
INFLUENCE OF ABUSIVE SUPERVISOR AND WORK AUTONOMY ON PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR OF BANK WORKERS

MBAEZE I. C.

Department of Psychology
Faculty of Social Sciences
Imo State University
Owerri

ONYENEKE, P. C.

Department of Psychology
Faculty of Social Sciences
Imo State University
Owerri

Abstract: *This study investigates influence of abusive supervision and work autonomy on pro-social behaviours of workers. Two hypotheses were postulated and tested as follows: (1) There will be no statistically significant influence of abusive supervision on pro-social behaviours of workers in Imo State. (2) There will be no statistically significant influence of work autonomy on pro-social behaviours of workers in Imo State. Two hundred (200) workers were selected through convenience sampling techniques from Zenith Bank, Access Bank, United Bank for Africa, all in Owerri which comprise of one hundred and thirteen (113) males and eighty seven (87) females with ages between 24-39 years and a mean age of 26 years. The participants were administered with Abusive Supervision Scale developed by Tepper (2000) which contains fifteen (15) items, work autonomy scale which was developed by Breugh (1985) which contains nine (9) items and pro-social behaviour scale developed by Ncneely and Meglino which contains twenty (20) items. In terms of Survey design, 2-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze data. Results shows that abusive supervision had no significant influence on pro-social behaviour $f(1,196) = 1.173, p = .280$. Work autonomy was found to have significant influence on pro-social behaviour $f(1,196) = 10.213, p = 0.02$. Workers with high work autonomy ($x = 56.94, SD = 13.07$) had high pro social behaviour than their counterparts with low work autonomy ($x = 50.05, SD = 11.72$). Recommendations and suggestions were made based on the implication of the finding.*

Introduction

In the last two decades, scholars of organizational behaviour have devoted considerable attention to pro-social behaviour in organizations. Special focus has been placed on employees actions which extend beyond the formal requirements of the job. Smith, Organ and Near (1983) coined the term organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) to capture these extra role behaviours, The era of globalization has bred increased interdependence among workers in an

organization hence a greater need for cooperation and pro-social interactions within and among the supervisors and workers of an organization. Thus, a vital role has been attributed to organizational citizenship behaviour in enhancing organizations effectiveness and sustainability, that is, if there is a mutual cooperation between the supervisors and workers (Katz, 1966; Smith, Organ and Near 1983, George and Hebl 2005).

Effective organizational functioning depends on many differing behaviour patterns. As early as (1964), Katz identified patterns involving joining and staying in the organization as well as meeting or exceeding specific standards of performance. He also referred to those behaviours that go beyond specific role requirements such as co-operating with co-workers, suggesting ways to improve the organization and speaking favorably about the organization to outsiders. These patterns of behaviour are particularly interesting in that they are clearly necessary for organizational survival. Thus, if such good behaviour could be demonstrated by a worker in an organization, he or she should have freedom in the work place and should not be placed under aggressive supervision. Some behaviour which employees exhibit in their work place has great links with their job performance. Puffer (1987) found a modest relation between pro-social behaviour and work performance and that the need for achievement was one of three variables specifically related to pro-social behaviour. It was found to be associated with the motivational basis of behaviour in an organization.

Pro-social behaviour in organization is also broadly linked with the notion of socially desirable behaviour, since there are cultural beliefs that people should behave pro-socially because it is socially desirable. Brief and Motowidlo (1986) pointed out that there are difficulties with a definition of pro-social behaviour because the various behaviours may be organizationally functional or dysfunctional. Volunteering to coach a new employee for instance contributes to organizational goals. An example of an organizational dysfunctional pro-social colleague is one who is publicly critical of the organization or even engaging in behaviours that clearly endanger the organizational goals or reputation in the eyes of other stakeholders (Verdi & Weitz 2004). There are some benefits of pro-social behaviour in an organization such as improved communications, improved job satisfaction, improved customer client satisfaction, improved job commitment and involvement and subsequently improved organizational efficacy.

By implication, when there is no co-operation between the employee and the employer, there will be inefficiency in work, poor decision making and ineffective performance largely resulting from conflict between organizational and individual considerations. Brief & Motowidlo (1986) argue that pro-social behaviour is a behaviour that is:

Performed by a member of an organization, directed towards an individual, group or organization with whom/which she/he interacts performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of others.

From all indications, pro-social behavior is highly organized by society in work organization. People cannot simply refrain from pro-social behaviour without rationalizing their decision. The term abusive supervision refers to subordinate perception of the extent to which their supervision engage in the sustained display of hostile, verbal and non-verbal behaviours, excluding physical contact, (Tepper 2000, p178). Behavioural descriptors consistent with this definition include using derogatory names; for instance, in an organization where the workers will put all their effort waiting to be appraised by the supervisor for a work well done, it turns

out that the supervisor is not pleased with their work by telling the workers that they are Stupid, useless or worthless. This action of the supervisor will automatically reduce the pro-social behavior of that individual. It also involves engaging in explosive outburst (e.g. yelling or screaming at someone). Abusive supervision which may threaten pro-social behaviour can come in various ways. Intimidation from the supervisor to the workers by the use of threat of job loss, withholding needed information, aggressive eye contact the silent treatment and humiliating or ridiculing someone in front of others (Keasly 1998 p87).

One manifestation of negative power also is the concept of abusive supervision (Tepper 2000). Abusive supervision will be an element of power used within organizations expressed, designed to create a negative environment between supervisors and workers. It is perhaps a subset of what Powell (1998) referred to in his theory of "abusive organization. More specifically, abusive supervision is defined as the sustained display of hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviour". Bies (2000) describes abusive suppression as consisting of public criticism, loud and angry tantrums, and rudeness. Ashforth (1997) describes abusive behaviour by supervisors as petty tyranny and Newman & Baron (1997) describe non-physical work place aggression as component of abusive supervision. The concept of abusive supervision is multidimensional and may subsume many related but conceptually distinct forms of deviant organizational behaviour.

The outcomes of abusive behaviour cannot be beneficial for the target individuals. Although, it has a low base rate phenomenon, its effects are noteworthy. A small outgrowing body of empirical research suggests that abused subordinates or workers report greater job and life dissatisfaction, intention to quit their jobs, role conflict and psychological distress compared with their non-abused counterparts (co-workers) (Ashforth, 1997, Duffy, Ganstar & Pagon 2002, Keasly, Troth & Maclean 1994) and that subordinate perception of unfairness explain their responses to abusive supervision (Tepper 2000). Hence, abusive supervision represents a source of injustice that has serious implications for organizations and employees (Bies & Tripp, 1998).

Work autonomy on the other hand is viewed as the employee's self-determination, discretion or freedom inherent in the job to determine several task elements. Brey (1999) claims that work autonomy could be seen as a desirable goal because employees themselves find it important to have control over task elements in their work. Work autonomy goes to the extent to which employees have major contribution in scheduling their work, deciding on procedures to be followed and having equal opportunity to handle tasks autonomously (Decarlo & Agrawal 1999). According to Becherer, Morgan & Lawrence (1982), work autonomy leads individuals to develop favorable, affective and behavioural reactions in their jobs and increase job satisfaction. An individual's autonomy at work is typically reduced when one requires consent from organizational superiors. That is a situation whereby the superior does not give his workers the room to air their views or he/she is aggressive whenever an employee tries to take decisions that will uplift or elevate their organization. This will definitely reduce the workers performance and will influence his/her pro-social behaviour.

Statement of the Problem

There have been several occurrence of abusive supervision of employees in the organizational sector.

A prevalent type of pro-social behaviour of an individual: This compatibility of expected roles in the work place and that of the work performance could have impact not only on the employee overall work performance but on his/her pro-social behavior. The research therefore wonders if:

- Abusive supervision will significantly influence pro-social behaviour of workers?
- Work autonomy will be significantly related to pre-social behaviours of workers?

Purpose of Study

The researchers in this study want to investigate if:

- Abusive supervision will have significant influence on the pro-social behaviours of workers in Imo state.
- Work autonomy will also have significant influence on the pro-social behaviour of workers in Imo state.

Literature Review

Social exchange theory of pro-social behavior (Blau 1964)

This theory has been widely used to explain several organizational behaviours. Social exchange hinges on the premise that when one does another a favour, that there is, an expectation of future return. It is therefore argued that high level of perceived organizational support create feelings that they ought to be committed to their employers by engaging in behaviour that support organizational goals. The theorist continued by saying that individuals in a social system hold mutual expectations of unspecified obligations, whereby one individual does a favour to another while anticipating a future return. The latter expectations stem from the norm of reciprocity, namely, a belief that in the long run, individuals fairly materialize their mutual obligations (Holmes 1981).

Also, most research on the workers pro-social behaviour invoked Organs (1988) social exchange based explanation of pro-social behavior. Organ's explanation suggests that employees perform pro-social behaviour when they believe that their relationship with the organization is one of social exchange (i.e. relationship that exists outside formal contracts such that the participants' contribution is unspecified) rather than economic exchange (i.e relationships in which party's contribution is contractually specified, Blaau 1964). Organ (1988) argues that organizational practices that engender favorable attributes incur a sense of obligation to recompense the organization in a manner befitting a social exchange relationship. Moreover, Organ (1988), believes that employees reciprocate using pro-social behavior because there is a fair system (i.e. feeling of trust, support and good faith).

Intrinsic Motivation Theory of Work Autonomy (AMABILE 1988)

According to Intrinsic Motivation theory, an individual is more likely to perform an innovative task that influences his/her intrinsic motivation and Inner reward (Amabile Individuate are expected to be most creative when they experience a high motivation (Saley, 1991), Further research by Brey (1999) contends that and have freedom in their work place so that they can be able to contribute to the overall goals of the organization as well as their pro-social behavior. For instance, in the hotel industry, employees' behaviors are always governed. They are placed on daily regulations whirh m; them not to be effective in their work. Leidei,

(1993) and Sulton, (1991) went on to say hotels should have greater work autonomy because they perform demanding tasks, not just "physical" but emotional or interactive duties which should be applicable to otl organizations. Smith (1996), suggests that greater wider or degrees of work autonomy shot be granted to workers that provide services in the society and organizations. When this is done; according to Smith (1996), pro-social behaviour in the work setting will be fostered which w culminate to more productivity, commitment and involvement.

Equity Theory of Abusive Supervision (John Adams 1965)

This theory attempts to explain relational satisfaction in terms of perception of fair/unfair distributions of resources within interpersonal relationship. John Adam (1963), who propounded this theory asserted that employees seek to maintain equity between the inputs that they bring to a job and the outcomes that they receive from it against the perceived inputs and outcomes of others. This unfairness can come in many diverse' ways and forms such as abusive supervision, unfair distribution of work reward which can create tension within an individual in an organization. Most people can always differentiate fair treatment from unfair treatment in the organization's (Messick & Sentis 1979) less supportive behaviour (Zellar, Tepper & Duffy, Hoobler 2004), This theory calls for a fair balance to be struck between an employee's inputs (hard work, skill level, tolerance, enthusiasm and so on) an employees' output (salary, benefit, intangibles such as recognition and so on).

According to the research involving equity theory, employee job performance may either increase or decrease according to an employee's perception of fair rewards for work performed, (Adams, 1965, Greenberg, 1990). If there is an equal equity between workers and their supervisors or workers and their counterparts, there will be high motivation to deliver and perform effectively in their organization. In the same vain, when abusive supervision is employed, pro-social behaviors will diminish, giving room to anti-social behaviors which lowers production, motivation and commitment.

Attachment Theory of Pro-Social Behavior (Bowlby 1988)

This theory describes the dynamics of long term relationship between humans. Its most important tenet is that an infant needs to develop a relationship with at least one primary care giver for social and emotional development to occur normally. It suggests that mothers have a paramount role in the development of their children's pro-social behavior in general and in the enhancement of their children's empathic understanding of others in particular, Evidence for this can be drawn from the evolutionary theory of parental investment as well as infants preference for the maternal voice soon after birth and infant's ability to imitate facial expression and motor mimicry. This supports the notion that the hand that rocks the cradle holds the key to the gate of pro-social behavior and empathic understanding of others. According to this theory and inline with the research findings on intimate relationships, secure attachment styles equip individuals with pro-social orientation.

There should be a sense of independence and actual skill to behave cooperatively and pro-socially and to act as effective, citizens in variety of social situations, including work organization. According to Bowlby (1998), there must be a level of degree of congruence between the supervisor and the worker, for it to be possible for them to have an effective goal in the organization. Consequently, the theorist predicts reluctance performance in performing

pro-social actions at work place. Further research on attachment theory show that it does not only affect tendencies to act pro socially but it also shapes the way individuals construct their social experiences, both in the sphere of close relationship and also, in an organizational context (Collins & Feeney, 2004, Hazan & Shaver 1990).

Empirical Review

King & Colleagues (2005), carried out a study on abusive supervision pro-social behavior using two hundred and sixty five (165) females and forty seven (47) men. Self report questionnaires were used to access the research variables. The result show that positive effect of pro-social behavior of workers in an organization depends on the positive interaction from supervisors. Furthermore, Tepper & Duffy (2004, 2005) worked on abusive supervision and pro-social behavior. The researchers did this by recruiting three hundred (300) participants in which 60% were female and 40% male which had working experiences. The researchers found out at the end of the study that abusive supervisor engendered subordinate turn over, work family conflict, job and life dissatisfaction and psychological distress.

Ashforth (1997) conducted a study of abusive supervision in which his participants were seventy seven (77) full time employees of a medium sized University in the South-Eastern United States. In his result, he found out that tyrannical supervision leads to frustration, helplessness and alienation from work and found out that pro-social behaviors of those workers under abusive supervision were not conducive for a working organization and does not yield and lead to high productivity in the organization. Also, another study was carried out by Zeller, Tepper and Duffy (2002), on the relationship between abusive supervision and pro-social behaviors. In their study, they tested their hypothesis using data collected from three hundred and forty three (343) National Guard members and their military supervisors.

Selected participants completed the surveys during regularly scheduled group meetings and these procedures allowed them to match the responses of the supervisor and the subordinates. Subordinates and supervisors were predominantly male 93% and female 96% respectively. The measures used for abusive supervision was that the subordinates completed a fourteen (14) item scale consisting of eight (8) items from Teppers (2002). Fifteen (15) item measures of abusive supervision which had a five point scale. After data was analyzed, result shows that abusive supervision influences the pro-social behavior of a worker in an organization.

Tepper (2000) found out that abusive supervision is associated with lower job and life satisfaction, lower normative and effective commitment, work family conflict and increased job stress. Richman, Flaherty and Christian (1992) in their study also found that abusive supervision leads to increased dissatisfaction and job stress. Mark J. and Veronica H. (2001) studied the role of abusive supervision on the pro-social behavior of workers drawn through convenience sampling technique which compose of one hundred and sixteen (116) female and one hundred and sixty (160) males. Abusive supervision scale was used to assess the participants. Result shows that abusive supervision had a negative correlation on pro-social behavior. Contradicting his findings was a study carried out by-Do- video J.F and Penner L.A (2001) on abusive supervision on pro-social behavior. The researchers conducted the study by employing eighty six (86) workers from an industry. Findings show that abusive supervision had no influence on pro-social behavior.

Baard P.P. & Ryan R.M (1985) examined work autonomy and pro-social behavior in which the participants were college students who helped to complete measures of work autonomy support. The finding was that employees with high autonomy orientation experienced higher need satisfaction at work which in turn increased their performances than their colleagues with low or no work autonomy. Deci (1994) in his own study on work autonomy and pro-social behavior found out the importance of autonomy support in promoting positive outcomes. He found that autonomy support has a great role to play in the pro-social behavior of a worker in an organization. He also found that work autonomy leads to a greater engagement in an initially uninteresting activity. The effect of his findings were replicated by Grolnick (1989) in elementary schools where teachers and parents autonomy support were shown to relate better academic performances.

Illomaki (1986) in his study of work autonomy and pro social behavior used two hundred and sixty (260) participants who were employees from the national movies theatre management company. Each theatre was under the authority of a General Manager, thus, eleven (11) managers took part in the study. The member of the employees completed a survey describing perception of their work autonomy and their pro social behavior in their organization. The result found out that limitation of workers in carrying out duties has an influence on their pro social behavior. Deci, Connel & Ryan (1989) investigated a work setting in which trained managers offered autonomy support to their employees and found that there was trust, positive effects at work and work satisfaction in the organization. Gagni, Koesstner, & Zukerman (2000) also found that management autonomy support predicted increased acceptance of organizational change over a 13 month period.

Dejonge (1995) carried out a study on the influence of work autonomy and gender on pro-social behavior of workers. Three hundred and thirty nine (339) workers were drawn from three industries through simple random sampling which includes one hundred and fifty six (156) females and one hundred and eighty three (183) males. Workers were interviewed personally on how they discharged their duties in their organization. Pro-social behavior scale was utilized to measure their pro-social behavior and the result shows that work autonomy and gender had no significant influence on pro-social behaviors of workers. L alas P. & John D. (2009), worked on work autonomy and pro-social behaviors and found out at the end of their study that work autonomy gives workers ample privilege to put in their best in their work which entails that work autonomy had significant influence on behavior.

Howard Weiss & Russel Cropanzano (2008) found out in their study of work autonomy that the degree of autonomy workers have on their jobs affect their productivity. They further opine that positive effect is a fringe benefit of work flexibility that pays rich dividends to high pro-social behavior. Neville (2012) researched on perceived effect of abusive supervision and personality on pro[^]social behaviors of workers. The study was conducted in England which employed one hundred and eleven workers comprising of seventy four (74) males and (37) females. At the end of the study, the research found out that abusive supervision has significant influence on pro-social behavior. Aishatu & Usman (2007) carried out a study on organizational support and autonomy on pro-social behavior. Two hundred and two (202) respondents were drawn from Ahmadu Bello University, Bauchi, through convenience sampling technique method. One hundred and eleven (111) males and ninety two (92) females' participants were

administered with organizational support and pro-social behavior scale. Results show that organizational support had significant influence on pro-social behavior of workers.

Maureen & Bien (1998) worked on the roles of motivation and abusive supervision of pro-social behaviors of workers. Abusive supervision and pro-social behavior scale was administered to one hundred and thirty eight (138) workers who were selected through simple random sampling technique from two (2) soap producing industries. The participants age range from 24-33years with a mean age of 26.5years Results at the end of the study reveal that abusive supervision had no role on pro-social behavior while motivation was found to have significant influence on pro-social behavior. In a longitudinal study by thau, Berinut, Thitchell & Marrs (2009), to see the relationship between abusive supervision and work place deviance on pro-social behavior using three hundred and seventy seven (377) graduates of a large Mid Western University for the year of 1988-1998, randomly selected; abusive supervision had a significant positive relationship with interpersonal deviance. This led the researchers to conclude that abusive supervision leads to anti-pro-social behavior. Thus, there is the presumption that abusive supervision should be relatively related to pro-social behavior.

Summary of Literature Review

From all these theories and studies that have been cited, most of them tend to reveal that abusive supervision and work autonomy has significant influence on pro-social behaviors of workers, just a few tend to show otherwise.

Hypothesis

- There will be no statistically significant influence of abusive supervision on pro-social behaviors of workers in Imo-state.
- There will be no statistically significant influence of work autonomy on pro-social behaviors of workers in Imo state.

Method

The participants used in this study comprise of two hundred (200) Bank workers who were selected through convenient sampling technique from Zenith Bank, Access bank, United Bank for Africa (UBA) and First Bank all located at bank road in Owerri, Imo state. They include eighty seven (87) females and one hundred and thirteen (113) males. Their ages range between 24-39 years, with a mean age of 26years.

Instruments

Three instruments were employed in this study for the collection of data; they include Abusive Supervision scale, Work Autonomy scale and Pro-Social Behavior scale. Abusive Supervision scale was developed by Tepper (-2000) which contains fifteen (15) items such as my boss gives me silent treatment, my boss puts me down in front of others, my boss breaks promises he/she makes etc which will be scored directly in a five (5) point likert format which will range from 1 Never to 5 often. The scale was revalidated in Nigeria by Ezekwesili .E. (2010), using Cronbach reliability or alpha reliability of 0.87. The second instrument that was used was a work Autonomy scale which was developed by Breugh (1985) which contains nine (9) items e.g I am able to modify what my job objectives are, I have some control over what am supposed to accomplish etc which were scored in a five point likert format which ranged from 1; strongly disagree to 5; strongly agree.

Work Autonomy scale was revalidated in Nigeria by Ezekwesili. E. (2010) a coefficient reliability of 0.81 was obtained. The third instrument is a pro-social behavior scale developed by Ncneely and Meglino (1994) which comprises of twenty (20) items e.g. I speak favorably about the organization to outsider, I am receptive to new ideas, I offer ideas to improve the functioning of the Department etc which was also scored in a five point likert format ranging from 1; strongly disagree to 5; strongly agree. To adapt the scale to Nigerian environment, the scale was revalidated by Ezekwesili .E. (2010) a consistent reliability index of 0.95 was obtained.

Procedure

The researchers started this study by writing to the management of the Banks namely Zenith Bank, Access Bank United Bank for Africa (DBA) and First Bank in order to notify and obtain permission to use their workers for the study. It took sometime for them to approve the letter, when it was approved, the researchers came to the Banks, introduced themselves and their purpose of coming in order to build a rapport with them. On an agreed day, the researchers used convenient sampling technique to select fifty (50) workers from each Bank, and when this was done, the researchers administered the three questionnaires face to face to the selected participants. Due to their busy and tight schedules at work, most of the workers took the questionnaires home to fill them which they returned. The researchers thanked them as they collected the questionnaires back.

Design/Statistics

The design employed in this study was a survey design because the study made use of large samples which were selected in the field. The statistics used was F-test on a 2-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) because the study is made up of two independent variables, and the dependent variable was stored in a likert format.

Results

Descriptive statistics of the variables

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	n
Abusive supervisor	55.62	12.45	121
Not abusive supervisor	51.70	13.41	79
High work autonomy	56.94	13.07	117
Low work autonomy	50.04	11.72	83

Table 2

Summary table f-test of the 2-way ANOVA

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Abusive supervisor (A)	183.863	1	183.863	1.73	.280
Work autonomy (B)	1601.005	1	1601.005	10.213	.002
AxB	148.744	1	148.744	.949	.331

Abusive supervisor			
Work autonomy		1	156.766
Error	30726.075		
Total	618320.000	200	

Hypothesis one which states that there will be no statistically significant influence of abusive supervisor on pro-social behavior of workers is accepted, $f(1,196) = 1.173$, $p = .280$. This means that abusive supervisor had no significant influence on pro-social behavior as the pro-social behavior of workers whose supervisors were abusive and those not abusive. The second hypothesis which states that there will be no statistically significant influence of work autonomy on pro-social behaviors is rejected $f(1,196) = 10.213$, $p = .002$. This shows that work autonomy had significant influence on pro-social behaviour as participants with high work autonomy ($x = 56.94$, $SD = 13.07$) had high pro-social behavior than their counterparts with low work autonomy ($x = 50.05$, $SD = 11.72$)

Discussion

The result of the study shows that abusive supervisor had no significant influence on pro-social behavior of workers, as no difference was found in the pro-social behavior of workers of whose supervisors were abusive and those not abusive. The study of Maureen and Bien (1998) supports this finding. They found out abusive supervision had no role on pro-social behavior. But the study of King & Colleagues (2005) does not support this finding. The researchers discovered that abusive supervision had significant influence on pro-social behavior of workers. The second finding indicates that work autonomy had no significant influence on pro-social behavior of workers $f(1,196) = 10.213$, $p = .002$. Participants with high work autonomy ($x = 56.94$, $SD = 13.07$) had high pro-social behavior than their counterparts with low work autonomy ($x = 50.05$, $SD = 11.72$). The study of Duffy (2002) is in line with this study. The research result shows that work autonomy had influence on pro-social behaviors. Contradicting this finding was another study carried out by Dejonge (1995) who found out that work autonomy had no significant influence on pro-social behaviors of workers. The researcher went on to submit that when a worker is given a free hand to discharge his/her duties; this will help improve his/her pro-social behaviors in the work place.

Implications of the Study

The first result and the finding of this study imply that abusive supervision does not in any way influence pro-social behavior of workers. This is true because if a worker's relationship with his/her supervisor is not cordial, it does not mean that the worker cannot help a fellow worker or maintain a good relationship with them. The second result and finding implies that work autonomy has significant influence on pro-social behavior of workers. When a worker is given freedom to carry out his/her duties, it makes him happy and relaxed. This will certainly overlap in his relationship with his fellow workers.

Suggestion for Further Studies

More research is needed on this topic in order to discover new facts. But when carrying it out, researchers should pay attention to the following; first, they should try as much as possible to increase their sample size by selecting participants from more than one state so that

research finding can be generalized. Secondly, they should also ensure that workers are relaxed, comfortable and should not hurriedly fill the questionnaires. Third, they can also investigate on the following topics:

- Influence of motivation and self esteem on job involvement.
- Role of gender and personality on organizational commitment.
- Perceived impact of socio-economic status and age on pro-social behavior.

Significance of the Study

Irrespective of the limitations encountered in this study, there is some importance. First, the study has revealed that abusive supervision has no relationship with pro-social behaviors disputing many people's perception that it predicts pro-social behaviors. Secondly, it has also showed that autonomy is an important variable that must not be neglected if managers or owners of industries want their workers to have high pro-social behavior.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the researchers hereby recommend that supervisors should do their best not to be harsh on their workers as this will make them work well and better. Secondly, despite the fact that work autonomy breeds high pro-social behaviors, workers should try not to abuse the opportunity but should see it as an opportunity to work harder.

Summary/Conclusion

The main purpose of this study is to evaluate the influence of abusive supervision and work autonomy. The survey was conducted with two hundred (200) Bank workers who were selected through convenience sampling technique from Zenith Bank, Access Bank, United Bank of Africa (U.B.A) and First Bank all in Owerri, Imo state. The analysis carried out from the data collected shows that abusive supervision had no significant influence on pro-social behavior while work autonomy was found to have significant influence on pro-social behaviors of workers.

References

- Adams, J.S. (1965). *Inequity in social exchange In company*. Berkowitz Experimental Psychology Vol (2) New York.
- [ed) Advances in
- Ashforth, B. (1997). *Duffy tyranny in organization: A preliminary examination of antecedent and consequences Canadian Journal of Administrative Science* 14,126-140.
- Baard, P.P. Deci. E.I. & Ryan R.M. (IBSS). *The relationship of intrinsic need satisfaction to performance and well being in the work setting*. Journal of Applied Social Psychology.
- Bardura, A, (1977): *Self Efficacy*. New York: Freeman.
- Bercherer, R.C., Morgan F.W. & Lawrence R.M. (1982). *The job characteristics of industrial salesperson: relationship to motivation and job satisfaction*, Journal of Marketing vol. 46,125-135.

- Bies, R.J. & Tripp T.M. (1998). *Two faces of the powerless: coping with tyranny*. In R.M Karmer & M.A Neale (eds) power and influence in organizations (pp 203-219).
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*, New York, Wiley. Bowlby, A. (1988). *Attachment theory*, New York, me Graw Hill.
- Brey, P. (1999). *Work autonomy and drama of digital networks on organizations*. Journal of Business Ethics vol. 22 15-25.
- Brief, A.P. & Motowidlo S.J. (1986). *Pro-social organizational behaviors*. *Academy of Management Review* 11 (4), 710-725.
- Cropanzeno, R., Howes J.C. Grandey, A.A. & Tooth P. (1997). *The relationship of organizational politics.support to work behaviors attitudes and stress*. Journal of Organization Behavior 18, 159-180.
- Deci, E.L., Ryan R.M. & Koestner, R. (1999). *A meto analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic motivation: Psychology Bulletin* 125, 627-668.
- Dejonge, J. (1995). *Influence of work autonomy and gender on pro-social behaviour*. New York, Newton Press.
- Duffy, M.K., Gaster, D. & Pagon, M. (2002). *Social undermining and social support in the work place*. *Academy of Management, Journal* 45, 331-351.
- Gagne, M. Roestner, R. & Zuckerman, M. (2000). *Facilitating the acceptance of organizational change: the importance of self determination*. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 30, 1843-1852.
- Katz, D. (1964). *The motivational basis of organizational behaviour*. *Journal of Behavioral Science* 9.131-133.
- Keashly, I. (1998). *Emotional abuse in the workplace, conceptual and empirical issues*. *JOURNAL* 43, 178-190.
- King, E.B., George, J.M. & Herbi M.R. (2005). *Linking personality to helping behaviours at work: An International Perspective* *Journal of Personality*.
- Komaki, J.C. (1986). *Toward effective supervision: an operate analysis and comparison of mangers at work*. *Journal of psychology* 178-189.
- Lelas, P. 8 John D. (2009). *Work autonomy and pro-social behaviour on organizational commitment*. *Journal of Psychology* (15) 18-26.
- Mark, J. & Veronica, H. (2001). *Role of abusive supervision on prosocial behaviour*.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour. The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington M.A: Lexington Books.
- Swith, C. A., Organ D.W. & Near, D.P. (1983). *Organizational behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents*. *JOURNAL of Applied Psychology*, 68,653-663.
- Tepper, B.J. (2000). *Consequences of abusive supervision*. *Academy of Management Journal* 43, 178-190.

Zeltars, K.L. Tepper B.J. & Duffy M.K. (2002). *abusive supervision and subordinates organizational citizenship behaviour*, Journal of Applied Psychology 87, 1068-1076.