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Abstract

This thesis will try to assert and explain the current management situation in restaurants in France. It will further guide restaurant leaders to understand the implication of a good human management to improve employees’ satisfaction and productivity, reduce turnover, but also hopefully to invite restaurants managers to make their organization a more human work place. I chose the Toronto Empathy Questionnaire and Tepper Scale of abusive leadership to investigate the matter, with a total of 36 respondents. The results show no clear correlations between the two constructs.
**Introduction**

Why do people react differently towards abusive leadership? Taking care of the workforce so employees are satisfied and benefit the organization by delivering a better performance can be qualified as common sense. However, it appears that the hospitality sector, and more precisely the restaurant industry is far behind towards this matter. Job stress not only leads to problems and loss of productivity but also to gigantic costs for the organizations that were estimated at $300 billion every year in the U.S Schwartz (2004).

Kitchens are not spared by this plague according to Food for Thoughts non profit organization promoting food service professionals’ mental health awareness. They confirm that “spending time in the pressure cooker of the commercial kitchen can, and does, lead to mental health problems for chefs and cooks, including depression and addiction to drugs and alcohol.” Faulder, L. (2017). An increasing number of research articles are recognizing chefs as being at maximal risk for mental, emotional, and physical/health-related issues due to reasons that include working in demanding work environments (Zopiatis, Kyprianou, & Pavlou, 2011; Nagasu, Sakai, Ito, Tomita, Temmyo, Ueno, & Shigeji, 2007). Bullying and threats of violence are also inevitably inherent to chefs’ lives, contributing to emotional issues (Nielsen, Notelaers, & Einarsen, 2010; Bloisi & Hoel, 2008; Murray-Gibbons & Gibbons, 2007; Johns & Menzel, 1999).

In France, violence is mostly not even questioned, it’s “Craft Culture” according to an anonym food industry specialist interviewed for a famous French magazine Jary, E. (2015). Many chefs are not only diminishing the seriousness of the subject, but some are even encouraging this management style, arguing that they wouldn’t be as good if they had never been abused in their career. Like Christian Etchebest who recalls receiving a rack of lamb straight in the face and kicks in the back but confesses not being chocked because it was not
gratuitous violence. Or Adeline Grattard, Yam’Tcha Paris restaurant owner, who declared that if she hadn’t been humiliated, she wouldn’t have dared to do as much as she did. Camus, E. (2014).

Conversely, other famous Chef like the Michelin starred Eric Guerin prohibits any inappropriate behavior in his restaurant after he experienced violence and abusive leadership earlier in his career that he didn’t find as constructive as the two previous Chefs. Thus, it led us to wonder what conditions subordinates’ reactions to such abusive behaviors? Why some end up with more determination, motivation and improving their skills as the voice of their leader is raising and some others stay petrified, loose confidence and involvement? Some possible answers can be found in research literature, laying in subordinates’ personality type, attribution styles and other organizational situational factors like trust, perception of interactional justice, or other employees opinion of the leader that I will further explain. But in this study I decided to focus on a certain personality trait or I should call ability, that is emotional intelligence.

Emotional Intelligence is composed of several elements, of which empathy that I decided to focus on for this study.
**Purpose**

Under an ethical matter, the purpose of the present study is to explore restaurants subordinates’ different reactions towards bullying, abuse, and other forms of aggression according to their empathy score. The goal is to gain a better understanding of what, in the personality, conditions our answers when facing abusive leadership, and more precisely, to explain why some become better under violent leadership, and why some can’t hold it. As we will see later, surprisingly, abusive leadership is only abusive according to the perceptions of employees, and some employees are performing better under this type of management. This also led us to wonder more globally if restaurant violent leadership should be changed or kept in use as a filter to separate the employees who are “born for it” from others.

**Delimitations**

The empathy construct was chosen for its ease of measurement compared to general personality that might have taken more financial, knowledge and time resources to study. This research only asserts the situation in French restaurants, and I am conscious that country culture might be an important factors influencing the constructs of the study. Also, the population chosen is composed deliberately of individuals who experienced abusive leadership, thus the sample is relatively small with 36 answers and only 31 usable after controls (abusive supervision experience). Furthermore, when reactions were assessed in the questionnaire, the respondents evaluated their performance themselves and no numerical data was used to confront their statement, thus the validity of the results shall be considered accordingly.
Chapter 1: A violence context in culinary arts

A. Origins of abusive supervision in restaurants

Surprisingly compared to other industries, violence in the restaurant business is common place, and largely accepted and expected (Johns & Menzel, 1999; Alexander et al. 2012). As we could note from a review of different articles and interviews, facts are always reported to be the same. In an article “Hell in the kitchens” from Emmanuelle Jary, some chefs shared their experience and opinions. For Thomas for example, a French chef from the Pré Catelan in Paris, pushing, grabbing, shaking, is normal, but he insists on the importance that one shouldn’t leave any mark. Alain Senderens another French chef, has stuck a fork in the hand of a member of the brigade because he “lost it” while there was an enormous pressure in the kitchen. Sexism, Racism, and homophobia are also common recalls Isabelle who was told by the Head Chef that her place was in his bed and not in the kitchen. The article also reports an anonymous specialist’s opinion after he had done several expertise in Parisian Palaces: In French cuisines, blows and insults are considered as craft culture, and not as violence. Jary, E. (2015); Camus, E. (2014); Makdeche, K. (2014); Giroud, A. (2016).

Reading or experiencing such violent behaviors leads to wonder where does this culture come from? Why not all industries are affected? And why does it still exist in the media era where the word spread very fast?
The culinary world violent context and the antecedents of abusive behaviors

*Artistry*

Several explanations of the origins of abusive behaviors from supervisors can be found. Hinterstoißer, T. (2011) reports that aggression and violence may be imputed to artistry, creativity and to motivate young restaurant staff, serving as an excuse to perpetrate unethical behaviors. In support of this argument, Bourdain (2004), noted in his study that chefs state “giving and receiving abuse is part of the socialization process that creates the hardiness’ needed to function in a commercial kitchen or restaurant”.

Explanation confirmed by a three michelin stars French Chef René Meilléur to who attributes his success to the violence he underwent. “I took plenty of buttock kicks”, he confided to Geraldine Meignan for l’Express, “hopefully, or I wouldn’t be where I’m at today.” Meignan, G. (2015).

*Stress, Exhaustion and difficult working conditions*

Working in the restaurant industry is a challenge. Long hours, physical tasks, service stress, pressure of the customer satisfaction, it is physically and emotionally tiring. A French Chef recognized the difficult conditions for the hospitality employees, he compared the stress inherent to the service time as the one an actor playing in front of a different public each night would experience. Catalano, G. (2014). Guy Savoy, another Michelin starred chef blames the difficulty to handle permanent doubts. He states that in such jobs, the fear of not being able to make a good service or to get a bad comment from a customer is constant, and results in a high stress level. Giroud, A. (2016).
Smith and Carroll, (2006) confirm that a higher than average number of people are working over 65 hours a week, with higher work-loads (Huang, 2007) in that industry, and experience role conflict, role ambiguity, interpersonal conflict, and general work constraints (Young & Corsun, 2010).

Lastly, a busy service under stress can lead to a bad communication style as there is a need to be direct and effective. For some chefs, there is no room for taking the time to talk in a “politically correct” manner, being direct is more important than being polite. Arnoldsson, J. (2015).

**Brigade & Masculinity**

Another explanation resides in the masculinity, the severity and the military discipline required in kitchens’ organization, which uses army-like vocabulary to designate the ‘brigade’ (the kitchen team) or the ‘coup de feu’ (gunfire, service time).

This autocratic management style is most visible in restaurant kitchens, acceptance of hierarchical structure among the team and being subjected to a work discipline of military-like severity (Pratten, 2003; Bloisi and Hoel, 2008; Mathisen et al., 2008).

The young age of most restaurant employees and the competition to climb up the ladder also contributes to a ‘testosterone atmosphere’, where one should demonstrate its legitimacy to be there, whether it has to be through verbal or physical violence. A very famous UK chef Gordon Ramsay, proves this point by claiming that “a kitchen has to be an assertive, boisterous, aggressive environment, or nothing happens” (Hollweg, 2001).
**Drugs & alcohol**

A study published in 2012 by the French National Institute for Prevention and Education for Health (INPES) revealed how vulnerable is the hospitality regarding addictions matters. Indeed, 26.9% of employees of this industry admitted they have an important consumption of alcohol, 12.9% confessed consuming, cocaine (9.2%) and amphetamines (7.9%). Knowing that those addictions push to aggressive behaviors, hyperactivity, violence, and other extreme behaviors, it would thus be a plausible explanation of abusive supervision and violence in the restaurant industry.

**Heritage**

Bloisi and Hoel (2008) reported that “abuse may be an expected part of the culture of commercial kitchens, which is supported by historical and contemporary social structures within education and training systems in this industry”. This couldn’t be better illustrated than with the words of Evelyne Olayat, headmaster in a French hospitality school in Paris. She states that it’s a hard profession, “make or break” for her students that she admits to know very fast if they are made for it or not. In other words, instead of putting into question the industry’s violence culture, she rather recognizes the students that she thinks would succeed to “stand the heat” or not, like if it was the norm and not changeable. We could also quote the experience of Camille, a young commis who confided her violent experience and objectively explained her torturer behavior by the fact that he was an old school successor, for who violence became the norm. Makdeche, K. (2014)
Why it keeps going

*Diverse opinions about violence*

As we saw previously, some chefs almost do the apology of violence in the kitchen, arguing that it made them tougher and better at what they do. Thus, without a fierce motivation from managers to improve and change the deeply rooted violence and abusive supervision culture, it will evolve very very slowly, and at a cost. First, with the speed of light, information now spreads on all the media, and restaurants are not spared. Clients who know about a restaurant with leaders who persecute their employees may boycott it, and spread the word, resulting in a lower revenue for the restaurant. Secondly, employee might turn their back to this restaurant or this chef, and it is common knowledge that turnover is a cost for a company.

*Labor Ministry & Employee Protection Bureau*

According to the Labor Ministry, since 2013, only few tens of apprenticeship contracts were broken, but only one minutes has been further conducted for harassment. While they know about the current situation, the sacred “Omerta” prevails in the kitchens. The sacred silence doesn’t help them to make the situation better. A report from the employee protection bureau (Inspection du Travail) for sexual harassment certifies that they couldn’t solve the case because of the absence of collaboration from witnesses. Meignan, G. (2015).

This leads us to the third reason of the continuation of violent management in the kitchen world.
Omerta, the law of silence

By fearing reprisals, employees don’t speak. They are scared to be rejected by their team, fired or to undergo serious trouble to find another job. Many French gastronomy chefs belong to a community, they know each other and would spread the word, thus making it difficult for the “traitor” to get hired, after he dared to denounce an unacceptable situation that is the norm, and should be accepted from the moment we decide to become a chef.

A glimmer of hope

The fooding movement

Cooking shows are blooming on TV, with more than 434 hours of cooking related shows on English TV channels, Prince, R. (2014) answering to the growing interest and demand of spectators. Gastronomy world passionates and triggers new vocations, no matter the age, no matter the media; Ypulse (2015) study showed that 63% of the population between their 13 and 32 post pictures of what they are eating on social media, and the total number of hours of cooking shows on English TV channels comes to an impressive 434.5 hours in a week. But do these amateurs cordons bleus know about the reality and the darkness of cooking behind the scenes? Most of them don’t, and decide candidly to start a career in the gastronomy world like Camille who had worked seven years in another field. She believes that what is going to change this unethical management style is people like her, who come from different horizons. Those newcomers have a clear knowledge about what is acceptable, and what is not, what is legal in regard to labour law, and what deserves criminal punishment. It is true that starting as
an apprentice in the kitchens, first the lack of maturity and confidence, secondly the belief that labour world is like this probably keep a lot of young chefs to try to bang their fists on the tables. The journalist Jary, E. (2015) confirms in her article “L’enfer en cuisine” (Hell in the Kitchen), that being a chef no longer is sidings, but young chefs choose it by passion, and start to refuse to be ill-treated.

Different minded chefs

Hopefully, some chefs put into question these automatism and refuse to replicated what they had to endure. It’s the case of Eric Guerin, yet also a michelin starred Chef under pressure. He confided being burnt intentionally with a pan over his hand by his supervisor because he put too much water in the mushrooms. Today, he tries to find other ways to teach rigor and high cuisine, with management skills. Camus, E. (2014)

These kitchens bullies pushed some employees to change their profession, some to depression and worse, some to suicide. This thesis has the goal not only to answer to the research question but also to contribute to the denunciation and to remind what is the reality behind the scenes in French restaurants. While we know from chefs’ interviews (Camus, E. (2014); Meignan, G. (2015); Makdeche, K. (2014); Hollweg, (2001); Giroud, A. (2016)) that some subordinates confide benefiting more from this violence and abusive treatment than being traumatized, it thus interested us to wonder what in the personality influences the reactions towards such leadership. Literature has found several explanations that the the next section will review, but no researcher has investigated the implication of empathy in subordinates’ reaction towards abusive supervision.
Chapter 2: Definition of constructs and literature review

The main purpose of this chapter is to deeply explore the existing empirical studies on the concepts of abusive leadership, emotional intelligence, empathy, violence in kitchens and personality traits in an abuse context.

B. Definitions & characteristics of constructs

1. Empathy

1.1 Definition

It seems that more and more companies believe that emotional intelligence skills may be a key component for organizations' s to manage efficiently and consequently, to lead to success (p.379) Zeidner, Matthews & Roberts (2004). Empathy is one of the five components of emotional intelligence model drew by Golemans (1998). The authors Salovey, P., Mayer, J.D. (1990) define emotional intelligence as "the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions".

Later, Goleman (1998) modeled the five pillars underlying emotions management:

1. Self awareness
2. Self Management
3. Internal motivation
4. Social Skills
5. Empathy
As a first pillar, he indicates self-awareness as having the ability to know and understand your own self, by identifying one’s personality, strengths, limitations, emotions, values and motives.

Self management, the second pillar, covers the ability to control emotions in order to think before acting.

Then, the internal motivation is argued to be another key component of emotional intelligence, which is described as “a passion to work for internal reasons that go beyond money and status”.

Fourthly comes the ability to manage relationships and to build networks, in other words these social skills “help out to build rapport and find common ground with others.”

And lastly, the notion that I will focus on for this study: empathy.

Empathy is an extremely complex subject that belongs to various domains such as psychology, philosophy or neuroscience. This explains why several authors argue that there are many different definitions and measures that keep raising debates amongst researchers (De Vignemont, F., & Singer, T. (2006); Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2004)).

In this study, I chose to refer empathy as the skill enabling to understand what others are feeling and the antecedents of such emotions. This skill also leads to treating people according to their emotional reactions Goleman (1995).

More accurately, it is the ability to perceive and understand another person’s emotions and to react appropriately. In their inherent traits, empathetic people are known for being more amenable to silence social signals indicating what other people may want or need, Leiberg, S. Anders, S. (2006). Keen, S. (2007).

In other words, being empathic means to recognize others’ feelings, the causes of these
feelings, and to be able to participate in the emotional experience of an individual without becoming part of it. To further understand, Halpern, J. (2007) highlighted the importance of the sense of objectivity in empathy, that is to say disconnecting feelings from others’ feelings. Empathy is often confused with sympathy or compassion. While the latter designates the degree to which you agree with a person’s feelings (from the latin language *cum-patire*; “suffer with”), empathy is generally defined as the ability to be aware of what the other feels and to understand without agreeing with the person’s feelings. This objectivity however doesn’t exclude caring for others, and in the case of negative feelings the desire for the “victim” that she feels better, and this is why some authors are conflicting on the definition and constructs of empathy.

Goleman, D. (1995) argues that there are 3 types of empathy.

1. Emotional empathy, closely linked with emotional contagion since it refers to being “infected” by the other’s emotions, thus feeling the same. An explicit example could be physically & intellectually feeling the fear of the actor in a thriller movie.

2. Compassionate empathy, that is not only understanding the other persons’ feelings, but also showing concern, helping to cope if needed.

3. Cognitive empathy, that refers to the simple ability to recognizing the other person’s feelings and what they might be thinking, also called perspective-taking.

This definition comprising the three dimensions it the one that will be used throughout the study.

In order to understand better the subject and its context, we will now go through the importance of empathy and what consequences lacking this skill leads to. Indeed, our study focuses on the implication that empathy that has in the reaction towards abusive leadership,
thus analyzing what are its benefits and what are the outcomes of not being empathic may give more insight to the matter.

1.2 Characteristics of empathic and non empathic people

Above the ability to understand others and to Simmons, A. (2013) argued that empathetic concern, or the fact that we feel concern for others’ well-being makes us an ethical person and gives one motivation to help others or not harm them. It is also contributing to be a more tolerant, respectful, friendly and accepting person. Oxley, J. (2014).

In the context of work, some researchers found that managers who are able to put themselves’ in their subordinates’ shoes are abler to understand them, and thus to motivate them and to get the best out of them. Skinner, C., & Spurgeon, P. (2005)

Empathy is a personality trait that was identified in transformational leadership style, which was proven to improve employee performance en employee retention Baker, W., O'Malley, Michael, Bond, & Jim. (2015), but also to receive, process information and to find solutions. Ket de Vries, M. (2014) argues in an article in Harvard Business Review that “empathy enhances our ability to receive and process information, and to find solutions.

On the other hand, a low level cognitive empathy or “perspective taking” empathy was strongly shown to be related to offending behaviors. Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2004)

This can be explained by the fact that a lack of empathy is linked with a disregard for the well-being of others and a lack of concern about moral wrongdoing Maibom, H. L. (2009).

It also seems that narcissism traits hold not only and general anger but a lack of empathy. (Bass & Riggio, 2006)
2. Abusive Leadership (AL)

2.1 Definition

According to Tepper B. J. (2000), abusive supervision or abusive leadership can be defined as “subordinates’ perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact are those who yell or scream, use derogatory names, and/or publicly ridicule others in the workplace.” In practice, abusive supervision can take place in different forms, such as punitive behaviors, yelling, ridiculing, and name-calling and terrorizing employees Kevin Kelloway, E., Sivanathan, N., Francis, L., & Barling, J. (n.d.).

Physical violence is excluded as the author only makes reference to non verbal behaviors that do not imply physical contact with the subordinate. I wanted to highlight however, that for this study I decided to consider abusive leadership as a more global construct in the case of French restaurants, since physical violence is commonplace as we saw earlier. Thus, to this definition as I focus on abuse in the particular context of a kitchen, I also take into account physical violence such as pushing, grabbing, burning, to hitting with or without objects. (Tepper, 2000) highlighted that abusive supervision is actually a subjective assessment; supervisor is abusive only if the subordinate perceives it as abusive. In other words, while someone external witness an exchange as abusive from his perspective, it may not be the case for the “victim” of such treatment, and “two subordinates could differ in their evaluations of the same supervisor’s behavior” (Tepper, 2000, p. 178).

Thus, Abusive leadership, is a matter of perception.

Conversely, Martinko, M. J., Sikora, D., & Harvey, P. (2012) raised the contrary effect, as it is also possible “that supervisors are perceived as abusive even though they themselves never
intended abuse or believed their behavior was abusive”. The same authors believed that these evaluations of abusive supervision are shaped according personality, and other abusive leadership researchers have found reasons in many various areas. The next section will give an overview of the different factors influencing perception of abusive leadership.

2.2 Factors influencing Abusive Leadership perception

Attribution styles

Attributions are people’s causal explanations for the outcomes of their behaviors Weiner, (1986). (Russell, (1991), qualify attribution styles as “people’s perceptual biases”. Broadly speaking, when we attribute explanation to an event, a behavior, and in our case to AL, we talk about locus of causality and stability. In other words, according to the “perceiver”, the outcome of a situation can make reference to an internal or an external cause, and can be qualified as stable or unstable. Brees, J., Martinko, M., & Harvey, P. (2016). For example, chance is typically classified as external and unstable. However, it appears that optimism level influences the attribution style. Indeed, people with an optimistic style tend to attribute their successes to internal and stable dimensions like ability, and attribute their failures to external and unstable causes such as chance. On the contrary, people with pessimistic attribution styles tend to make external and unstable attributions for successes and internal and stable attributions for failures.

What is interesting to focus on in the case of our study is employees’ hostile attribution style, factor affecting subordinates’ perception of AL. Employees with a hostile attribution style honestly believe that their negative outcomes are due to other people, when they are blamed for a mistake they feel that they are being mistreated Martinko et al., (2007). Martinko et al., (2010) found that employees who make external attributions for failures are more likely to perceive
supervisor abuse and hostility from others, Aquino et al., (2004) added that they also may experience feelings of victimization. In conclusion, hostile attribution style can be accounted as a moderator of the perception of AL, which explains in part why employees react differently towards abusive behaviors.

**LMX**

The Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory states that a leader or supervisor’s behavior is generally different according to his or her follower. The approach focuses on the relationships that the leader creates with his followers, and from these exchanges, in-groups and out-groups in the organization are formed. The theory argues that working with an in group allows a leader to accomplish more work in a more effective manner.

The in-group members don’t only complete the tasks that are given to them, but they voluntarily want to do more than what they are asked, this leads them both to work harder. On the contrary, out-group members simply do what they are asked to do, and don’t go over the roles they are assigned with. (Northouse, 2004, p.157). Typically, high quality exchange relationships are governed by mutual influence and dependence, but also high degrees of trust, support, loyalty, respect and mutual obligations. Liden & Maslyn 1998

Martinko, M. J., Sikora, D., & Harvey, P. (2012) demonstrated that a low quality LMX followers belonging to the “out group” would be more likely to perceive their leader as abusive. If they don’t feel recognized or valued as in group members, they may feel that every actions the leader takes is unfair, as their relationship with the latter are not as smooth and based on high trust and mutual esteem as with in-group members. Their argument is supported by Tepper’s scale of abusive leadership that I used for this present study, as some items like “makes negative comments about me” and “tells me I’m incompetent” would be consistent in evaluating the quality LMX relationships between the supervisor and his
follower(s). Shapiro, D. L. et al., (2011) found that subordinates with higher LMX tend to more favorably evaluate leaders who are even transgressing. They compare LMX to love, blinding employees confronted to faulty supervisors. In other words, out-group members are more likely to perceive treatment from their leaders as abusive, and in-group members on the other hand, might not perceive abuse because of high LMX “blinding” them.

Core self evaluation as AL perception bias

Another personality trait shaping employees’ reactions towards abusive leadership has been found in the way they perceive themselves. Self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, neuroticism and locus of control are the four traits shaping one’s opinion of oneself, also called core self-evaluation.

(a) self-esteem: the most fundamental self-evaluation is reflecting one’s appraisal of one’s overall values;

(b) generalized self-efficacy: the evaluation of one’s capacities to perform well across a variety of situations;

(c) neuroticism: the tendency to have a negative explanatory style and to focus on negative parts of oneself; and

(d) locus of control: the belief about the relationship between one’s behaviors and their outcomes (attribution style, as we have seen earlier). Judge et al. (1997)

AL. Wu, T., & Changya Hu. (2009) showed that an employee’s evaluation of his/her value tends to influence his perception of abusive supervision. The researchers proved that low core self-evaluation brings “to focus on negative aspects of self to fit the negative self-concept. It thus leads the subordinate to selectively pay attention to and remember a greater number of the negative aspects and the negative behaviors delivered by the supervisor and to report a greater number of abusive supervisor behaviors.”
**Peers opinions**

According to Martinko et al., (2011) and Ashkanasy, et al., (2016), colleagues’ opinions and comments about how fair they perceive their leaders’ treatments can influence the perceptions of abusive supervision. The varying classification of leader’s behavior from abusive to inspirational according to social contextual factors, and peer opinions about the supervisor is shaping other employee’s perception of this same leader through what Roberson, Q. M., & Williamson, I. O. (2012). called fairness perceptions.

**Confirmation bias theory**

Generally speaking, a confirmation bias leads us to look for cues that are confirming our opinion. Armstrong, J. S., & Plous, S. (1994); Best, R. G., et al., (2005) drew upon this theory by showing that subordinates give greater attention and evaluate social interactions that support existing self-beliefs. In the case of negative opinions of one-self or negative self-evaluation, then, incongruent interactions are ignored and/or forgotten. Thus, other events or behaviors confirming ones’ beliefs would be held. Another theory going in the same direction links a personality trait called negative affectivity with the tendency to have a pessimistic attribution style. Martinko et al., (2007) believed that negative affective people tend to seek out and focus on negative information, facilitating the formation of pessimistic attribution styles.

**Trait anger**

Brees, J. R. (2012) found that trait anger was also positively associated with perceptions of abusive supervision. This personality trait leads to perceive environments, situations, and other’s behavior as provocative and hostile because they believe others purposely and unnecessarily cause them to happen, thus producing anger responses Speilberger, (1996).
Neurotism

Brees, et al., (2014) argued that high neurotics compared with low neurotics, are more likely to perceive their supervisors’ behaviors as hostile and abusive. Indeed, neurotic individuals are characterized by their negative biased perception of their environments and other peoples’ behavior. (Headey & Wearing, 1989). Thus, by concentrating on negative behaviors, neurotic subordinates might perceive more abusive supervision than a non neurotic.

2.3 Inspirational or abusive? How responses to Abusive Behaviors differ

We just saw the different factors influencing the perception of abusive behaviors, where perception actually refers to:

1) being aware of abusive supervision

2) In special case perceiving supervision doesn’t always mean that there is objectively leader is or intended to be such, and may result from low core self evaluations or other factors.

Having the glasses allowing to “see” abuse doesn’t say however, how these behaviors will be characterized and more precisely, if they will be condemned. In other words, perceiving abuse, and labelling or interpreting it is two different outcomes with different antecedents. In the movie Whiplash, the music director Terrence Fletcher is known for his strong character, and violence practices to select and motivate the students he thinks will be the next virtuoso. Andrew Neyman, his new protégé is pushed to his limits so that he achieves perfection. Throughout the movie, Andrew perceived the methods of Fletcher as abusive. The music
director even confesses that one of his student committed suicide after his self esteem was hurt by his behavior. However, in the closing scene, Andrew delivers an incredible performance and openly show his complicity with Fletcher, also admitting the achievement. While the two sides identified abusive behaviors, they still labelled them as inspirational and motivational. Thus, we can conclude that abuse may have a different outcome according to the victim, and Neal M. Ashkanasy, Rebecca J Bennett, Mark J. Martinko (2016) argue that this perception is shaped by social contextual factors that we will explore. The authors state that those social contextual factors are a) the supervisor’s success in developing subordinates, b) the subordinate’s trust in the supervisor, c) causal accounts provided for motives guiding the supervisor’s behavior, and d) peer opinion about the supervisor.

**Company is striving**

Illustrating their words with Steve Jobs’ abusive leadership style, the authors of the book High Performance Work Practices or Abusive Supervision: Where is the Boundary? (2016) report that when the company or the leader is striving, abusive leader is not sanctioned, and is even recognized for his methods. Hollander (1958) explains this situation by the fact that leaders who have a successful track record are less rejected by subordinates if they later deviate from normative/ethical practices. In the case of Jobs, his aggressive and yelling style was more accepted when apple stock was raising than declining. Neal M. Ashkanasy et al., (2016). Another example was given with the sport coach Dougherty, whose leadership style was praised when his team was winning, while news coverage turned negative from the moment his team started to loose. Following the logical demonstration of the authors, a chef whose cuisine or a room manager whose organization and serving practices are recognized and praised would thus benefit from more tolerance from the employees if they were abusive
supervisors. Subordinates might perceive the abusive practices, but witnessing the success of such methods they might not want to question them, and might consider them as inspirational more than abusive.

*Trust in the leader pushes the follower to see his abusive attitude as motivational*

Kramer (1994), showed that trust biases an employee to see benign intention behind aggressive behaviors. This is consistent with LMX theory, as high LMX is characterized by higher trust between the supervisor and the subordinate. In other words, the higher the trust in the leader, and the less the subordinate would attribute abusive attitude to bad intentions such as harming or being violent for free. On the contrary, they may perceive it as motivational if they think their leader is looking to improve their competencies and performances. In line with the report of success, Neal M. Ashkanasy et al., (2016) also highlighted the weight of “success stories” in the acceptance of abusive leaders. If a leader demonstrates consistency over time with regard to how he treats his or her subordinates, that is to say if he proves that he makes subordinates more performant, it might enhance trust of other subordinates, thus leading them to trust and accept the leader’s behavior even though it’s abusive. If we consider that the leader is making his subordinates more performant, then by accepting to follow the leader’s method, the follower makes the most of this aggressive behavior and is not affected negatively by AL.

*Interactional justice*

Why would some employees react negatively toward AL while other “accept it”, or at least don’t overreact? As Aryee et al., (2007) suggest in their study, when abusive supervision is cognitively interpreted as interactional injustice, it evokes frustration and resentment. We can define interactional justice as individuals’ perceptions of the degree to which organizational
representatives treat them with respect, honesty, propriety, and sensitivity to their personal needs (Bies & Moag, 1986).

Aryee et al., (2007) also stressed that these perceptions of interpersonal mistreatment are the cause for which subordinates might answer with aggressive behaviors. They argue that replying with aggression is a way of restoring their damaged social image, Aquino, Tripp & Bies, (2001) add that it helps to re-elevate their self-image. As they are highly motivated to defend themselves against acts of injustice that may serve to threaten their personal identity.

In conclusion, interactional justice is an important mediating cognitive process through which individuals interpret their abusive supervisor when deciding to respond aggressively to abuse. Aryee et al., (2007)

*Narcissism*

Abusive supervision could be viewed as one form of negative feedback or personal insult. Burton, J. P., & Hoobler, J. M. (2011). Kernis et al., (1997), demonstrated that individuals with unstable high self-esteem become more “ego-involved” when experiencing negative feedback while individuals with unstable low self-esteem are more likely to be more accepting of negative feedback.

Thus, argument of researchers is that narcissism is a factor influencing the reaction towards AL. As narcissist have fragile high self-esteem, they are considered to be more reactive to threats to their self-esteem Twenge & Campbell, (2003)., and when facing an insult or social rejection, narcissists feel that their high opinion of themselves is attacked, leading them to view aggression as one strategy for regaining respect Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2003)
Subordinates low in agreeableness & extraversion

Agreeableness is another factor conditioning the answer to the perception of abusive supervision. Agreeable persons are known for trying to keep harmonious relationships and for resolving conflict with compromises Graziano et al., (1996). They are also highly sociable and cooperative Skarlicki et al., (1999), and are more likely to regulate their angry feelings (Jensen-Campbell et al., 2003). On the contrary, individuals with a lower rate of agreeableness are lacking a concern for others’ welfare and are less capable of inhibiting aggressive responses. Judge et al., (2013).

Thus, subordinates low in agreeableness were shown to be more inclined to respond with deviant behaviors to perceptions of abusive supervision than subordinates high in agreeableness. Wang, G., Harms, P. D., & Mackey, J. D. (2014)

2.4 Consequences of Abusive leadership

When an employee is confronted with stress caused by ill-treatment or abusive leadership at work, the negative outcomes are almost countless. When facing such behaviors, employees show two types of coping strategies: They leave their job (Wright and Cropanzano, 1998), or they reduce their performance (Hobfoll, 1989) to counterbalance the loss of resources that abuse is causing.

Sliter et al., (2012) confirms these findings and argues that employees « do not passively wait for resources to be depleted, and will strive to protect their resources. Hence, employees act to preserve these resources by withdrawing from work. »

Amongst the “least dramatic” effects of abusive leadership, researchers reported a decrease in organizational commitment (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002; Tepper, Duffy, Henle, &
Lambert, 2006), lower job performance (e.g. Harris, Kacmar, & Zivnuska, 2007), negative job attitudes (e.g. Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, & Ensley, 2004).

It can also have way more harmful consequences for the employee, decreasing his self-esteem (Burton & Hoobler, 2006), enhancing his psychological distress (Tepper, 2000, 2007), lower job and even life satisfaction (Tepper, 2000; Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, & Ensley, 2004).

Also, in the service industry to which restaurants belong it is important to provide a constant customer service quality, however abusive supervision has been shown to decrease employees’ exhibition of proactive customer service performance » Lyu, Y., et al., (2016).

In addition to that, an interesting facet of which we don’t often think of is emotional contagion. According to Howard and Gengler (2001), emotional contagion “refers to someone catching the emotion being experience by another”. Indeed, restaurant employees, and especially room employees like waiters, maître d’hôtel, etc., are the main individuals in the frontline taking care of the service operations. They generally have close and long customer interactions Yee, R.W et al., (2008) that directly and significantly shape their judgments on the services offered, Roth, A.V., Menor, L.J., (2003). Furthermore, it seems that customers may be exposed to employees’ emotional display and experience corresponding changes in their own affective states. Pugh, Douglas S. (2001). Other researchers studied how sales employees’ satisfaction may influence customer satisfaction, and found that a highly dissatisfied salesperson will exhibit a significant level of emotional tension that will be felt by the customer Singh, J et al., (1994), which creates a cognitive tension that is reducing their satisfaction. Oshikawa, S. (1968); Russo, J. E. et al., (1998)

Salesperson being in long customer interactions, we believe that restaurant employees work in a close context and thus, if they are affected by abusive supervision and experienced violence during their work, there might be consequences for the customers.
It is also important to highlight that it is a growing trend in high end restaurants to let the chefs themselves to present and serve the dishes. Thus, if the treatment in kitchen is bad and hurting employees, it also may affect customers through these interactions while there wouldn’t usually be any consistent exchange in classical service restaurants. Another consequence of abusive leadership that we can think of is related to the image that a restaurant portrays to a public. The recent scandals some French restaurants faced with the revelation of employees’ violent treatments may have had consequences on customers’ decision to visit. With the rapid spread through media, such information doesn’t stay under silence anymore, and consequently, I argue that some clients may choose to boycott restaurants that mistreat their employees, resulting in a lower benefit for the organization. In addition, abusive leadership also seems to pull aggressive behaviors throughout the organization. Some study found that workplace violence brings employees to criticize one another and to behave more aggressively towards one another. Phillips, A. (n.d.). Thus, the more there is aggression between leader and subordinate, the more subordinates are pushed to replicate those behaviors, catching the organization is a vicious circle. Finally, abusive supervision leads to consequences that certainly have a cost for the organization with behaviors leading to lower productivity, decreased profit growth, customer satisfaction, theft, sabotage and eventually turnover as we said earlier (Detert & Trevino, 2007; M. S. Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007; Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002).

3. Research question and hypothesis

As we saw earlier, personality traits affect the perception but also the reaction to abusive supervision, (see research review: What influences AL’s perception). I also got interested in
empathy in relation to justice sensitivity. Justice sensitivity reflects an individual’s concern for justice and is an important predictor of justice-related emotion and behavior (Baumert et al., 2013). In their study, they showed that participants with high concern scores, also called empathic concern, were more likely to be sensitive to others’ injustice. These results lend us to ask ourselves if similarly, we are sensitive to our own injustice treatment because of our empathy level, thus I was wondering if it could modify the reaction of subordinate when he is facing abuse.

It is important to define what is meant by “reaction”. As reactions, we imply two factors: first, quality of work any self-asserted performance change when confronted with violent behaviors. For a chef, it could be that the dish is less well plated, or that something is missing from the plate for example, while for a room employee, it could mean to be slower, less organized...etc. For time and resources constraints reason, the answers are given by respondents through non numerical and subjective self evaluation, which, I am conscious, are not the most precise data.

Reactions also include inspiration or motivation. As Ashkanasy, N. M., et al., (2016) argued in their book chapter “Abusive Leaders or Master Motivators? ‘Abusive is in the Eye of the Beholder’” abusive leadership can be surprisingly inspirational for some subordinates, depending on social contextual factors that we described earlier.

Hence, the existence of violence in French restaurants combined with an interest in emotional intelligence led us to wonder about employees’ different reactions when they are confronted with abusive supervision. Since no research has been found on the link between abusive leadership and subordinate’s emotional intelligence or its component; empathy, I wanted to investigate the matter. As empathy may be related to tolerance, understanding, but also sensitivity in a sense, I believe that it was interesting to know more about its implication in reactions of subordinates when they are facing abusive supervision and violence in a
restaurant setting. Thus, this leads to the study hypothesis:

H1: Quality of work and motivation are affected according to the level of empathy in an abusive supervision context.
Chapter 3: Research method

1.1 Study design

The design of this study is descriptive. According to the US Office of Research Integrity, a descriptive study can be defined as one in which nothing in the environment is manipulated in order to collect information (https://ori.hhs.gov/content/module-2-research-design). They further argue that sometimes descriptive studies “are referred to as "correlational " or "observational ". Descriptive studies are also conducted to demonstrate associations or relationships between things in the world around you.” Thus, it applies to my research design and to my research question “Is empathy a personality trait influencing motivation and work quality of subordinates facing abusive leadership?”

1.2 Sample

The sample for the data collection is employees who currently work or who have worked in a restaurant. One could argue that there is less violence happening between room subordinates and supervisors because of the necessity of their presence in front of the customers and not in the back office, that often lead to more abusive behaviors from supervisors as we can see in the kitchens. However, I believe them to be evolving under the same stressful and violent work environment, thus while the study focuses mainly on Chefs, room employees are also included. Before they started the study, they found an explanation about the subject and criteria which was experiencing abusive supervision. As a final result, 36 persons answered of which 15 replied in English and 21 in French. Only 31 were kept because of their abusive supervision score, as we did not consider scores that were under 2 (from 1 to 5 on the Likert
Indeed, 3 of the respondents had the lowest score for abusive supervision, which means that they answered “I cannot remember her/him using this behavior with me” to all the questions and were then not considered for the study. The 2 others were rejected for the study because of their experience in France, as their answer was “none”. The demographic makeup of this sample was 55% French and 45% respondents from abroad. 75% of the respondents were female and 25% were male. In terms of age, 31.7% were between 20 and 25, 36.1% were between 25 and 30 years old, 32% were over 30.

1.3 Data collection

The survey consisted of four different sections: personal general information (4 items) abusive leadership (11 items); quality of work and motivation when under abusive supervision (3 items) and empathy score (16 items). The first part was dedicated to know more about my respondents (gender, age, number of years worked in France and nationality). The second part was about the abusive leadership score of the people surveyed. It consisted of 11 items using the five-point Likert-scale and responses ranging from (1) *I cannot remember her/him using this behavior with me* to (5) *He/she uses this behavior very often with me*. In the third part, two questions had a likert-5 scale and one had Yes/No/I can’t evaluate myself type of answer. Finally, the empathy section also used a likert-5 scale.

The data was collected from April 5 to April 30th, 2017. The study was sent through LinkedIn, on my personal Facebook page and through the Paul Bocuse Institute Facebook group where we thought to have the biggest chances to have respondents corresponding to the study i.e. working in restaurants and having faced/facing abusive supervision. When the questionnaire was sent, the definition of abusive leadership was given as not only verbal aggression but also physical aggression as we mentioned earlier, we broadened the definition that fitted better our study of French restaurants.
Also, in order to include as many people possible, the survey was sent out in both French and English. To control that they fit with the study, I also asked them if they had any experience in France. Some unreliable statements were changed or discarded.

1.4 Measurements

I believe that the TEQ (Toronto Empathy Scale) is the measure that fits the best the definition that I chose for Empathy (i.e. “skill enabling to understand what others are feeling and the antecedents of such emotions. This skill also leads to treating people according to their emotional reactions” Goleman (1995).)

Spreng et al. (2009) developed the TEQ to assess several empathy attributes:

1) The perception of an emotional state in another that stimulates the same emotion in oneself (items 1 and 4)
2) Emotion comprehension in others (item 8)
3) Emotional states in others by indexing the frequency of behaviors demonstrating appropriate sensitivity (items 2, 7, 10, 12, 15).
4) Sympathetic physiological arousal (items 3, 6, 9 and 11)
5) Altruism (items 5, 14 and 16)
6) The frequency of behaviors engaging higher-order empathic responding, such as prosocial helping behaviors (item 13)

The questionnaire has been shown to have high internal consistency, construct validity, and test–retest reliability (Spreng et al., 2009). Another reason for this questionnaire to be chosen is for its relatively short size that I believe is important for respondents not to be discouraged.
to answer, as the questionnaire included 37 questions in total.

For the abusive supervision scale, I chose an 11-item version of a 15-item scale developed by Tepper (2000) to measure subordinates’ perceptions of abusive supervision. Sample items include “My supervisor makes negative comments about me to others,” “My supervisor ignores me or gives me the silent treatment,” and “My supervisor tells me me my thoughts or feelings are stupid.”

The reliability of the scale was measured with Cronbach alpha at .89.

Finally, the three questions that evaluate motivation and quality of work under a context of abusive supervision were chosen:

1) The first question tried to assert if in a general context, severe leadership that pushes employees to their limits is efficient for them to be performant. This did not specially concern the respondent but was more related to a general management context.

2) The second question was similar but the abusive behaviors were more precise “raising the voice, criticizing you in front of other, anger towards your mistakes” and specifically concerned the respondent and his opinion whether these management practices were pulling their motivation.

3) The third question asked the respondents if they could identify that the customers noticed their trouble after an episode of violent leadership. This was not a direct question regarding the clients but was more designed to assert in an other way if employees suffered from this type of management, in other words, if abusive leadership had an effect on them (i.e. “trouble”).

4) Finally, the fourth question was directly related to the ability to work efficiently and to
deliver the same level of service before or during abusive supervision episodes.

After the data was collected through Google document, the first treatments were made thanks to Excel. The questions were answers were not valid (Too low abusive leadership score, no experience in France etc.) were deleted, data was organized, means scores for abusive supervision and empathy were calculated. Also, questions with nominal answers were given a numerical value, Yes=2; No=1, I can’t evaluate myself = 0.

1.5 Data analysis

This study explores the abusive supervision level that subordinates experience or experienced, their empathy score and specific reactions when facing abusive leadership. Current or past restaurant industry employees were asked to agree or disagree with 11 questions about abusive supervision and 16 questions about their empathy. They also replied to questions about their motivation and quality of work in the same abusive supervision context.

To start the analysis, even though the TEQ (Toronto Empathy Questionnaire) was found to have high internal consistency, construct validity, and test–retest reliability (Spreng et al., 2009), I estimated the values of Cronbach’s Alpha for each question through the help of SPSS. It appeared that the Cronbach’s Alpha for the 16 questions had a score of 0.514.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cronbach’s Alpha for the Empathy construct*
According to Nunally (1978) Cronbach Alpha values of a scale should be ideally 0.7 or above, so I decided to run a factor analysis with a dimension reduction to see if categories could be found to improve the reliability test of this multidimensional scale.

The parameters were Eigenvalues over 1, Varimax rotation, small coefficients < 0.4 were deleted.

Surprisingly, the categories did not fit the different dimensions’ categories i.e:

Perception of an emotional state in another that stimulates the same emotion in oneself (items 1 and 4), emotion comprehension in others (item 8), emotional states in others (items 2, 7, 10, 12, 15), etc.

Instead, we identified five new groups, and from these new categories Cronbach’s alpha test was run again. (See table 3)

While not all the group of questions had an alpha > 0.7 the results were still better than the first Cronbach alpha, and the low scores could be explained by the fact that the items were specific to some traits and could indicate that there is no redundancy in the measurements.
1.6 Results

I chose to use one-way ANOVA in SPSS to test individual independent variables with nominal score (Yes/No/I Can’t evaluate myself) as follows, with the hypothesis that empathy score affects reactions employees have under abusive supervision. The first two questions that I analyzed are:

- The trouble felt under abusive supervision
- The quality of work under abusive supervision

One-way ANOVA is useful to determine if there is a significant difference in means score for each dependent variable across our 5 groups of empathy scores. See tables at the end of the document.

E (1,2,3...) = Scores for Empathy group n° (1,2,3...)
Q3 = The quality of work under abusive supervision
Q4 = The trouble felt under abusive supervision

Means plot results for ANOVA Empathy group 1- Question 3

ANOVA regression slope for empathy score group 1 and quality of work
From the mean plot we could try to interpret the regression line by saying that the higher the empathy score, and the more empathy is correlated with a change in work quality in an abusive leadership context. However, for E1 Q3: Sig = 0.342, p>0.05, so we cannot conclude that the quality of work is affected by the score for empathy group 1 (question 1,5,13,15,16) in an abusive leadership context. Same conclusions can be drawn for:

- E2 Q3: Sig = 0.729, p>0.05
- E3 Q3: Sig = 0.453, p>0.05
- E4 Q3: Sig = 0.439, p>0.05
- E5 Q3: Sig = 0.527, p>0.05

### ANOVA for each empathy score group for question about quality of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 Empathy Score</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.437</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.437</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>10.703</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11.142</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2 Empathy Score</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>10.880</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.938</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 3 Empathy Score</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>15.030</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.410</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 4 Empathy Score</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>9.825</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.090</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 5 Empathy Score</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>20.905</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.280</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the question 4, here we can draw the same conclusion E1 Q4: Sig = 0.944, p>0.05, so the trouble felt in an abusive leadership context is not correlated with the score for the empathy group 1. Same conclusions can be drawn for:

E2 Q4: Sig = 0.457, p>0.05
E3 Q4: Sig = 0.571, p>0.05
E4 Q4: Sig = 0.668, p>0.05
E5 Q4: Sig = 0.541, p>0.05

Secondly, the two other questions I asked looked into the reactions of employees towards abusive leadership. They were measured thanks to Likert 5 scale, thus, a correlation is usable in SPSS instead of ANOVA.

Questions:

- The opinion of the respondent about the efficiency of severe leadership in a general context (Q1)
- The motivation under abusive supervision in a personal context (Q2)

**Question 1.**

I used a scatter dot graph in order to visualize any correlation between empathy scores and the answer to question 1.
The scatter dots don’t seem to show any particular correlation between the two variables, but after that step I ran the test of correlation for the question 1 in confrontation with different empathy scores per group.

According to the board down under, the question 1 named “general motivation” there is a positive association between the variables as $r=0.498$ and $p<0.05$ that we can qualify as moderate according to our course at UIS by Burak Tunca on the PDF SPSS III.

Correlation table SPSS – Question 1 VS different group empathy scores
Question 2.

Same process as for question 1, I ran the test of correlation for the question 2 in confrontation with different empathy scores per group.

According to the board down under, there is no correlation between any empathy scores and the question 2 as all signification levels are above 5%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal motivation</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 Empathy Score</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 Empathy Score</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 Empathy Score</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 Empathy Score</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5 Empathy Score</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlation table SPSS – Question 2 VS different group empathy scores

As none of the correlation can be validated no further analyze with scatter dot was made.

1.7 Discussion & Conclusion

The goal of this thesis was to determine the possible influence of empathy on the response of employees facing abusive leadership.

Thanks to SPSS, with ANOVA and correlation calculations I tried to identify any link between the two constructs. For the first question no strong links were found with the most of empathy scores. It didn’t seem that one’s level of empathy is affecting the fact that we find
abusive leadership motivational or not except for one group of empathy. As the results show, there was a positive association between the Group 1 Empathy score and the first question about general motivational aspect of abusive leadership as $r=0.498$ and $p<0.05$.

As we said upper, this question tried to assert if in a general context, severe leadership that pushes employees to their limits is efficient for them to be performant. This did not specially concern the respondent but was more related to a general management context.

In other words, it may mean that the empathy level of respondents influences the fact that they perceive abusive leadership as motivational, thus, that may affect their response if there are confronted with abusive behavior from their superiors. For example, we may imagine that they feel more motivated by an aggressive supervisor and that they deliver better results because they are “pushed”, but further research could investigate why this group of empathy only was related to such results.

The three other questions didn’t show any conclusive results, or at least they couldn’t be validated according to the P values found.

**1.8 Limitations and future research**

It is admitted that this study may have certain limitations, and that the results may not apply to all the restaurants employees in France, due to the fact that the sample size is relatively small ($N=31$) due to the researcher’s limited access for gathering data. Also, it can always happen that the respondent didn’t understand the questions as the researcher wanted them to be understood which is a second limitation.

Future research could look into other trait in emotional intelligence affecting the response of employees facing abusive leadership like self awareness, Self Management, Internal motivation and Social Skills.
Also, as it was said previously, further research could also investigate why the group 1 of empathy only was related to the motivational perception of abusive leadership and not the other groups of empathy.
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APPENDIX

Table 1: The Toronto Empathy Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>When someone else is feeling excited, I tend to get excited too</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Other people's misfortunes do not disturb me a great deal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>It upsets me to see someone being treated disrespectfully</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I remain unaffected when someone close to me is happy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I enjoy making other people feel better</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>When a friend starts to talk about his/her problems, I try to steer the conversation towards something else</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I can tell when others are sad even when they do not say anything</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I find that I am &quot;in tune&quot; with other people's moods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I do not feel sympathy for people who cause their own serious illnesses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I become irritated when someone cries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I am not really interested in how other people feel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I get a strong urge to help when I see someone who is upset</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>When I see someone being treated unfairly, I do not feel very much pity for them</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I find it silly for people to cry out of happiness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards him/her</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Tepper scale

1. My boss makes negative comments about me to others.
2. My boss expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason.
3. My boss tells me my thoughts or feelings are stupid.
4. My boss tells me I'm incompetent.
5. My boss reminds me of my past mistakes and failures.
6. My boss breaks promises he/she makes.
7. My boss is rude to me.
8. My boss gives me the silent treatment.
9. My boss invades my privacy.
10. My boss puts me down in front of others.
11. My boss ridicules me.
Answers:

- I cannot remember her/him using this behavior with me
- He/she very seldom uses this behavior with me
- He/she occasionally uses this behavior with me
- He/she uses this behavior moderately often with me
- He/she uses this behavior very often with me

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>3.419</td>
<td>.9228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>3.452</td>
<td>1.1787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>3.968</td>
<td>.2123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>7.419</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>7.387</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>6.871</td>
<td>2.783</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s alpha Q2, Q4 and Q12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>7.3387</td>
<td>2.4088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>7.3394</td>
<td>1.33602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>3.2266</td>
<td>.87129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14R</td>
<td>1.0032</td>
<td>1.04419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>7.6452</td>
<td>5.903</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>8.0845</td>
<td>5.996</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>7.1613</td>
<td>8.340</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14R</td>
<td>8.5806</td>
<td>7.185</td>
<td>.509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s Alpha for Q7, Q8, Q9, and Q14
Cronbach’s Alpha for Q7, Q8 and Q11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.194</td>
<td>4.028</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.774</td>
<td>3.581</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.258</td>
<td>5.331</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s Alpha for Q3, Q6, Q10 and Q12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.516</td>
<td>.6256</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.903</td>
<td>.8309</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.968</td>
<td>1.1101</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.968</td>
<td>.9123</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s Alpha for Q1, Q5, Q13, Q15 and Q16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.935</td>
<td>.8538</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.387</td>
<td>.6672</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.935</td>
<td>.7273</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.903</td>
<td>1.2742</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.935</td>
<td>.9978</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.161</td>
<td>6.873</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.161</td>
<td>6.540</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.161</td>
<td>6.495</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.710</td>
<td>7.673</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.161</td>
<td>6.954</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>