ABUSIVE SUPERVISION, WORK TENSION AND OVERLOAD AS PREDICTORS OF COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOR

Chris Nwachinemere Uzondu[*], **Sampson Kelechi nwonyi and
Ebere Theresa Ugwumgbor**

Department of Psychology, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, 41000 Enugu state, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT: *The study investigated abusive supervision, work tension and work overload as predictors of counter productive work behaviour (CWB). Three hundred and one (301) secondary school teachers participated, who were randomly drawn from Urban Girls Secondary School, Nsukka; Nsukka High School, Nsukka; St. Teresa's College, Nsukka; Queen of the Rosary Secondary School, Nsukka; Community Secondary School Obukpa, Nsukka; Model Secondary School, Nsukka and Community Secondary School Isienu, Nsukka. Their age ranged between 25years to 59years and above. These teachers were accidentally sampled. Four instruments were used: Abusive Supervision Scale designed by Tapper (2000), Work Tension Scale designed by House and Rizzo (2013), Work Overload Scale designed by Kaplan (2006) and Counter Work Productive Behavior Scale designed by Suzy and Spector (2003). Three hypotheses were stated and tested. The result of the multiple regression analysis showed that all the null hypotheses were rejected implying that the abusive supervision, work tension and work overload all significantly predicted CWB; abusive supervision ($\beta = .24$, $t = 4.10$, $P < 0.05$), work tension ($\beta = .21$, $t = .20$, $P < 0.001$) and work overload ($\beta = .22$, $t = .10$, $P < 0.001$). It was however concluded that abusive supervision of any kind and degree, work tension as well as work overload by this research are associated with CWB. Implications and limitations were discussed and suggestions were made for further studies.*

KEYWORDS: Abusive Supervision, Work Tension. Over Load, Counter Productive Work Behavior.

INTRODUCTION

There is a growing interest among organizational researchers on the topic of Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB). Counterproductive work behavior refers to behavior of an employee that harms an organization or its members (Michael, 2006) and it includes such acts as shoplifting, sabotage, verbal abuse, withholding of effort, lying, lateness, theft, absenteeism refusing to cooperate and physical assault. Over the years, researchers have investigated similar set of behaviors using different terminologies which included: Organizational delinquency (Robert, 2006), Organization-motivated Aggression (O'Leary-Kelly, 1996), Organizational Retaliatory behaviors, Workplace Aggression and Workplace Deviance (Steven, 2007), Revenge and Intimidation (Gallagher, 2008) and Antisocial Behavior in Organizations (Griffin & Yvette, 2005).

Counterproductive work behavior is defined as an employee's behavior that goes against the goal of an organization. This behavior can be intentional or unintentional and result from a wide range of underlying causes and motivations. It has been proposed that a person-by-environment interaction can be utilized to explain a variety of counterproductive work

behaviors. For instance, an employee who steals from the company may do so because of lax supervision (environment) and underlying psychopathology (person) that work in concert to result in the counterproductive behavior. Most researches in this area have focused attention on identifying environmental antecedents of CWB such as job stressors and identifying personality traits such as affectivity that may increase an individual's propensity to engage in CWB (Penney & Spector, 2005). Although, many researchers agree on the interactionist perspective in investigating the contributions of both interpersonal and environmental variables in predicting behavior, few have studied both with CWB in the same study (Penney & Spector, 2005). Moreover, while a number of studies in this area have examined the relationships between job stressors and CWB, lesser study seems to have been conducted in Nigerian organizations. The growing interest in CWB stemmed from the fact that CWB is a common occurrence in organizations and can have a tremendous negative impact on both organizations in terms of low productivity, increased insurance costs, lost or damaged property and decreased turnover (Lindberg, 2008) and the people in terms of increased dissatisfaction (Kristine, 2011) and expressed job stress. A useful framework for understanding CWB derives from the job stress literature. Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) consists of volitional acts that harm or intend to harm organizations and their stakeholders (example, clients, coworkers, customers and supervisors) (Kevin, Lori, Matthew & James, 2010).

Specific CWBs include abusive behavior against others, aggression (both physical and verbal), purposely doing work incorrectly, sabotage, theft and withdrawal (example, absence, lateness and decreased turnover). Other examples of CWB are emotional abuse, bullying, mobbing, deviance, aggression, retaliation and intimidation (Blaug, Army &Rohit, 2007). A number of job stressors have been linked to the performance of CWB including role ambiguity, role conflict, workload, organizational constraints and interpersonal conflict (Blaug, Army & Rohit, 2007). Gallagher (2008) in his study found that job tension was significantly correlated with intimidation, a form of CWB. An explanation for relation between job stressors and CWB can be based on the Samuel (2010) conservation of resources theory. According to this theory, people strive to protect and retain resources under stressful conditions. An alternative explanation for the relationship between job stressors and CWB was that stressors may provoke, trigger or cue individuals to engage in CWB such as workplace aggression as a form of retaliation or attempt to restore justice to an unfair situation (Samuel, 2010). Therefore, it is expected that the experience of job stress will be positively correlated with performance of CWB among the teachers. Individuals who are high in negative affectivity are more sensitive and more reactive to negative events (Marsland, Sheldon, Bruce & Stephen, 2001). Baumeister (2004) is of the view that people act aggressively when they feel bad(state of negative affect), those who are high in negative affectivity are more likely to have the propensity to feel bad more often. They are more likely to experience distress and dissatisfaction, focus on their failures and dwell on the negative side of life in general (Westman, 2004) - a wide range of negative states including fear, anger, guilt, disgust, loneliness and self-dissatisfaction. This phenomenon is similar to over-reaction such that behaviors are not necessarily in line with appropriate responses in a given situation. In addition to their potential fear of changing jobs, persons high in negative affectivity are likely to remain in unsatisfying jobs (Sharon, 1989).

Abusive supervision leads to counterproductive work behavior (Tapper, 2000). If a subordinate encountered abusive supervision as a result of being late to work is a typical example of how abusive supervision could lead to counterproductive work behavior. He or

she may decide to form the habit of lateness as revenge to abusive supervision, saying after all, he or she will only be abused and that is all. Though "abuse" may conjure images of physical violence, it is not included in the activities encompassed by the term – actions such as belittling, undermining, or yelling at subordinates are classic examples of abusive supervision. It should come as no surprise that victims of abusive supervision are likely to commit acts of organizational deviance – things like theft, sabotage, and the shirking of duties. Employees are said to be committed to an organization when they have a sense of liking for and loyalty to their organization. Committed employees tend to behave in ways that are in the best interest of the organization, and frown upon activities detrimental to the organization's success. Victims of abusive supervision are less likely to be committed to the organization, leading to a greater likelihood for committing acts of CWB. They may hold the organization responsible for allowing their supervisor to behave in such a manner, believing that the organization does not care about its employees' well-being. Supervisors play a significant role in creating employee commitment to an organization.

Abusive supervision describes the hostile actions of managers toward their subordinates (Mary, 2012). When subordinates are abused by their supervisors, they look to coworkers for support and behavioral guidance. If they see that deviant behaviors like theft and shirking are accepted, they are more likely to engage in those behaviors themselves. Kelly and Benneth (2002) asserted that the past decade has recorded an explosion of interest and research on the topic of abusive supervision. Such behaviors typically include ridiculing and humiliating subordinates in public, refusing to speak with subordinates, or otherwise debasing subordinates. Research suggests that abusive supervision has a detrimental effect on a number of organizational outcomes, including an increase in anti-social behavior among subordinates, job performance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Abusive supervision is estimated to affect approximately 10 to 16 percent of American workers at a cost of $23.8 billion dollars annually (Tapper, 2000). As the world economy becomes increasingly globalized and company workforces become more culturally diverse, there is an increasing need to understand the implications of these trends for organizational leadership theories. In the study of abusive supervisory behavior, research from a faculty member at the Penn State Smeal College of Business emphasizes the relevance of the concept of power distance, or the degree to which individuals accept and believe that organizational, institutional, or societal power should be distributed unequally.

Based on a social learning model, which implies people learn what actions are appropriate from models in their surrounding environment, the researchers suggest that this learning pattern is exacerbated for those with high power distance orientations because they are more likely to view their superiors as role models and therefore as people to pattern their own interpersonal behavior after. Thus, they argued that for high power distance orientation subordinates, abusive superiors should be respected and learned from; as a result, high power distance subordinates are likely to mimic the abusive behaviors their supervisors display. The researchers conducted several studies using a series of surveys that invited employed individuals to participate in research on workplace attitudes and behaviors. They measured employee perceptions of how abusive their supervisor is, to what extent they believed they would be rewarded for abusive behavior, and their own abusive behavior, among others. These were considered in relation to the employee's power distance orientation. The findings show that subordinates with higher power distance orientations modeled the actions of their superiors, engaging in more abusive interpersonal behavior themselves.

Furthermore, results show that deviant behavior between subordinates and their co-workers is facilitated when the behavior goes unpunished, otherwise implying that such behavior is encouraged, even rewarded. Noting that previous studies have primarily suggested and found high power distance orientation is a "good thing" in that it buffers subordinates from negative effects associated with abusive supervision (example, perceiving such treatment as fair), the researcher (Lian, Ferris & Brown, 2012) explain that high power distance orientation is a double-edged sword for abusive supervisors."Although they may perceive such abusive behavior as fair, the fact that the subordinates turn around and treat their co-workers in an abusive manner is problematic," write the researchers. "It will also have negative consequences in their relationships to fellow co-workers.

However, given that interpersonal deviance is typically thought to negatively impact performance and morale, it's questionable whether or not having subordinates with high power distance orientations are a boon or a bane to abusive leaders."Their study ultimately shows that an important caveat in the research of abusive supervision exists in the power distance orientation of subordinates. This conclusion is equally notable given that high power distance has typically been conceived of as purely justifying the effects of abusive supervision giving that the process by which subordinates imitate superiors is largely based in social learning theory, the research findings can be used to suggest ways in which organizations can halt this modeling process. The most obvious way to do so is to remove the model. That is, by implementing a zero-tolerance policy for abusive supervision and firing those who violate the policy. Of course, zero-tolerance policies are harsh and not always applicable in every situation. In such cases, other forms of punishment (i.e. unpaid leave, formal reprimands and so on) may be used.

Therefore, raising the awareness among supervisors of the potential impact their behaviors may have on subordinates and the organization as a whole may help to motivate change, especially when paired with training to provide supervisors with new manners in which to interact with others. In terms of future research, their findings suggest that social learning theory tenets may be particularly useful in understanding workplace interactions in high power distance countries. In the study of abusive supervisory behavior, (Bialas, 2009) emphasize the relevance of power distance, or the degree to which individuals accept and believe that organizational power should be distributed unequally. Key findings include. High power distance orientation is a double-edged sword in that it buffers subordinates from the negative effects of supervisory mistreatment, but leads to deviant interpersonal relations among fellow employees. Employees with higher power distance orientations modeled the actions of their superiors, engaging in more abusive behavior themselves. Abusive behavior between subordinates and their co-workers is facilitated when the behavior goes unpunished, otherwise implying that such behavior is encouraged, even rewarded. Given that the process by which subordinates imitate superiors is largely based on social learning theory, the research findings can be used to suggest ways in which organizations can halt this modeling process.

Work tension leads to counterproductive work behavior (Blaug, Army & Rohit, 2007). Everything changes but Work tension and anxiety is often found in all human relationships and in organizations. Why is this so? There is a constant work tension present in all relationships because people want and need different things. This work tension is often viewed as negative, but in reality it is necessary and very positive. This work tension is necessary and healthy for change and growth to occur. The issues that come up usually are a

result of people not viewing those differences as being healthy, and subsequently not recognizing how to effectively manage and utilize that work tension in the change and growth process.

Nevertheless, in the process of being able to manage and utilize the work tension that is present in relationships in one's organization, one first need to recognize and differentiate between different types of work tension. There are therefore five (5) levels of work tension that one needs to be able to identify and intervene with: Reactivity, Triangulation, Projection, Cut off and Polarization. It is absolutely critical that individuals should not only become aware of these 5 levels of work tension, but also take action to make sure the tension is nipped in the bud before things get out of hand. The more managers try to ignore or smooth over issues, the more issues will become negative and destructive. When one can identify tension and learn to utilize it to help people connect and work more effectively with each other, the better off one and one's organization will be. It's not an absence of conflict and tension that makes organizations and relationships successful, but how organizations and people view problems as opportunities for growth to occur that makes all the difference.

Work tension has to do with stress at work. It is defined as experience of unpleasant, negative emotions in an organization. It is sign and symptom of excessive job and workplace stress which include: Feeling anxious, irritable, or depressed, apathy, loss of interest in work, problems sleeping, fatigue, trouble concentrating, using alcohol or drugs to cope, muscle tension or headaches, stomach problems, social withdrawal, and loss of sexual drive. All these work related tensions and stress are potential causes of CWB. Common causes of excessive workplace stress include: Fear of being laid off, more overtime due to staff cutbacks, pressure to perform to meet rising expectations and pressure to work at optimum levels all the time without increase in job satisfaction, take-home and other remuneration, could perhaps lead to CWB.

Moreover, to learn how to manage job stress, there are a variety of steps one can take to reduce both overall stress levels and the stress one finds on the job and in the workplace. These include:Taking responsibility for improving one's physical and emotional well-being, Avoiding pitfalls by identifying knee jerk habits and negative attitudes that add to the stress experienced at work, Learning better communication skills to ease and improve your relationships with management and coworkers, Recognize warning signs of excessive stress at work, Reduce job stress by taking care of oneself, Reduce job stress by prioritization and organization, Reduce job stress by improving emotional intelligence, Reduce job stress by breaking bad habits and learn how managers or employers can reduce job stress. When work related tensions are minimally reduced through the above methods, CWB in such an organizations will as well be brought to the lowest level.

Work overload leads to counterproductive work behaviour (Kaplan, 2006). Observations reveal that teachers work more hours because they were mandated to. Off course, so many of them handle so many Subjects of which in the actual sense is very improper and alternatively, more teachers should have been employed to make their work easier and reduce work overload but the reverse is the case. For instance, extra-moral classes seem to be the most work overload they suffer from, in addition to other academic problems they face. In such teachers' working condition, CWB is imminent.

Work overload is defined as too much responsibilities given to individuals in an organizational setting (Michie, 2002). Many employees do suffer from work overload

because they work more than the usual official working periods. For instance, work overload in Secondary School could result from any or all of the following: Preparation of lesson note, delivering of the lessons, Attending to student's cases, as well as administrative challenges, Stress of generating examination questions, conducting examinations, marking and computing of results and in some cases, extra-moral classes. All these contribute to work overload among Secondary School Teachers. In terms of job satisfaction, the work overload is perceived more seriously when the Secondary School Teachers perceive that their work input is not commensurate to their monthly take- home (Rafael, 2005). Usually, their official dismissal hour in Secondary School is 1:30pm, but one discovers that most teachers come back home around 4:00pm. Why the extra time?

However, feeling trapped, rank-and-file workers do as they are told and do their best to keep the ensuring stress at bay. But some times, one finds out that the more demanding job becomes, the more individuals lack good work and health. Work overload brings about depression. Some individuals have suffered from high blood pressure, headache etc, as a result of work overload they experience in their organization. Some people resign from their job because of the stressful nature of their job and they are glad as they do not deal with the job anymore hence do not want to be trapped by CWB effect. When employees or individuals are overloaded with work, it affects the level of productivity or goals of the organization and possibly leads to CWB. They work a lot more hours. Sometimes they do not take lunch, due to the nature of work they do. If all these work-related overloads are not adequately rewarded and reinforced by the organization, the employees may encounter CWB.

The following hypotheses are tested in this research:

1. Abusive supervision will not statistically significantly predict counterproductive work behaviour.

2. Work tension will not statistically significantly predict counterproductive work behaviour.

3. Work overload will not statistically significantly predict counterproductive work behaviour.

METHOD

Participants: Three hundred and one (301) Secondary School Teachers, selected from seven schools in Nsukka urban, participated in the study. The schools were Urban Girls Secondary School, Nsukka; Nsukka High School, Nsukka; St. Teresa's College, Nsukka; Queen of the Rosary Secondary School, Nsukka; Community Secondary School Obukpa, Nsukka; Model Secondary School, Nsukka and Community Secondary School Isienu, Nsukka. The Schools are all located in Nsukka, Enugu State. Both random sampling and accidental sampling methods were used in the study. Random sampling technique is used to select the sampled secondary schools; While accidental sampling technique is used to select the participants. The ages of the participants ranged from 25 to 59 years.

Instruments: A questionnaire comprising four scales was utilised in this study. The assessment scales were Abusive Supervision Scale, Work Tension Scale, Work Overload Scale and Counterproductive Work Behavior Scale.

Abusive Supervision Scale is a 15-item scale designed by Tapper (2000) to measure abusive supervision as perceived by subordinates. Participants will be required to respond to each item on a 5-point Likert scale indicating the extent to which they agree or disagree with each of the statements made in the questionnaire ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree. For instance: 1=Strongly Disagree (SD), 2=Disagree (D), 3=Undecided (U), 4=Agree(A), 5 = Strongly Agree (SA) (Tapper, 2000). Tapper (2000) reported reliability index for the Scale as .95. Pilot study using eighty (80) participants for the present study was conducted and the result showed a Cronbach's alpha of .92.

Work Tension Scale is a 7-item scale designed by Rizzo (2013) to measure work tension and an employee's psychological or psychosomatic symptoms associated with tension experienced at work. It includes the extent to which tension from work tends to keep employees awake at night and be constantly on an employee's mind. Responses are scored as follows: 1= false, 2= coded 1, 3= coded 2, 4= true (House & Rizzo, 2013). The alpha reliability ranges from .71 to .89 as reported by House and Rizzo (2013). Pilot study using eighty (80) participants for the present study was conducted and the result showed a Cronbach's alpha of .72.

Work Overload Scale is an 11-item work overload scale designed by Kaplan (2006) to measure work overload. The items of the scale are divided into two groups: the first four (4) items and the other seven (7) items. Responses to the first four items are scored as 1= rarely, 2 = occasionally, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, and 5 = very often (Kaplan, 2006). While responses to the other seven items were anchored on a 5-point Likert scale as 1= hardly any, 2= a little, 3= some, 4= a lot, and 5= a great deal (Kaplan, 2006). The Cronbach's alpha values of the instrument as reported by Kaplan (2006) range from .72 to .81. Pilot study using eighty (80) participants for the present study was conducted and result showed a Cronbach's alpha that ranges from .50 to .67.

Counterproductive Work Behaviour Scale is a 29-item scale designed by Suzy and Spector (2003) to measure integrity, emotion, violence and intentional acts of individuals in work place or counterproductive work behaviour. Responses are obtained and scored on a five Likert response format as 1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = everyday, 4 = every weekend, 5 = every two weeks (Suzy & Spector, 2003). The Cronbach'salpha value of the scale as reported by Suzy and Spector (2003) ranges from .88 to .94. Pilot study using eighty (80) participants from (Community Secondary School Umuna, Community Secondary School Ukopi-Ekwegbe, Community Secondary School Umunko and Premier Secondary School Ukehe in Igbo-Etiti) was conducted with the instrument. The result of the pilot study showed a Cronbach's alpha of .98.

Procedure: Questionnaire forms containing the four assessment measures and a section for the provision of relevant socio-demographic data were prepared by the researchers. The authors visited the selected schools in Nsukka, in Enugu state, Nigeria. Approval to conduct the research in the schools was granted to the researchers by the Principals of the two schools. Having obtained the informed consent of the teachers, the questionnaires were thereafter, administered to the teachers in their respective offices and collected after filling.

Design/Statistics: This is a cross-sectional survey research. Regression analysis was performed to ascertain the predictive powers of the variables on the dependent variable.

RESULTS

Table 1: Regression model summary showing Abusive Supervision, Work Tension and Work Overload on Counterproductive Work Behaviour.

Model	R	R Square	Adj. R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	RSquare Change	Fchange	df1	df2	Sig
				Change Statistics					
1	.254^a	.065	.054	2.384	.065	5.958	3	259	.001*

*Significant P < .001

The result of the model summary shows the strength of the relationship between abusive supervision, work tension and work overload on counterwork productive behavior (CWB). It indicates the R, R Square and Adjusted R for the relationship as .25, .06 and .05 respectively. It indicates that abusive supervision, work tension and work overload were implicated by 5% in CWB.

Table 2: Regression Beta (β) coefficient showing significant predictors of Abusive Supervision, Work Tension and Work Overload on Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB).

Model	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient		
	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)	t	Sig
Abusive Supervision	.268	.065	.248	4.102	.05**
Work Tension	.310	.476	.213	.201	.001*
Work Overlaod	.414	.278	.221	.102	.001*

**Significant P < .05; *P < .001

The table above shows a significant relationship between abusive supervision and CWPB (β = .24, t = 4.10, P < 0.05), work tension and CWPB (β = .21, t = .20, P < 0.001) and work overload on CWB (β = .22, t = .10, P < 0.001).

Table 3: Correlations Matrix of Abusive Supervision, Work Tension and Work Overload on Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB).

Variable	1	2	3	4
1. CWB				
2. Abusive Supervision	.400**			
3. Work Tension	.359*	.370*		
4. Work Overload	.189*	.069	.041	

Significant *P < 0.05; **P < 0.001

The correlation table above showed that martial conflict was significantly and positively correlated to abusive supervision (r = .40, P < .001), work tension (r = .35, P < .05) and abusive supervision (r = .37, P < .05). Work overload was also shown to significantly and positively correlate to abusive supervision (r = .18, P < .05).

DISCUSSION

This study examined whether abusive supervision, work tension and overload would predict counterproductive work behavior among secondary school teachers**.** Abusive supervision was shown to significantly associate CWB ($\beta = .24$, $t = 4.10$, $P < 0.05$). Based on this finding the first hypothesis that abusive supervision will not statistically significantly predict counterproductive work behavior was rejected. This result is in an agreement with the findings of Feng (2013) whose results suggested that locus of control moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and sabotage, production deviance and theft, but not abusive supervision and withdrawal; perceived mobility moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and withdrawal and theft, but not abusive supervision and sabotage and production deviance. This implies according to Sulea (2013) that abusive supervision positively correlated with counterproductive work behavior. Counterproductive work behavior therefore correlates with abusive supervision of individuals in work place. Similarly, in support of the above findings, Mary (2012) observed that when confronted with stressful conditions, individuals high with abusive supervision may ascribe more malicious motives to the actor leading to increased negative emotional arousal which may lead to counterproductive work behavior. Individuals low in displaying abusive supervision, on the other hand, may give the actor the benefit of doubt and attribute the behavior to more causes, enabling them to proceed without feeling the need to respond or retaliate with counterproductive work behavior.

Other research findings have earlier strengthened the result of the present study that persons under stressful condition, who report high levels of abusive supervision, are more likely to report counterproductive work behaviour (Stavroula, Amanda & Tom, 2003). For example, Hongping, (2014) explained that subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervision were negatively related with their counterproductive work behaviours. With regards to the various dimensions of counterproductive work behavior, abusive supervision had significant negative relationship with counterproductive work behaviour directed to the organization and to the individuals but was not significantly related to role-prescribed behaviours.

Work tension significantly predicted CWB ($\beta = .21$, $t = .20$, $P < 0.001$). Therefore, the second hypothesis that work tension will not statistically significantly predict counterproductive work behavior was rejected. This result means that employees who are working under tension are likely to encounter CWB. This finding was confirmed by Blaug, Amy and Rohit (2007) who found that work tension may have an adverse effect on executive's attitudes**.** Leblanc and Barling (2005) in support, found that counterproductive work behaviour expectations associate with greater work tension and less job satisfaction. This is however in consonant with Michael, Remus, and Erin (2006) who found that perceived counterproductive work behaviour, was related negatively to voluntary turnover, propensity to leave, work tension and positively to work satisfaction. The correlations of counterproductive work behaviour with voluntary turnover, propensity to leave and work satisfaction were not significant for Nurses who are supposedly classified low on work related tension.

Abdul, Alwi and Aizzat (2012) confirmed that work tension significantly demonstrated a significant and negative relationship with production counterproductive work behaviour. The relationship between work tension feedback, interpersonal counterproductive work behaviour and property counterproductive work behaviour was postulated. In similar manner, work tension identity demonstrated a significant and negative relationship with organizational counterproductive work behaviour. Thus, there is a significant negative relationship between

work tension characteristics (work tension autonomy, work tension identity, work tension feedback, work tension significance, skill variety) and counterproductive work behavior (organizational counterproductive work behavior, interpersonal counterproductive work behaviour). There is a significant negative relationship between work tension autonomy,and both organizational counterproductive work behavior and interpersonal counterproductive work behavior.

Work overload finally was shown to significantly associate with CWB (β = .22, t = .10, P < 0.001). Thus, the third hypothesis that work overload will not statistically significantly predict counterproductive work behavior was not accepted. This implies, like work tension, those employees overloaded with work will exhibit CWPB. Krischer, (2010) confirmed the findings of the present study that work overload stress and negative affectivity were positively correlated with counterproductive work behavior. Negative affectivity moderated the relationship between work overload stress and counterproductive work behavior such that high levels of counterproductive work behavior occurred when work overload stress and negative affectivity were both high. The results indicated that work overload significantly reduced counterproductive work behavior thereby increasing job satisfaction, job performance and job commitment.

Robertson, (2009) indicated in his results that stressors related to the organizational climate, the work relationships, organizational hassles and work overload predict counterproductive work behavior. Furthermore, job satisfaction was positively related to the high quality of the work relationship and low levels of tension in the organizational climate and hassles, while the level of satisfaction with the organization was associated with the work-family balance and the organizational climate. Jilie, Amanda and Goodman (2008) found in a laboratory group that less group productivity in addition to less satisfaction, increased defensiveness, work overload and counterproductive work behavior.

Implications of the Study

CWB have been seen to adversely affect organizational behavior and organizational procedures. Specific CWBs include abusive behavior against others, aggression (both physical and verbal), purposely doing work incorrectly, sabotage, theft and withdrawal (example, absence, lateness and decreased turnover). Other examples of CWB are emotional abuse, bullying, mobbing, deviance, aggression, retaliation and intimidation (Blaug, Army & Rohit, 2007). A number of job stressors have been linked to the performance of CWB including role ambiguity, role conflict, workload, organizational constraints and interpersonal conflict (Blaug, Army & Rohit, 2007).The rate at which employees work under tension or stress could trigger CWB in organizations. So also work overload in a particular work description can predispose employees into exhibiting CWB. Thus, the findings of the study could however be generalized to other sample but the same research could be replicated with other larger sample before such a generalization. The study could also be a guide for further study on CWB in relation to abusive supervision, work tension and work overload.

This study could be limited to inadequate sample and could not allow for generalization to a situation involving large sample size that may run in thousands. As a survey study and no matter how robust it is, relationship or correlation between two variables can be compared with experimentation that outlines the cause-effect relationship.

It is therefore recommended that managers and other employers of labour should not abuse the supervisory roles. Employees' rights and views should be respected and appreciated as it is part of the supervisory obligations. Also, job description should be clearly spelt out in 'white and black' and made available for every employee. This will go a long way to reduce not only work tension, work overload but also duplication of duties in work environment. In a situation where extra hour is added to the normal official hour, the management should as well inform the employee and pay them accordingly.

CONCLUSION

Abusive supervision of any kind and degree, work tension as well as work overload by this research are associated with CWB. Therefore, employers of labours, private and public office holders should be mindful of their actions in organizational settings and always spell out job designations to avoid clashes of interest, work duplications and the corresponding stress.

REFERENCES

Abdul, R., Alwi, S., &Aizzat, M. N. (2012). Impact of work tension characteristics on counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Business and Development Studies, 4*(1), 123-145.

Baumeister, R. F. (2004). *Human nature and aggressive motivation.* Presses Universitaires De Grenoble.

Bialas, S. (2009). Power distance as a determinant of relations between managers and employees in the enterprises with foreign capital. *Journal of Intercultural Management, 1*(2), 105-115.

Blaug, R., Amy, K, & Rohit , L. (2007). *Stress at work.* The Work Foundation: 3 Carlton House Terrace, London.

Feng, W. S. (2013). Tit for tat? Abusive supervision and counterproductive work behaviours: The moderating effects of locus of control and perceived mobility. *Journal of management, 30,* 281-296.

Gallagher, N. (2008). Job tension. *Journal of Organizational Psychology, 5,* 22-45.

Griffin, R. W. & Yvette, P. L. (2005). Bad behaviour in organizations: A review and typology for future research. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 988-1005.

Hongping, Z. (2014). High core self-evaluators maintain creativity: A motivational model of abusive supervision. *Journal of Management.40*(4)*,* 1151-1174.

Julie, W., Amanda, S., & Goodman, C. (2008). *Laboratory medicine*: *A national status report*. The Lewin Group

Kelly, L. Z., & Bennett, J. T. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behaviour.*Journal of Applied Psychology,* 87(6), 1068-1076.

Kevin, E. K., Lori, F., Matthew, P., & James, E. C. (2010). Counterproductive work behaviour as protest. *Human Resource Management Review, 20,* 18-25.

Krischer, M. (2010). Cancounterproductive work behaviours be productive? Counterproductive work behaviour as emotion-focused coping. *Journal of occupational Health Psychology, 15*(2), 154-166.

Kristine, V. (2011). *Employee responses to job dissatisfaction*. University of Rhode Island.

Lian, H., Ferris, D. L., & Brown D. J. (2012). Does power distance exacerbate or mitigate the effects of abusive supervision? It depends on the outcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(1), 107-123.

Lindberg, G. (2008). *World gastroenterology organization practice guideline: Acute diarrhea*. WGO Practice Guidelines.

Marsland, A. L., Sheldon, C., Bruce, S. R., & Stephen, B. M. (2001). Associations between stress, trait negative affect, acute immune reactivity and antibody response to hepatitis b injection in healthy young adults. *Health Psychology, 20*(1), 1-11.

Mary, B. M. (2012). A trickle-down model of abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology, 65*, 325-357.

Michael, M. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviours: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology, 59,* 591-622.

Michael, M. Remus, I., & Erin, J. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviours.*Personnel Psychology, 59,* 591-622.

Michie, S. (2002). Causes and management of stress at work. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 59,* 67-72.

O'Leary, K. (1996). Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(1), 225-253.

Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2005). Job stress, incivility and counterproductive work behaviour: the moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of organizational behaviour, 26,* 777-796.

Rafael, M. B. (2005). Job satisfaction as an indicator of the quality of work. *Journal of Socio-Economics, 34,* 656-673.

Robert, J. F. (2006). *Office of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention*. U.S. Department of Justice.

Robertson, J. (2009). The impact of occupational stress on job satisfaction and counterproductive work behaviour. *Psihology Resurselor Umane, 7*(2), 30-39.

Samuel, O. S. (2010). Job stress and counterproductive work behaviour: negative affectivity as a moderator. *Journal of the social sciences, 5,*486-492.

Sharon, L. B. (1989). *Managing resistance to change*. Ideals.

Stavroula, L., Amanda, G., & Tom, C. (2003). *Work organization and stress.* Institute of Work, Health and Organisations.

Steven, H. A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviours: causes, impacts and solutions. *Corporate Governance*, 7(5), 586-598.

Sulea, C. (2013). Abusive supervision and counterproductive work behaviours: The moderating effects of personality. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 12*(4), 196-200.

Suzy, F., Spector, P. E. & Mile, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behaviour in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 59,* 291-309.

Westman, M. (2004). Crossover of marital dissatisfaction during military downsizing among Russian army officers and their spouses. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 769-779.