

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269631129>

You Wouldn't Like Me When I'm Sleepy: Leader Sleep, Daily Abusive Supervision, and Work Unit Engagement

Article in *The Academy of Management Journal* · November 2014

DOI: 10.5465/amj.2013.1063

CITATIONS

269

READS

2,523

4 authors, including:



Christopher M. Barnes

University of Washington Seattle

87 PUBLICATIONS 4,714 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Lorenzo Lucianetti

Università degli Studi G. d'Annunzio Chieti e Pescara

71 PUBLICATIONS 1,808 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Michael S. Christian

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

39 PUBLICATIONS 5,483 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Semantic networks and creativity [View project](#)



You Wouldn't Like Me When I'm Sleepy: Leader Sleep, Daily Abusive Supervision, and Work Unit Engagement

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Journal</i>
Manuscript ID:	AMJ-2013-1063.R3
Manuscript Type:	Revision
Keywords:	Leadership < Organizational Behavior < Topic Areas, Mood and emotions < Attitudes, Cognitions, and Affect < Organizational Behavior < Topic Areas, Organizational behavior (General) < Organizational Behavior < Topic Areas
Abstract:	We examine daily leader sleep as an antecedent to daily abusive supervisory behavior and work unit engagement. Drawing from ego depletion theory, our theoretical extension includes a serial mediation model of nightly sleep quantity and quality as predictors of abusive supervision. We argue that poor nightly sleep influences leaders to enact daily abusive behaviors via ego depletion, and these abusive behaviors ultimately result in decreased daily subordinate unit work engagement. We test this model through an experience sampling study spread over ten work days with data from both supervisors and their subordinates. Our study supports the role of the indirect effects of sleep quality (but not sleep quantity) via leader ego depletion and daily abusive supervisor behavior on daily subordinate unit work engagement.

1
2
3
4
5 **You Wouldn't Like Me When I'm Sleepy:**
6 **Leader Sleep, Daily Abusive Supervision, and**
7 **Work Unit Engagement**
8
9
10

11
12
13 **Christopher M. Barnes**
14 University of Washington
15 585 Paccar Hall
16 Seattle, WA 98195
17 Phone: 1-517-214-0438
18 Email: chris24b@uw.edu
19
20

21 **Lorenzo Lucianetti**
22 University of Chieti and Pescara
23 Viale Pindaro 42
24 65127 – Pescara (ITALY)
25 Phone: +39 085 4537900
26 Email: llucianetti@unich.it
27
28

29 **Devasheesh P. Bhave**
30 Singapore Management University
31 Phone: +65-6808 5371
32 Email: dbhave@smu.edu.sg
33
34

35 **Michael S. Christian**
36 University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
37 Chapel Hill, NC, 27510
38 Phone: 919.962.2983
39 Fax: 919.962.4266
40 Email: mike_christian@unc.edu
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Abstract: We examine daily leader sleep as an antecedent to daily abusive supervisory behavior
6 and work unit engagement. Drawing from ego depletion theory, our theoretical extension
7
8 includes a serial mediation model of nightly sleep quantity and quality as predictors of abusive
9
10 supervision. We argue that poor nightly sleep influences leaders to enact daily abusive behaviors
11
12 via ego depletion, and these abusive behaviors ultimately result in decreased daily subordinate
13
14 unit work engagement. We test this model through an experience sampling study spread over ten
15
16 work days with data from both supervisors and their subordinates. Our study supports the role of
17
18 the indirect effects of sleep quality (but not sleep quantity) via leader ego depletion and daily
19
20 abusive supervisor behavior on daily subordinate unit work engagement.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Abusive supervision – the “sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behavior,
4 excluding physical contact” of supervisors toward subordinates, as perceived by subordinates
5
6 (Tepper, 2000: 178) – has pervasive and negative effects on employees, their work outcomes,
7
8 and organizations. Over the past decade and a half, researchers have investigated the deleterious
9
10 effects of abusive supervision, particularly on subordinate affect, attitudes, motivation, and job
11
12 performance (for a recent meta-analysis, see Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Thus, understanding
13
14 why and under what circumstances supervisors might be abusive is paramount for researchers
15
16 and practitioners interested in improving a variety of organizationally relevant outcomes.
17
18
19
20
21

22 However, researchers have recently noted two important limitations to theory explaining
23
24 abusive supervision. First, as noted by Tepper (2007) and again in Tepper, Moss, and Duffy
25
26 (2011), theory and research on abusive supervision has focused much more on outcomes of
27
28 abusive supervision than antecedents. Although the outcomes of abusive supervision are
29
30 important, a sound understanding of its causes is necessary to enable management theory to
31
32 guide managers towards reducing abusive supervision.
33
34
35

36 A second limitation is that research on abusive supervision has typically taken a static
37
38 approach, implicitly assuming that some supervisors engage in abusive supervision and some do
39
40 not, rather than examining whether this behavior fluctuates within a given supervisor. This
41
42 assumption is highlighted by the word “sustained” in the definition of abusive supervision.
43
44 Tepper (2007: 265) explicitly notes that “abusive supervision involves continuing exposure to
45
46 hierarchical mistreatment—a boss who has a bad day and takes it out on his or her subordinates
47
48 by exploding at them would not be considered an abusive supervisor unless such behavior
49
50 became a regular feature of his or her repertoire.” Thus, although research has confirmed the
51
52 proposition that some supervisors are often abusive, whereas others are usually not abusive, this
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 definition is restricted to a leader's "style," or behaviors on average. Thus, much of the research
4
5 on abusive supervision has developed around the examination of "abusive supervisors,"
6
7 precluding the possibility that any leader could be high in abusive supervision on one day and
8
9 low on abusive supervision on another day.
10
11

12
13 With our research, we offer a complementary perspective to the between-persons
14
15 paradigm of abusive supervisors by examining abusive supervisory behaviors, which we argue
16
17 fluctuate within-person on a daily basis. Emerging evidence suggests that leaders might be more
18
19 (or less) abusive on some days than on others. Johnson, Venus, Lanaj, Mao, and Chang (2012)
20
21 found that abusive supervisory behavior varied more within-supervisors than it did between
22
23 supervisors. In other words, supervisors exhibited more within-person variation in abusive
24
25 behavior than was observed for comparisons between supervisors. Building from this research,
26
27 we expand Tepper's (2000) definition of abusive supervision to examine abusive supervisory
28
29 behaviors, defined as any display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behavior, excluding physical
30
31 contact. With our research, we examine how these behaviors are likely to vary on a day-to-day
32
33 basis, and refer to them henceforth as daily abusive supervision. We posit that not only is there
34
35 potentially more predictive power within individuals than between individuals, but a less static
36
37 view of abusive supervision allows for interventions that can potentially apply to a broad set of
38
39 employees. This opens options beyond staffing for managing abusive supervision. Interventions
40
41 aimed at improving daily self-control and mood, such as breaks, positive events, or even a
42
43 mindfulness exercise, could potentially set the stage for low abusive supervision on a given day.
44
45 However, an important question remains unanswered: What factors that were previously
46
47 assumed to be simply noise may account for daily abusive supervision?
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Accordingly, the purpose of this paper is to take a within-person approach to extend
4 theory on abusive supervision by examining daily antecedents and outcomes. Specifically, we
5 draw from theory on ego depletion to examine nightly sleep quantity and quality as antecedents
6 of daily abusive supervisor behavior. Moreover, our conceptual framework suggests that when
7 supervisors are depleted and thus abusive, there will be regulatory consequences that “trickle-
8 down,” to the work unit, sapping their collective work engagement, or the willingness of the
9 members of the unit to self-regulate by investing energy in their work tasks. Thus, we expand the
10 abusive supervision literature by hypothesizing that daily abusive supervision reduces unit work
11 engagement. We move beyond traditional static approaches to studying the antecedents of
12 abusive supervision by proposing that daily abusive supervisor behavior varies in part on the
13 quantity and quality of sleep the night before. Moreover, this includes a crossover view, in that
14 leader sleep influences work unit engagement. Consistent with our theorizing, we test our model
15 of sleep and daily abusive supervisor behavior using a sample of supervisor-led work units and
16 an experience sampling method research design.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **ABUSIVE SUPERVISION: MOVING TO A DAILY APPROACH**

37
38 As noted by Tepper (2007) and Tepper, Moss, and Duffy (2011), theory and research on
39 abusive supervision has focused much more on outcomes of abusive supervision than
40 antecedents. However, this nascent area of research has been helpful in beginning to explore
41 important antecedents such as justice, subordinate characteristics, and diversity (Aquino, Grover,
42 Bradfield, & Allen, 1999; Aryee, Chen, Sun, & Debrah, 2007; Tepper, Duffy, Henle, & Lambert,
43 2006; Tepper, Moss, & Duffy, 2011). This research has begun to open the topic of antecedents to
44 abusive supervision, although from a relatively static, cross-sectional point of view. However, no
45 studies have considered factors that (a) vary on a daily basis such as sleep and (b) are proximally
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 aligned with self-regulatory models, which we argue can expand our understanding of what
4 causes abusive supervision. Models of sleep and work require a daily focus in order to be
5 properly specified at the correct level of analysis (Klein & Kozlowski, 2000). Although there are
6 clearly important relationships between abusive supervision and other constructs at the between-
7 person level of analysis (c.f. Tepper, 2007), the baseline assumption that there is nothing of
8 importance in the domain of abusive supervision occurring at the within-level of analysis may be
9 a model misspecification. In the specific case of leader sleep and work unit engagement, both the
10 conceptual development and the data are consistent with daily variance as the focus.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 Leadership research has long contended that leadership occurs within a specific context,
23 and a specific set of circumstances (c.f. DeRue, 2011). For example, leaders can switch from a
24 directive set of behaviors to an empowering set of behaviors (Lorinkova, Pearsall, & Sims,
25 2013). Although the leadership literature has focused on long term changes in leader behavior,
26 human behavior in general also varies on a much shorter time scale, based on dynamic factors
27 such as mood, self-control, salient goals, and activated identities (Barnes et al., 2011; Dalal,
28 Lam, Weiss, Welch, & Hulin 2009; Leavitt et al., 2012; Scott et al., 2012; Venus, Stam, & van
29 Knippenberg, 2013). Leadership is determined in part by dynamic variables such as mood and
30 identity (Johnson et al., 2012; Venus, Stam, & van Knippenberg, 2013), and should also
31 naturally vary over time on similar time scales. Indeed, Johnson et al. (2012) found that abusive
32 supervision varied on a daily basis, and that this variance was greater than between-persons
33 variance. Thus, abusive behaviors might be linked to within-person variables that vary over
34 time. The substantial body of work of within-person variability in affect (e.g., Dalal, et al, 2009;
35 Glomb, Bhave, Miner, & Wall, 2011) suggests that no person is always pleasant or always
36 unpleasant. Building from this premise, individuals may be abusive on one day but not on others.

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Johnson and colleagues (2012) advanced theory by showing the degree to which leaders
4 were (in)consistent from day-to-day in their level of abusive supervisory behavior; however,
5
6 Johnson and colleagues (2012) did not investigate day-level predictors of this daily variance.
7
8 Thus, their results pave the way for further research taking a daily view of the factors that lead
9
10 to, and result from, daily abusive supervision. In order to enhance the richness of the abusive
11
12 supervision literature in this new direction, we examine “daily abusive supervision”, turning our
13
14 focus to abusive behaviors, rather than the leader’s style. This construct is defined the same as
15
16 the original abusive supervision construct was defined by Tepper (2000), with the exception that
17
18 we refer to behaviors—which are variable within-person—rather than a supervisor’s preferred
19
20 method of supervision, and we remove the constraint that the behavior is sustained over
21
22 prolonged periods of time. This definition enables us to investigate daily fluctuations. In other
23
24 words, we argue that abusive behavior engaged in on a single day is still abusive and meaningful.
25
26 Thus, in addition to being associated with a leadership style, supervisory abuse is a behavior that
27
28 can vary on a daily basis. Our work links back to the larger topic of abusive supervision, but
29
30 allows for growth in a useful direction. We hope that it opens further research questions beyond
31
32 the model that we test in our paper.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **SLEEP, EGO DEPLETION, AND ABUSIVE SUPERVISION**

42
43 Leaders may often experience situations or events that create tempting impulses or urges
44
45 to engage in abusive supervisory behavior in their interactions with subordinates. Frustration
46
47 with a lack of progress on a project or with interpersonal conflict may create an urge to yell or
48
49 speak uncivilly towards a given subordinate (c.f., Tepper, Moss, & Duffy, 2011). Encountering a
50
51 mistake made by an employee might create an impulse to publicly belittle the employee. Having
52
53 ideas criticized by an employee might induce the urge to coerce the subordinate into silence. We
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 argue that leaders sometimes struggle to control these impulses, and that a primary reason for
4
5 their inability to overcome them is failures in self-regulation.
6
7

8 Self-regulation is the psychological process by which counter-normative urges and
9
10 impulses are controlled (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). Ego depletion theory describes how the
11
12 ability to exert self-regulation waxes and wanes over time. According to ego depletion theory, all
13
14 forms of self-regulation draw from a single finite pool of resources (Baumeister, Bratslavsky,
15
16 Muraven, & Tice, 1998; Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). Engaging in acts requiring self-
17
18 regulation depletes this pool, leaving them less able to do so until the resources are recovered.
19
20 Recent research indicates that ego depletion leads people to be especially likely to fail in
21
22 resisting temptations to engage in negative behaviors (c.f., Gino, Schweitzer, Mead, & Ariely,
23
24 2011). Examples of such behavior induced by ego depletion include lying (Mead, Baumeister,
25
26 Gino, Schweitzer, & Ariely, 2009), cheating (Christian & Ellis, 2011), deception (Welsh, Ellis,
27
28 Christian & Mai, 2014), and other unethical behavior (Barnes, Schaubroeck, Huth, & Ghumman,
29
30 2011). Moreover, the capacity for self-regulation is dynamic, and can be depleted by a range of
31
32 factors (for a meta-analysis, see Hagger, Wood, Stiff, & Chatzisarantis, 2010).
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Recent extensions to ego depletion theory indicate an important antecedent to self-
40
41 regulation that is relevant to all employees: sleep. Self-regulation may be affected by both sleep
42
43 quantity – the amount of time an individual spends in a sleeping state – and by sleep quality –
44
45 which refers to difficulty of falling asleep and staying asleep (Barnes, 2012). Barnes further
46
47 notes that sleep quantity and quality have parallel additive effects on self-regulation. This is in
48
49 line with the proposition of Baumeister, Muraven, and Tice (2000) that sleep is important for the
50
51 recovery of physiological resources involved in self-regulation. Moreover, sleep physiologists
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 have found that a lack of sleep leads to socially inappropriate behavior (Horne, 1993), suggesting
4
5 the possibility of impaired self-control.
6
7

8 Emerging physiological evidence supports this view, suggesting that sleep deficiencies
9
10 impair the functioning of structures in the brain that are critical to self-regulation. A growing
11
12 literature in neurophysiology indicates that self-regulation relies disproportionately on the
13
14 prefrontal cortex and amygdala regions of the brain (Banks, Eddy, Angstadt, Nathan, & Phan,
15
16 2007; Beauregard, Levesque, & Bourgouin, 2001; Chuah et al., 2010; Nilsson et al., 2005;
17
18 Ochsner et al., 2004). These regions are fueled by glucose (Fairclough & Houston, 2004), which
19
20 is utilized throughout the day and replenished during sleep. Brain-imaging studies indicate a
21
22 decrease in cerebral metabolism under conditions of sleep deprivation and insomnia, most
23
24 notably in the prefrontal cortex (Altena et al., 2008; Thomas et al., 2000). Thus,
25
26 neurophysiological research indicates that sleep is an important determinant of self-regulation.
27
28
29
30

31 Given the importance of self-regulated behavior in organizations, its connection with
32
33 sleep has recently been targeted by management researchers. Christian and Ellis (2011) found
34
35 that compared to sleeping 6 hours or more, nurses sleeping fewer than 6 hours in a night had
36
37 reduced resources and increased organizational deviance the next day. Barnes et al. (2011)
38
39 similarly found that a lack of sleep led to resource depletion, producing unethical behavior.
40
41 Ghumman and Barnes (2013) found that a lack of sleep led to impairments in the suppression of
42
43 prejudice. Barber, Barnes, and Carlson (2013) found that sleep difficulties led to decrements in
44
45 self-regulation, in turn undermining attempts at social desirability. Wagner, Barnes, Lim, and
46
47 Ferris (2012) found that a lack of sleep led to an increase in cyberloafing at work.
48
49
50
51

52 Every day and night, employees make choices between allocating time toward sleep
53
54 versus other competing activities such as time spent working, with family, or recreating (Barnes,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Wagner, & Ghumman, 2012). Consistent with this, Knutson, Rathouz, Yan, Liu, and Lauderdale
4
5 (2007) conducted a large scale study of sleep, and found that the within-person standard
6
7 deviation exceeded the between-person standard deviation. Recent management studies have
8
9 found day-level relationships between sleep (quantity and quality) and several workplace
10
11 phenomena, including affect, job satisfaction, unethical behavior, surface acting, and time spent
12
13 working (Barnes et al., 2011; Barnes et al., 2012; Christian & Ellis, 2011; Scott & Judge, 2006;
14
15 Sonnentag, Binnewies, & Mojza, 2008; Wagner et al., 2014; Welsh, et al., 2014).
16
17
18
19

20 Specific to the topic of daily self-regulation, Barnes et al. (2011) and Christian and Ellis
21
22 (2011) extended theory on ego depletion to indicate that sleep varies along with self-regulatory
23
24 capacity on a daily basis. Self-regulatory resources are depleted daily, and replenished during
25
26 sleep. Thus, a lack of sleep in a given night leaves an individual with depleted self-regulation the
27
28 next day. Consistent with this reasoning, Barnes et al. (2011) provided evidence from a diary
29
30 study showing daily relationships between sleep quantity/quality and self-regulation, as did
31
32 Christian and Ellis (2011), who manipulated one night of sleep deprivation. Thus, we expect
33
34 daily leader sleep quantity and quality to influence the leader's ego depletion on the next day.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 *Hypothesis 1a: Daily leader sleep quantity is negatively related to daily leader ego depletion.*

42
43 *Hypothesis 1b: Daily leader sleep quality is negatively related to daily leader ego depletion.*
44
45
46
47

48 As we note above, leaders face many temptations to engage in abusive behavior toward
49
50 subordinates, especially when they experience stress, frustration, and difficulties at work.
51
52 Suppressing those temptations and behaving in a civil manner requires self-regulation. As noted
53
54 in Hypotheses 1a and 1b, we expect sleep to influence self-regulation. Thus, we contend that
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sleep on a given night (both quantity and quality) will influence abusive supervisory behavior the
4
5 next day, and that ego depletion will mediate this effect.
6
7

8 Although previous research has not examined this relationship directly, it does lend
9
10 indirect support. Horne (1993) found that sleep deprivation led to an increase in interpersonally
11
12 inappropriate behavior. Kahn-Greene, Lipizzi, Conrad, Kamimori, & Killgore (2006) found that
13
14 sleep deprivation leads to frustration, lack of willingness to accept blame, increased tendency to
15
16 blame others, and weakened inhibition of aggression. As reviewed by Tepper (2007), several
17
18 studies show that displaced feelings of aggression are a likely antecedent of abusive supervision
19
20 (Aryee, Chen, Sun, & Debrah, 2007; Hoobler & Brass, 2006; Tepper, Duffy, Henle, & Lambert,
21
22 2006). Thus, leaders who have weakened inhibition from a nightly sleep deficiency and are
23
24 frustrated or blame others are likely to engage in abusive supervision. Indeed, Barnes (2012)
25
26 argued that low sleep quantity and poor sleep quality would lead to workplace incivility.
27
28 Accordingly, drawing from an ego depletion approach, we hypothesize that daily sleep quantity
29
30 and quality will negatively influence daily abusive supervision through the mediator of ego
31
32 depletion.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 *Hypothesis 2: Daily leader ego depletion is positively related to daily abusive supervisor*
42
43 *behavior.*
44

45
46 *Hypothesis 3: Daily leader ego depletion mediates the effects of (a) daily leader sleep quantity*
47
48 *and (b) daily leader sleep quality on daily abusive supervisor behavior.*
49
50

51 52 53 **EFFECTS ON UNIT WORK ENGAGEMENT** 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 Abusive supervision involves subordinate perceptions of mistreatment by their supervisor
4 and should thus affect subordinate outcomes. We focus, in particular, on a motivational
5
6 outcome—daily unit level work engagement—for three reasons. First, our ego depletion
7
8 framework specifies the critical role of self-regulatory resources underlying supervisor behavior,
9
10 and we extend this line of reasoning to suggest that follower behavior is similarly underpinned
11
12 by motivation and willingness to allocate self-regulatory energy to tasks. Second, subordinate
13
14 motivation is proximal psychologically to abusive behavior and thus likely to be a strong
15
16 psychological outcome for subordinates experiencing abusive supervision (c.f., Schyns &
17
18 Schilling, 2013). Third, a primary function of leadership is to instill motivation and meaning in
19
20 their group of followers (e.g., Avolio, 1990), thus work engagement is conceptually linked to
21
22 leader behavior (Christian et al., 2011; Macey & Schneider, 2008).
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Work engagement is a state of cognitive, emotional, and physical investment in one's
30
31 personal experience or performance of work (Christian et al., 2011; Kahn, 1990; 1992; Rich,
32
33 LePine, & Crawford, 2010). In a review of the work engagement literature, Bakker (2014) notes
34
35 that work engagement fluctuates on a daily basis, and that this daily fluctuation is driven in part
36
37 by negative employee experiences at work. Indeed, several recent articles empirically support the
38
39 idea that daily fluctuation in engagement is meaningful and predictable (Bakker & Despoina,
40
41 2009; Breevaart, Bakker, & Demerouti, 2014; Christian, et al., 2011; Lanaj et al., 2014;
42
43 Sonnentag, 2003; Sonnentag et al., 2009).
44
45
46
47

48 Moreover, work engagement occurs collectively. Workers who are treated poorly and
49
50 experience disengagement as a result will be likely to engage in collective sensemaking
51
52 processes whereby they affect each other's daily work engagement (Costa, Passos, & Bakker,
53
54 2014). We conceptualize work engagement at the unit level, following the lead of others (e.g.,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Barrick, Thurgood, Smith, & Courtright, in press, Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Salanova,
4 Agut, & Piero, 2005). Unit-level engagement is a conceptually appropriate level of analysis for
5
6 examining outcomes of leadership, because a leader's influence tends to produce shared
7
8 responses among subordinates (e.g., Christian, Christian, Garza, & Ellis, 2012; George, 2000).
9
10 Subordinates within the same work unit are likely to have similar levels of exposure to abusive
11
12 supervision on a given day, such that multiple subordinates will be exposed to that same
13
14 behavior. Moreover, group members tend to converge in their affect, attitudes, and behavior
15
16 (Bhave, Kramer, & Glomb, 2010; Duffy, Shaw, & Stark, 2000; Felps, Mitchell, Hekman, Lee,
17
18 Holtom, & Harman, 2009; Sy & Choi, 2013), as they interact and make sense of social and
19
20 environmental information as a group (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977).
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Indeed, unit level engagement has been shown to converge among unit-members
28
29 (Salanova et al., 2005). Work unit engagement has beneficial effects on important outcomes such
30
31 as firm performance (Barrick, et al., in press), service climate, unit performance, and customer
32
33 loyalty (Salanova, Agut, & Piero, 2005), as well as having cross level effects on individual
34
35 burnout (Bakker, van Emmerik, & Euwema, 2006). This is further consistent with our topic of
36
37 abusive supervision; recent research illustrates aggregate subordinate responses to abusive
38
39 supervision (Priesemuth, Schminke, Ambrose, & Folger, in press).
40
41
42

43 Work engagement is related to leadership to the extent that effective leaders help
44
45 subordinates to view their work as meaningful and valuable, and to attach their identities to the
46
47 work itself (Bono & Judge, 2003; Grant, 2012). Thus, leader behavior may influence the extent
48
49 to which subordinates feel personally invested in the work they perform, especially to the degree
50
51 to which a leader is fair and trustworthy and engenders feelings of psychological safety (Kahn,
52
53 1990; Macey & Schnieder, 2008). Abusive supervision is inconsistent with signals of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 competence, value, and respect (Mayer, Thau, Workman, Dijke, & De Cremer, 2012). By
4
5 providing an experience that employees will find aversive, abusive supervision should leave
6
7 employees more likely to withdraw than to engage themselves heavily in their work. Related
8
9 research indicates that CEO leadership influences collective organizational engagement (Barrick
10
11 et al., in press). Although we examine work units rather than firms as a whole, the logic is similar
12
13 in that leaders influence the engagement of subordinates within their collective.
14
15

16
17 We integrate unit work engagement into our model of sleep and abusive supervision.
18
19 Specifically, as indicated in Hypothesis 3, sleep quantity and quality will negatively influence
20
21 daily abusive supervision through the mediating mechanism of ego depletion. As indicated in our
22
23 logic above, daily abusive supervision will negatively influence daily unit engagement.
24
25 Therefore, we expect a relationship with two levels of serial mediation, such that the effects of
26
27 leader sleep are transmitted to subordinate unit engagement first through leader ego depletion
28
29 and then through daily leader abusive supervision. Figure 1 depicts the full conceptual model.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 *Hypothesis 4: Daily abusive supervision will be negatively related to daily unit work*
38
39 *engagement.*

40
41 *Hypothesis 5a: Daily leader ego depletion and daily abusive supervisor behavior will serially*
42
43 *mediate the daily leader sleep quantity to daily unit work engagement relationship.*

44
45
46 *Hypothesis 5b: Daily leader ego depletion and daily abusive supervisor behavior will serially*
47
48 *mediate the daily leader sleep quality to unit work engagement relationship.*
49
50

51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

Sample

1
2
3 We drew our participants from Amadeus - Bureau Van Dijk (<https://aida.bvdinfo.com/>), a
4 database of public and private firms which include domestic and multinational firms in Italy. We
5 contacted managers from these organizations and informed them about our study. After
6 managers expressed their respective organizations' willingness to participate in the study, we
7 informed employees of these organizations via e-mail about the project and invited them to sign
8 up individually for the study. We offered feedback about the study results after completion of
9 data collection as an incentive for participation. Participants were from a variety of industries
10 and occupations, including accounting, supply chain, operation management, human resources,
11 and marketing in the industries of banking, information technology, and health care. 99
12 supervisors agreed to allow the administration of surveys, and completed the surveys themselves.
13 Their workgroups ranged from 3-8 members, with a mean of 4.6 per group. We received
14 completed questionnaires from 261 subordinates, representing a response rate of 57%. Across
15 groups, response rates ranged from 25% to 100%.

16
17 For supervisors, 28% of respondents were female; 6% were between 18 and 30 years old,
18 25% between 31 and 40, 33% between 41 and 50 and 35% were older than 51 (mean 46 years,
19 SD 9.8). Twenty two percent of supervisors worked within the current position for less than 2
20 years, 15% between 2 and 4 years, 24% between 4 and 6 years, and 38% worked more than 6
21 years in the current positions. Mean supervisor tenure with their organizations was 7 years (SD
22 5.8).

23
24 Forty percent of subordinates were female; 26% were between 18 and 30 years old, 36%
25 between 31 and 40, 25% between 41 and 50 and 13% were older than 51 (mean 38 years, SD
26 9.8). Twenty eight percent of subordinates worked with the current supervisor for less than 1
27 year, 47% between 2 and 4 years, 12% between 4 and 6 years, and 13% worked more than 6
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 years with the current supervisor (mean 3.6 years, SD 3.3). In the sample, on average
4
5 subordinates interacted with their current supervisors “rarely” 2%, “once every few weeks” 9%,
6
7 “once per day” 13%, “a few times per day” 23% and “several times per day” 53%.
8
9

10 Overall, we received 826 out of 990 possible supervisor surveys (83.43% response rate)
11 and 2148 out of 2610 possible subordinate surveys (82.30%) out of those participating. Ten
12 supervisors either provided less than 2 surveys or did not meet the minimum requirement of
13 having at least one subordinate who completed at least 2 surveys, and were thus removed from
14 the data. As noted below, subordinate-days in which subordinates had either “none” or “little”
15 contact with their supervisors were left out of the data. After the available daily subordinate
16 surveys were matched with the available daily supervisor surveys, and were aggregated to the
17 supervisor-level, it yielded a final sample of 606 unit-days nested within 88 supervisors.
18
19

20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 **Procedures**

30
31 Participants were recruited through contacts with their organizations. Individuals who
32 indicated an interest in participating were presented with the informed consent document. This
33 provided instructions for the study, as well as assurances of confidentiality. Surveys were
34 provided in Italian, the native language of the participants. To develop the Italian version of the
35 surveys, we followed the translation-back translation procedures outlined by Brislin (1986).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Supervisors first completed a baseline survey. In order to capture daily variance in the
44 constructs of our model, the rest of the study used interval-contingent experience-sampling
45 methodology (see Alliger & Williams, 1993; Wheeler & Reis, 1991). Similar to the majority of
46 experience sampling research in the management literature, we chose a 2 week period. This is
47 consistent with Reis and Wheeler’s (1991) suggestion that two weeks represents a generalizable
48 sample of individuals’ lives. During the two weeks of the study (including only workdays),
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 participants were asked to complete 1 survey per day. Supervisors were asked to complete their
4 surveys at the beginning of their workday (measuring supervisor sleep and ego depletion), and
5 subordinates were asked to complete their surveys at the end of their workday (all other
6 measures). This allowed for temporal precedence, with the independent variables and first stage
7 mediator (supervisor sleep quantity and quality, and supervisor ego depletion) measured earlier
8 in the workday than the second stage mediator and outcome (abusive supervisor behavior and
9 subordinate work engagement).

19 **Measures**

20
21
22 *Supervisor sleep.* Supervisor sleep was measured with the Pittsburgh Sleep Diary (Monk
23 et al., 1994). Participants were asked the time at which they went to bed, how long it took to fall
24 asleep, what time they woke in the morning, and how long they were awake after initially falling
25 asleep. Time awake after initially falling asleep is referred to in the sleep physiology literature as
26 “wakefulness after sleep onset” (WASO). In the instructions to participants, in the WASO
27 question, participants were provided with an example to help them understand the meaning (“For
28 example, if you were asleep until 1am, woke at 1am and fell back asleep at 1:20am for the rest of
29 the night, your answer would be 20 minutes”). These times were used to calculate the number of
30 minutes spent asleep, which was how we operationalized sleep quantity. Previous research
31 indicates that this measure of sleep quantity correlates with objective measures of sleep quantity
32 (Barnes et al., 2011). We reverse-coded WASO, which captures interruptions to sleep, as our
33 operationalization of sleep quality. This follows the same approach as previous research in
34 management measuring sleep quality with interruptions to sleep (Wagner et al., 2012).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 *Daily Leader Ego Depletion.* To measure daily ego depletion, we used the 5 item scale
54 that Lanaj et al. (2014) selected to measure ego depletion in a diary study format. These items
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 originally came from Twenge et al. (2004). Participants were instructed to indicate the degree to
4 which they agreed with each item on a 5 point Likert scale, in which 1=*very slightly or not at all*
5 and 5=*very much*. A sample item is “My mental energy is running low.” Average coefficient
6 alpha for this scale was .92.
7
8
9
10
11

12 ***Daily Abusive Supervisor Behavior.*** To measure daily abusive supervisor behavior, we
13 used the 5 item scale that Johnson et al. (2012) specifically developed to measure daily abusive
14 supervision. Participants were instructed to indicate the “frequency with which your supervisor
15 engaged in each of the 5 behaviors **today at work**”, using a 6 point Likert scale provided in
16 increments of 1 occasion, in which 1=*never* and 6=*5 or more*. A sample item is “Behaved in a
17 nasty or rude manner toward a group member”. Average coefficient alpha for this scale was .78.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ***Daily Unit Work Engagement.*** Work engagement was measured with 3 items drawn
28 from Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova (2006) and validated for use in a daily survey context by
29 Lanaj et al. (2014), one item for each conceptual dimension of work engagement, physical,
30 emotional, and cognitive (cf. Rich et al., 2011). In their pilot work, Lanaj et al. (2014) found that
31 the shortened version of the Schaufeli et al. (2006) work engagement scale correlated with the
32 full version at $r=.83$ ($p<.01$). The items were reworded to focus on daily engagement, and
33 participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed with the items on a 5 point
34 Likert scale in which 1=*strongly disagree* and 5=*strongly agree*.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 A recent meta-analysis indicates that when assessing and aggregating affectively-laden
47 variables (i.e., work engagement) at the group-level, a direct consensus model may be more
48 appropriate than a referent shift model (Wallace, Edwards, Paul, Burke, Christian, & Eissa,
49 2013). Wallace et al. argue that an employee’s assessment of the work environment relative to
50 their personal affective experience is more accurate than an employee’s assessment of the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 affective experiences of others inside and outside of one's workgroup. As Wallace and
4
5 colleagues (2013) recommend, direct consensus models are appropriate for constructs that have
6
7 affective components, withstanding sufficient within-group agreement statistics. Thus, we used
8
9 items that measured individual engagement and then aggregated to the work unit level
10
11 (aggregation information is provided later in this manuscript). An example item for cognitive
12
13 engagement is "Today, I was immersed in my work." Average coefficient alpha for this measure
14
15 was .86.
16
17
18
19

20 ***Control and Cutoff Measures.*** Participants who have either no contact or only a little
21
22 contact with their supervisor in a given day possess insufficient information to rate the abusive
23
24 behavior of their supervisor on that day. Accordingly, we asked participants "How much contact
25
26 did you have today with your supervisor?", with responses on a 5 point Likert scale in which
27
28 1=*none*, 2=*little*, 3=*a moderate amount*, 4=*quite a bit*, and 5=*a high amount of contact*. We
29
30 included subordinate responses only on days in which their contact with their supervisor was 3 or
31
32 greater on this scale, analogous to the approach previously used by Pugh, Groth, and Hennig-
33
34 Thureau (2011) and Bono et al. (2007) to target the questionnaire toward those with sufficient
35
36 information to answer it.
37
38
39
40

41 Trait anxiety has been linked to both sleep problems (LeBlanc, Mérette, Savard, Ivers,
42
43 Bailargeon, & Morin, 2009) and negative behaviors from leaders (Kant, Skogstad, Torsheim, &
44
45 Einarsen, 2013). Thus, in order to eliminate anxiety as a confound in the relationship between
46
47 leader sleep and abusive supervision, we included leader trait anxiety as a control variable.
48
49 Following Wagner, Barnes, and Scott (2014), we used a 4 item measure of anxiety drawn from
50
51 MacKinnon, Jorm, Christensen, Korten, Jacomb, and Rodgers (1999). Participants rated on a 5
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 item Likert scale the degree to which each of 4 adjectives described them “on average”. Sample
4
5 adjectives include “nervous” and “distressed”. Coefficient alpha for this scale was .74.
6
7

8 ANALYSIS

9
10 Given the multilevel nature of our model, the data collected to test our model included
11
12 nesting that violates assumptions of independence of observations required for ordinary least
13
14 squares regression analyses. Accordingly, we conducted our analyses in multilevel format using
15
16 Mplus (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2010). Furthermore, in order to test the proposed serial
17
18 mediation, we performed multilevel path analysis (MacKinnon, 2008; Preacher, Zyphur, &
19
20 Zhang, 2010). Specifically, in order to test the serial mediation, in our model daily leader sleep
21
22 quantity and quality were the independent variables, daily leader ego depletion was the first-
23
24 stage mediator, daily abusive supervision was the second-stage mediator, and unit work
25
26 engagement was the dependent variable. We test and report mediation through a test of the
27
28 statistical significance of the indirect effect and its associated confidence interval (MacKinnon,
29
30 2008). The data consisted of 2 levels. The lowest level (Level 1) comprised daily unit ratings,
31
32 leader sleep and ego depletion, which were nested within leader our leader control variable-
33
34 (Level 2).
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 In order to empirically justify aggregation of subordinate ratings of a given leader on a
42
43 given day and aggregation of subordinate daily ratings to unit daily ratings, we conducted ICC
44
45 analyses. This analysis indicates what proportion of the variance is accounted for by the group
46
47 level, and whether or there is significant nesting. For leader daily abusive supervision $ICC(1)=$
48
49 $.43$ ($p<.01$) and $ICC(2) = .91$, $F=1.87$. For daily unit work engagement, $ICC(1) = .48$ ($p<.01$) and
50
51 $ICC(2) = .65$, $F=2.81$. These values all support the aggregation we indicated in our conceptual
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 development.

RESULTS

Table 1 reports the descriptive statistics and the correlations at the within-person level.

As a preliminary step in the analysis, partitioning of the variance indicated that 57% of the variance in abusive supervision was within-supervisors, and 54% of the variance in work engagement was within-work units (i.e., the work unit-day level of analysis). Table 2 reports the results of our hypotheses and the multilevel path analysis. We proposed that daily leader sleep quantity (H1a) and sleep quality (H1b) will be negatively related to leader ego depletion. Results provided support for H1b: daily sleep quality ($\gamma = -.13, p < .05$) was negatively related to leader ego depletion; there was no statistically significant relationship between daily sleep quantity and leader ego depletion ($\gamma = .02, p > .05$).

Hypothesis 2, which posited that daily leader ego depletion positively relates to daily abusive supervision, received empirical support ($\gamma = .35, p < .01$). Hypothesis 3 posited that daily leader ego depletion will mediate the relationship between daily sleep quantity (H3a) and daily sleep quality (H3b) and daily abusive supervisor behavior. Hypothesis 3a was not supported. Hypothesis 3b was supported: the indirect effect of daily sleep quality on daily abusive supervisor behavior via daily leader ego depletion was significant ($ab = -.04, p < .05$; 95% CI [-.084, -.003]).

Hypothesis 4, which posited that daily abusive supervision will be negatively related to daily unit work engagement, was supported ($\gamma = -.45, p < .01$). Hypothesis 5 posited that daily leader ego depletion and daily abusive supervision will serially mediate the relationship between daily sleep quantity (H5a) and daily sleep quality (H5b) and daily unit work engagement. Hypothesis 5a was not supported but Hypothesis 5b received support: the indirect effect of daily sleep quality on daily abusive supervision via daily leader ego depletion (the first-stage

1
2
3 mediator) was statistically significant ($ab = -.15, p < .01$; 95% CI [-.229, -.080]); notably, the
4
5 indirect effect of daily sleep quality on daily unit work engagement via both daily leader ego
6
7 depletion (the first-stage mediator) and daily abusive supervision (the second-stage mediator)
8
9 was also significant ($ab = .02, p < .05$; 95% CI [.000, .039]; 90% CI [.003, .036]. The estimate (ab)
10
11 of the indirect effect for the serial mediation is statistically significant at the 5% level of
12
13 significance (i.e., $p < .05$), and the lower bound of the 95% confidence interval is a non-zero
14
15 positive value beyond the three decimal places, which, as such does not include zero.
16
17 Nevertheless, as an additional check, we also report the 90% confidence interval for this indirect
18
19 effect.
20
21
22
23

24 Overall, the results indicated that daily leader ego depletion mediated the relationship
25
26 between daily leader sleep quality and daily abusive supervision. Furthermore, there was
27
28 evidence of serial mediation such that the relationship between daily leader sleep quality and unit
29
30 work engagement was mediated by leader ego depletion and daily abusive supervision. We did
31
32 not observe these indirect effects for the daily sleep quantity and unit work engagement
33
34 relationship.
35
36
37

38 **Supplementary Analyses**

39
40 To provide additional insight on different functional forms of abusive supervisory
41
42 behaviors, we performed a number of supplementary analyses. Specifically, we considered the
43
44 variability in abusive supervision (as indicated by the standard deviation of abusive supervision)
45
46 and the trend in abusive supervision over the study period (as indicated by the linear trend of
47
48 abusive supervision). Although we do not have any *a priori* hypotheses for these analyses, we
49
50 explore them to allow the possibility of finding useful information. We focus solely on the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 variables of interest in these analyses and exclude the various potential combinations of control
4
5 variables.
6

7
8 As a first step, we examined whether abusive supervision variability is related to unit
9
10 work engagement above and beyond the mean level of abusive supervision. Results indicated
11
12 that abusive supervision variability was related to unit work engagement ($\gamma = .09, p < .10$) only at
13
14 less stringent cutoff level of an alpha value of .10. Next, to understand whether units may react to
15
16 the same daily abusive supervision differently depending on the predictability of the behavior,
17
18 we examined abusive supervision variability as a moderator of the abusive supervision – unit
19
20 work engagement relationship (see Table 3). Results indicated that abusive supervision
21
22 variability may play such a moderating role ($\gamma = .13, p < .10$) such that unit work engagement
23
24 was highest when both mean and variability in abusive supervision were low, albeit again only at
25
26 a less stringent alpha cutoff level (see Figure 2).
27
28
29
30

31
32 In a third exploratory analysis we examined the trend in abusive supervision as a
33
34 predictor of unit work engagement to assess whether subordinates respond differently if abusive
35
36 supervision is getting worse (or lessening) over time (i.e., within the two-week time period of our
37
38 study). There were no statistically significant effects for the trend of abusive supervision as a
39
40 predictor of unit work engagement ($\gamma = -.04, p > .05$). In a related analysis, to assess whether
41
42 units may respond to the same level of daily abusive supervision differently depending on the
43
44 trend in abusive supervision, we examined the trend as a moderator of the daily abusive
45
46 supervision – unit work engagement relationship. Results indicated that the moderator effects
47
48 were not significant ($\gamma = -.09, p > .05$).
49
50
51

52
53 Finally, given the null findings associated with sleep quantity, we examined the
54
55 interactive effects of sleep quantity and sleep quality on daily abusive supervision. Results
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 indicated that the interaction term was not statistically significant ($\gamma = .08, p > .05$). We also
4
5 examined the interactive effects of sleep quantity and sleep quality on daily ego depletion, a
6
7 more proximal outcome. Results indicated that the interaction term was statistically significant,
8
9 although at a less stringent cutoff of an alpha of .10 ($\gamma = -.14, p < .10$), such that daily ego
10
11 depletion was lowest when both sleep quantity and sleep quality were high.
12
13
14

15 Overall, the exploratory analyses revealed few statistically significant findings.
16
17 Moreover, there was no clear and meaningful pattern that emerged from those analyses. It is
18
19 plausible that a larger sample, or more specifically, data collected over a longer timeframe, may
20
21 be necessary to detect trends and variability in abusive supervision, and to more clearly isolate
22
23 interactive effects of sleep quantity and quality.
24
25
26

27 DISCUSSION

28
29 We used an experience sampling design to examine the daily relationships among
30
31 supervisor sleep, subsequent supervisory abusive behaviors towards subordinates, and
32
33 subordinate outcomes. The results generally supported our hypotheses with regards to sleep
34
35 quality, but not sleep quantity. Supervisor sleep quality was associated with daily abusive
36
37 behaviors through the mediator of daily ego depletion. Supervisor sleep quality was also linked
38
39 indirectly—via daily leader ego depletion and daily abusive supervisor behavior—to subordinate
40
41 unit work engagement. Our results have several theoretical and practical implications.
42
43
44

45 To begin, we challenge the prevailing static viewpoint that assumes that leaders are either
46
47 abusive to some degree or not abusive at all. Whereas the majority of research has considered
48
49 abusive supervision to be a chronic factor—much like a trait or a consistent style—our study
50
51 suggests that supervisors vary in their level of abusive behavior on a daily basis. Our results
52
53 stand with those of Johnson and colleagues (2012) as the only two studies that have tested this
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 approach. Our findings add to the literature by suggesting that in order to accurately describe
4
5 abusive supervision, theory and research should focus as much on “momentary” abuse as it has
6
7 on “sustained” abuse. Thus our research moves the literature on abusive supervision, and on
8
9 leadership more generally, forward by demonstrating the importance of a daily perspective in
10
11 understanding leader behavior.
12
13

14
15 Further, our results suggest at least two reasons why fluctuations in abusive behavior are
16
17 theoretically important. First, daily abusive behaviors are associated with fluctuations in
18
19 supervisor sleep quality. This is unlikely to be found in a between-subjects research design,
20
21 because the effects of nightly sleep quality are proximal and most likely to have effects on
22
23 behavior the following day. More generally, by linking sleep to leader behavior, we contribute to
24
25 the very small body of research on antecedents to abusive supervision, arguing that the
26
27 exogenous causes of abusive supervision may vary on a daily basis. Our study explains one
28
29 reason why leaders exhibit inconsistency in their abusive behaviors, filling a critical gap in our
30
31 understanding of the reasons why managers may be abusive (cf. Tepper, 2007; Tepper, et al.,
32
33 2011).
34
35
36
37
38

39 In addition to examining antecedents, our results suggest a connection between the non-
40
41 work domain of leaders and the work domain of subordinates, supporting our hypothesis that, at
42
43 the day-level, a supervisor’s sleep quality impacts subordinate outcomes indirectly by increasing
44
45 supervisors’ daily abusive behaviors. The finding that daily abusive supervisor behavior leads to
46
47 detrimental subordinate outcomes on a daily basis is in contrast to other studies of the outcomes
48
49 of abusive supervision, which have focused exclusively on differences between individuals’
50
51 emotions, attitudes, and behaviors (see Schyns & Schilling, 2013). As such, our study
52
53 demonstrates how a daily perspective enables tests of subordinate reactions to abuse from a
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 within-person vantage. This has clear implications for negative spillover processes (Eby, Maher,
4 & Butts, 2010), in which difficulties outside of the work domain can negatively impact work
5 experiences. In this case, poor sleep quality outside of work negatively influences leader
6 behavior toward subordinates.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13 Moreover, our findings that leader sleep has an indirect effect on daily work unit
14 engagement highlight an important “crossover” process that might have long-term downstream
15 outcomes for organizations and employees. For organizations, workers who are disengaged on
16 any given day will have lower job performance (Rich, LePine, & Crawford, 2010) which can
17 affect the quality of work output by the organization. A single day of work can represent a
18 sizeable amount of value for an organization. Imagine if a supervisor’s employees disengaged
19 entirely from work for a single day. Subtracting weekend (or alternative days off), holidays,
20 vacation time, and sick days, full-time employees will typically work somewhere between 220
21 and 240 days per year. Thus, even a single day of work represents somewhere around half of a
22 percent of the full value that employee brings for a year. Given that there is considerable daily
23 variance in each of the outcomes we study, it is reasonable to expect that there can be many days
24 in a given year in which a supervisor suffers a poor night of sleep, is high in abusive supervision
25 the next day, and elicits disengagement from his/her subordinates. Obviously, exact amounts are
26 difficult to estimate, given that these constructs vary continuously and that there are also
27 between-individual differences that also influence these frequencies. Nevertheless, we posit that
28 lost value from disengagement on a given day can represent considerable amounts of lost value
29 to organizations. This becomes even more apparent when one begins to aggregate across many
30 such days of low work unit engagement, many work units, many organizations, and many years,
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 or when one examined high reliability contexts in which a moment of disengagement can
4
5 produce disastrous consequences.
6
7

8 Our study also contributes to research on sleep in organizations in several ways. Using an
9
10 ego depletion framework, we theorized that sleep would affect leadership behaviors, a
11
12 relationship that has not previously been proposed. Moreover, we respond to calls to “focus more
13
14 directly on sleep quality in addition to sleep quantity” (Barnes, et al., 2011, p. 178), given results
15
16 indicating that sleep quality may play an important role in determining behavior (Barnes, et al.,
17
18 2011) and attitudes (Scott & Judge, 2006) in the workplace. In our study, sleep quality—the
19
20 difficulty of falling asleep and staying asleep (Barnes, 2012)—emerged as an explanatory
21
22 variable. This finding is important because it adds to the range of factors relating sleep to
23
24 workplace dynamics. Barnes further notes that sleep quantity and quality have parallel additive
25
26 effects on self-regulation.
27
28
29
30

31 Although we predicted such parallel effects, the effects for sleep quantity were generally
32
33 not supported. It is possible that this is simply the result of sampling error, but this is difficult to
34
35 assess. The p values for sleep quantity were not close to conventional cutoffs, indicating that
36
37 there would have had to be considerable levels of such sampling error to create a Type II error.
38
39 An alternative possibility is that supervisors are more aware of their sleep quantity than quality,
40
41 and are more carefully monitoring their behavior after low sleep quantity but not poor sleep
42
43 quality. Another possibility is that chronic sleep deprivation may be more powerful than acute
44
45 sleep deprivation in predicting abusive supervision. Although we do not have any measures of
46
47 chronic sleep deprivation, future research may do well to examine this question. Moreover, there
48
49 is some evidence in the extant literature of a possible threshold effect with quantity. Christian
50
51 and Ellis (2011) found a difference between those above and below 6 hours of sleep, and in our
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sample we found that only 13 percent of the observations of supervisor sleep quantity achieved
4
5 this level of deprivation. This may have limited our ability to explain variance in abusive
6
7 supervision by restricting the range of the independent variable. Further, sleep quality is a
8
9 variable that might be subject to more variation than quantity.
10
11

12 **Limitations and future research**

15 Despite the strengths of our methodology—we collected data over time from the separate
16
17 sources of subordinates and supervisors—helping us to avoid inflated correlations commonly
18
19 found in same-source data (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003), our study has
20
21 several limitations. We did not manipulate variables or use random assignment techniques, which
22
23 would enable more clear causal inferences. Instead, we rely on our theory, the time-separated
24
25 nature of our daily assessments, and a within-participant design that partials out any between-
26
27 participant differences in order to test our hypotheses specifying directional relationships.
28
29 Although we control specifically for supervisor trait anxiety, and use a design that parses out any
30
31 potential between-supervisor confounds, we did not include an exhaustive list of day-level
32
33 controls. We encourage future research to include such day-level control variables, perhaps
34
35 starting with the most conceptually relevant, such as supervisor day-level workload, supervisor
36
37 day-level stress, and supervisor day-level health and well-being related variables.
38
39
40
41
42

43 Because the focus of our research was on supervisor sleep, we did not examine the effects
44
45 of subordinate sleep (either as predictors or consequences), despite some compelling theoretical
46
47 possibilities that can be addressed in future studies. Niedhammer, David, Degioanni, Drummond,
48
49 and Philip (2009) found that the experience of workplace bullying was associated with sleep
50
51 disturbance. Given the conceptual overlap between workplace bullying and abusive supervision,
52
53 it may well be that daily abusive supervisor behavior would lead to sleep difficulties that night
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 for subordinates. Indeed, Rafferty, Restubog, and Jimmieson (2010) found more directly that
4 abusive supervision is associated with subordinate insomnia. Thus, researchers could examine
5 the relationship between subordinate and supervisor sleep quantity and quality. These
6 relationships could be modeled as having lagged crossover effects (Eby et al., 2010), with causal
7 effects emerging over time, as one role's lack of sleep crosses over to the other. Supervisor sleep
8 might have effects on subordinate sleep or vice versa, because it is possible that tired and
9 fatigued employees lead coworkers to experience stress that is disruptive to their subsequent
10 sleep patterns. Alternatively, the relationship between supervisor and subordinate sleep might be
11 modeled as an interaction effect. Tired leaders working with tired subordinates could result in a
12 particularly toxic combination. Subordinate deviance and unethical behavior are the results of
13 both lack of subordinate sleep (e.g., Barnes et al., 2011; Christian & Ellis, 2011) and abusive
14 supervision (e.g., Tepper, Henle, Lambert, Giacalone, & Duffy, 2008). Thus, it is quite possible
15 that the result of lack of sleep in the supervisor-subordinate dyad could exacerbate the tendency
16 towards deviance for the subordinate.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Despite a growing body of work that supports an ego-depletion view of sleep and
37 resulting effects on antisocial or unethical behaviors (e.g., Barnes et al., 2011; Christian & Ellis,
38 2011), a recent study has shown, by manipulating sleep and ego depletion, that these effects may
39 not consistently hold (Vohs, Glass, Maddox, & Markman, 2011). Vohs and colleagues' work
40 suggests that the effects of ego depletion on aggressive behavior hold across sleep-deprivation
41 conditions, and thus ego-depletion might be differentiated from fatigue induced by suboptimal
42 sleep. Future research might be conducted to try to untangle the differences and similarities
43 between sleep's effects on fatigue and ego depletion. Also, as Vohs and colleagues point out, it is
44 possible that self-report measures of depletion are more likely to capture variance associated
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 with people's lay beliefs about the effects of sleep on self-control. Although this is a question
4
5 perhaps best addressed by controlled laboratory research, future field studies that expand on our
6
7 results might benefit from measuring self-control depletion by developing and using behavioral
8
9 measures.
10

11
12 Another potential area for future research would be individual differences that would
13
14 moderate the effects of leader sleep on daily abusive supervisor behavior. Our model focuses on
15
16 the causal mechanism of ego depletion, from a perspective of self-control. However, future
17
18 research may find that individual differences in trait self-control play an important moderating
19
20 role; for leaders who are dispositionally high in trait self-control, they may manifest a weaker
21
22 relationship between sleep and abusive supervision, whereas the relationship may be stronger for
23
24 those low in trait self-control. Similarly, leader agreeableness and emotional stability may play
25
26 moderating roles. Moreover, future research should also include other potential predictors of the
27
28 daily subordinate outcomes of unit work engagement. Not only are such antecedents relevant in
29
30 predicting these outcomes, but some may also play a moderating role of the effects of daily
31
32 abusive supervisor behavior on subordinate outcomes.
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 In our exploratory analyses, we found a preliminary indication that one potential
40
41 individual difference moderator to consider for further study is the consistency of the behavior of
42
43 the leader. We found a marginally significant interaction, such that subordinates are hesitant to
44
45 heavily engage in their work if their leaders are highly variable in abusive supervision, even if
46
47 the supervisor is not being abusive on a given day. Perhaps such subordinates are waiting for the
48
49 other shoe to drop, in that they might expect the leader's behavior to become abusive at any
50
51 moment. Although we are reluctant to infer conclusively from this exploratory analysis, we hope
52
53 that future research follows up on this idea both conceptually and empirically.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Future research should extend our model to other workplace outcomes and over other
4 periods of time. Our initial work focuses on daily work unit engagement. However, there are
5 potentially many other outcomes that could be impacted by leader daily sleep and daily abusive
6 supervisor behavior, to include attitudes, psychological safety, turnover intentions, perceived
7 supervisor support, and subordinate stress and strain. Moreover, examining the effects over
8 different durations of time could help to identify effects yet to be uncovered. All of the
9 constructs in our model, including abusive supervision (to more clearly isolate differences
10 between momentary versus sustained abuse), can be examined on a longer timescale, considering
11 average differences between people, which would be relatively stable. For example, we focused
12 on daily variation in sleep, which influences daily variation in the other constructs in our model.
13 However, future research could also examine chronic sleep deprivation or chronic insomnia, and
14 how this might influence between-leader differences in abusive supervision. Whether to focus on
15 the momentary or sustained aspects of abusive supervision should be driven by the research
16 question and the nature of the variation of other constructs in a given model.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Finally, future research should delve deeper into the causal steps suggested by our model.
37 Although we already present a model with a mediational chain, future research should examine
38 the processes underlying each of these links and fill in greater detail in order to further enhance
39 our understanding of how these relationships play out. For example, it may be that subordinate
40 psychological safety or emotions mediate the relationship between abusive supervision and work
41 unit engagement.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Practical implications**

51
52
53 Our study also makes several contributions to practice. By focusing on the antecedents to
54 daily abusive supervisor behavior, we offer important guidelines to organizations interested in
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 limiting abusive behaviors among supervisors at work. Our daily approach towards supervisory
4 behavior has implications for management practice, and possesses distinct advantages over more
5 traditional static approaches. For example, static approaches assuming that leaders are
6 consistently abusive imply selection or termination as the only effective methods by which
7 abusive supervision can be curbed: abusive managers are abusive, through and through.
8 However, our study suggests that the rate of abusive behavior is related to exogenous daily
9 factors such as sleep. Our sleep framework suggests that within-persons interventions to aid
10 sleep will lead to lower levels of abusive supervision behavior the next day. Indeed, treating
11 abusive supervision on a given day may be much less intimidating and much more manageable
12 than preventing all occurrences of abusive supervision in a between-persons approach.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The finding that abusive behavior varies daily suggests that certain factors, including and
28 in addition to sleep, might lead to rises and falls in abusive supervision. Leaders should thus be
29 aware of their own abusive “triggers.” For example, they can attempt to delay important
30 interactions or decisions on days when they have a poor night of sleep the night before. Through
31 leadership training, organizations can increase awareness of the connections that we observed in
32 our research, by helping leaders to connect the dots between their sleep, their abusive behavior
33 towards subordinates, and resulting subordinate hostility and attitudes. In customer service
34 organizations, cultivating a clear understanding of the relationship between a leader’s behavior
35 and resulting subordinate hostility could have positive effects on customer perceptions of service
36 quality and emotional delivery. Moreover, subordinates can learn from our results as well—it is
37 advisable that a subordinate refrain from behaviors that could instigate an abusive episode, if
38 they are aware that their manager has slept poorly.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Research has begun to uncover strategies for managing sleepy employees that could potentially apply to leaders in a manner that would decrease levels of abusive supervisor behavior. Barnes (2011), Caldwell (2012), and Caldwell, Caldwell and Schmidt (2008) summarize some of these strategies. Research conducted by Welsh et al. (2014) suggests that consuming caffeine might help mitigate the effects of poor sleep on ego depletion and susceptibility to following unethical instructions from an authority figure. It is possible that caffeine could play a beneficial role for tired supervisors and help to reduce their propensity for abusive behaviors. Finally, recent research by Lanaj et al. (2014) indicates that eliminating smartphone use late at night can additionally help employees sleep better. Thus, boundary work that establishes off-hours for smartphones and work email should help with the effects of sleep on daily abusive supervisor behavior.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our study connects leader sleep quality to daily abusive supervisor behavior, which ultimately results in deleterious outcomes for subordinates. Organizations wishing to create positive work environments for their workforce should take note of the importance of considering the effect of daily events, both non-work (e.g., sleep) and during work (e.g., abusive supervision behavior) as precursors to important motivational factors such as unit work engagement. Our study shows that abusive supervision varies within-person, not just between person, creating a complicated—but increasingly complete—picture for organizational scholars, managers, and workers.

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Alliger, G. M., & Williams, K. J. 1993. Using signal-contingent experience sampling
7
8 methodology to study work in the field: A discussion and illustration examining task
9
10 perceptions and mood. *Personnel Psychology*, 46: 525–549.
11
12
13 Altena, E., van Der Werf, Y., Sans-Arigita, E. J., Voorn, T. A., Rombouts, S. A. R. B., Kuijer, J.
14
15 P. A., & van Someren, E. J. W. 2008. Prefrontal hypoactivation and recovery in
16
17 insomnia. *Sleep*, 31, 1271–1276.
18
19
20 Aquino, K., Grover, S. L., Bradfield, M., & Allen, D. G. 1999. The effects of negative
21
22 affectivity, hierarchical status, and self-determination on workplace victimization.
23
24 *Academy of Management Journal*, 42: 260-272.
25
26
27 Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L. Y., & Debrah, Y. A. 2007. Antecedents and outcomes of abusive
28
29 supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 191-201.
30
31
32 Bakker, A. B. 2014. Daily fluctuations in work engagement. *European Psychologist*, 1: 1-10.
33
34
35 Bakker, A. B., & Despoina, X. 2009. The crossover of daily work engagement: Test of an actor-
36
37 partner interdependence model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94: 1562-1571.
38
39
40 Bakker, A. B., van Emmerik, H., & Euwema, M. C. 2006. Crossover of burnout and engagement
41
42 in work teams. *Work and Occupations*, 33: 464-489.
43
44
45 Banks, S. J., Eddy, K. T., Angstadt, M., Nathan, P. J., & Phan, K. L. 2007. Amygdala-frontal
46
47 connectivity during emotion regulation. *Social Cognitive & Affective Neuroscience*, 2:
48
49 303–312.
50
51
52 Barber, L., Barnes, C. M., & Carlson, K. 2013. Sleepy respondents: Random and systematic
53
54 error effects of insomnia on survey behavior. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16:
55
56 616-649. doi: 10.1177/1094428113493120
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Barnes, C. M. 2011. "I'll sleep when I'm dead": Managing those too busy to sleep.
4
5 *Organizational Dynamics*, 40(1): 18-26. DOI: 10.1016/j.orgdyn.2010.10.001
6
7
8 Barnes, C. M. 2012. Working in our sleep: Sleep and self-regulation in organizations.
9
10 *Organizational Psychology Review*, 2: 234-257. doi: 10.1177/2041386612450181
11
12 Barnes, C. M., Schaubroeck, J. M., Huth, M., & Ghumman, S. 2011. Lack of sleep and unethical
13
14 behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115: 169-180.
15
16
17 Barnes, C. M. & Wagner, D. T. 2009. Changing to daylight saving time cuts into sleep and
18
19 increases workplace injuries. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94: 1305-1317. doi
20
21 10.1037/a0015320
22
23
24 Barnes, C. M., Wagner, D. T., & Ghumman, S. 2012. Borrowing from sleep to pay work and
25
26 family: Expanding time-based conflict to the broader non-work domain. *Personnel*
27
28 *Psychology*, 65: 789-819. doi: 10.1111/peps.12002
29
30
31 Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. 1986. The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social
32
33 psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of*
34
35 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 51: 1173.
36
37
38
39 Barrick, M., Thurgood, G., Smith, T., & Courtright, S. (in press). Collective Organizational
40
41 Engagement: Linking Motivational Antecedents, Strategic Implementation, and Firm
42
43 Level Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*.
44
45
46 Baumeister, R. F., & Boden, J. M. (1998). Aggression and the self: High self-esteem, low self-
47
48 control, and ego threat. In R. G. Geen & E. D. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Human Aggression:*
49
50 *Theories, Research, and Implications for Social Policy* (pp. 11–137). San Diego, CA:
51
52 Academic Press.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1252-1265.
- Baumeister, R. F., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. 2000. Ego depletion: A resource model of volition, self-regulation, and controlled processing. *Social Cognition*, 18: 130-150.
- Beauregard, M., Levesque, J., & Bourgouin, P. 2001. Neural correlates of conscious self-regulation of emotion. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 21(RC165): 1-6.
- Bhave, D.P., Kramer, A., & Glomb, T.M. 2010. Work family conflict in workgroups: Social information processing, support, and demographic similarity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95: 145-158.
- Blanc, M., Mérette, C., Savard, J., Ivers, H., Baillargeon, L., & Morin, C. M. 2009. Incidence and risk factors of insomnia in a population-based sample. *Sleep*, 32: 1027- 1037.
- Bono, J. E., Foldes, H. J., Vinson, G., & Muros, J. P. 2007. Workplace emotions: The role of supervision and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 1357-1367.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. 2003. Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46: 554-571.
- Breevart, K., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. 2014. Daily self-management and employee work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 84: 31-38.
- Brief, A. P., Butcher, A. H., & Roberson, L. 1995. Cookies, disposition, and job-attitudes: The effects of positive mood-inducing events and negative affectivity on job-satisfaction in a field experiment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 62: 55-62.

- 1
2
3 Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. 2002. Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual*
4
5 *Review of Psychology*, 53: 279-307.
6
7
8 Brislin, R. W. (1986). The wording and translation of research instruments. In W. J. Lonner & J.
9
10 W. Berry (Eds.) *Field Methods in Cross-Cultural Research* (pp. 137-164). Newbury
11
12 Park, CA: Sage.
13
14
15 Caldwell, J. A. 2012. Crew schedules, sleep deprivation, and aviation performance. *Current*
16
17 *Directions in Psychological Science*, 21: 85-89.
18
19
20 Caldwell, J. A., Caldwell, J. L., & Schmidt, R. M. 2008. Alertness management strategies for
21
22 operational contexts. *Sleep Medicine Reviews*, 12: 257-273
23
24
25 Christian, M. S., & Ellis, A. P. J. 2011. Examining the effects of sleep deprivation on workplace
26
27 deviance: A self-regulatory perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 913–
28
29 934.
30
31
32 Christian, M. S. Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. 2011. Work engagement: A quantitative review
33
34 and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64:
35
36 89-136.
37
38
39 Chuah, L. Y. M., Dolcos, F., Chen, A. K., Zheng, H., Parimal, S., & Chee, M. W. L. 2010. Sleep
40
41 deprivation and interference by emotional distractors. *Sleep*, 33: 1305–1313.
42
43
44 Costa, P., Passos, A. M., & Bakker, A. B. 2014. Team work engagement: A model of emergence.
45
46 *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87: 414-436.
47
48
49 Dalal, R. S., Bhave, D. P., & Fiset, J. (2014). Within-Person Variability in Job Performance A
50
51 Theoretical Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, 40:1396-1436.
52
53
54 Dalal, R. S., Lam, H., Weiss, H. M., Welch, E. R., & Hulin, C. L. 2009. A within-person
55
56 approach to work behavior and performance: Concurrent and lagged citizenship-
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 counterproductivity associations, and dynamic relationships with affect and overall job
4 performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52: 1051-1066.
5
6

7
8 Danner, D. D., Snowdon, D. A., & Friesen, W. V. 2001. Positive emotions in early life and
9 longevity: Findings from the nun study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,
10 80: 804-813.
11
12

13
14 DeRue, D. S. 2011. Adaptive leadership theory: Leading and following as a complex adaptive
15 process. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 31: 125-150.
16
17

18
19 Diener, E., Nickerson, C., Lucas, R. E., & Sandvik, E. 2002. *Social Indicators Research*, 59:
20 229-259.
21
22

23
24 Doyle, W. J., Gentile, D. A., & Cohen, S. 2006. Emotional style, nasal cytokines, and illness
25 expression after experimental rhinovirus exposure. *Brain Behavior and Immunity*, 20:
26 175-181.
27
28

29
30 Duffy, M. K., Shaw, J. D., & Stark, E. M. 2000. Performance and satisfaction in conflicted
31 interdependent groups: When and how does self-esteem make a difference? *Academy of*
32 *Management Journal*, 43: 772-782.
33
34

35
36 Eagly, A., & Chaiken, S. 1993. *Psychology of Attitudes*. New York: Harcourt, Brace
37 Jovanovich.
38
39

40
41 Eby, L. T., Maher, C. P., & Butts, M. M. 2010. The intersection of work and family life: The role
42 of affect. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61: 599-622.
43
44

45
46 Fairclough, S. H., & Houston, K. 2004. A metabolic measure of mental effort. *Biological*
47 *Psychology*, 66: 177-190.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Felps, W., Mitchell, T. R., Hekman, D. R., Lee, T. W., Holtom, B. C., & Harman, W. S. 2009.
4
5 Turnover contagion: How coworkers' job embeddedness and job search behaviors
6
7 influence quitting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 545-561.
8
9
10 Fredrickson, B. L. 2000. The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The Broaden-and-
11
12 Build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56: 218-226.
13
14
15 Ghumman, S. & Barnes, C. M. 2013. Sleep and prejudice: A resource recovery approach.
16
17 *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43: E166-E178. doi: 10.1111/jasp.12045
18
19
20 Glomb, T. M., Bhave, D. P., Miner, A. G., & Wall, M. 2011. Doing good, feeling good:
21
22 Examining the role of organizational citizenship behaviors in changing mood. *Personnel*
23
24 *Psychology*, 64: 191-223.
25
26
27 Gino, F., Schweitzer, M. E., Mead, L., & Ariely, D. 2011. Unable to resist the temptation: How
28
29 self-control depletion promotes unethical behavior. *Organizational Behavior and*
30
31 *Human Decision Processes*, 115: 191–203
32
33
34 Grant, A. M. 2012. Leading with meaning: Beneficiary contact, prosocial impact, and the
35
36 performance effects of transformational leadership. *Academy of Management*
37
38 *Journal*, 55: 458-476.
39
40
41 Hagger, M. S., Wood, C., Stiff, C., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. 2010. Ego depletion and the
42
43 strength model of self-control: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136: 495–525.
44
45
46 Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. 2002. Business-unit-level relationship between
47
48 employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-
49
50 analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 268.
51
52
53 Hoffmann, S. A., Griffin, M. A., & Gavin, M. B. 2000. The application of hierarchical linear
54
55 modeling to organizational research. In K. Klein & S. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

theory, research, and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions, and new directions: 75–170. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hoobler, J. M., & Brass, D. J. 2006. Abusive supervision and family undermining as displaced aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 1125-1133.

Horne, J. A. 1993. Human sleep, sleep loss and behavior: Implications for the prefrontal cortex and psychiatric disorder. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 162: 413–419.

Hox, J.J. 2010. *Multilevel Analysis*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ilies, R., & Judge, T. A. 2002. Understanding the dynamic relationships among personality, mood, and job satisfaction: A field experience sampling methodology. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89: 1119-1139.

Johnson, R. E., Venus, M., Lanaj, K., Mao, C., & Chang, C. H. 2012. Leader identity as an antecedent of the frequency and consistency of transformational, consideration, and abusive leadership behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 1262-1272.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. 2004. Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89: 755–768.

Kahn-Greene, E. T., Lipizzi, E. L., Conrad, A. K., Kamimori, G. H., & Killgore, W. D. S. 2006. Sleep deprivation adversely affects interpersonal responses to frustration. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41: 1433–1443.

Kant, L., Skogstad, A., Torsheim, T., & Einarsen, S. 2013. Beware the angry leader: Trait anger and trait anxiety as predictors of petty tyranny. *Leadership Quarterly*, 24: 106-1024.

Klein, K. J., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. 2000. From micro to meso: Critical steps in conceptualizing and conducting multilevel research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 3: 211-236.

- 1
2
3 Knutson, K. L., Rathouz, P. J., Yan, L. L., Liu, K., & Lauderdale, D. S. 2007. Intra-individual
4
5 daily and yearly variability in actigraphically recorded sleep measures: The CARDIA
6
7 study. *Sleep*, 30: 793-796.
8
9
- 10 Lanaj, K., Johnson, R., & Barnes, C. M. 2014. Beginning the workday yet already depleted?
11
12 Consequences of late-night smartphone use and sleep. *Organizational Behavior and*
13
14 *Human Decision Processes*, 124: 11-23
15
16
- 17 Lazarus, R. S. 1991. *Emotion and Adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
18
19
- 20 Leavitt, K., Reynolds, S., Barnes, C. M., Schilpzand, P., & Hannah, S. T. 2012. Different hats,
21
22 different obligations: Plural occupational identities and situated moral judgments.
23
24 *Academy of Management Journal*, 55: 1316-1333.
25
26
- 27 LeBlanc, M., Merette, C., Savard, J., Ivers, H., Baillargeon, L., & Morin, C. M. 2009. Incidence
28
29 and risk factors of insomnia in a population-based sample. *Sleep*, 32: 1027-1037.
30
31
- 32 Lorinkova, N. M., Pearsall, M. J., & Sims, H. P. 2013. Examining the differential longitudinal
33
34 performance of directive versus empowering leadership in teams. *Academy of*
35
36 *Management Journal*, 56: 573-596.
37
38
- 39 Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. 2005. The benefits of positive affect: Does happiness
40
41 lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131: 803-855.
42
43
- 44 MacKinnon, A., Jorm, A. F., Christensen, H., Korten, A. E., Jacomb, P. A., & Rodgers, B. 1999.
45
46 A short form of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule: Evaluation of factorial
47
48 validity and invariance across demographic variables in a community sample.
49
50 *Personality and Individual Differences*, 27: 405-416.
51
52
- 53 MacKinnon, D. P. 2008. *Introduction to Statistical Mediation Analysis*. New York: Lawrence
54
55 Erlbaum Associates.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Mayer, D. M., Thau, S., Workman, K. M., Van Dijke, M., & De Cremer, D. 2012. Leader
4 mistreatment, employee hostility, and deviant behaviors: Integrating self-uncertainty and
5
6 mistreatment, employee hostility, and deviant behaviors: Integrating self-uncertainty and
7
8 thwarted needs perspectives on deviance. *Organizational Behavior and Human*
9
10 *Decision Processes*, 117: 24-40.
- 11
12 Monk, T. H., Reynolds, C. F., Kupfer, D. J., Buysse, D. J., Coble, P. A., Hayes, A. J. . . .
13
14 Ritenour, A. M. 1994. The Pittsburgh Sleep Diary. *Journal of Sleep Research*, 3: 111–
15
16 120.
- 17
18
19 Moskowitz, J. T. 2003. Positive affect predicts lower risk of AIDS mortality. *Psychosomatic*
20
21 *Medicine*, 6:, 620–626.
- 22
23
24 Muraven, M., & Baumeister, R. F. 2000. Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does
25
26 self-control resemble a muscle? *Psychological Bulletin*, 126: 247–259.
- 27
28
29 Muthén, L.K. and Muthén, B.O. (1998-2010). Mplus User’s Guide. Sixth Edition.
30
31
32 Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén
- 33
34 Niedhammer, I., David, S., Degioanni, S., Drummond, A., & Philip, P. 2009. Workplace
35
36 bullying and sleep disturbances: Findings from a large scale cross-sectional survey in the
37
38 French working population. *Sleep*, 32: 1211-1219.
- 39
40
41 Nilsson, J. P., Soderstrom, M., Karlsson, A. U., Lekander, M., Akerstedt, T., Lindroth, N. E., &
42
43 Axelsson, J. 2005. Less effective executive functioning after one night’s sleep
44
45 deprivation. *Journal of Sleep Research*, 14: 1–6.
- 46
47
48 Ochsner, K. N., Ray, R. D., Cooper, J. C., Robertson, E. R., Chopra, S., Gabrieli, J. D. E., &
49
50 Gross, J. J. 2004. For better or for worse: Neural systems supporting the cognitive down-
51
52 and upregulation of negative emotion. *Neuroimage*, 23: 483–499.
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ostir, G. V., Markides, K. S., Black, S. A., & Goodwin, J. S. 2000. Emotional well-being
4 predicts subsequent functional independence and survival. *Journal of the American*
5 *Geriatrics Society*, 48: 473-478.
6
7
8
9
10 Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. 2003. Common method
11 biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended
12 remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 879 - 903.
13
14
15
16
17 Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. 2008. Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and
18 comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40:
19 879-891.
20
21
22
23
24 Priesemuth, M., Schminke, M., Ambrose, M. L., & Folger, R. in press. Abusive supervision
25 climate: A multiple-mediation model of its impact on group outcomes. *Academy of*
26 *Management Journal*.
27
28
29
30
31 Rafferty, A. E., Restubog, S. L. D., & Jimmieson, N. L. (2010). Losing sleep: Examining the
32 cascading effects of supervisors' experience of injustice on subordinates' psychological
33 health. *Work & Stress*, 24: 36-55.
34
35
36
37
38 Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. 2002. *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data*
39 *Analysis Methods*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.
40
41
42
43 Reis, H. T., & Wheeler, L. 1991. Studying social interaction with the Rochester Interaction
44 Record. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, vol. 24:
45 270–318. San Diego: Academic Press.
46
47
48
49
50 Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. 2010. Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on
51 job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53: 617-635.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Richman, L. S., Kubzansky, L., Maselko, J., Kawachi, I., Choo, P., & Bauer, M. 2005. Positive
4 emotion and health: Going beyond the negative. *Health Psychology, 24*: 422–429.
5
6
7
8 Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiró, J. M. 2005. Linking organizational resources and work
9 engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: the mediation of service
10 climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*: 1217-1227.
11
12
13
14
15 Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. 2006. The measurement of work engagement
16 with a short questionnaire – A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological*
17 *Measurement, 66*, 701-716.
18
19
20
21
22 Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. 2013. How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of
23 destructive leadership and its outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly, 24*: 138-158.
24
25
26
27 Scott, B. A., & Barnes, C. M. 2011. A multilevel investigation of emotional labor, affect,
28 withdrawal, and gender. *Academy of Management Journal, 54*, 116-136.
29
30
31
32 Scott, B. A., Barnes, C. M., & Wagner, D. 2012. Chameleonic or consistent? A multilevel model
33 of self monitoring and variability in emotional labor. *Academy of Management Journal.*
34 *55*, 905-926. doi: 10.5465/amj.2010.1050
35
36
37
38
39 Scott, B. A., & Judge, T. A. 2006. Insomnia, emotions, and job satisfaction: A multilevel study.
40 *Journal of Management, 32*: 622–645.
41
42
43
44 Shoss, M. K., Eisenberger, R., Restubog, S. L. D., & Zagenczyk, T. J. 2013. Blaming the
45 organization for abusive supervision: The roles of perceived organizational support and
46 supervisor’s organizational embodiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*: 158-168.
47
48
49
50
51 Smith, C. A., Haynes, K. N., Lazarus, R. S., & Pope, L. K. 1993. In search of the “hot”
52 cognitions: Attributions, appraisals, and their relation to emotion. *Journal of Personality*
53 *and Social Psychology, 65*: 916–929.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Sonnentag, S., Binnewies, C., & Mojza, E. J. 2008. "Did you have a nice evening?" A day-level
4 study on recovery experiences, sleep, and affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93:
5
6 674–684.
7
8
9
- 10 Sy, T., & Choi, J. N. 2013. Contagious leaders and followers: Exploring multi-stage mood
11 contagion in a leader activation and member propagation (LAMP) model. *Organizational*
12
13 *Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 122: 127-140.
14
15
16
- 17 Tepper, B. J. 2000. Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*,
18
19 43: 178-190.
20
21
- 22 Tepper, B. J. 2007. Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research
23 agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33: 261-289.
24
25
26
- 27 Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Henle, C. A., & Lambert, L. S. 2006. Procedural injustice, victim
28 precipitations, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 59: 101-123.
29
30
31
- 32 Tepper, B. J., Henle, C. A., Lambert, L. S., Giacalone, R. A., & Duffy, M. K. 2008. Abusive
33 supervision and subordinates' organization deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93:
34
35 721-732.
36
37
38
- 39 Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., & Duffy, M. K. 2011. Predictors of abusive supervision: Supervisor
40 perceptions of deep-level dissimilarity, relationship conflict, and subordinate
41 performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54, 279-294.
42
43
44
- 45 Twenge, J., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. 2004. Measuring state self-control: Reliability, validity,
46 and correlations with physical and psychological stress. Unpublished manuscript, San
47
48
49
50
51
52
- 53 Thomas, M., Sing, H., Belenky, G., Holcomb, H., Mayberg, H., Dannals, R., . . . Redmond, D.
54
55 2000. Neural basis of alertness and cognitive performance impairment during sleepiness.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 I. Effects of 24 h of sleep deprivation on waking human regional brain activity. *Journal*
4 *of Sleep Research*, 9: 335–352.
5
6
7
8 Venus, M., Stam, D., & van Knippenberg, D. 2013. Leader emotion as a catalyst of effective
9 leader communication of visions, value-laden messages, and goals. *Organizational*
10 *Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 122: 53-68.
11
12
13
14
15 Vohs, K. D., Glass, B. D., Maddox, W. T., & Markman, A. B. 2011. Ego Depletion Is Not Just
16
17 Fatigue Evidence From a Total Sleep Deprivation Experiment. *Social Psychological and*
18 *Personality Science*, 2: 166-173.
19
20
21
22
23 Wagner, D. T., Barnes, C. M., Lim, V., & Ferris, D. L. 2012. Lost sleep and cyberloafing:
24
25 Evidence from the laboratory and a Daylight Saving Time quasi-experiment. *Journal of*
26 *Applied Psychology*, 97: 1068-1076. doi: 10.1037/a0027557
27
28
29
30 Wagner, D. T., Barnes, C. M., & Scott, B. A. 2014. Driving it home: How workplace emotional
31
32 labor harms employee home life. *Personnel Psychology*, 67, 487-516
33
34
35 Wallace, J. C., Edwards, B. D., Paul, J., Burke, M., Christian, M., & Eissa, G. (2013). Change
36
37 the Referent? A Meta-Analytic Investigation of Direct and Referent-Shift Consensus
38
39 Models for Organizational Climate. *Journal of Management*.
40
41
42 Weiss, H. M. 2002. Antecedents of emotional experiences at work. *Motivation and Emotion*, 26:
43
44 1-2.
45
46
47 Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. 1996. Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the
48
49 structure, causes, and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in*
50 *Organizational Behavior*, 18: 1-74.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Weiss, H. H., Nicholas, J. P., & Daus, C. S. 1999. An examination of the joint effects of affective
4 experiences and job beliefs on job satisfaction and variations in affective experiences
5 over time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 78: 1-24.
6
7
8
9

10 Welsh, D. T., Ellis, A. P. J., Christian, M. S., & Mai, K.M. 2014. Expanding the self-regulatory
11 model of sleep deprivation and unethical behavior: The role of caffeine and social
12 influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
13
14
15
16

17 Wheeler L., & Reis, H. T. 1991. Self-recording of everyday life events: Origins, types, and uses.
18
19 *Journal of Personality*, 59: 339–354
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Descriptives and Correlations

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4
1. Daily Sleep Quality	-8.29	14.23	-			
2. Daily Sleep Quantity	435.59	70.73	.18	-		
3. Daily Leader Ego Depletion	1.82	.83	-.13	-.03	-	
4. Daily Abusive Supervision	1.58	.55	.13	.01	.33	-
5. Daily Unit Work Engagement	3.06	.87	-.04	.03	-.35	-.52

Notes. N = 606.

Correlations greater than $|\cdot 12|$ are statistically significant at $p < .05$, two-tailed

Table 2: Multilevel Path Analysis Results

	Ego Depletion	Abusive Supervision	Unit Work Engagement	
<i>Main Effects</i>				
Supervisor Trait Anxiety	-.08	-.05	.03	
Sleep Quality	-.13*	.19**	-.02	
Sleep Quantity	.02	-.01	.02	
Ego Depletion		.35**	-.19**	
Abusive Supervision			-.45**	
<i>R-sq</i>	.02	.14	.30	
<i>Indirect Effects</i>				
		<i>Estimate</i>	<i>LLCI</i>	<i>UCLI</i>
Sleep Quality → Abusive Supervision (via Ego Depletion)		-.04*	-.084	-.003
Sleep Quantity → Abusive Supervision (via Ego Depletion)		.01	-.036	.050
Ego Depletion → Unit Work Engagement (via Abusive Supervision)		-.15**	-.229	-.080
Sleep Quality → Unit Work Engagement (via Ego Depletion & Abusive Supervision)		.02*	.000	.039
Sleep Quantity → Unit Work Engagement (via Ego Depletion & Abusive Supervision)		-.00	-.022	.016

Notes. N = 606. LLCI = lower level of the 95% confidence interval. UCLI = upper level of the 95% confidence interval. The model was estimated simultaneously. Standardized estimates are reported.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 3: Exploratory Analysis of Abusive Supervision Variability as a Moderator

	Unit Work Engagement		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Supervisor Trait Anxiety	.10	.04	.04
Abusive Supervision Variability	-.25**	.09†	.01
Abusive Supervision		-.66**	-.64**
Abusive Supervision X Abusive Supervision Variability			.13†
<i>R-sq</i>	.07	.39	.40
$\Delta R-sq$.32	.01

Notes. N = 606. † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. Standardized estimates are reported.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1: Conceptual Model





Figure 2: Exploratory Analysis of Abusive Supervision Variability as a Moderator



Bios

Christopher M. Barnes (chris24b@uw.edu) is an assistant professor of Organizational Behavior at the Michael G. Foster School of Business, University of Washington. He received his PhD in Organizational Behavior from Michigan State University. His research interests focus primarily on sleep and fatigue in organizations, with other interests in behavioral ethics, emotional labor, and team performance.

Lorenzo Lucianetti (llucianetti@unich.it) is an assistant professor in business administration in the Department of Management and Business Administration at the University of Chieti and Pescara (Italy). He is also a visiting research fellow at University of Cranfield (UK). His PhD is from the University of Chieti and Pescara. His research has an inter-disciplinary focus that spans multiple disciplines including Accountancy (Financial Reporting), Operations Management (Performance Measures Systems) and Psychology (Abusive Supervision and Mistreatment on the workplace).

Devasheesh P. Bhave (dbhave@smu.edu.sg) is an assistant professor of organizational behavior and human resources in the Lee Kong Chian School of Business at Singapore Management University. He received his Ph.D. from the Carlson School of Management at the University of Minnesota. His research interests include dynamic processes of affect and performance, interpersonal relationships at work, and customer service.

Michael S. Christian (mike_christian@unc.edu) is an assistant professor of organizational behavior at the Kenan-Flagler Business School, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. His research focuses on understanding how energy, engagement, self-control and other self-regulatory processes affect behavior at work. He studies how these factors dynamically relate to unethical behavior as well as desirable work performance. He received his PhD in management from the University of Arizona and his master's degree in industrial and organizational psychology from Tulane University.