

Chapter 52

The Effects of Mistreating Management Variability on Work Attitudes and Behaviors

Fakhraddin Maroofi

University of Kurdistan Sanandaj, Iran

Fatemeh Kahrarian

Islamic Azad University Kermanshah, Iran

ABSTRACT

The finding of this research indicates that individuals in a work unit are likely to develop negative attitudes and engage in deviate behaviors in response to a manager who is more mistreating toward some unit members but not toward others. These effects were found to be strong after explaining for each individual's personal experience of misuse from the manager. The findings are significant because they highlight the importance of mistreating management variability as a distinct unit-level construct. In sum, the findings highlight the importance of examining mistreating management at both the individual and unit levels of analyzes. This research shows that, in a work unit, non-targeted members are caused some of these negative outcomes because they are the unfair interpersonal treatment of others. Organizations should educate managers on how contradictory interpersonal treatment of subordinates impacts the fairness of the work unit and the negative implication on both targeted and non-targeted subordinates.

INTRODUCTION


Organizational researchers have important attention to harmful behaviors performed by individuals who hold positions of authority within organizations (Tepper, Duffy, Henle, & Lambert, 2006). Research on mistreating management (Tepper, 2000) has grown rapidly over the years. Mistreating management refers to “subordinates’ which managers engage in the sustained display of unfriendly verbal and nonverbal behaviors” (Tepper, 2000, p. 178). Research shows that mistreating management can be harmful to an organization and its employees which decreased employee obligation, job performance, organizational

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-5345-9.ch052

The Effects of Mistreating Management Variability on Work Attitudes and Behaviors

citizenship behaviors, and depression, (Harris, et al, 2011; Tepper, 2000, 2007). To date, the majority of research on mistreating management has been referred to the individual level (Harris et al., 2011; Tepper et al., 2006). Tepper's (2000) imply that behaviors that employees believe mistreating may be perceived differently by another employee. Martinko, et al, (2011) expanded this outlook by suggesting that mistreating management may be implied as a function of both a subordinate's characteristic of perceptions and clear mistreating behaviors on the part of the manager. Mistreating management conceived as a common phenomenon to the extent that individuals experience and observe the manager engaging in mistreating behaviors toward members of the unit. Bamberger and Bacharach (2006) found that unit-level mistreating management measured by collecting other unit members' ratings of mistreating management was negatively related to individual problems. This shows that there is an observable constituent of mistreating management that is commonly perceived by others. Researchers have linked unit-level mistreating management to outcomes (Mawritz, et al, 2012) such as unit-level counter productivity and workgroup abnormality. Despite these findings, however, there has been limited growth in the development on mistreating management. The purpose of this research shows this gap in the literature. This study tests the outcomes of a scattering regarding the model of unit-level mistreating management on employee attitudes and behaviors. Also, this research tests the incremental effects of unit-level mistreating management on employee attitudes. The main hypotheses are summarized in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Hypothesized model (Babatunde, 2013)



The present research contributes the literature on unit-level mistreating management in a number of ways. First, this study extends past research by testing the relevance of a scattering regarding conceptuality of unit-level mistreating management. This conceptuality is showing that mistreating managers tend to be selective about the targets of their misuse (Tepper, Moss, & Duffy, 2011; Tepper et al., 2006). Tepper et al. (2006) found that managers were more mistreating toward subordinates. Tepper et al. (2011) showed that managers were mistreating toward subordinates that they perceived to be different to them on deep-level attributes (e.g., values), and this was mediated by perceived relationship-oriented con-

24 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/the-effects-of-mistreating-management-variability-on-work-attitudes-and-behaviors/274406

Related Content

Transformative Learning and Ancient Asian Educational Perspectives

Viktor Wang and Kathleen P. King (2011). *Assessing and Evaluating Adult Learning in Career and Technical Education* (pp. 11-22).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/transformative-learning-ancient-asian-educational/45364

Cross-Cultural Business Education: Leading Businesses Across the Cultures

Chandan Maheshkar and Vinod Sharma (2021). *Research Anthology on Business and Technical Education in the Information Era* (pp. 677-711).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/cross-cultural-business-education/274391

Developing Cross-Cultural Competence Through Cultural Intelligence: Lessons for Business Educators

Navdeep Kaur (2018). *Handbook of Research on Cross-Cultural Business Education* (pp. 272-298).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/developing-cross-cultural-competence-through-cultural-intelligence/205954

Practices and Perspectives of First-Year WIL Activities: A Case Study of Primary Teacher Education

Hannah Milliken, Michelle J. Eady and Bonnie Amelia Dean (2021). *Applications of Work Integrated Learning Among Gen Z and Y Students* (pp. 233-255).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/practices-and-perspectives-of-first-year-wil-activities/275044

Internalizing Quality Culture: Professionalizing University Education

Ganesh A. Hegde (2013). *Evolving Corporate Education Strategies for Developing Countries: The Role of Universities* (pp. 339-352).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/internalizing-quality-culture/73761