervisors' hostility. This section discusses several avenues for future research.

First, the present study only accounted for two other-focused emotional responses (e.g., anger and sympathy). In the context of moral transgression, other-focused emotional responses are emotions felt by observers towards the perpetrator and victim involved in the situation. Emotion scholars also emphasised that individuals experience discrete self-oriented emotions depending on the nature and their appraisal of the events (Arnold, 1960; Roseman et al., 1990; Rozin et al., 1999). These emotions are elicited “when some aspect of the self is scrutinised and evaluated” (Tangney et al., 2007, p. 16), especially with respect to observing a moral violation or harmful behaviour (Haidt, 2003). These emotions are self-directed upon evaluating the social or moral acceptability of an observed event. Two self-oriented emotions—sadness and fear—have been considered relevant in the context of moral transgressions (Lazarus, 1991; Roseman, 1984). These negative self-oriented emotions can be felt by an individual if he or she observes a harmful behaviour caused by another person (Roseman, 1984). Sadness is a sense of displeasure associated to harmful events that he or she does not have a control (Frijida, 1988; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985). This is commonly experienced when an individual feels that he or she cannot do anything to help the victim (Tong et al., 2009). Fear involves doubt about an individual's capacity to withstand or cope with a given threat (Frijida, 1988). As a result, fear may lead to being avoidant and self-protecting

from perceived harm (Lerner & Kelter, 2001). When third parties' cognitive appraisal of an event is harmful and involves circumstances beyond his or her control, it may lead to self-oriented emotions discussed earlier (Roseman et al., 1990). This proposition has not been empirically examined in the context of abusive supervision. To this end, future research may also explore how supervisor abuse may result in self-oriented emotions such as sadness and fear.

Aside from in-direct retaliation towards the abusive supervisor and emotional support towards abused subordinate, third party observers may also engage in other forms of behavioural reactions (O'Reilly & Aquino, 2011). Specifically, third parties may directly punish the perpetrator and engage in defensive silence. Direct punishment involves measures taken by third parties to personally and visibly take action against the perpetrator (O'Reilly & Aquino, 2011). For example, a third party may decide to directly confront the perpetrator or engage in supervisor-directed deviance as a form of retaliation. Conversely, defensive silence is described as "withholding relevant ideas, information, or opinions as a form of self protection" (Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003, p. 1367). It is considered as a calculated and proactive behaviour of not speaking up about their concerns on various organisational problems (e.g., supervisor abuse) to safeguard one's self from external threats (Schlemker & Weigold, 1989). These behavioural reactions are contingent upon power characterised as the extent to which an individual has control over another's outcomes (Fiske, 1993; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977). Specifically, third parties' position power (e.g., lower or higher position in the formal organisational structure) relative to the perpetrator may significantly impact the type of reaction they would engage in. On the basis of cost benefit analysis (Skarlicki & Kulik,

2005), third parties are more likely to assess the available resources that come within the power they have in the organisation. Third parties who occupy higher positions in the organisational structure (relative to the perpetrator) have the resources to protect themselves, while low status third parties may have difficulty in defending themselves from counter retaliation. Thus, third parties with higher position power are more likely to punish perpetrators while most low status third party may potentially engage in defensive silence. Another variable to consider is the presence of other third parties. The bystander effect (Darlene & Latane, 1968) suggests that third parties are less likely to intervene when other people are around and aware of the situation. This occurs due to several reasons. First, third parties feel the pressure to conform to certain organisation norms (e.g., not to be involved in other employee's interpersonal conflict). Second, there is less accountability and responsibility to help as the number of witnesses increases (Latane & Darley, 1970). Thus, availability of other witnesses warrants further empirical attention.

Future research can also map out which emotions significantly influence specific behavioural reactions. Some emotions evoke appraisals of uncertainty and situational control (Lerner & Keltner, 2001). This suggests that emotions can guide individuals with realistic and appropriate actions suited to the situation and their perceived capability. For instance, fear of counter-retaliation from authorities (e.g., sanction from the organisation) can result in defensive silence (Dyne et al., 2003; O'Reilly & Aquino, 2011). When third parties experience fear, they are likely to question their ability to counteract possible pressures or intimidation. In order to minimise unwanted consequences, they are more likely to decide not to be personally involved in the situation. Second, other potential moderating variables can be included in the proposed model. The cognitive social theory

suggests the value of considering the interaction between person and contextual factors (Mischel, 1973). Indeed, Caldwell and O'Reilly (1990) emphasised that in the field of organisational behaviour, the robustness of a proposed model increases when both the person and the environment are examined simultaneously. Thus, aside from personality variables, it is worth investigating how contextual variables can influence third party reactions to abusive supervision. Aggressive norms may play a significant role in third parties' willingness to engage in retaliatory actions. As predicted by social learning theory (Bandura, 1973), individuals develop reactions based on social cues in the environment specifically through behavioural modelling or reinforcement (O'Leary-Kelly et al., 1996). For instance, insulting a fellow employee as an accepted practice during meetings may convey that being aggressive towards others is tolerated in the workplace. As such, third parties who are exposed in a context where aggression is supported are more likely to engage in retaliatory actions as well.

Finally, previous studies have shown that observing other forms of mistreatment (e.g., sexual harassment, workplace bullying) have negative ramifications on third parties' workplace attitudes and behaviours (Einarsen, 2000; Hoel et al., 2001). There are several reasons why non-victims are negatively affected. First, individuals have the tendency to empathise with the victim's situation. Empathising involves the "imaginative transposing of oneself into the thinking, feeling, and acting of another" (Allport, 1937, p. 536). This process is made possible through emotional contagion, "a process in which a person or group influences the emotions or behaviour of another person or group through conscious or unconscious induction of emotion states and behavioural attitudes" (Schoenewolf, 1990, p. 50). The target of abuse's expression of emotional stress via non-

verbal cues such as negative facial expressions and body language can be transferred to third party observers. Through vicarious experience and psychologically placing themselves in the victim's situation, witnesses can share the emotional stress of the victims (Lazarus, 1991 & Barsade, 2001). In fact, research findings (Rayner, 1999; Vartia, 2001) show that compared to non-observers, witnesses of workplace bullying reported more general and mental stress. As such, aside from reactions towards the supervisor-subordinate dyad, it would be interesting to empirically examine how witnessing supervisor abuse would directly affect third parties' psychological well-being. Second, the feeling of being the next target of hostility may also result in anxiety and distress (Frijda, 1993; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). The concept of covictimisation, defined as "the experience of directly observing an assault of another person" (Shakoor & Chalmers, 1991, p. 233) extends the scope of the impact of traumatic experience to third party observers. This idea suggests that witnesses become victims as well on the assumption that indirect exposure to abuse is traumatic and disturbing in itself (Glomb, Richman, Hulin, & Drasgow, 1997). These negative emotional states can impair an individual's cognitive processing which can ultimately reduce performance. For instance, Porath and Erez (2009) reported that by merely observing rudeness, respondents' routine and creative tasks performance and citizenship behaviours were negatively affected. When third parties witness rudeness, they become upset and there is a higher tendency to engage in cognitive moral appraisals (e.g. is it right to mistreat another person) and experience dilemmas on how to react (e.g., should I get involved in the situation?) (Porath & Erez, 2009). These off task cognitive processing about the observed event may negatively affect third parties' cognitive focus on job related activities. Given this, future

research should also investigate how third parties' workplace performance is affected upon observing supervisor abuse.

Overall Conclusion

The findings of this dissertation build on the abusive literature in several important ways. First, this research expanded abusive supervision beyond the typical supervisor-subordinate relationships and proposed and tested a novel theoretical model that accounted for third parties' emotional and behavioural reactions to supervisor abuse. Second, it examined abusive supervision using a moral perspective by considering how third parties perceive supervisor abuse as a morally-intense issue. Third, it investigated how personal characteristics (moral identity and negative reciprocity) influence third party reactions to abusive supervision. Lastly, this programme addressed the call for methodological diversity in the abusive supervision research by employing experimental and survey designs. Over-all, this dissertation provided theoretical and practical understanding on how third party observers assess and react upon observing supervisor abuse.

A witness...is a (wo)man whose life and faith are so completely one that when the challenge comes to step out and testify for his/er faith, s/he does so, disregarding all risks, accepting all consequences.

-Whittaker Chambers -

References

- Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B.J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 27-51.
- Aquino, K., & Bradfield, M. (2000). Perceived victimization in the workplace: The role of situational factors and victim characteristics. *Organization Science*, 11, 525–537.
- Aquino, K., Grover, S., Bradfield, M. & Allen, D. (1999). The effects of negative affectivity, hierarchical status, and self-determination on workplace victimization. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 260–272.
- Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U., & Bradfield, M. (1999). Justice constructs, negative affectivity, and employee deviance: A proposed model and empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 1073–1091.
- Aquino, K., Tripp, T. M., & Bies, R. J. (2001). How employees respond to personal offense: The effects of blame attribution, victim status, and offender status on revenge and reconciliation in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 52–59.
- Aquino, K. F., & Reed, A., II. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1423–1440.
- Allred, K. G. (1999). Anger and retaliation: Toward an understanding of impassioned conflict in organizations. In R. J. Bies & R. J. Lewicki (Eds.), *Research in negotiation in organizations* (vol. 7, pp. 27–58). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Allred, K. G. (2000). Distinguishing best and strategic practices: A framework for managing the dilemma between creating and claiming value. *Negotiation Journal*, 16, 387–397.
- Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L. Y., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 191–201.
- Aryee, S., Sun, L.-Y., Chen, Z. X. G., & Debrah, Y. A. (2008). Abusive supervision and contextual performance: The mediating role of emotional exhaustion and the

- moderating role of work unit structure. *Management and Organization Review*, *4*, 393–411.
- Ashkanasy, N.M. (1995). Supervisory attributions and evaluative judgments of subordinate performance: A further test of the Green and Mitchell model. In M.J. Martinko (Ed). *Advances in attribution theory: An organisational perspective*. Delray Beach FL: St. Lucie Press.
- Averill, J. (1982). *Anger and aggression*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Bamberger, P. A., & Bacharach, S. B. (2006). Abusive supervision and subordinate problem drinking: Taking resistance, stress, and subordinate personality into account. *Human Relations*, *59*, 723–752.
- Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J.H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior*, *22*, 161-173.
- Batson, C. D., & Coke, J. S. (1981). Empathy: A source of altruistic motivation for helping? In J. P. Rushton & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), *Altruism and helping behavior: Social, personality, and developmental perspectives* (pp. 167-187). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Batson, C. D., Fultz, J., & Schoenrade, P. A. (1987). Distress and empathy: Two qualitatively distinct vicarious emotions with different motivational consequences. *Journal of Personality*, *55*, 19–39.
- Bernardo, A. B. I. (2004). Mckinley’s questionable bequest: Over 100 years of English in Philippine education. *World Englishes*, *23*, 17–31.
- Betancourt, H., & Blair, I. (1992). A cognition (attribution)-emotion model of violence in conflict situation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *18*, 343-350.
- Bies R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (1996). Beyond distrust: “Getting even” and the need for revenge. In: R. M. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations* (pp. 246–260) Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (1997). What’s good about revenge? The avenger’s perspective. In R. J. Lewicki, R. J. Bies, & B. H. Sheppard (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (pp. 145–160). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York, NY: Wiley.

- Bordia, P., Restubog, S.L.D., Bordia, S., & Tang, R. L. (2010). Breach begets breach: Trickle-down effects of psychological contract breach on customer service. *Journal of Management*, 36, 1578-1607.
- Bowes-Sperry, L., & Powell, G. N (1999). Observers' reactions to social-sexual behavior at work: An ethical decision making perspective. *Journal of Management*, 25, 779-802.
- Braverman, M. (1999). *Preventing workplace violence: A guide for employers and practitioners*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Breaux, D.M., Tepper, B.J., Carr, J.C. & Folger, R.C. (2010). An attributional analysis of employees' response to abusive supervision. In L.L. Neider & C.A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *The dark side of management* (pp.??). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Carroll, J. S., & Payne, J. W. (Eds.). (1977). *Cognitive and social behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z. S., Bobocel, D. R., & Rupp, D. E. (2001). Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(2), 164–209.
- Cropanzano, R., Goldman, B., & Folger, R. (2004). Deontic justice: The role of moral principles in workplace fairness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 1019.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31, 874–900.
- Davis, M. A., Johnson, N. B., & Ohmer, D. G. (1998). Issue-contingent effects on ethical decision making: Across-cultural comparison. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17, 373-389.
- Douglas, S.C., & Martinko, M.J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 547-559.
- Eder, P., Aquino, K., Turner, C., & Reed, A. (2006). Punishing those responsible for the prison abuses at Abu Ghraib: The influence of the negative reciprocity norm (NRN). *Political Psychology*, 27, 807–821.

- Eisenberger, R., Lynch, P., Aselage, J., & Rohdieck, S. (2004). Who takes the most revenge? Individual differences in the negative reciprocity norm endorsement, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 787–799.
- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 335-362.
- Fincham, F.D. & Bradbury, T.N. (1992). Assessing attributions in marriage: The relationship attribution measure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 457-468.
- Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Folger, R. (1998). Fairness as a moral virtue. In M. Schminke (Ed.), *Managerial ethics: Morally managing people and processes* (pp. 13–34). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Folger, R. (2001). Fairness as deonance. In S. W. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner, & D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Research in social issues in management* (pp. 3–31). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). Fairness theory: Justice as accountability. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 1-55). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Frijda, N.H. (1986). *The emotions*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Garcia, P. R. J. M., Restubog, S. L. D., & Denson, T. F. (2010). The moderating role of prior exposure to aggressive home culture in the relationship between negative reciprocity beliefs and aggression. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44, 380–385.
- Goels, T. White, G., Beebe, N., Dorantes, C.A. & Hewitt, B. (2006). Moral intensity and ethical decision making: A contextual extension. *Database for Advances in Information Systems*, 37, 86-95.
- Goldman, B. M. (1999). Toward an understanding of employment discrimination claiming: An integration of organizational justice and social information processing theories. *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 361–386.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161–178.

- Granrose, C., Parasuraman, S. & Greenhaus, J. (1992). A proposed model of support provided by two-career couples. *Human Relations*, 45, 1367-93.
- Green, L., Richardson, D. R., & Lago, T. (1996). How do friendship, indirect and direct aggression relate? *Aggressive Behavior*, 22, 81-86.
- Greitemeyer, T. & Rudolph, U. (2003). Help giving and aggression from an attributional perspective: Why and when we help or retaliate. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33, 1069–1087.
- Gundlach, M. J., Douglas, S. C., Martinko, M. J. (2003). The decision to blow the whistle: A social information processing framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 28, 107-123.
- 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, 252-263.
- Harvey, P., Stoner, J., Hochwarter, W., & Kacmar, C. (2007). Coping with abusive supervision: The neutralizing effects of ingratiation and positive affect on negative employee outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 264–280.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. NY: Wiley.
- Ho, R., & Venus, M. (1995). Reactions to a battered woman who kills her abused spouse: An attributional analysis. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 47, 153-159.
- Ho, V.T., Weingart, L.R., & Rousseau, D.M. (2004). ‘Responses to broken promises: does personality matter?’ *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 276–293.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2002). Social and psychological resources and adaptation. *Review of General Psychology*, 6, 307–324.
- Hoobler, J.M., & Brass, D.J. (2006). Abusive supervision and family undermining as displaced aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 1125-1133.
- Jones, D.A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2005). The effects of overhearing peers discuss an authority’s fairness reputation on reactions to subsequent treatment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 363–372.
- Jones, T.M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model. *The Academy of Management Review*, 16, 366-395.

- Jones, T.M., & Ryan, L. V. (1997). The link between ethical judgment and action in organizations: A moral approbation approach. *Organization Science*, 8, 663-680.
- Jones, D.A. & Skarlicki, D. P. (2005). The effects of overhearing peers discuss an authority's fairness reputation on reactions to subsequent treatment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 363-372.
- Keashly, L., Trott, V., & Mclean M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims*, 9, 341-357.
- Kiazad, K., Restubog, S.L.D., Zagenczyk, T., & Kiewitz, C., & Tang, R. L. (2010). In pursuit of power: The role of authoritarian leadership in the relationship between supervisors' Machiavellianism and subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervision. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44, 512-519.
- Krehbiel, P. J., & Cropanzano, R. (2000). Procedural justice and emotion. *Social Justice Research*, 13, 337-358.
- Leung, K., Chiu, W., & Au, Y. (1993). Sympathy and support for industrial actions: A justice analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 781-787.
- Low, K. S. D., P. Radhakrishnan, Scanerder, X., & Rounds, X. (2007). The experiences of bystanders of workplace ethnic harassment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 2261-2297.
- Lyons, C. J. (2006). Stigma or sympathy? Attributions of fault to hate crime victims and offenders. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69, 39-59.
- May, D. R., & Pauli, K. P. (2002). The role of moral intensity in ethical decision making: A review and investigation of moral recognition, evaluation and intention. *Business and Society*, 41, 84-117.
- Menec, V. H. & Perry, R.P. (1998). Reactions to stigmas among Canadian students: Testing attribution-affect-help judgment model. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 138, 443-53.
- 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.

- Marcus-Newhall, A., Pedersen, W. C., Carlson, M., & Miller, N. (2000). Displaced aggression is alive and well: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 670–689.
- Martinko, M.J. (1995). The nature and function of attribution theory within the organizational sciences. In M.J. Martinko (Ed). *Advances in attribution theory: An organisational perspective*. Delray Beach FL: St. Lucie Press.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556.
- O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., & Bowes-Sperry, L. (2001). Sexual harassment as unethical behavior: The role of moral intensity. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 73-92.
- O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Tiedt, P., & Bowes-Sperry, L. (2004). Answering accountability questions in sexual harassment: Insights regarding harassers, targets, and observers. *Human Resource Management Review*, 14, 85-106.
- O'Reilly, J., & Aquino, K. (2011). A model of third parties' morally motivated responses to mistreatment in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 36, 526-543.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Parzefall, M.R. & Salin, D.M. (2010). Perceptions of and reactions to workplace bullying: A social exchange perspective. *Human Relations*, 63, 761-780.
- Parasuraman, S, Greenhaus, J.H., & Granrose, C.S. (1992). Role stressors, social support, and wellbeing among two-career couples. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 339-356.
- Perugini, M., & Gallucci, M. (2001). Individual differences and social norms: The distinction between reciprocators and prosocials. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 19-35.
- Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Paine, J., & Bacharach, D. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26, 513-563.

- Preacher, K. J., Rucker, D. D., & Hayes, A. F. (2007). Assessing moderated mediation hypotheses: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 42, 185-227.
- Rafferty, A., Restubog, S.L.D., Jimmieson, N. (2010). Losing sleep: Examining the cascading effects of supervisors' experience of injustice on subordinates' psychological health. *Work Stress*, 24, 36-55.
- Reidenbach, R. E., & Robin, D.P. (1990). Toward the development of a multidimensional scale for improving evaluations of business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9, 639-653.
- Restubog, S. L. D., Scott, K. L., & Zagenczyk, T. J. (2011). When distress hits home: The role of contextual factors and psychological distress in predicting employees' responses to abusive supervision. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0021593
- Reynolds, S. J. (2006). Moral awareness and ethical predispositions: Investigating the role of individual differences in the recognition of moral issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 233-243.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1997). Workplace deviance: Its definition, its manifestations, and its causes. In R. Lewicki, B. Sheppard, & M. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (pp. 3–27). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Roseman, I.J. (1996). Appraisal determinants of emotions: Constructing a more accurate and comprehensive theory. *Cognition & Emotion*, 10, 241-278.
- Roseman, I.J., Spindel, M.S., & Jose, P.E. (1990). Appraisals of emotion-eliciting events: Testing a theory of discrete emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 899- 915.
- Rozin, P., Lowery, L., Imada, S., & Haidt, J. (1999). The CAD triad hypothesis: A mapping between three moral emotions (contempt, anger, disgust) and three moral codes (community, autonomy, divinity). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(4), 574–586.

- Rudolph, U, Roesch, S., Greitemeyer, T., & Weiner, B. (2004). A meta-analytic review of help giving and aggression from an attributional perspective: Contributions to a general theory of motivation. *Cognition and Emotion*, 18, 815-848.
- Rupp, D. E., & Bell, C. M. (2010). Extending the deontic model of justice: Moral self-regulation in third-party responses to injustice. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20, 89–106.
- Salancik, G. R., J. Pfeffer (1978). Social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 224-253.
- Shweder, R.A., Much, N.C., Mahapatra, M. & Park, L. (1997). The “big three” of morality (autonomy, community, divinity) and the “big three” explanations of suffering. In A. Brandt & P. Rozin (Eds), *Morality and health* (pp.119-169). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Singhapakdi, A., Vitell, S. J., & Kraft, K. L. (1996). Moral intensity and ethical decision making of marketing professionals. *Journal of Business Research*, 36, 245-255.
- Singer, M., Mitchell, S., & Turner, J. (1998). Consideration of moral intensity in ethicality judgments: Its relationship with whistleblowing and need-for-cognition. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17, 527-541.
- Singer, M. S., & Singer, A. E. (1997). Observer judgments about moral agents' ethical decisions: The role of scope of justice and moral intensity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16, 473-484.
- Skarlicki, D. P., Ellard, J. H., & Kelln, B. R. C. (1998). Third-party perceptions of a layoff: Procedural, derogation, and retributive aspects of justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 119–127.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The role of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434–443.
- Skarlicki, D.P., & Kulik, C.T. (2005). Third party reactions to employee (mis)treatment: A justice perspective. In B.M. Staw & R.M. Kramer (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp.183-229). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

- Skarlicki, D.P., & Rupp, D. (2010). Dual processing and organizational justice: The role of rational versus experiential processing in third-party reactions to workplace mistreatment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 944-952.
- Spielberger C.D., Jacobs G.A., Russell S., & Crane, R.S. (1983). Assessment of anger: The state-trait anger scale. In J.N. Butcher, C.D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Advances in personality assessment*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson Hall.
- Tangney J.P., Stuewig J., & Mashek, D.J. (2007). Moral emotions and moral behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 345-72.
- Tepper, B.J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 178-190.
- Tepper, B.J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33, 261-289.
- Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., Breux, D. M., Geider, S., Hu, C. & Wie, H. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 109, 156-167.
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Hoobler, J. M., & Ensley, M. D. (2004). Moderators of the relationship between coworkers' organizational citizenship behavior and fellow employees' attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 455-465.
- Tepper, B.J., Duffy, M.K., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinates' resistance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 974-983.
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K. et al. (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 101-123.
- Tepper, B J, Henle, C. A., Lambert, L S., Giacalone, R. A., & Duffy, M.K. (2008). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organization deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 721-732.

- Tepper, B. J., Moss, S.E., Lockhart, D.E., & Carr, J.C. (2007). Abusive supervision, upward maintenance communication, and subordinates' psychological distress. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1169-1180.
- Tepper, B.J., Moss, S. E., & Duffy, M.K. (2011). Predictors of abusive supervision: Supervisor perceptions of deep-level dissimilarity, relationship conflict, and subordinate performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54, 279-294.
- Thau, S., Bennett, R.J., Mitchell, M.S., & Marss, M.B. (2009). How management style moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and workplace deviance: An uncertainty management theory perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108, 79-92.
- Turillo, C.J., Folger, R., Lavelle, J.J., Umphress, E.E., Gee, J.O. (2002). Is virtue its own reward? Self-sacrificial decisions for the sake of fairness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89, 839-865.
- Velasquez, M. G., & Rostankowski, C. (1985) *Ethics: Theory and practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 82-111.
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement-related emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 92, 548-573.
- Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Weiner, B. (1995). *Judgments of responsibility: A foundation for a theory of social conduct*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Weiner, B. (2000). Intrapersonal and interpersonal theories of motivation from an attributional perspective. *Educational Psychology Review*, 12, 1-14.
- Weiner, B., & Kukla, A. (1970). An attributional analysis of achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality Social Psychology*, 15, 1-20.
- Weiner, B., Perry, R.P. & Magnusson, J. (1988). An attributional analysis of reactions to stigma. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 738-48.

- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617.
- Williams, C., R., Brown, P., Lees-Haley, & Price, J. (1997). An attributional (causal dimensional) analysis of perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25, 1169–1183.
- Wu, T. Y. & Hu, C. (2009). Abusive supervision and employee emotional exhaustion: Dispositional antecedents and boundaries. *Group & Organization Management*, 34, 143-169.
- Yagil, D. (2006). The relationship of abusive and supportive workplace supervision to employee burnout and upward influence tactics. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 6, 49-65.
- Zellars, K.L., Tepper, B.J., & Duffy, M.K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 1068-1076.

Appendix A

Participant Information Sheets, Consent Form, and Debriefing Sheets

Appendix A.1: Information Sheet (Study 1)

Appendix A.2: Information Sheet (Study 2)

Appendix A.3: Information Sheet (Study 3)

Appendix A.4: Consent Form (Studies 1, 2, and 3)

Appendix A.5: Debriefing Sheet (Studies 1, 2, and 3)

Appendix A.1: Information Sheet (Study 1)

Good day! I am Lemuel Toledano and currently pursuing a Doctor of Philosophy in Business at The Australian National University, Australia under the supervision of Associate Professor Simon Lloyd D. Restubog. You are invited to participate in a study of how supervisor-subordinate relationships affect your thoughts, feelings, and behaviours at work. I hope to develop a better understanding of employees' experiences in the workplace for the purpose of helping employees manage work-related problems and concerns in order to make work life productive, enjoyable, and less stressful. You are selected as a possible participant in this study because you were identified as an employee in the organization.

What is the Experiment about?

- This experiment involves reading a short scenario-based vignette on supervisor-subordinate relationship. You will be asked to respond to some questions pertaining to the scenario that you have read. Often times, participants feel that questionnaires may contain trick items of questionable merit. We guarantee that this is not the case here. All questions have been part of several previous researches and are important items. Please address each item carefully, but do not spend considerable time on any particular question.

Confidentiality and General Instructions

- This questionnaire is anonymous and voluntary. Please **do not** write your name on it. You can withdraw from this study at any point in time. Responses to the questionnaire are strictly confidential and will only be seen by the researcher. You will receive a Self-report questionnaire which you have to complete. Please note that these rating will only be used for **research purposes only**.
- For this project to be successful, it is necessary for you to respond as honest as possible, even if the information that you provide is not favorable. Unfortunately, the world of work is not always a pleasant place. Hence, some of the issues that we seek to address here reflect both good and bad elements of your job.

Why an anonymous code?

- I would thus like to match responses to this questionnaire with responses to future surveys. To ensure anonymity, I have designed a **non-identifying** coding system. That way, I do not have to know your name in order to match this survey with future surveys. Please note that I will **never** share the code with anybody else. Please **do not forget** to create the anonymous code

Retrieval

- Please place the completed survey in the enclosed envelope and seal the envelope. I will be collecting it personally from you.

Ethics

If you have any questions about this research, you can contact the principal researcher Mr. Lemuel Toledano in the School of Management, Marketing, and International Business at the ANU (Phone +61 2 612 57353; email: lemuel.toledano@anu.edu.au). This research has been approved by the ANU Human Research Ethics committee. If you have any questions or concerns of ethical nature, you may contact the ethics committee at the ANU at human.ethics.officer@anu.edu.au or (02)-6125-3427.

Thank you very much for participating in this survey.

Appendix A.2: Information Sheet (Study 2)

Good day! I am Lemuel Toledano and currently pursuing a Doctor of Philosophy in Business at The Australian National University, Australia under the supervision of Associate Professor Simon Lloyd D. Restubog. You are invited to participate in a study of how supervisor-subordinate relationships affect your thoughts, feelings, and behaviours at work. I hope to develop a better understanding of employees' experiences in the workplace for the purpose of helping employees manage work-related problems and concerns in order to make work life productive, enjoyable, and less stressful. You are selected as a possible participant in this study because you were identified as an employee in the organization.

What is the Survey about?

- The survey asks questions about work-related attitudes, behaviors and experiences. I acknowledge that the survey is quite lengthy and will take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. Often times, participants feel that a survey may contain trick items of questionable merit. I guarantee that this is not the case here. All questions have been part of several previous researches and are important items. Please address each item carefully, but do not spend considerable time on any particular question.

Confidentiality and General Instructions

- This survey is anonymous and voluntary. Please **do not** write your name on it. You can withdraw from this study at any point in time. Responses to the survey are strictly confidential and will only be seen by the researcher. You will receive a Self-report Survey which you have to complete. Please note that these rating will only be used for **research purposes only**.
- For this project to be successful, it is necessary for you to respond as honest as possible, even if the information that you provide is not favorable. Unfortunately, the world of work is not always a pleasant place. Hence, some of the issues that we seek to address here reflect both good and bad elements of your job.

Why an anonymous code?

- I would thus like to match responses to this questionnaire with responses to future surveys. To ensure anonymity, I have designed a **non-identifying** coding system. That way, I do not have to know your name in order to match this survey with future surveys. Please note that I will **never** share the code with anybody else. Please **do not forget** to create the anonymous code

Retrieval

- Please place the completed survey in the enclosed envelope and seal the envelope. I will be collecting it personally from you.

Ethics

If you have any questions about this research, you can contact the principal researcher Mr. Lemuel Toledano in the School of Management, Marketing, and International Business at the ANU (Phone +61 2 612 57353; email: lemuel.toledano@anu.edu.au). This research has been approved by the ANU Human Research Ethics committee. If you have any questions or concerns of ethical nature, you may contact the ethics committee at the ANU at human.ethics.officer@anu.edu.au or (02)-6125-3427.

Thank you very much for participating in this survey.

Appendix A.3: Information Sheet (Study 3)

Good day! I am Lemuel Toledano and currently pursuing a Doctor of Philosophy in Business at The Australian National University, Australia under the supervision of Associate Professor Simon Lloyd D. Restubog. You are invited to participate in a study of how supervisor-subordinate relationships affect your thoughts, feelings, and behaviours at work. I hope to develop a better understanding of employees' experiences in the workplace for the purpose of helping employees manage work-related problems and concerns in order to make work life productive, enjoyable, and less stressful. You are selected as a possible participant in this study because you were identified as an employee in the organization.

What is the Survey about?

- The survey asks questions about work-related attitudes, behaviors, and experiences. We acknowledge that the survey is quite lengthy and will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. Often times, participants feel that a survey may contain trick items of questionable merit. I guarantee that this is not the case here. All questions have been part of several previous researches and are important items. Please address each item carefully, but do not spend considerable time on any particular question.

Confidentiality and General Instructions

- This survey is anonymous and voluntary. Please **do not** write your name on it. You can withdraw from this study at any point in time. Responses to the survey are strictly confidential and will only be seen by the researcher. You will receive two sets of surveys. The first survey form is a **Self-report Survey** which you have to complete. The second survey is **the Co-Worker Rating Form (CRF)** which you have to pass on to your co-worker. Please note that these rating will only be used for research purposes only.
- For this project to be successful, it is necessary for you to respond as honest as possible, even if the information that you provide is not favorable. Unfortunately, the world of work is not always a pleasant place. Hence, some of the issues that we seek to address here reflect both good and bad elements of your job.

Why an anonymous code?

- To ensure anonymity, I have designed a **non-identifying** coding system. That way, I do not have to know your name in order to match this survey with the CRF and future surveys. Please note that we will **never** share the code with anybody else. Please **do not forget** to create the anonymous code

Retrieval

- Please place the completed survey in the enclosed envelope and seal the envelope. I will be collecting it personally from you.

Ethics

If you have any questions about this research, you can contact the principal researcher Mr. LemuelToledano in the School of Management, Marketing, and International Business at the ANU (Phone +61 2 612 57353; email: lemuel.toledano@anu.edu.au). This research has been approved by the ANU Human Research Ethics committee. If you have any questions or concerns of ethical nature, you may contact the ethics committee at the ANU at human.ethics.officer@anu.edu.au or (02)-6125-3427.

Thank you very much for participating in this survey.

Appendix A.4: Consent Form (Studies 1, 2, and 3)
Third Party Attribution on Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship

I, _____, consent to taking part in the study above. I understand that my participation is completely voluntary, and that I may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. The objectives and procedures of the project have been explained to me and I understand them. I understand that it is sometimes essential for the validity of research results not to reveal the true purpose of the research to participants. If this occurs, I understand that I will be debriefed as soon as is practicable after my participation and, at that time, given the opportunity to withdraw from the research and have records of my participation erased. I have been advised that the results of the project may be published but that my personal details will remain confidential. I voluntarily consent to participate, but I understand that I may withdraw from the study at anytime.

Name of Participant: _____ Signature: _____
Date: _____

(to be printed)

Appendix A.5: Debriefing Sheet (Studies 1, 2, and 3)

Thank you for participating in this study!

Purpose of the Study:

This study is part of a research program investigating the third parties' perspectives on abusive supervision (i.e., nonphysical hostility directed by supervisors against their subordinates) in different organisations including the university. Specifically, we develop and test a theoretical model which accounts for third parties' cognitive, emotional, and behavioural reactions to supervisor abuse.

Benefits of the Study:

The findings of this research will further extend our knowledge on abusive supervision by examining the perspectives of third parties – who are not direct targets of supervisor hostility but serve as bystanders or witnesses to such an event.

Thank-you gift:

As a token of appreciation for your research participation, I have provided you with a coffee voucher.

Further information and The Australian National University researcher contacts:

If you are interested to learn more about our research, the following articles would be helpful:

1. Restubog, S. L. D., Scott, K. L., & Zagenczyk, T. J. (2011). When distress hits home: The role of contextual factors and psychological distress in predicting employees' responses to abusive supervision. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0021593.
2. Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33(3), 261-289.
3. Jones, T.M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model. *The Academy of Management Review*, 16, 366-395.
4. Weiner, B. (2000). Intrapersonal and interpersonal theories of motivation from an attributional perspective. *Educational Psychology Review*, 12, 1-14.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, including feeling distressed as a result of your participation, please contact Mr. Lemuel S. Toledano (Tel: +61 2 612 57353; Email: lemuel.toledano@anu.edu.au).

Access to results:

In the analysis and reporting of results, no individual data will be identified thereby maintaining participant privacy and confidentiality. The results of the study will be presented at conferences and published in academic journals. Should you wish to have access to the final results of the study, please contact the researcher using the email address indicated above.

Appendix B

Materials for Study 1

Appendix B.1: Third Party Demographic Questions

Appendix B.2: Sample Vignettes

Appendix B.3: Anger

Appendix B.4: Sympathy

Appendix B.1: Third Party Demographic Questions

What are your terms of employment?

- ☐ Permanent (Full time)
- ☐ Probationary
- ☐ Permanent (Part-time)
- ☐ Temporary (agency hired/casual)

What is your age as of your last birthday? _____

How long have you been working with your current organization?

- ☐ less than a year
- ☐ 6-10 years
- ☐ 16-20 years
- ☐ 26-30
- years
- ☐ 1-5 years
- ☐ 11-15 years
- ☐ 21-25 years
- ☐ Over 30
- years

What level of management do you belong?

- ☐ Lower
- ☐ Middle
- ☐ Upper

Your job type:

- ☐ accounting/finance management
- ☐ manufacturing/production
- ☐ information technology
- ☐ others: _____
- ☐ customer service
- ☐ marketing/sales
- ☐ research and development
- ☐ legal
- ☐ public relations
- ☐ general

What is your gender? ☐ Male ☐ Female

Appendix B.2: Sample Vignettes

Low Perceived Responsibility, Low Magnitude of Consequence, Low Social Consensus Condition

Janet has been working as a secretary at the university for three years. Six months ago, she was transferred to the office of Dean Gomez. It has not been a pleasant experience for Janet. The Dean is very demanding with his orders and very demeaning with his language. He yells at Janet when giving instructions and calls her slow.

Janet worked on a report the previous night in preparation for today's visit of the education board. As Janet was sitting down, Dean Gomez stormed her cubicle and slammed the report on her desk. He complained that it was badly edited. "How can you be working for an academic institution?" The Dean walked away and banged the door behind him. He does not intentionally hurt his secretary. But the prescribed stress management pills adversely affect his moods and make him impatient and cranky.

Janet breathed a heavy sigh and proceeded with her work. The other staff members in the room saw what happened. Some of them remarked that Dean Gomez's actions were wrong and unacceptable. While some of them defended the Dean's behavior as his way of maintaining the department's high standards.

High Perceived Responsibility, High Magnitude of Consequence, High Social Consensus Condition

Janet has been working as a secretary at the university for three years. Six months ago, she was transferred to the office of Dean Gomez. It has not been a pleasant experience for Janet. The Dean is very demanding with his orders and very demeaning with his language. He yells at Janet when giving instructions and calls her slow.

Janet worked on a report the previous night in preparation for today's visit of the education board. As Janet was sitting down, Dean Gomez stormed her cubicle and slammed the report on her desk. He complained that it was badly edited. "How can you be working for an academic institution?" The Dean walked away and banged the door behind him. He intentionally inflicts this kind of treatment on his secretary. This behavior is his way of asserting his authority.

Janet got red in the face and burst into tears. Crying uncontrollably, she ran away from the office, hysterically screaming that she will resign immediately. The other staff members in the room saw what happened. They all agreed that Dean Gomez's actions were wrong and unacceptable.

Appendix B.3: Anger

<i>Item 1</i>	Angry
<i>Item 2</i>	Mad
<i>Item 3</i>	Irritated
<i>Item 4</i>	Furious
<i>Item 5</i>	Annoyed
<i>Item 6</i>	Frustrated
<i>Item 7</i>	Aggravated
<i>Item 8</i>	Resentful

Appendix B.4: Sympathy

<i>Item 1</i>	Sympathetic
<i>Item 2</i>	Grieved
<i>Item 3</i>	Compassion

Appendix C

Materials for Study 2

Appendix C.1: Third Party Demographic Questions

Appendix C.2: Perceived Responsibility

Appendix C.3: Magnitude of Consequence

Appendix C.4: Social Consensus

Appendix C.5: Anger

Appendix C.6: Sympathy

Appendix C.7: Retaliation

Appendix C8: Moral Identity (Symbolization)

Appendix C.1: Third Party Demographic Questions

01. Gender (please encircle):			
1	Male	2	Female
02. Age (as of last birthday): _____			
03. How long have you been working with your current organization (please encircle)?			
1	less than 1 year	2	1-5 years
3	6-10 years	4	11-15 years
5	16-20 years	6	21-25 years
7	26-30 years	8	Over 30
years			
04. Please indicate your current employment status (please encircle):			
1	permanent/regular	2	probationary
3	contractual	4	casual

Appendix C.2: Perceived Responsibility

<i>Item 1</i>	I believe that the supervisor/boss is fully responsible of that situation
<i>Item 2</i>	I believe that the actions of the supervisor/boss are intentional
<i>Item 3</i>	I believe that the supervisor/boss had total control over his/her actions
<i>Item 4</i>	I believe that the actions of the supervisor/boss are motivated by selfish rather than unselfish concerns

Appendix C.3: Magnitude of Consequence

- Item 1* The actions of the supervisor/boss were detrimental to my co-worker
- Item 2* The actions of the supervisor/boss caused harm to my co-worker
- Item 3* The actions of the supervisor/boss had serious consequences for my co-worker
- Item 4* The overall harm done as result of the supervisor/boss action would be small

Appendix C.4: Social Consensus

<i>Item 1</i>	Most of the employees in the organization would agree that the actions of the supervisor/boss are wrong
<i>Item 2</i>	Most people even those working in other organizations would agree that the actions of supervisor/boss are wrong

Appendix C.5: Anger

<i>Item 1</i>	Angry
<i>Item 2</i>	Mad
<i>Item 3</i>	Irritated
<i>Item 4</i>	Furious
<i>Item 5</i>	Annoyed
<i>Item 6</i>	Frustrated
<i>Item 7</i>	Aggravated
<i>Item 8</i>	Resentful

Appendix C.6: Sympathy

<i>Item 1</i>	Sympathetic
<i>Item 2</i>	Grieved
<i>Item 3</i>	Compassion

Appendix C.7: Retaliation

<i>Item 1</i>	I spread rumors about the supervisor/boss
<i>Item 2</i>	I made up stories to get the supervisor/boss in trouble
<i>Item 3</i>	I made negative comments about the supervisor's/boss' appearance to someone else
<i>Item 4</i>	I took something that belonged to the supervisor/boss
<i>Item 5</i>	I told others not to associate themselves to the supervisor/boss
<i>Item 6</i>	I asked my co-workers to be indifferent to the supervisor/boss
<i>Item 7</i>	I informed other people about the supervisor's/boss' inappropriate behaviours
<i>Item 8</i>	I gossiped about the supervisor/boss behind his/her back
<i>Item 9</i>	I called the supervisor/boss "names"
<i>Item 10</i>	I insulted the supervisor/boss behind his/her back

Appendix C8: Emotional Support

<i>Item 1</i>	I showed concern about his/her welfare
<i>Item 2</i>	I made him/her feel that s/he can count on my understanding and support
<i>Item 3</i>	I listened to his/her feelings regarding the way s/he has been treated by the supervisor

Appendix C8: Moral Identity (Symbolization)

<i>Item 1</i>	I often wear clothes that identify me as having these characteristics
<i>Item 2</i>	The types of things I do in my spare time (e.g., hobbies) clearly identify as having these characteristics
<i>Item 3</i>	The kinds of books and magazines that I read identify me as having these characteristics
<i>Item 4</i>	The fact that I have these characteristics is communicated to others by my membership in certain organizations
<i>Item 5</i>	I am actively involved in activities that communicate to others that I have these characteristics

Appendix D

Materials for Study 3

Appendix D.1: Co-Worker and Target of Abuse Demographic Questions

Appendix D.2: Co-Worker Perceived Responsibility

Appendix D.3: Co-Worker Perceived Magnitude of Consequence

Appendix D.4: Co-Worker Perceived Social Consensus

Appendix D.5: Co-worker Anger

Appendix D.6: Co-worker Sympathy

Appendix D.7: Target of Abuse Rated Retaliation

Appendix D.8: Target of Abuse Rated Emotional Support

Appendix D.9: Co-Worker Negative Reciprocity

Appendix D.10: Moral Identity (Symbolization)

Appendix D.11: Moral Identity (Internalization)

Appendix D.1: Co-Worker and Target of Abuse Demographic Questions

What are your terms of employment? Please tick the box that applies.

- ☐Permanent (Full time)
- ☐Permanent (Part-time)
- ☐Probationary
- ☐Temporary (agency hired/casual)

What is your age as of your last birthday? ____

How long have you been working with your current organization?

- ☐less than a year
- ☐6-10 years
- ☐16-20 years
- ☐26-30 years
- ☐1-5 years
- ☐11-15 years
- ☐21-25 years
- ☐Over 30 years

What level of management do you belong?

- ☐Lower
- ☐Middle
- ☐Upper

What is your gender? ☐ Male ☐ Female

Appendix D.2: Co-Worker Perceived Responsibility

<i>Item 1</i>	I believe that the supervisor/boss is fully responsible of his/her actions towards my co-worker
<i>Item 2</i>	I believe that the actions of the supervisor/boss are intentional
<i>Item 3</i>	I believe that the supervisor/boss had total control over his/her actions
<i>Item 4</i>	I believe that the actions of the supervisor/boss are motivated by selfish rather than unselfish concerns

Appendix D.3: Co-Worker Perceived Magnitude of Consequence

- Item 1* The actions of the supervisor/boss were detrimental to my co-worker
- Item 2* The actions of the supervisor/boss caused harm to my co-worker
- Item 3* The actions of the supervisor/boss had serious consequences for my co-worker
- Item 4* The overall harm done as result of the supervisor/boss action would be small

Appendix D.4: Co-Worker Perceived Social Consensus

- Item 1*

Most of the employees in the organization would agree that the actions of the supervisor/boss are wrong
- Item 2*

Most people even those working in other organizations would agree that the actions of supervisor/boss are wrong

Appendix D.5: Co-worker Anger

<i>Item 1</i>	Angry
<i>Item 2</i>	Mad
<i>Item 3</i>	Irritated
<i>Item 4</i>	Furious
<i>Item 5</i>	Annoyed
<i>Item 6</i>	Frustrated
<i>Item 7</i>	Aggravated
<i>Item 8</i>	Resentful

Appendix D.6: Co-worker Sympathy

<i>Item 1</i>	Sympathetic
<i>Item 2</i>	Grieved
<i>Item 3</i>	Compassion

Appendix D.7: Target of Abuse Rated Retaliation

<i>Item 1</i>	Spread rumors about my supervisor
<i>Item 2</i>	Made up stories to get my supervisor/boss in trouble
<i>Item 3</i>	Made negative comments about my supervisor's/boss' appearance to someone else
<i>Item 4</i>	Took something that belonged to my supervisor/boss
<i>Item 5</i>	Told others not to associate themselves to my supervisor/boss
<i>Item 6</i>	Asked our other co-workers to be indifferent to my supervisor/boss
<i>Item 7</i>	Informed other people about my supervisor's/boss' inappropriate behaviors
<i>Item 8</i>	Gossiped about my supervisor/boss behind his/her back
<i>Item 9</i>	Called my supervisor/boss "names"
<i>Item 10</i>	Insulted my supervisor/boss behind his/her back

Appendix D.8: Target of Abuse Rated Emotional Support

<i>Item 1</i>	Showed that s/he is concern about the way my supervisor/boss has been treating me
<i>Item 2</i>	Made me feel that I can count on his/her understanding and support in relation to my problems on how I am being treated by my supervisor/boss
<i>Item 3</i>	Listened to my feelings about the way my supervisor/boss has been treating me

Appendix D.9: Co-Worker Negative Reciprocity

<i>Item 1</i>	If someone dislikes you, you should dislike them
<i>Item 2</i>	If a person despises you, you should despise them
<i>Item 3</i>	If someone says something nasty to you, you should say something nasty back
<i>Item 4</i>	If a person wants to be your enemy, you should treat them like an enemy
<i>Item 5</i>	If someone treats me badly, I feel like I should treat them even worse
<i>Item 6</i>	If someone has treated you poorly, you should not return the poor treatment

Appendix D.10: Moral Identity (Symbolization)

<i>Item 1</i>	I often wear clothes that identify me as having these characteristics
<i>Item 2</i>	The types of things I do in my spare time (e.g., hobbies) clearly identify as having these characteristics
<i>Item 3</i>	The kinds of books and magazines that I read identify me as having these characteristics
<i>Item 4</i>	The fact that I have these characteristics is communicated to others by my membership in certain organizations
<i>Item 5</i>	I am actively involved in activities that communicate to others that I have these characteristics

Appendix D.11: Moral Identity (Internalization)

<i>Item 1</i>	I strongly desire to have these characteristics
<i>Item 2</i>	Being someone who has these characteristics is an important part of who I am
<i>Item 3</i>	It would make me feel good to be a person who has these characteristics
<i>Item 4</i>	I would be ashamed to be a person who had these characteristics
<i>Item 5</i>	Having these characteristics is not really important to me