We examined the effects of abusive supervision on originality and counterproductive work behavior. Beyond this, we also investigated the moderating role of future orientation. Data was collected from 650 pairs of managers and subordinates, of which 584 pairs returned with valid data. The probability of total effective retrieval is 89.84%. Results of main effects did show that abusive supervision positively effects on counterproductive work behavior and moderating effects did show that future orientation moderates positively the relationship between abusive supervision and originality. Based on our findings, some limitations, implications, and directions for future research are discussed as well.
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INTRODUCTION

Research on traditional leadership focuses on effective and positive leadership behaviors, through positive encouragement and substantive incentives to stimulate subordinates to produce positive behavior change and performance benefits, such as transforming leadership (Burns, 1978), transactional leadership (Bass, 1985) and ethical leadership (Treviño, 2000, 2003). However, over the past 20 years, scholars have begun to pay attention to the impact of negative leadership behavior on employees and the organization. (e.g., Ashforth, 1987, 1994, 1997; Bies, 1999; Tepper, 2000; Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002). According to Tepper (2007), negative leadership concepts include petty tyranny (Ashforth, 1987, 1994, 1997), workplace victimization (Aquino, 2000), workplace bullying (Hoel & Cooper, 2001), supervisor aggression (Schat, Desmarais, & Kelloway, 2006), supervisor undermining (Duffy et al, 2002), negative mentoring experiences (Eby, McManus, Simon, & Russell, 2000), generalized hierarchical abuse (Vredenburgh, & Brender, 1998) and abusive supervision. Notably, abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000; Tepper, Duffy, & Shaw, 2001; Tepper, 2007) is representative concept of negative leadership research.

Abusive supervision is defined as “subordinates’ perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact” (Tepper, 2000, p. 178). Overview of research on abusive supervision, scholars have found this management style is not only damaging to subordinates’ work attitude and behavior
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at the working level, such as job satisfaction (Tepper, 2000; Breaux, Perrewé, Hall, Frink, & Hochwarter, 2008)、 OCB (Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002; Aryee, Chen, Sun, & Debrah, 2007; Harris, Harvey, & Kacmar, 2011; Rafferty, & Restubog, 2011; Xu, Huang, Lam, & Miao, 2011)、 emotional exhaustion (Yagil, 2006; Harvey, Stoner, Hochwarter, & Kacmar, 2007; Tepper, 2007; Breaux et al, 2008; Wu, & Hu, 2009; Khan, Qureshi, & Ahmad, 2010), but also have a negative impact on the health of subordinates and family at the non-working level, such as work-to-family conflict (Tepper, 2000; Carlson, Ferguson, Perrewé, & Whitten, 2011)、 family well-being (Tepper, 2007) and family undermining (Hoobler, & Brass, 2006). From the above that, abusive supervision generally lead to negative results for employees.

In addition to concerns about abusive supervision’s negative results, another research orientation is to explore whether there is some moderating factor of the relationships mentioned above. Researchers have discussed the moderating factors at four levels, such as norms toward organization deviance at organizational level (Tepper, Henle, Lambert, Giacalone, & Duffy, 2008)、 personality at subordinate level (Tepper, Duffy, & Shaw, 2001; Bamberger, & Bacharach, 2006)、 social support at team level (Duffy et al, 2002; Hobman, Restubog, Bordia, & Tang, 2009) and authoritarian management style at supervisor level (Thau, Bennett, Mitchell, & Marrs, 2009). The above four moderating factors, this study further discussions on subordinates’ personality factors, the current study is limited in conscientiousness, agreeableness and neuroticism under five personality traits proposed moderator factor by Tepper et al. (2000) and Bamberger et al. (2006), this study presents future orientation to be a moderator variables, scrutinizing the moderating role of future time perspective in abusive supervision research. Future orientation is based on people's perception of the concept for the past, present and future time. Under the temporal focus, people's thoughts about the past, present and future will directly affect the present attitude, decision-making and behavior, relevant research evidence including goal-setting, motivation and performance (Bandura, 2001; Cottle, 1976; Fried & Slowik, 2004; Nuttin, 1985)、 self-regulation and learning (Carver & Scheier, 1982; Sanna, Stocker, & Clarke, 2003)、 sense-making (Weick, 1979)、 affect (Wilson & Ross, 2003) and strategic choice (Bird, 1988; Das, 1987; Hambrick & Mason, 1984).

Thus, abusive supervision is the focus of a negative leadership study, the first purpose of this study use justice perspective to analyze the main effect. Moreover, we use future orientation to be a moderating variable, time perspective is one of our research purposes. The expected contribution of this study is the application of justice and uncertainty management theory perspective on the understanding of the main effect of abusive management and future orientation as a moderating effect. Finally, this study further integrates time focus literature to the expansion of existing theories. Hope this study provides more in-depth understanding of the role of abusive supervision.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Abusive supervision

Tepper (2000) defined abusive supervision as “subordinates’ perceptions of the extent to which their supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact”. Abusive supervision has several important features, first, abusive supervision is a subordinate’s subjective assessment for supervisor behavior, when subjectively assessed, and subordinates' will be affected by subordinate personal traits, work environment and colleagues. Secondly, abusive supervision is a persistent non-physical contact hostile behavior, supervisor use ongoing mistreatment and abusive behavior. Finally, abusive supervision is supervisor for some purposes stubborn behavior, and supervisor does not think
that is an abuse and victimization. In other words, abusive supervision is focused on subordinates as the victims (Fox & Spector, 2005), when the supervisor demonstrated abusive supervision, every subordinates feel different, depends on the degree of subordinates’ perception.

**Uncertainty management theory**

Lind & Van den Bos (2002) proposed uncertainty management theory (UMT), which aims to explore how individuals respond to and deal with the environment of various uncertainties. Uncertainty will make people have a bad experience, such as fear (Van den Bos et al., 2008), and affect on individual's cognition and behavior (Lind & van den Bos, 2002). UMT noted that fairness is very important for an individual message processing environment uncertainty, fair stimulation slows the individual anxiety generated, thereby reducing the uncertainty (Lind & van den Bos, 2002). Lind & Van den Bos (2002) study also noted that that when an individual in a highly uncertain situation, the message will be special emphasis on fairness, for unfair message generates relatively strong negative reaction.

**Abusive supervision and counterproductive work behavior**

Counterproductive work behavior is also known as disruptive behavior, which is defined as the intent to harm the organization and members of the organization of spontaneous behavior (Spector & Fox, 2002). With the similar study of the counterproductive work behavior concept including antisocial behavior (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997), organizational vice (Moberg, 1997), organizational misbehavior (Vardi & Wiener, 1996; Vardi & Weitz, 2004), workplace aggression (Baron & Neuman, 1996), organizational retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), organization-motivated aggression (O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996) and non-compliant behavior (Puffer, 1987). Domagalski and Steelman (2005) research indicates that subordinates at work suffered incivility behavior and unjust treatment, induce angry emotional reaction, further affecting the behavior of subordinates work; Research indicates that abusive supervision and supervisor’s violations goals (Inness, Barling, & Turner, 2005), subordinates' angered (Schat, et al., 2006), counterproductive work behavior of subordinates (Duffy et al., 2002) and subordinates abnormal behavior (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007) has positive relationship. Interaction between supervisors and subordinates, supervisor continues to show improper behavior, in the long run will lead to psychological problems, such as job nervous and emotional debilitating (Harvey, Stoner, Hochwater, & Kacmar, 2007; Breaux et al, 2008; Khan, Qureshi, & Ahmad, 2010), lead to subordinates' feel frustration and helplessness. Face with abusive supervision, let subordinates perceived unfairness (Tepper, 2000, 2007), in fairness perspective, individual motivation is based on a comparison made between colleagues. When Faced with unfair individual messages, will produce a negative reaction (Adams, 1963), including change their input, change their income, distorted perception of their own, distorted perception of others, changing the reference object, changes in the present work. In other words, individual will attempt to determine, through a fair exchange process to reduce social unfairness, individuals face an uncertain environment and treated unfairly, will be timely controlled on the environment, had negative attitudes and behaviors on the organization, let individuals have a positive impact on counterproductive work behavior. Subordinates attack behavior is a purposeful and goal oriented (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994). Source of the attack is supervisor, subordinates might be direct attacks supervisors, however, when subordinates do not retaliate to the source, they will choose the more available or is not threatening than the target to conduct attacks (Inness et al, 2005). Subordinates in a stressful environment and unfair organization, will produce negative
emotions such as anger, and then make a decision as counterproductive work behavior. Therefore, we propose the following assumptions:

Hypothesis 1: Abusive supervision will be positively related to subordinates’ counterproductive work behavior.

Abusive supervision and originality

Originality is the creative person has the ability and traits (Guilford, 1950), is also a kind of creative thinking behavior. After 1980s, originality entering integrative theory of creative ideas is not simply a personal event, but includes personal factors, situational factors and the results of social environment interaction. Originality contains three ingredients: field relevant skills, creativity relevant skills and motivation (Amabile, 1988, 1996), individual creativity are the product of the interaction of three ingredients under. In summary, originality is a multi-structure, including process of individual to generate new ideas, personal traits, willingness to engage in innovation and environmental feedback on individual efforts (Mumford & Gustafson, 1988). UMT noted that fairness is very important for an individual message processing environment uncertainty, fair stimulation slows the individual anxiety generated, thereby reducing the uncertainty (Lind & van den Bos, 2002). When supervisor ongoing questioned subordinate creativity and contribution degree, subordinates' perceived supervisor fairness (Lain, Ferris, & Brown, 2012) and job dedication (Aryee, Sun, Chen, & Debrah, 2007) will produce comparisons inconsistencies, this inconsistency can cause psychological frustration and helplessness, hinder the will and motivation of originality (Scott & Bruce, 1994), thus and then make a decision to reduce output and adjust the originality behavior. Therefore, we propose the following assumptions:

Hypothesis 2: Abusive supervision will be negatively related to subordinates’ originality.

The moderating role of future orientation

Based on the assumptions discussed above, the effect of abusive supervision influences organizational citizenship behavior. But this paper points out, under certain personality traits and time perspective, impact of abusive supervision on organizational citizenship behavior will deteriorate. This study use future orientation to be moderating variable, studies indicate that future orientation is a positive personality trait (Trommsdorff, 1983), people will be selected based on experience future goals (Fried et al., 2004). In other words, future orientation is an individual trait with expectations for the future, the ability to interpret and construct (Gjesme, 1983), individual imagination for the future will affect the results of his behavior (Husman & Lens, 1999), and future orientation is regarded as the ability of individuals to conceptualize the future. Future orientation time perspective can be dated back to 1930, proposed by the Kurt Lewin, it will be divided into five dimensions: extension, coherence, density, directionality and affectivity. The more systematic research is to 1970s, Sande (1972) divided it into six dimensions, including length, level of interest, optimism, pessimism, influence and expectations, in which the length is similar to the concept of future. Moreover, future orientation is a social cognitive perspective formed by the social and cultural values, is a belief in the future of the expected target (Bembenuity & Karabenick, 2003; Husman & Lens, 1999; Miller & Brickman, 2004). Above all, future orientation have the concept of time perspective, is a set of cognitive psychological process, individual will pay attention to possible future developments and arise longing perception, and to the process of decision making (Gardner, Dunham, Cummings, & Pierce, 1987; Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1989).
According to UMT, when individuals experience high degree of uncertainty, they will pay special attention to the message of fairness, and for the unfair messages produce more negative reactions (Lind & Van den Bos, 2002). The best time perspective of the future-oriented research description is attention, studies indicate that individual height control their attention assigned to the target (Gardner et al., 1987), according to different periods, individuals will transfer its attention (Shipp, Edwards, & Lambert, 2009). Accordingly point of view, when individuals with a high degree of future-oriented, face abusive supervision will produce more perceived unfairness under lengthen the future time, will be perceived more uncertainty, the focus will be allocated to the future more goals, thus ignoring the existing plans and actions (Shipp et al., 2009). In other words, when individuals under highly future-oriented, will produce high uncertainty, and thus the present originality and counterproductive work behavior produce more negative behavioral responses. Therefore, we propose the following assumptions:

Hypothesis 3: Future orientation will moderate the negative relationship between abusive supervision and counterproductive work behavior such that the relationship will be stronger when future orientation is high rather than low.

Hypothesis 4: Future orientation will moderate the negative relationship between abusive supervision and originality such that the relationship will be stronger when future orientation is high rather than low.

Figure 1: Theoretical model

METHOD

Sample and procedure

In this study, in order to avoid common method variance (CMV) (Peng, Gao and Lin, 2006), using paired questionnaire. We collected data for this study from 650 subordinates of 30 supervisors in 30 groups in Taiwan. Part of the questionnaire by the research team directly surveying and recycling, part of the questionnaire commissioned by the colleagues conducted surveying, in order to ensure confidentiality, the questionnaire will be recovered directly into the enclosed envelope. We received responses from 30 supervisors (100% response rate) and 584 subordinates (89.84% response rate). Total data were 650 pairs and 584 pairs of them were valid retrievals. The probability of total effective retrieval is 89.84%. The group sizes of the branches ranged from 5–27 subordinates. Supervisors on sample characteristics, university degree or above accounted for 48.27%, age range between 21 to 50 years old, 21 to 30 years old accounted for 82.53%, 5-10 years of service accounted for 51.72%. Subordinates on the sample characteristics, 21-30 years old accounted for 76.20%, less than 2 years of service accounted for 75.50%.
Measures

This section provides each variable were measured scale sources, reliability. Measures used a five-point Likert-type response scale, with “1” denoting “strongly disagree” and “5” representing “strongly agree”.

Abusive supervision. We used abusive supervision scale by Tepper (2000). Scale includes ten items. The example items are “Makes negative comments about me to others”. The coefficient alphas were 0.95.

Future orientation. We used Future orientation scale by Gjesme (1979). Scale includes six items. The example items are “I have been thinking a lot about what I am going to do in the future”. The coefficient alphas were 0.75.

Counterproductive work behavior. We used counterproductive work behavior scale by Skarlicki & Folger (1997). Scale includes sixteen items. The example items are “On purpose, damaged equipment or work process”. The coefficient alphas were 0.96.

Originality. We used originality scale by Tierney, Farmer, & Graen (1999). Scale includes seven items. The example items are “Demonstrated originality in his/her work”. The coefficient alphas were 0.94.

Control variables. We included two indicators of demographic diversity: subordinates age and subordinates seniority. Subordinates age were divided into five categories: below 20, 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, 50 or more. Subordinates seniority were divided into seven categories: 1 or less, 1-2, 3-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21 or more.

Convergent and discriminant validity

This study compares the structure factor model and the chi-square difference test (Table 1). The results of the nested model CFA suggested that the four-factor model provided a good fit ($\chi^2(696) = 4648.41$, $p < .001$), root mean square error of approximation [RMSEA] = 0.09, non-normed fit index [NNFI] = 0.94, comparative fit index [CFI] = 0.94, standardized root mean square residual [SRMR] = 0.04). The four-factor model fit the data better than the one-factor model ($\chi^2(6) = 18520.48$, $p < .001$) and the two-factor model ($\chi^2(5) = 7339.13$, $p < .001$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta$ df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>23168.89***</td>
<td>18520.48***</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>11987.54***</td>
<td>7339.13***</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>4648.41***</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 584.; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; NNFI = non-normed fit index; CFI = comparative fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual.

* $p <0.05$  ** $p <0.01$  *** $p <0.001$

Model 1: incorporated all four constructs into one factor.

Model 2: combined abusive supervision and future orientation distress into F1, combined counterproductive behavior and originality distress into F2.

Model 3: represented four independent factors.
RESULTS

Correlation analysis

Table 2 shows descriptive statistics and inter-correlations for the study variables. The reliability coefficients were all greater than 0.75. The abusive supervision correlated positively with counterproductive work behavior ($r = .08$, $p < 0.01$); The abusive supervision correlated negatively with future orientation ($r = -.19$, $p < 0.001$); The counterproductive work behavior correlated negatively with originality ($r = -.30$, $p < 0.001$); The subordinates age correlated negatively with abusive supervision ($r = -.11$, $p < 0.01$); The subordinates age correlated negatively with counterproductive work behavior ($r = .12$, $p < 0.01$); The subordinates tenure correlated negatively with counterproductive work behavior ($r = .21$, $p < 0.001$); The subordinates seniority correlated positively with subordinates age ($r = .50$, $p < 0.001$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Abusive supervision</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CWB</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Originality</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Future orientation</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Age with subordinate</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tenure with subordinate</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 584. Coefficient alphas are listed in parentheses along the diagonal. CWB = counterproductive work behavior

* $p < 0.05$  ** $p < 0.01$  *** $p < 0.001$

Hypothesis testing

Table 3 shows the results of hierarchical regression. We tested the hypotheses by regressing counterproductive work behavior on the control variables (Step 1), the main effects of abusive supervision (Step 2), the moderator effects of future orientation (Step 3), and an interaction term consisting of the abusive supervision $\times$ future orientation cross product (Step 4). At step 1, subordinates’ tenure on counterproductive work behavior has significant ($\beta = .20$, $p < .001$). At step 2, the main effect of abusive supervision on counterproductive work behavior has significant ($\beta = .09$, $p < .005$), H1 is supported. At step 4, the abusive supervision $\times$ future orientation cross product on counterproductive work behavior do not has significant, H2 is not supported. Table 4 shows the results of hierarchical regression. We tested the hypotheses by regressing originality on the control variables (Step 1), the main effects of abusive supervision (Step 2), the moderator effects of future orientation (Step 3), and an interaction term consisting of the abusive supervision future orientation cross product (Step 4). At step 2, the main effect of abusive supervision on originality do not has significant, H2 is not supported. At step 4, the abusive supervision $\times$ future orientation cross product on originality has significant ($\beta = -.10$, $p < .005$), H4 is supported. In addition, to further understand the moderator direction of abusive supervision on originality, Figure 2 show that the relationship will be stronger when future orientation is high and the relationship will be weaker when future orientation is low.
### Table 3 Hierarchical Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Subordinates’ CWB</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age with subordinate</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure with subordinate</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive supervision</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderator variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future orientation</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive supervision × Future orientation</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R2</strong></td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>12.24***</td>
<td>9.72***</td>
<td>7.40***</td>
<td>5.98***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>△R2</strong></td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>△F</strong></td>
<td>12.24***</td>
<td>4.50*</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 584. CWB = counterproductive work behavior. * p < 0.05  ** p < 0.01  *** p < 0.001

### Table 4 Hierarchical Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Subordinates’ originality</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age with subordinate</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure with subordinate</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive supervision</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderator variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future orientation</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive supervision × Future orientation</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R2</strong></td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>△R2</strong></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>△F</strong></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>5.41*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 584. * p < 0.05  ** p < 0.01  *** p < 0.001
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Discussion and conclusions

Regarding control variables, subordinates’ seniority showed positive effect on counterproductive work behavior. It is possible that more experienced employees have better resistance to stress, when face to abusive supervision, they will fight their supervisor through counterproductive work behavior. In terms of main effect, the effect of abusive supervision on counterproductive work behavior is supported; the effect of abusive supervision on originality is not supported. Etzioni (1961) pointed out that leaders can through three involvement allows subordinates to show submissive behavior, includes (1) alienative involvement: meaning subordinates to obey the leader, because of fear of punishment or mistreatment; (2) calculative involvement: meaning subordinates to obey the leader, because avoiding disadvantages and (3) moral involvement: meaning subordinates to obey the leader, because internalization or identity. Amabile (1988, 1996) pointed out that originality contains three ingredients: field relevant skills, creativity relevant skills and motivation, individual creativity are the product of the interaction of three ingredients under. In other words, obedience is the result of the influence of the leader, in this study, supervisor through alienative involvement let subordinates showing submissive behavior, relative to let subordinates cannot produce work related skills, motivation and creativity, the reason may be alienative involvement. In terms of moderating effect, future orientation to strengthen the negatively relationship between abusive supervision on originality, but on counterproductive work behavior is no support. Ainsworth (1979) proposed the concept of secure attachment behavior, this study showed that more junior subordinate, subordinate to the leaders and norms are afraid that because of the lack of familiarity, the reason may be secure attachment.
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Theoretical and practical contribution

First, the past 20 years, scholars have begun to pay attention the impact of negative leadership behavior on employees and the organization, the effects of abusive supervision is representative concept of research, the moderator factor is another important research orientation. This study presents future orientation among the existing literature, aimed at understanding the moderating role of time perspective on the consequences of abusive supervision. Secondly, this study uses justice perspective to explain coping and decision behavior when the individual faced with abusive supervision. Finally, through the time perspective, citing future orientation, to rethink the impact of abusive supervision, present the evidence of empirical data, the results of this study are expected to echo. And further extend uncertainty management theory.

In practice, supervisors and everyone must conduct high-quality interactive (Nothouse, 1997), this study argues that, because the army as a legitimate armed groups, supervisors' risk in this environment is relatively high, in this organizational culture, fairness opinion is very important, specific practices such as must strengthen communication mechanisms from bottom to top, and strengthen the authority from top to bottom.

Limitations and future research

In this study, the research seeks to improve the design and analysis, but there is still the following points should be noted, first, about the external validity issues, in this study, samples from the army, failed to contain Navy and Air Force unit, collected mainly from the southern part of the country; On the other hand, in recent years, corporate leadership style caused a lot of frequent accidents, abusive supervision and other negative leadership become research topic of attention, suggested further increase the sample in order to improve external validity. Second, about the questionnaires distributed process issues, this study used paired questionnaire included supervisor and subordinate questionnaire included. It can avoid common method variance problems. However, part of the questionnaire commissioned colleague to release and recovery, there are doubts about the questionnaire cannot really grasp. Suggested that future studies, we must strengthen and control the process of issuing questionnaires, the researchers themselves should personally release and recycling. Third, about the research design issues, the study was cross sectional of the study design and concluded that a causal inference cannot be true, suggested future research can use longitudinal designed to verify the true causal relationship. Fourth, in terms of the variable, this study use the dependence variable of counterproductive work behavior, suggest that it can be added subordinates positive behavior, such as organizational citizenship behavior, needs to be subsequent in-depth research and analysis. Finally, about the level issues, this study discussed the impact of individual level, however, there are still cross-level factors must be noted, such as team cohesion, team climate and other factors, pending subsequent researchers further reflection. Must strengthen communication mechanisms from bottom to top, and strengthen the authority from top to bottom.
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