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Abstract

Introduction: Recently, interest in abusive supervision has grown (Tepper, 2007). However, little is still known about organizational factors that can reduce the adverse effects of abusive supervision.

Objective: Based on a substitutes for leadership perspective (Kerr & Jermier, 1978), we predict that job resources adequacy and role clarity act as buffers in the negative relationship between abusive supervision, distributive justice and job satisfaction.

Method: A sample of 253 employees from a City Hall was used to test our hypotheses.

Results: We found that abusive supervision was significant and negatively related to distributive justice when job resources adequacy and role clarity were low, but not when job resources adequacy and role clarity were high, with consequences for job satisfaction.

Conclusions: These findings suggest that job resources adequacy and role clarity can reduce the negative impact of abusive supervision, which then lessens distributive unfairness perceptions and job dissatisfaction.
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Résumé

Le rapport entre la supervision abusive, la justice distributive et la satisfaction au travail: Une approche des substituts du leadership

Introduction: Récemment, l'intérêt pour la supervision abusive a augmenté (Tepper, 2007). Cependant, il nous reste très peu d’information sur les facteurs organisationnels qui peuvent réduire les effets néfastes de la supervision abusive.

Objective: Basé sur la perspective des substituts du leadership (Kerr & Jermier, 1978), nous prévoyons que l’adéquation des ressources du travail et la clarté des rôles agissent comme modérateurs dans le rapport négatif entre la supervision abusive, la justice distributive et la satisfaction au travail.

Méthode: Un échantillon composé par 253 employés d'un Conseil Municipal a été utilisé pour tester nos hypothèses.

Résultats: Nous avons constaté que la supervision abusive présente un rapport significatif et négatif avec la justice distributive, lorsque l’adéquation des ressources du travail et la clarté des rôles sont faibles, mais pas lorsque l’adéquation des ressources du travail et la clarté des rôles sont élevés, avec des conséquences sur la satisfaction au travail.

Conclusions: Ces résultats suggèrent que l’adéquation des ressources du travail et la clarté des rôles peuvent réduire l’impact négatif de la supervision abusive, ce qui réduit ainsi la perception d'injustice distributive et l'insatisfaction au travail.

Mots Clés: supervision abusive, substituts du leadership, adéquation des ressources du travail, clarté des rôles, justice distributive, satisfaction au travail
ABUSIVE SUPERVISION AND SUBSTITUTES FOR LEADERSHIP

The relationship between abusive supervision, distributive justice and job satisfaction: A substitutes for leadership approach

In the last dozen years, research interest in the destructive side of leadership has grown due to the potential negative consequences of such behaviors in organizations, including organizational costs, as well as negative personal outcomes (Aasland, Skogstad, Notelaers, Nielsen & Einarsen, 2010). The most studied negative workplace supervisor behavior is abusive supervision, because although it is a low base-rate phenomenon, there is evidence that its effects are noteworthy (Zellars, Tepper & Duffy, 2002). It is defined as “subordinates’ perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact” (Tepper, 2000, p. 178).

This definition includes several features. Firstly, it presupposes a continuing exposure to abusive behavior. Supervisors engage in abuse behaviors for a purpose (e.g. to elicit high performance or to send the message that mistakes will not be tolerated) and abusive supervisors may mistreat their subordinates to accomplish objectives other than causing injury (Tepper, 2007). Secondly, abusive supervision refers to behaviors that reflect indifference, as well as hostility (Tepper, 2000). Finally, abusive supervision consists in a subjective assessment and depends on subordinates’ perceptions of abuse and may be colored by characteristics of the observer and/or subordinate (e.g. personality, demographic profile) and of the context in which the assessment is made (e.g. the work environment, coworker perceptions). Overall, abusive supervision represents prolonged emotional or psychological mistreatment of subordinates from behaviors such as taking undue credit, assigning blame inappropriately, ridiculing subordinates publically, withholding important information or using disparaging
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language, threats, and intimidation tactics (e.g. Harvey, Stoner, Hochwarter & Kacmar, 2007; Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al, 2006).

Abusive supervision has been related to several negative outcomes, including job dissatisfaction, injustice perceptions, psychological and physical illness, deviant behaviors or withholding of organizational citizenship behaviors (e.g. Tepper, 2000; Tepper, Duffy, Henle & Lambert, 2006; Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, & Ensley, 2004; Tepper, Duffy, & Shaw, 2001; Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002). These studies have generally interpreted abusive supervision based on the characteristics and personality traits of supervisors, and have mostly ignored the variability that exists between individuals and different contexts (Martinko, Harvey, Sikora & Douglas, 2009).

Most studies of abusive supervision have focused on moderating factors – both individual and situational – that exacerbate the effects of exposure to abusive supervisors (e.g. Tepper, 2000; Tepper, 2007). Some other studies, albeit scarce, have also identified possible buffers of the adverse effects of abusive supervision (Aryee, Sun, Chen, & Debrah, 2008), namely subordinates’ individual characteristics, such as conscientiousness (Tepper, Duffy & Shaw, 2001), power distance orientation (Lian, Ferris, & Brown, 2012; Lin, Wang & Chen, 2013), or negative reciprocity beliefs (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007). However, we believe one key dimension has been overlooked in the literature: task characteristics. Task characteristics may help subordinates better understand their roles and work processes (Kerr & Jermier, 1978), thus minimizing the negative effects of abusive supervisors, by providing task guidance and incentives to perform and to respond to their work demands, reducing their dependence on the supervisor.

We draw on the substitutes of leadership perspective developed by Kerr and Jermier (1978) to propose two task characteristics (i.e. job resources adequacy and role
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clarity) as potential moderators of the abusive supervision process. According to this model, substitutes of leadership influence the relationship between leaders’ behaviors and work outcomes, by replacing or acting in place of a specific leader behavior. Kerr and Jermier (1978) proposed a variety of subordinate, task, and organizational characteristics that moderate the effect of task and people oriented leadership on relevant behaviors and work outcomes (Kerr, 1977). The effect of these factors (i.e. moderators) is “to negate the leader’s ability to either improve or impair subordinate satisfaction and performance (Kerr & Jermier, 1978, p. 377).

Abusive Supervision and Distributive Justice

Previous research has long recognized that there is a relationship between leader effectiveness and distributive, procedural, and interpersonal fairness (e.g. van Knippenberg, De Cremer and van Knippenberg, 2007; Grover & Coppins, 2012). Organizational justice plays an important role in leadership, in that subordinates’ perceptions of fairness determine their evaluations of supervisors' leadership capabilities (Pillai, Scandura & Williams, 1999). As justice research clearly suggests, the fairness of the outcomes and treatment received from their leaders constitutes a key concern to followers (De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2003; van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). Therefore, if managers do not pay attention to fairness (regarding processes, interpersonal treatment or outcomes), leadership cannot be effective because followers will reject leader authority (Pillai, Scandura & Williams, 1999).

Abusive supervision represents a source of injustice that has serious implications for organizations and employees (Tepper, 2007). Tepper’s (2000) model of abusive supervision was derived from the theory of organizational justice, since abusive supervision affects perceptions of interactional, procedural and distributive unfairness, with serious implications for organizations and employees. That is, when subordinates
perceive injustice, disconcerting feelings of imbalance may lead to negative attitudes and behaviors, including job dissatisfaction and turnover intentions. Justice scholars refer that distributive justice (perceived fairness of the outcomes or allocations that an individual receives), is the best predictor of personal outcomes (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001), such as job satisfaction.

Since distributive justice deals with the perceived fairness of outcomes, it presents strong implications in the organizational context, of which the distribution of outcomes is an essential component (Cohen-Charash & Spector 2001). For example, subordinates of abusive supervisors may feel disadvantaged compared to target referents, by perceiving that they are getting less than they deserve or they may have to overcome this situation by increasing the time and effort needed to perform their tasks, thus decreasing the perceptions of distributive justice (Tepper, 2000).

**Substitutes for Abusive Supervision: Job Resources Adequacy and Role Clarity**

Kerr and Jermier (1978) proposed the concepts of neutralizers and substitutes for leadership when they questioned the assumption present in nearly all leadership theories that leaders always have an effect on followers, regardless of the style adopted or the situation (Wu, 2010). These authors argued that leaders’ behaviors are not the only influence on subordinates’ understanding, attitudes, and effectiveness, nor are the most important factor in some situations (Wu, 2010). Instead, Kerr and Jermier (1978) suggested 14 characteristics of subordinates (e.g., ability/experience/knowledge, need for independence, professional, orientation, indifference to organizational rewards), tasks (e.g., unambiguous/routine, methodologically invariant, provides its own feedback, intrinsically satisfying), and organizations (e.g., formalization, inflexibility, highly specified functions, cohesive work group, organizational rewards not within leader control, spatial distance between leader and subordinate) believed to neutralize
ABUSIVE SUPERVISION AND SUBSTITUTES FOR LEADERSHIP
and/or substitute for the effects of a leader's behavior, either positive or negative
(Dionne, Yammarino, Howell & Villa, 2005). These characteristics may interact with
leaders’ behaviors or may influence subordinates’ job satisfaction, morale, role
perceptions and performance (Wu, 2010). According to Kerr and Jermier (1978), the
greater the extent to which these variables are present, the less influence the leader is
likely to have on subordinate behavior (Williams & Podsakoff, 1988).

Leadership neutralizers constitute characteristics that make it effectively
impossible for leadership to make a difference (Kerr & Jermier, 1978). On the other
hand, substitutes for leadership describe characteristics which render leadership not only
impossible but also unnecessary (Kerr & Jermier, 1978). Leadership substitutes may act
as moderator or suppressor variables by influencing the relationship between leader
behavior and subordinate attitudes and/or performance (Kerr, 1977). For example, some
characteristics that help subordinates better understand their roles and work processes,
or allow them to obtain feedback from sources other than their managers, function as
substitutes for leadership (Kerr & Jermier, 1978). Neutralizers do not replace the
leader’s behavior and, as a result, produce an influence vacuum (Podsakoff, MacKenzie,
& Bommer, 1996). In turn, substitutes for leadership reduce leader’s ability to influence
subordinate criterion variables and, in effect, replace leader influence (Podsakoff,
MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996). Leadership substitutes are potentially useful as
remedies where there are organizational problems stemming from negative leadership
(such as abusive supervision). That is, organizations can provide task guidance and
incentives to perform to such a degree that they virtually negate the leader's ability to
either improve or impair subordinate performance (Howell, Bowen, Dorfman, Kerr &
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Overall, substitutes for leadership moderate the effect of leadership on relevant work outcomes, making it redundant (Kerr & Jermier, 1978). Kerr and Jermier (1978) suggested that future research should expand the model, by identifying other relevant leader behaviors and other potential substitutes and/or neutralizers (i.e., expansion of the domains). However, empirical support for the substitutes model has not raised questions, even though subordinate, task, and organizational characteristics substantially increase the proportion of variance accounted for employee role perceptions, job attitudes, and performance; and often they are more strongly related to the criterion variables than the leader behaviors (Podsakoff, MacKenzie & Bommer, 1996). Kerr and Jermier (1978) focused only on task and relationship oriented leader behaviors and highlighted that the development of such taxonomy was still at an early stage, since the substitutes construct had much wider applicability. Over the last decades, additional substitutes for leadership have been identified, such as teams, core self-evaluations, job autonomy, task significance or organizational reputation (Huusko, 2007; Neves, Rego & Cunha, 2014; Nübold, Muck & Maier, 2013), however there is still a call for extending the list of potential substitutes for leadership, which also takes the specific domain of leadership into account (e.g. Dionne et al., 2005), because the same moderators should not operate for all dimensions of leader behavior (Neves, Rego & Cunha, 2014).

Within the perspective developed by these authors, job characteristics compensate for deficiencies in the relationship with the supervisor (Podsakoff, Niehoff, MacKenzie & Williams, 1993). This may be, for example, when subordinates have the necessary means to perform their tasks at their disposal in their immediate work environment (including equipment and tools, materials, facilities, support services, space, and time) (Job resources adequacy: Rousseau & Aubé, 2010), or when subordinates receive inputs from the environment that guide behavior and provide
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knowledge that it is appropriate, such as duties, allocation of time, the clarity or existence of guides, directives, policies; and the ability to predict sanctions as outcomes of behavior (Role clarity: Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970).

The defining aspects of a substitute hold true for job resources adequacy and role clarity. Firstly, job resources adequacy and role clarity directly influence work outcomes, regardless of the leader's behavior (e.g. Foote, Seipel, Johnson & Duffy, 2005; Villanova & Roman, 1993). Secondly, when job resources adequacy is high, subordinates can orient their energy toward obtaining desired outcomes (Peter & O’Connor, 1980). Previous research highlights that job resources adequacy has an impact on work outcomes, since it increases the level of potential effort, job-related knowledge or skills that can be applied towards job tasks (Bacharach & Bamberger, 1995). That is, this construct constitutes an important predictor of both individual and organizational level phenomena, including organizational innovation, adaptation, development and job satisfaction (Bacharach & Bamberger, 1995).

In the same sense, when role clarity is high, subordinates possess a clear understanding of their requirements, enabling them to preserve their mental energy and use it effectively to accomplish their jobs (Whitaker, Dahling, & Levy, 2007; Fried et al. 2003). Lapidus, Roberts and Chonko (1996) point out that organizational formalization delineates written job goals and objectives, work schedules and performance appraisals, manifesting itself in the form of role clarity. Role clarity facilitates contextual performance by clarifying the expected standards, as well as the behaviors that are valued by the organization, contributing to important organizational outcomes (Whitaker, Dahling, & Levy, 2007). For example, role clarity has been found to have a positive effect on satisfaction with the work itself (e.g. Bray, Beauchamp, Eys & Carron, 2005; Shoemaker, 1999).
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Thirdly, subordinates' actual feeling of having the means at their disposal to perform their tasks, as well as certainty and knowledge about appropriate behaviors, duties, guides, directives and policies, should increase subordinates’ feelings of control over their job and thus help escape from the tight control of their abusive supervisors.

In sum, abusive supervision may have a differential effect on subordinates’ distributive justice perceptions, depending on whether job resources adequacy or role clarity is currently high or low. High job resources adequacy and high role clarity should be an effective substitute of abusive supervision, and therefore should prevent a decrease in distributive justice perceptions as a result of abuse.

Carry Over Effects to Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction constitutes a central topic of organizational research and, recently, organizational scholars have turned their attention to the role of organizational justice in shaping this work attitude (Clay-Warner, Reynolds, Roman. 2005). In fact, a large number of studies have linked justice perceptions to a broad range of organizational outcomes, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, withdrawal behaviors and organizational citizenship behaviors (see Colquitt et al., 2001 for a review). However, previous research suggests that different justice perceptions have different predictive roles depending on whether the outcome in question is personal (for example, pay or job satisfaction) or reflects more general evaluations of organizational outcomes. Previous research has concluded that distributive justice tends to be a better predictor of employees’ attitudes toward personal outcomes, including job satisfaction, pay satisfaction and life satisfaction, whereas procedural justice tends to be a better predictor of employees' attitudes toward organizations and their representatives, such as organizational commitment, and interactional justice appears to play an
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important role in explaining how work-related experiences affect individuals’ lives away from work (e.g. Tepper, 2000).

According to the personal outcomes model (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992), workers focus on distributive fairness to increase their personal outcomes, because they expect fair distributions to produce favorable allocations. Thus, distributive justice is the key antecedent predicting workplace attitudes regarding personal outcomes, such as job satisfaction (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). The personal outcomes model has found empirical support, since distributive justice has been consistently identified as a dominant predictor of job satisfaction. For example, McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) conducted a study with bank employees and found that distributive justice tends to be a stronger predictor of personal outcomes (pay satisfaction and job satisfaction) than procedural justice. In the same line, Martin and Bennett (1996) conducted a study of financial services employees, concluding that distributive justice is closely linked to evaluations of specific personally relevant outcomes, such as facet satisfaction. Finally, Colquitt et al. (2001) conducted a meta-analytic review of 183 justice studies that suggest that organizational justice is a consistently strong predictor of person-referenced outcomes, including satisfaction with a pay raise or performance evaluations.

Although there is little empirical research on the role of distributive justice as mediating factor between leadership and work outcomes, some studies clearly indicate that distributive justice mediates the relationship between the quality of supervisor-subordinate interactions and work outcomes (e.g. Lee, 2001; Hassan & Chandaran, 2006). Tepper (2000) reported that abusive behaviors affect negatively employees’ perceptions of the fairness of organizational outcomes. In turn, the perceived distributive injustice resulting from abusive supervision translates into job dissatisfaction.
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The present study extends Tepper’s (2000) work by suggesting that this relationship is conditional on both job resources adequacy and role clarity are related to distributive justice and, subsequently, job satisfaction. When job resources adequacy is low, a higher level of abusive supervision should be accompanied by decreased distributive justice perceptions (Tepper, 2001) and thus produce low job satisfaction. When job resources adequacy is high, higher level of abusive supervision should fail to produce decreased distributive justice perceptions, as employees have the means at their disposal in their work context to fully use their abilities and skills to fulfill their tasks and thus can escape from the tight control of their abusive supervisors. Therefore, abusive supervision should not contribute to lower perceptions of fairness in the allocation of outcomes that are consistent with the goals of a particular situation, as defined by distributive justice.

Similarly, when role clarity is low, a higher level of abusive supervision should be accompanied by decreased distributive justice perceptions (Tepper, 2001) and thus produce low job satisfaction. However, when role clarity is high, higher level of abusive supervision should fail decrease distributive justice perceptions, as employees possess a precise understanding of their fit and function within a given context. In both cases, employees can escape from the tight control of their abusive supervisors, and thus maintain their levels of perceived distributive fairness.

Overview Section

The present study aims to explore the moderating role of job resources adequacy and role clarity on the relationship between abusive supervision and distributive justice and its carry-over effect on job satisfaction. We examined distributive justice as a key mechanism of the abusive supervision – job satisfaction relationship based on Tepper’s (2000) argument that abusive supervision negatively influences perceptions of
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distributive justice, which in turn exerts greater influence on personal outcomes, such as pay satisfaction and job satisfaction, than procedural, interpersonal or informational justice (Colquitt, 2001). Technically, we are describing mediated moderation, involving the interaction between two predictor variables (abusive supervision and job resources adequacy, as well as abusive supervision and role clarity) on a mediator (distributive justice) which, in turn, affects an outcome (job satisfaction) (Morgan-Lopez & MacKinnon, 2006).

The present research contributes to the literature in the following ways: First, we contribute to the abusive supervision literature by extending Tepper’s (2000) original model and demonstrating that the mediating effect of distributive justice on the relationship between abusive supervision and job satisfaction is not a linear process, but conditional on other factors. Second, it integrates the substitutes for leadership and abusive supervision literature, by proposing that both job resources adequacy and role clarity may represent substitutes for abusive supervision. Finally, we are broadening the study of abusive supervision by proposing that task characteristics (i.e. role clarity and job resources adequacy) may constitute possible buffers of the adverse effects of abusive supervision on employee justice and job satisfaction perceptions.”

In line with previous research, we propose that:

*Hypothesis 1:* Abusive supervision is negatively related to distributive justice.

*Hypothesis 2:* Job resources adequacy ($a$) and role clarity ($b$) moderate the negative relationship between abusive supervision and distributive justice, such that when job resources adequacy or role clarity is higher, abusive supervision has a weaker relationship with distributive justice.
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Hypothesis 3: Distributive justice mediates the relationship between the (a) abusive supervision X job resources adequacy interaction and the (b) abusive supervision X role interaction and job satisfaction.”

The proposed model is represented in Figure 1.

Method

Sample and Procedure

We contacted the Human Resources Management Department of a City Hall, which agreed to participate in our study. We invited 405 full-time employees of this organization to participate in the study. For those that accepted the invitation, questionnaires were distributed individually and collected directly by the researchers to ensure confidentiality. A letter was attached to each of the questionnaires to inform respondents about the aim of the survey and the voluntary nature of their participation, as well as to reassure them of the confidentiality of their responses. The sample size was reduced to 253 employees (62.5% return rate) owing to the employees who declined to participate or didn’t complete the surveys. Missing values varied across items (the cutoff point was three missing values), but never exceeded 2%. Therefore, listwise deletion of cases with missing values was used. The sample size after listwise deletion is n=253, compared with a total sample size of 255. Evaluations of the assumptions including normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of residuals revealed no violations. With a p<. 001 criterion for Mahalanobis distance, there were no outliers among the cases.
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To examine if our sample was representative of the total population, we compared their demographic characteristics. Even though the organization had 405 employees and we obtained data from 253 subordinates, we consider that this sample is representative of the total population; since the overall characteristics are quite similar. Overall, 16.9% of the surveyed employees did not complete high school (17.4% of the employees considering the total population), 41% of the participants had completed high school (40.3%) and 42.1% had a university degree (42.3%). Average organizational tenure was approximately 4.6 years (5.2 years), 59.9% of employees were under 45 years old (62.6%) and 55.7% were women (63%).

Measures

The questionnaires were in Portuguese, but all measures were originally in English. In line with the conventional method of back translation (Brislin, 1976), three steps were taken. First, the measures were translated from English to Portuguese. This was done with the parallel back-translation procedure. Back translation first involves translating the measures from English to Portuguese by an expert. Secondly, this translation was then translated back to the original language by another expert without the use of the original measures. This method provides an initial assessment of the adequacy of the translated version of the measures. Finally, we pretested the Portuguese version of the questionnaire on 20 employees from the participating organizations (who were not included in final the sample). The pre-test did not reveal major any major issues concerning our surveys.

For all measures, with the exception of control variables, respondents rated their agreement with each statement using a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) (the items comprising each of the five measures are shown in the Appendix).
Control Variables. Gender, age, organizational tenure, education and tenure with the supervisor have been found to be related to distributive justice or job satisfaction (e.g. Ambrose & Cropanzano, 2003; Bedeian, Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Clark, Oswald, & Warr, 1996; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Gordon & Arvey, 1975; Hunt & Saul, 1975; Jackson, Messe & Hunter, 1985; Rice, Near & Hunt, 1980) and therefore we analyzed whether it was important to control for their influence in our model. According to the recommendations offered by Becker (2005), we controlled for subordinates’ age, education and tenure with supervisor in our analysis because these were the only control variables significantly correlated with our outcome variables. We coded education as 1 = primary education; 2 = ninth grade; 3 = completed high school; 4 = undergraduate degree; 5 = graduate degree; and tenure with supervisor as less than 6 months = 1; between 6 months and 1 year = 2; between 1 and 5 years = 3; between 5 and 10 years = 4; between 10 and 20 years = 5; over 20 years = 6. As such, both distributive justice and job satisfaction are positively and significantly correlated with age, such that older employees reported higher levels of distributive justice and job satisfaction perceptions. In turn, job satisfaction is significantly and negatively correlated with education and tenure with supervision, such that less educated employees and employees who have been working less time for the current supervisor reported lower levels of job satisfaction (Table 1).

In order to rule out alternative explanations for our findings, in addition to these controls, role clarity was included as a control variable in the job resources adequacy model and job resources adequacy was included as a control variable in the role clarity model.

Abusive Supervision. Subordinates reported the frequency with which their supervisors presented abusive behaviors using Tepper’s (2000) 15-item scale. Sample
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items include ‘My supervisor ridicules me’ and ‘My supervisor does not allow me to interact with my coworkers’. Cronbach alpha was .91.

**Distributive Justice.** We measured distributive justice by using the 5-item Distributive Justice Index (Moorman, 1991). (e.g. ‘My organization has been rewarding me fairly the responsibilities I have’; ‘My organization has been rewarding me fairly the stresses and strains of my job’). The respondents indicated the extent to which they believed they were fairly rewarded for their responsibilities, experience, effort, work, and job stress. Cronbach alpha was .88.

**Job Resources Adequacy.** Subordinates were asked about the basic resources required to accomplish related goals using six items based on the work of Tesluk and Mathieu (1999) and Peters and O’Connor (1980) (e.g. ‘I have adequate materials and supplies to do my job’; ‘I have adequate tools and equipment to accomplish my work’). Cronbach’s alpha was .70.

**Role Clarity.** We measured role clarity by using Rizzo, House and Lirtzmann’s (1970) Role Ambiguity Scale. These eleven items assess the extent of clarity or predictability perceived in their work-related behavior (e.g. ‘I feel certain about how much authority I have’; ‘I know exactly what is expected of me’). Cronbach alpha was .72.

**Job satisfaction.** We measured job satisfaction using the three-item overall satisfaction subscale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1979). Sample items include ‘All in all, I am satisfied with my job’; ‘In general, I don't like my job’. Cronbach alpha was .77.
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Results

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics and correlations among the variables in the study. Reliability coefficients are reported along the main diagonal in the table. It is possible to notice that abusive supervision is significantly and negatively correlated with distributive justice ($r = -0.25, p<0.01$), job resources adequacy ($r = -0.18, p<0.01$), role clarity ($r = -0.32, p<0.01$) and job satisfaction ($r = 0.51, p<0.01$), and positively correlated with tenure with supervisor ($r = 0.13, p<0.05$) and educational level ($r = 0.16, p<0.05$).

Besides abusive supervision, distributive justice was also related to job resources adequacy ($r = 0.45, p<0.01$), role clarity ($r = 0.26, p<0.01$), job satisfaction ($r = 0.40, p<0.01$), and, finally age ($r = 0.15, p<0.05$).

Because our sample includes employees with different professional categories working in six different departments, we conducted analyses of variance (ANOVAs) tests to examine any potential differences between departments or professional categories in the reports of job resources adequacy and role clarity. ANOVAs results indicated no significant differences between departments or professional categories for job resources adequacy ($F(5,250) = 0.526, ns; F(2,251) = 0.844, ns$; respectively) or for role clarity ($F(5,252) = 1.085, ns; F(2,250) = 0.997, ns$; respectively).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

We conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS 20 to examine whether our measurement model had an acceptable fit. We compared our theoretical five-factor model with a four-factor model that combined job resources adequacy and
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role clarity; and finally, a single-factor model that combined all five constructs into one single factor.

Since our sample size was small (N = 253), compared to the number of indicators in our measurement model (k = 40), we followed the parceling procedure recommended by Bagozzi and Edwards (1998) for the abusive supervision (15 items), distributive justice (5 items), job resources adequacy (6 items) and role clarity (11 items) scales. We didn’t follow the parceling procedure for the job satisfaction scale, as it is the scale with the smallest number of items. An item parcel is an aggregate level indicator composed of the average of two or more items (Little, Cunningham, Shahar, & Widaman, 2002). In order to maintain item-to-construct balance, we, derived parcels that are equally balanced in terms of their difficulty (intercept) and discrimination (slope) (Little, Cunningham & Shahar, 2002). Specifically, we used the highest loading items to anchor each parcel, followed by the lowest loading items. When more items were available, we continued this procedure, by placing lower loaded with higher loaded items.

Using this procedure we reduced the number of indicators in the abusive supervision scale to five indicators, in the distributive justice scale to three indicators, in the job resources adequacy to three indicators and in the role clarity scale to four indicators. The main advantages of this procedure are the reduction of the number of parameters to be estimated and the decrease of measurement error (Bagozzi & Edwards, 1998). The hypothesized five-factor model was the best fitting model ($\chi^2(125) = 391,262**;$ CFI = .92; TLI = .89; RMSEA = .07; SRMR = .06), so the five constructs were treated separately in subsequent statistical tests of our hypotheses (Table 2). The first factor (abusive supervision) presented factor loadings ranging from .43 to .88. The second factor (distributive justice) presented factor loadings ranging from .57 to .77.
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The third factor (job resources adequacy) presented factor loadings ranging from .39 to .71. The fourth factor (role clarity) presented factor loadings ranging from .31 to .74. Finally, the fifth factor (job satisfaction) presented factor loadings ranging from .60 to .88.

-----------------------------------------------------------

Insert Table 2 about here

-----------------------------------------------------------

Test of Hypotheses

To test the proposed mediated moderation effect, we adopted the procedure outlined by Hayes (2012). The bootstrapping procedure estimates the conditional indirect effect as the mean conditional indirect effect calculated across 1,000 bootstrap sample estimates and the standard error of the conditional indirect effect as the standard deviation of the estimates (Preacher, Rucker & Hayes, 2007). This procedure has been recommended for testing of indirect effects, especially with smaller sample sizes, because it has no assumptions regarding underlying sampling distributions (Shrout & Bolger, 2002). Through the computation of bootstrapped confidence intervals (CIs), it is possible to avoid some problems due to asymmetric and other non-normal sampling distributions of an indirect effect (MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams, 2004). Following recommendations, we resampled 1,000 times, and used the percentile method to create 95% CI (Preacher & Hayes, 2007). The indirect effect is statistically significant at the .05 level if the 95% CI for these estimates does not include zero (Zhao, Lynch & Chen, 2010). Additionally, and following Aiken and West’s recommendation (1991), we centered the predictor variables prior to entering them into the equation.
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The main results are presented in Table 3. Among the control variables, only age is significantly related to distributive justice (B= .01; 95% CI [-.04, -.02]; p<.05). In line with hypothesis 1, abusive supervision was significantly and negatively related to distributive justice (B = -.36; 95% CI [-.36, -.11]; p <.01).

The interaction term between abusive supervision and role clarity (B= -.43; 95% CI [-.38, -.12]; p< .01) was also significant. Using simple slope analysis, we found that the negative relationship between abusive supervision and distributive justice was significant when role clarity was low (t=3.15; p<.05), but not when it was high (t=-.52; p>.05) (Figure 2). These results support hypothesis 2a.

The interaction term between abusive supervision and job resources adequacy (B= -.20; 95% CI [-.08, -.01]; p< .05) was also significant. Using simple slope analysis, we found that the negative relationship between abusive supervision and distributive justice was significant when job resources adequacy was low (t=3.07; p<.05), but not when it was high (t=-.55; p>.05) (Figure 3). These results confirm hypothesis 2b.

Finally, we tested our mediated-moderation hypotheses (Preacher et al., 2007) of whether the interaction effects of abusive supervision X role clarity and abusive supervision X job resources adequacy extended to job satisfaction, through its relationship with distributive justice. Before testing the overall conditional indirect effects, we examined whether the mediator was significantly related to job satisfaction.1

1 We set out to explore the differential effects of the three justice dimensions in the relationship between abusive supervision and job satisfaction, but for the sake of parsimony and adequate resource management, we did not include these analyses on our final model. We tested the mediating effect of
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As predicted, we found that distributive justice was significantly related to job satisfaction (B = .21; 95% CI [.03, .15]; p < .01). We then analyzed the conditional indirect effect of abusive supervision on job satisfaction through distributive justice at specific values of the moderators, that is, role clarity and job resources adequacy.

In support of hypothesis 3a, the indirect effect of abusive supervision X role clarity on job satisfaction through distributive justice was significant for low (B = .20; 95% CI [.10, .25]; p < .05) but not for high role clarity (B = .09; 95% CI [-.07, .16]; p > .05). As predicted in hypothesis 3b, the indirect effect of abusive supervision X job resources adequacy on job satisfaction through distributive justice was significant for low (B = .21; 95% CI [.05, .21]; p < .05) but not for high job resources adequacy (B = .10; 95% CI [-.14, .04]; p > .05). That is, an increase in abusive supervision is related to lower job satisfaction through a decrease in distributive justice perceptions only when role clarity or job resources adequacy is low. When role clarity or job resources adequacy is high, abusive supervision is not related to changes in distributive justice or job satisfaction.

procedural and interactional justice on the relationship between abusive supervision and job satisfaction, however, the mediating effect was not significant either for procedural (B = .02; 95% CI [-.02, .07]; ns) or interactional justice (B = .10; 95% CI [-.22, .02]; ns).
The focus of the present study was to test the moderating role of job resources adequacy and role clarity on the relationship between abusive supervision and distributive justice and its carry-over effect on job satisfaction. First, corroborating Tepper’s (2000) findings, the present study showed that subordinates’ perceptions of distributive justice act as a mediator of the abusive supervision–job satisfaction relationship. However, the most important findings of our study is that job resources adequacy and role clarity moderate the indirect relationship between abusive supervision and job satisfaction through decreased distributive justice perceptions. When job resources adequacy or role clarity are high, perceptions of abusive behaviors from the supervisor do not decrease distributive justice perceptions or job satisfaction, since they have the means at their disposal to perform their tasks, as well as certainty and knowledge about appropriate behaviors, duties, guides, directives and policies, increasing subordinates’ feelings of control over their work.

These results are aligned with Kerr and Jermier’s (1978) substitutes for leadership model which proposes a wide variety of individual, task and organizational characteristics identified as factors that influence the relationship between supervisors’ behaviors and subordinates’ work outcomes (such as job satisfaction). These characteristics replace supervisors’ behaviors and serve as important remedies where there are organizational problems (Howell et al, 1990). We also contribute to the model by identifying two additional substitutes (i.e. job resources adequacy and role clarity) to the list of leadership substitutes originally proposed by Kerr and Jermier (1978). Our results showed that job resources adequacy and role clarity can undermine abusive supervisors’ ability to influence negatively their subordinates, and therefore serve as substitutes for leadership.
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This study contributes to a growing body of research exploring abusive supervision in organizations by showing that task characteristics (i.e. job resources adequacy and role clarity) are particularly relevant under the highly demanding conditions caused by abusive supervision. Our results support the view that organizations can effectively buffer the negative effects of abusive supervision, namely by providing employees with increased job resources adequacy and role clarity. Job resources adequacy provides the means in the employees’ immediate work situation to fully accomplish their tasks (Rousseau & Aubé, 2010). In turn, role clarity guarantees a precise understanding of subordinates’ fit and function in work context (Foote et al., 2005). These aspects are even more important when employees are facing abusive supervisors because both job resources adequacy and role clarity add to the employees’ latitude of control over their jobs and allow them to have greater independence in relation to their supervisors, consequently minimizing its negative impact on the allocation of outcomes, i.e., distributive justice (and indirectly job satisfaction).

**Implications for Theory and Practice**

This study makes several contributions to the existing body of literature. First, these findings are consistent with the leadership substitutes perspective developed by Kerr and Jermier (1978) which proposes that characteristics of the job compensate for deficiencies in the relationship with the supervisor (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Our results suggest that job resources adequacy and role clarity neutralize the potentially damaging effects of abusive supervisory behaviors, since both constructs are sources of task guidance and support.

Second, our findings also expand the content domain of abusive supervision research by examining job characteristics (i.e. job resources adequacy and role clarity) as a moderator of the relationship between abusive supervision and negative outcomes.
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Abusive supervision research focuses almost exclusively on behaviors and personality traits of supervisors, which have direct effects on subordinates work attitudes and behaviors (Harvey et al., 2007). Although the mediating effect of subordinates’ distributive justice perceptions between abusive supervision and their job satisfaction had been confirmed in Tepper’s (2000) research, the current study contributes to a new perspective over abusive supervision by demonstrating that organizational practices actively contribute to minimize the negative consequences of the abuse process.

This research also provides some guidance for managerial practice. Since employees’ job satisfaction is closely related to performance and retention (Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton, 2001), exploring factors that can buffer the negative effect of distributive injustice perceptions on job satisfaction assumes an important role. Our research showed that providing employees with job resources adequacy and role clarity can reduce the negative impact of abusive supervision, which then lessens distributive unfairness perceptions and job dissatisfaction. For example, organizations should consider providing clarity of behavioral requirements, as well as the resources needed by employees to accomplish their tasks, including equipment, tools, materials, facilities, support services, space, and time. Indeed, role clarity is likely to be a job characteristic that can be easily enhanced through the improvement of formal organizational communication or clear communication of expectations.

Since abusive supervision is related to distributive injustice perceptions and job dissatisfaction, we should also make efforts to reduce abusive supervision in organizations. For example, organizations should provide management skills training that aim at learning proper ways of interaction with subordinates, as well as abuse prevention training, in order to ensure that supervisors engage in appropriate management practices, also through a zero-tolerance culture regarding abusive
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supervision. However, it might be difficult to control all abusive behaviors (and this highlights the importance of examining potential substitutes or neutralizers), since these behaviors also have deep roots in supervisor’s own personality (e.g. Aryee, Chen, Sun & Debrah, 2007; Thau, Bennett, Mitchell & Marrs, 2009).

Given that all our respondents worked in a Portuguese public institution and our data were collected in 2011, when Portugal received a bailout from the ‘Troika’ and had to enact a series of public spending cuts which affect significantly public employees, the buffering effect of role clarity and job resources adequacy proved to be particularly relevant in an economic crisis context. This context is characterized by uncertainty, fear of downsizing, high unemployment rates and loss of job security, making our respondents more vulnerable to supervisory mistreatment since they have scarce employment alternatives and feel they cannot separate themselves from their supervisor abusive behavior. Therefore, studying abusive supervision in this severe economic context is particularly relevant because it could provide a facilitative context for abusive supervision. This could be because the features of an economic crisis context may emphasize both dominance and conformity, which may foster a tolerance of overbearing supervision. Further research should collect data during an average economic growth period to investigate the economic context effects on the proposed research framework.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

This research also presents some limitations. First, subordinates may be reluctant to report abusive behaviors about their supervisors and, consequently, the levels of these sensitive variables may have been artificially suppressed. However, our data are aligned with previous research on abusive supervision, thus minimizing our concern about the veracity of our participants (e.g. Zellars et al., 2002). Specifically, our study reported a mean level of abusive supervision of 1.66, which is similar to those found in previous
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studies, ranging from 1.26 (Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler & Ensley, 2004) to 1.87 (Aryee et al., 2008).

Another limitation is related to common method bias, since all data were collected from a common source (employees). We applied a number of procedures to minimize the potential impact of CMV (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003) and our tests suggest that a method latent variable explained very little variation in the data. Procedurally, in order to decrease socially desirable responding, we presented detailed information about the precautions taken to ensure the confidentiality of our respondents. To decrease evaluation apprehension, we assured our respondents that there were no rights or wrongs answers to the items in the survey. We counterbalanced the order of the measurement of the predictor and criterion variables in order to control for priming effects, item-context induced mood states, and other biases related to the question context or item embeddedness (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

We also employed statistical remedies to partial out common method variance in our analyses. Using AMOS 20, we estimated a model that included a fifth latent variable to represent a method factor and allowed all 18 indicators to load on this uncorrelated factor (Podsakoff et al., 2003). According to Williams, Cote and Buckley (1989), if the fit of the measurement model is significantly improved by the addition of an uncorrelated method factor then CMV may be present. Fit statistics after adding an uncorrelated method factor improved slightly ($\chi^2(89) = 203.58**$; $\text{CFI} = .93$; $\text{TLI} = .91$; $\text{RMSEA} = .06$; $\text{SRMR} = .06$). To determine the extent of the influence of CMV, the variance explained by the method factor can be calculated by summing the squared loadings, in order to index the total amount of variation due to the method factor. In our case, CMV accounted for 14% of the total variance, which is less than the 25% threshold observed by Williams et al. (1989). The results of these analyses suggest that
CMV is indeed present in the study. However, the improvement in fit is small and more importantly the method factor appears to account for little variation in the data. Therefore, and based on these procedures, CMV does not appear to be a pervasive problem in this study and that the relationships observed represent substantive rather than artifactual effects. On the other hand, there are no strikingly high correlations among variables and research has shown that common method bias deflates interaction effects, making them more difficult to detect (Busemeyer & Jones, 1983). Nonetheless, future research should obtain ratings from different sources (i.e. supervisors and subordinates).

Because our study is cross-sectional by design, we cannot infer causality. Indeed, it is possible that, for example, employee lower levels of distributive justice perceptions could drive perceptions of abusive supervision as opposed to the causal order we predicted. Future work would benefit from the use of longitudinal or experimental designs to draw stronger inferences regarding causality.

This study's findings suggest additional directions for future research. For example, scholars may wish to explore other substitutes for leadership. The leadership substitutes perspective (Kerr & Jermier, 1978) includes other subordinate characteristics (e.g. experience, training and knowledge), task characteristics (e.g. intrinsically satisfying tasks) and organizational characteristics (e.g. staff support or spatial distance between supervisors and their subordinates) that may also moderate the relationship between perceptions of abusive supervision and job related perceptions, attitudes and outcomes.

Another logical extension of our study would be to examine both interactional and procedural justice and different organizational outcomes, usually linked to these justice perceptions, such as organizational commitment, withdrawal behaviors and
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organizational citizenship behaviors (Colquitt et al., 2001). Both procedural and interactional justices constitute two important mediators in the relationship between abusive supervision and work outcomes (e.g. Aryee et al., 2007; Zellars, Tepper & Duffy, 2002). Since abused subordinates receive a poor interpersonal treatment at the hands of their supervisor, they tend to perceive low levels of interactional justice (Aryee et al., 2007). Similarly, the absence of formal procedures that discipline abusers or protect abuse victims at work may produce perceptions of procedural unfairness (Zellars, Tepper & Duffy, 2002). As several studies suggest, justice perceptions transmit the effects of supervisory practices on employees’ work-related attitudes, affective reactions, and performance contributions (Mossholder, Bennett, Kemery & Wesolowski, 1998; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999; Tepper, Eisenbach, Kirby, & Potter, 1998).

Conclusion

In conclusion, the current study extends research on abusive supervision by using a substitutes for leadership approach and examining the moderating effect of job characteristics in the indirect relationship between abusive supervision and job satisfaction through distributive justice perceptions. These findings contribute to the literature by proposing that two job characteristics, job resources adequacy and role clarity, may operate as substitutes for abusive supervision. Our results draw attention to previously unexamined buffers of abusive supervision, showing that these job characteristics act as buffers in the negative relationship between abusive supervision, distributive justice and job satisfaction. This study provides the basis for practical interventions that have the potential to mitigate the adverse consequences of abusive supervision, particularly through the empowerment of employees, such as with increased levels of job resources adequacy and role clarity. There is clearly more work
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to be done in this area, but our research takes a much-needed step toward exploring the
important role that task characteristics play in shaping the negative effects of abusive
supervision.
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(Appendix follows)
Abusive Supervision (Tepper, 2000)
The items were prefaced with the statement, “My supervisor. . .” (O meu supervisor. . .)
1. Ridicules me (Ridiculariza-me)
2. Tells me my thoughts or feelings are stupid (diz que os meus pensamentos ou sentimentos são estúpidos)
3. Gives me the silent treatment (Ignora-me)
4. Puts me down in front of others (Trata-me mal em frente de outras pessoas)
5. Invades my privacy (Invade a minha privacidade)
6. Reminds me of my past mistakes and failures (Relembra-me dos meus erros e falhas do passado)
7. Doesn’t give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of effort (Não me atribui tarefas que exigem que dê muito de mim)
8. Blames me to save himself/herself embarrassment (Culpa-me muitas vezes para se salvar a si próprio)
9. Breaks promises he/she makes (Quebra as promessas que faz)
10. Expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason (Descarrega a sua raiva em mim quando a sente por outro motivo)
11. Makes negative comments about me to others (Faz comentários negativos sobre mim aos outros)
12. Is rude to me (É rude comigo)
13. Does not allow me to interact with my coworkers (Não me permite interagir com os meus colegas de trabalho)
14. Tells me I’m incompetent (diz-me que sou incompetente)
15. Lies to me (Mente-me)

Distributive Justice (Moorman, 1991)
1. My organization has been rewarding me fairly the amount of effort I have put in (A minha organização retribui de forma justa o esforço com que desempenho o meu trabalho)
2. My organization has been rewarding me fairly the responsibilities I have (A minha organização retribui de forma justa as responsabilidades que tenho)
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3. My organization has been rewarding me fairly the work that I have done well (A minha organização retribui de forma justa as tarefas que desempenho bem)
4. My organization has been rewarding me fairly the stresses and strains of my job (A minha organização retribui de forma justa as exigências e dificuldades do meu trabalho)
5. My organization has been rewarding me fairly the amount of education and training I received (A minha organização retribui de forma justa a quantidade de formação que recebo)

Job Resources Adequacy (Peters & O'Connor, 1980; Tesluk & Mathieu, 1999)

1. I have adequate materials and supplies to do my job (Eu tenho os materiais e instrumentos necessários para executar as minhas funções)
2. I have adequate tools and equipment to accomplish my work (Eu disponho das ferramentas e equipamento necessários para realizar o meu trabalho)
3. I can get adequate training to do my job (Eu consigo obter a formação necessária para realizar o meu trabalho)
4. I have access to technical support when needed (Eu tenho acesso a apoio técnico sempre que necessito)
5. I have the space needed to execute my tasks (Eu tenho o espaço necessário para realizar as minhas funções)
6. I have the time needed to complete the assigned work (Eu disponho do tempo necessário para realizar o meu trabalho)

Role Clarity (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970)

1. I feel certain about how much authority I have (Eu tenho a certeza sobre a autoridade de que disponho)
2. Clear, planned goals and objectives for my job (Eu tenho objectivos e metas de trabalho claros e planeados)
3. I am able to act the same regardless of the group I am with (Eu ajo da mesma maneira, independentemente do grupo em que estou inserido)
4. I know that I have divided my time properly (Eu sei que divido o meu tempo de forma apropriada)
5. I know what my responsibilities are (Eu sei quais são as minhas responsabilidades)
6. I have to "feel my way" in performing my duties (Eu tenho que sentir que desempenho as minhas funções à minha maneira)
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7. I feel certain how I will be evaluated for a raise or promotion (Tenho a certeza sobre como vou ser avaliado para obter um aumento ou uma promoção)

8. I have just the right amount of work to do (Tenho a quantidade certa de trabalho para fazer)

9. I know exactly what is expected of me. (Eu sei exactamente o que esperam de mim)

10. Explanation is clear of what has to be done (A explicação sobre as tarefas que tenho que fazer no meu trabalho é clara)

11. I perform work that suits my values (Desempenho funções que vão ao encontro dos meus valores)

Job Satisfaction (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1979)

1. All in all I am satisfied with my job (No global, eu estou satisfeito com o meu trabalho)

2. In general, I don't like my job (No geral, eu não gosto do meu trabalho)

3. In general, I like working here (No geral, eu gosto de trabalhar aqui)
### Table 1

**Descriptive statistics and correlations among variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>41.46</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tenure with Supervisor</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Distributive Justice</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job Resources Adequacy</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>(.70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Clarity</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>(.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.*

- a 5-point scales;
- C Cronbach’s alphas are displayed on the diagonal in parentheses;
- c Education (1 = primary education; 2 = ninth grade; 3 = completed high school; 4 = undergraduate degree; 5 = graduate degree); Tenure with supervisor (1 = less than 6 months, 2 = between 6 months and 1 year, 3 = between 1 and 5 years, 4 = between 5 and 10 years, 5 = between 10 and 20 years, 6 = over 20 years); * p < .05; ** p < .01, all two-tailed tests.
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Table 2

CFAs for the hypothesized and alternative models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five-factor model</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>391.262**</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-factor model</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>434.923**</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-factor model</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>952.174</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes.  

* Merge job resources and role clarity.  

CFAs = confirmatory factor analyses; $df =$ degrees of freedom; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root-mean-square error residual; ** p < .01.
### Bootstrapping results for role clarity as moderator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-2.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure with Supervisor</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Resources Adequacy</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>5.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-4.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Interaction term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS X RC</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-2.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4: Mediator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>4.04**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes. * p < .05; ** p < .01; Tabled values are unstandardized regression coefficients; AS – Abusive Supervision; RC – Role Clarity.
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### Table 4

*Bootstrapping results for job resources adequacy as moderator*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-2.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure with Supervisor</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Main effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-4.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Resources Adequacy</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>7.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Interaction term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS X JRA</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-1.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4: Mediator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>3.48**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes. * p < .05; ** p < .01; Tabled values are unstandardized regression coefficients; AS – Abusive Supervision; JRA – Job Resources Adequacy.*
Figure 1. Hypothesized mediated moderation model
Figure 2. Interaction between Abusive Supervision (AS) and Role Clarity