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Abstract

Number of misfortunes are reported by the employees such as they are scolded or abused by their leaders resulting in negative psychology of employees. Accordingly, this study examined the influence of abusive supervision on the turnover intentions of the employees mediated by job dissatisfaction. Additionally, the study also considered the moderating role of job embeddedness as a moderator. Following the positivism approach the study was deductive and quantitative. The data were collected by using the questionnaires adapted from the previous studies. A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed among the public sector employees resulting in a total of 350 questionnaires used for data analysis. The respondents were selected by using the convenience sampling. And data were subjected to both SPSS and Smart PLS for analysis. Findings of the study revealed that presence of the abusive supervision tends to result in job dissatisfaction among the employees. Later on, the dissatisfied employees tend to have intentions to leave the jobs. The study results revealed that the job dissatisfaction tends to mediate the relationship between abusive supervision and turnover intentions. Results put forward that the job embeddedness is not a significant moderator. The study is a significant contribution to the literature since it enhanced the understanding about the process through which abusive supervision tends to influence turnover intentions. Although it did not support the job embeddedness as a moderator, but it provided another future avenue for research.

Keywords: abusive supervision, abusive leader, job dissatisfaction, turnover intentions, job embeddedness

1. INTRODUCTION

Effective supervision and job satisfaction among employees are two critical components of organizational success. An efficient and effective leader must guide the direction of the organization and motivate employees to work together to achieve common goals. (Voon et al., 2011).

In the organizations supervisors are usually the ones who have power to influence many aspects of employees. Supervisors should use their influence towards the employees carefully in
order to refrain from turnover intentions/destructive behavior.

Studies have been done that emphasize the dark side of leadership, and the harmful effects on employees, which is perceived as pejorative. (Martinko et al., 2013). According to the interactionism point of view, situational and character-related factors interact to influence behavior. The history of this perspective in the fields of personality and social psychology is extensive. (Palmer et al., 2017) According to previous studies, abusive supervision impact negatively on employee outcomes, such as job dissatisfaction and plans to quit. (Restubog et al., 2011); (Aryee et al., 2007), and that positively connects with the avoidance feedback and unexpected conducts toward managers (Thau et al., 2009); (Whitman et al., 2014). When abusive supervision is experienced by the abused employees, they think that they have gotten lesser results than they deserve in contrast with their objective (Martin & Murnighan, 1981).

The dynamic role of supervisors in reducing employee unhappiness with the workplace is a topic of study for certain academics. The phrase "abuse oversight" refers to subordinates' perception of "the extent to which their superiors engage in linguistic and nonverbal behavior of sustained hostility other than physical contact" (Tepper, 2000). According to previous research, abusive supervision is characterized by subjective evaluation and explanation (Martinko et al., 2013). Employees may perceive a supervisor's behavior as abusive in one situation but not in another, because their perception is more about emotion than action. When employees are not satisfied with their jobs, abusive supervision can progress to more harmful and destructive leadership (Avey et al., 2015), which could make workers more dissatisfied with their jobs. Workplace dissatisfaction is often desired for firms, although not always. (Zhou & George, 2001). Employee turnover is only one of the numerous detrimental workplace consequences that researchers have connected low job satisfaction with (Hom et al., 1992). As a typical sign of disruptive supervision in the workplace, abusive oversight appears to have a natural relationship with employee dissatisfaction (e.g. (Hobman et al., 2009); (Bowling & Michel, 2011); (Haggard et al., 2011); (Kernan et al., 2011); (Harvey et al., 2013); (Martinko et al., 2013).

Previous research has demonstrated that theoretically, abusive supervision is connected to job dissatisfaction in some samples (Law et al., 2004); (Harvey et al., 2013); (Martinko et al., 2013). For instance, (Tepper, 2000) made the case that workers who experienced abusive supervision were probably not as happy with their jobs. Employee job satisfaction is negatively impacted by bullying in the workplace, according to recent empirical studies. (Arenas et al., 2015). The study makes the case that ineffective supervision is a frequent kind of workplace bullying (Ouyang et al., 2015) might lead to job dissatisfaction among employees. The social identity theory states that "when a boss is unfriendly towards a worker, the worker's feeling of belonging to the organization may be diminished and the worker may feel sad" (Tajfel & Turner, 1985) (Ouyang et al., 2015). For example, the depressed feeling in the employee
becomes the source of heaving intention to resign from the company.

Job discontent is a major worry for many organizations since it leads to the desire to leave a job, a significant criteria variable for organizational researchers. (Abid et al., 2015); (Jang & Kandampully, 2018). High turnover intention can significantly decrease workplace trust and prevent employees from showing loyalty to an organization, hence it is generally recognized as a main concern for supervisors. e.g. (Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2016). It can damage the workplace climate and lead to lower performance, hence turnover is a critical problem for businesses (Chang et al., 2013). Engagement at work (Mendes & Stander, 2011), prospering possibilities (Abid et al., 2016), and organizational fairness (Imran et al., 2014) are all factors that lessen the intensity of turnover intentions. Researchers have already discovered a link between abusive supervisory style and unfavorable organizational outcomes such as high turnover and lower productivity. Abusive supervision also leads to workplace mobbing and, as a result, a desire to leave. Workers who stay at a company yet have a strong desire to quit may engage in counterproductive behaviors such as frequent absences, frequent sick leaves, and poor job performance (Farquharson et al., 2012).

One of the most difficult challenges the organization has is retaining talented employees (Arasli et al., 2017). These examples demonstrate the value of job embeddedness (Zhang et al., 2019), which is referred to be the variables affecting employee retention (Chen & Ayoun, 2019). Job embeddedness therefore decreases employees' desire to quit (Takawira et al., 2014), which is an excellent predictor of actual turnover (Zhang et al., 2019). Additionally, it promotes productive job outcomes including service recovery performance and organizational citizenship behavior. (Kapil & Rastogi, 2018); (Safavi & Karatepe, 2019). Prior research has looked at antecedent, mediator, and moderator of job embeddedness (Collins & Mossholder, 2017); (Kapil & Rastogi, 2018); (Potgieter & Blignaut, 2018). Employee loyalty to the company is influenced by job embeddedness. As a result, when there is a significant degree of job embedding, the association between job dissatisfaction and turnover tends to weaken. The study's goal is to investigate how abusive management influences employees' desire to leave the firm, which is mediated by their level of work satisfaction. The moderating role of job embeddedness was also examined in the study.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Abusive Supervision and Job Dissatisfaction

The dissatisfaction of employees is a frequently occurring form of workplace attitudes. Previous research reveals that the type and quality of interactions involving subordinates and their supervisors may significantly impact job satisfaction, particularly for salesmen. Poor supervision, in particular, can have a wide-ranging impact on various aspects of employees' work attitudes (Tepper et al., 2007). According to empirical research, negative correlation exist between workplace bullying and employee job satisfaction (Arenas et al., 2015). This study
shows that abusive supervision, which is considered a common form of workplace bullying (Ouyang et al., 2015) can lead to job dissatisfaction among employees. Poor supervision can lead to dissatisfaction among employees through a range of hostile behaviors, including emotional anger (Ashforth, 1994) social and destructive criticism (Greenberg & Baron, 1993), and disruptive behavior (Duffy et al., 2002). Social Identity Theory states that, hostile management will reduce employees’ sense of belonging to the company and increase the risk of depression. (Ouyang et al., 2015). Prior studies found out that employees/workers exposed to abusive supervision have fewer favorable opinions than non-abused employees. Abusive supervision is another cause of stress that undermines workers’ emotional job satisfaction. Consequently, it is assumed that.

**H1:** There is a positive relationship between abusive supervision and job dissatisfaction.

### 2.2. Job Dissatisfaction and Turnover intention

According to Mendes and Stander (2011) Turnover is correlated with organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Job dissatisfaction is an uncomfortable or unfavorable mental state brought on by stress that causes one to reevaluate their jobs or previous employment experiences. Job dissatisfaction has been found to directly influence employees’ intentions to leave, especially younger ones (Medina, 2012). It has also been proposed that the opposite of work dissatisfaction—job satisfaction—has an inverse relationship with the intention to leave. When an employee compares his or her desired objectives with the actual outcomes, it describes their affective reaction to their employment (Zheng et al., 2010). An employee may leave their job due to job dissatisfaction by being absent from work, arriving late, taking sick leave, asking for a transfer, etc. employment satisfaction is the emotional reaction that an employee has that is favorable and leads to them getting what they want out of their employment (Vidal et al., 2007). This suggests job dissatisfaction is positively correlated with the intention to leave a job (Spector et al., 2007). In the highly competitive workplace of today, we consider employee turnover to be a serious issue. Organizations work to reduce their turnover ratio as much as they can to cut expenses. This results from the expense of replacement, recruitment, etc. that turnover brings about. Voluntary and involuntary turnover are the two sorts. When an employee departs the company on his or her own, it is referred to as voluntary turnover as opposed to when the employer “fires” the employee (Dess & Shaw, 2001). The organization is affected by turnover in both good and bad ways. When there is turnover, management must pay a high price to replace the employees who departed the company. Additionally, when employees quit their jobs, it naturally and negatively affects the productivity of the remaining employees (Breaux et al., 2008). Job dissatisfaction is characterized by a worker’s bad attitude towards his or her organization. According to a Right Management poll from 2012, 65% of respondents were unsatisfied with their work. Of the 30,000 workers who were part of the Mercer Study, 56% of them intended to quit their employment globally. It
follows that job dissatisfaction reduces employee commitment and increases the likelihood of turnover. Consequently, it is assumed that:

**H2:** There is a significant relationship between the job dissatisfaction and turnover intentions.

### 2.3. Mediating Role of Job Dissatisfaction

When employees are unhappy with their jobs, their urge to maintain their present resource reservoirs and stop more resource losses dominates their work behaviors (Hobfoll, 2001). In a comparable manner, we contend that deviant behavior may be a coping mechanism used by employees to express their anger at having a job that gives little thrill. This irritation arises from having a job that drains their resources (Hobfoll, 2001; Hobfoll et al., 2000; Hobman et al., 2009; Taylor et al., 2017)

Employees are particularly driven to protect themselves by displaying work habits that might reduce the related irritation to the extent that they feel negatively about their employment position (Penney et al., 2011). For example, Employees who are dissatisfied with their work, for instance, sometimes feel irritated by the lack of prospects for further professional growth (Rayton & Yalabik, 2014; Skowronski, 2012). That is, negative behavioral responses to unhappiness are guaranteed and limit the loss of resources by making employees feel bad about their careers. (Hobman et al., 2009). Similar to this, staff members who do not enjoy performing their work duties may relate these unfavorable emotions due to a lack of personal support from the organization. (Bowling, 2010; Shamsudin et al., 2014). They can stop additional resource losses by directing the negative energy associated with this attribution towards dysfunctional work activities that risk the existence of their organization or its members. (Fox & Spector, 2006; Taylor et al., 2017). Finally, dissatisfied workers may engage in abnormal conduct to preserve their energy, which is also consistent with the reasoning behind COR theory. In other words, workplace frustration may cause individuals to focus their attention on detrimental activities like postponing their present work practices (Devonish, 2013; Hsieh & Wang, 2016). For instance, boredom may cause disgruntled workers to shift their attention from providing time-consuming, productive contributions to actively sabotaging the internal operations of their organizations by being inactive (Lo Iacono et al., 2016). As a result, the risk that individuals engage in deviant activity should increase as employee satisfaction at work decreases. Consequently, it is assumed that:

**H3:** Job dissatisfaction is a significant mediator between the abusive supervision and turnover intentions.

### 2.4. Job Embeddedness as a Moderator

Job embeddedness is the a collection of forces that may convince employees to commit to their workplace (Thau et al., 2009). Embedded figures and field theory provide the basis of job embeddedness (William Lee et al., 2014). Job embeddedness includes a variety of influences that encourage a person to remain with the firm rather than leaving their existing position. In particular, it includes three domains: ties, fit, and sacrifice (Burmeister et al., 2018). Employee loyalty and continued employment within the
same company are a result of organizational and societal variables (Haider & Akbar, 2017).

Additionally, prior research has offered sufficient proof of job embedding in the setting of turnover (Burmeister et al., 2018; Hom et al., 1992; Hom et al., 2017). It outlines the degree to which a person is connected to their organization or community in relation to other elements of their existence, as well as how simple it is for them to sever those connections when they leave. Prior analysis has already produced strong proof of the JE’s excellent predictive value in relation to turnover (Mitchell et al., 2001). There is little research on the moderating influence of job embeddedness (Burton et al., 2010). Even when they are dissatisfied, it is said that employees who are more rooted in their jobs tend to participate in turnover behaviors less. Consequently, it is assumed that:

**H4:** Job embeddedness is a significant moderator between the job dissatisfaction and turnover intentions.

![Figure 1: Research Framework (Source: Author’s own work)](image)

3. **METHODOLOGY**

This study explored the effects of abusive supervision on turnover intention. The study has considered the role of job dissatisfaction as a mediator. Deductive, cross-sectional, and quantitative approach was followed in the study.

The study was conducted in the public sector employees working in Lahore, Pakistan. Positivism research philosophy was followed in the study and quantitative-deductive approach was followed. Aligned with the philosophical choices, data were collected by using the adapted questionnaires from previous studies.

Following are the details of the questionnaire adapted in the present study. Turnover intentions was measured by 3 items (Skelton et al., 2019). Job Dissatisfaction was measured by 6 items (Rothe, 1951). Abusive supervision was measured by 5 items (Dai et al., 2019). Job
embeddedness was measured by using 7 items (Darrat et al., 2017).

Data were collected from the public sector offices located in Lahore, Pakistan. The respondents of the study were selected by the non-probability convenience sampling. For data collection from the public sector employees, a priori permission was obtained from the head of particular department. Once, they allowed for the data collection than a total of 500 questionnaires were distributed among the respondents. The data collection resulted in a total of 350 questionnaires used for data analysis. Both SPSS and Smart PLS was used for data analysis. All the participants were ensured about the specific use of the data for the study purpose only. And, no personal identification related data were obtained from the participants of the study.

4. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The table 1 shows the demographics data of the respondents, 65 representing 45.8% were male and 77 representing 54.2% were female. 3 respondents representing 2.1% are from the age group of Up to 20, 25 respondents are from the age group of 20-25 representing 17.6%, 36 respondents are from the age group of 26-30 representing 25.4%, 43 the maximum respondents we received from the age group of 31-35 representing 30.3%, 26 respondents are from the age group of 36-40 representing 18.3% and 9 respondents are from 40+ age group representing 6.3%.

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 shows Mean for Turnover Intensions, Job Dissatisfaction, Abusive Supervision and Job Embeddedness is 1.7277, 1.9425, 2.1592 and 3.0674 respectively. Whereas the standard deviation values for Turnover Intensions, Job Dissatisfaction, Abusive Supervision and Job Embeddedness is .96071, .87520, 1.04523 and 1.17171 respectively.

Table 1: Profile of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Up to 20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Service</td>
<td>Up to 1 Year</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10+ Years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's own work

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intentions</td>
<td>1.7277</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>1.9425</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>2.1592</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>-.320</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Embeddedness</td>
<td>3.0674</td>
<td>-.384</td>
<td>-.820</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's own work
Table 2 also presents the Skewness and Kurtosis values for the data. All the Skewness and Kurtosis values fall between the +2 to -2 ranges. Thus, there is no problem with the data’s normalcy. Finally, Table 2 displays the Cronbach’s Alpha values, representing the internal consistency of the data. All the values are above 0.7, indicating that the data is reliable.

4.2. Correlations

Table 3 displays the correlation values between the variables being studied. With an r-value of 0.695 and a p-value less than 0.05, the findings show a positive association between employee turnover intentions and job discontent. Further research found that turnover intention is positively connected to abusive supervision and job embeddedness, with coefficients of 0.335 and 0.054 respectively. The strongest correlation (.695) is seen between turnover intentions and work dissatisfaction. Because the p value is smaller than 0.05, all correlations are significant. All of the other variables are connected as well.

Table 3: Correlations Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>JD</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>JE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s own work

4.3. Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Table 4 below displays the findings of the confirmatory factor analysis. The factor loading values are higher than 0.5 and the AVE is higher than 0.50, suggesting the constructs' convergent validity. Finally, the results also show the value of the CR for the variables which is greater than 0.8 indicating the reliability.

4.4. Discriminant Validity

Conducting cross-sectional research where the relationship between the variables becomes necessary to assess the discriminant validity to assure that variables are different from each other. Accordingly, the present study has used the HTMT to assess the discriminant validity. All of the variables’ HTMT values falling below 0.85 indicates that all of the constructs are different. As per the findings reported in table 5 all of the values are less than 0.85 established the discriminant validity.

4.5 Path Coefficients

Table 6 shows the values for the path coefficients, explained variance, and collinearity statistics. As per the results of the study R2 for fear of Job dissatisfaction regarding abusive supervision is valued at 0.202, indicating that fear of job dissatisfaction has captured the 20.2% variance in abusive supervision while it captured the 56.6% variance in turnover intentions. Additionally, VIF value is for variables ranged between 1 and 1.136 indicating no multi-collinearity issue in the data.

Table 6 shows the path coefficients of the variables under study. The results thus obtained indicate that, abusive supervision positively influences job dissatisfaction ($\beta = 0.449$, $t=5.798$, $p=0$) and turnover intentions ($\beta = 0.721$, $t=14.123$, $
suggesting that an increase in abusive behavior by supervisors can lead to increased job dissatisfaction and a greater probability of employees intending to leave their jobs. However, in addition, there was no significant correlation identified between moderating effects and turnover intentions (\( \beta = 0.119, t = 1.026, p=0.305 \)) or evidence to support work embeddedness as a moderator of turnover intentions (\( \beta = 0.092, t=0.765, p=0.445 \)).

Table 4: Confirmatory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>rho_A</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusive supervision</td>
<td>AS1</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS2</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS3</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS4</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS5</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>JD1</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JD2</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JD3</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JD4</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JD5</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JD6</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JE1</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JE2</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JE3</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JE4</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JE5</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JE6</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TI1</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TI2</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TI3</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s own work

Table 5: Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abusive Supervision</th>
<th>Job Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>Job Embeddedness</th>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s own work

Table 6: Path Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Standardized Estimates</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Explained Variance</th>
<th>Collinearity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS -&gt; JD</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>5.798</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD -&gt; TI</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>14.123</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS -&gt; JD -&gt; TI</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>4.913</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD*JE -&gt; TI</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.361&gt;p</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s own work
5. DISCUSSION

The primary goal of the study is to examine how abusive supervision affects turnover intention from the viewpoint of work discontent. The study has also considered the job embeddedness's function as a moderator. The topic of the "dark side of leadership" has emerged to emphasize its detrimental impact on employees. Data collection was done from the public sector organizations where employees like nurses, lawyers, and teachers were our respondents. In public sector people usually face abusiveness or pressure from their supervisors which motivates job dissatisfaction and turnover, that's why we choose to conduct the research from public sector considering job embeddedness as our moderator. Previous studies also show that abusive supervision is directly linked with job dissatisfaction and turnover intentions (Mathieu & Babiak, 2016). The purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between abusive supervision and job dissatisfaction. Public sector employees filled out the survey forms to provide data. After analyzing the results, we discovered a correlation between abusive leadership and job dissatisfaction because they are significantly correlated with each other (p=.000, r=.373). Job dissatisfaction can be reduced if the supervisors start treating employees with respect and dignity. These findings are consistent with previous studies (Wang, Lin, Chen, & Wu, 2022; Ahmad, 2016).

The study's goal was to look at the relationship between job dissatisfaction and turnover. Data was collected from public sector employees using questionnaires. After doing the research, we discovered a link between job dissatisfaction and turnover intentions because they are significantly correlated with each other (p=.000, r=.695). Pizza and free snacks at lunch are not what make an employee happy and satisfied; but how their superiors treat them. Small gestures like expressing gratitude for someone's efforts or providing a flexible schedule can go a long way. These results are consistent with earlier research. Previously, conducted studies have also reported the positive influence of the negative side of leadership towards the job dissatisfaction among the employees (Haider et al., 2018; Haider & Yean, 2023). The aim of this research was to investigate how the relationship between abusive supervision and turnover intentions is mediated by job dissatisfaction. Data for this study was collected using questionnaires from employees of public sector organizations. After analysis, we found that job dissatisfaction is a significant mediator between abusive supervision and turnover intention. These findings are consistent with previous studies (Humayun, Hamid, & Naseem, 2022). This study aims to investigate the moderating role of job embeddedness in the relationship between job dissatisfaction and turnover intention. Data was collected from the public sector using questionnaires. After analysis, we found that there is no significant moderation between job dissatisfaction and turnover intention. These findings are inconsistent with previous studies (Khairunisa & Muafi, 2022). In conclusion, this study sheds light on the detrimental impacts of abusive supervision on worker job dissatisfaction and intentions to quit, particularly in the public sector where workers are subjected to pressure.
and oppression from their superiors. The results of this study are consistent with earlier studies that have shown that abusive supervision has a good impact on job dissatisfaction which has an advantageous effect on turnover intentions when it is mediated by job dissatisfaction. That is, there is a strong correlation between the variables. The connection between job dissatisfaction and turnover intention was not sufficiently affected by job embeddedness. Influential elements like psychological ownership or perceived organizational support should be examined in further research. Overall, these findings highlight the need for organizations to overcome abusive supervision and create a positive work environment that leads to job satisfaction and employee retention.

6. CONCLUSION

This study has a number of limitations that should be taken into account. First off, because the sample was drawn from a particular region, it's possible that the findings can't be applied to other industries or nations. Second, the study's "cross-sectional design" makes it impossible to determine a cause-and-effect link between the variables, and it's likely that the overall technique variation had an impact on the findings. Additionally, all variables were assessed from the same source, which might have influenced the outcomes. Finally, although the moderating effect of job embeddedness was examined, the study did not address the underlying processes by which job embeddedness modifies the association between job dissatisfaction and turnover intentions.

Future studies can follow changes in abusive supervision, job embedding, job dissatisfaction and turnover intentions using a longitudinal approach, enabling a more thorough analysis of causal relationships. By combining qualitative and quantitative data, a mixed methods approach can help researchers better comprehend the topic they are researching. Future research might also look at additional influencing factors that may have an impact on the association between job dissatisfaction and turnover intentions with, such as psychological ownership, organizational commitment, or perceived organizational support. Finally, considering that cultural variations may have an impact on employee attitudes and abusive supervision, cross-cultural research may be required to assess the generalizability of the study's findings to other cultures or nations.
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