Impact of Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions on Subordinate's Perception of Abusive Supervision

Shahid N Khan[1]

[1] Department of Management, Monash University, Australia

Correspondence: Shahid N Khan, Department of Management, Monash University, Australia. E-mail: shahid.khan@monash.edu

Abstract

This study is designed to explore and identify the impact of Hofstede's cultural dimensions on employees' perception of their supervisory abuse in a cross-cultural context e.g. Australia and Pakistan. This study is a conceptual and a literature review in nature, since the aim was to highlight and identify with the help of prior research the impact of Hofstede's cultural dimensions on the employees' perception of their supervisory abuse in a western and eastern cultural context e.g. Australia and Pakistan. The researcher with the help of literature review developed some propositions that show the impact of these cultural dimensions on employees' perception of abusive supervision in two different cultural contexts that can play a vital role in moderating employees' perception of supervisory abuse in a cross-cultural context e.g. Australia and Pakistan. The paper concludes that although abusive supervision exist in almost all countries and cultures but the intensity of abusive supervision and the subordinate's perception of their supervisory abuse is based upon their cultural values and norms which play an important role in shaping their perception regarding their supervisory abuse. The researcher has presented the Hofstede's cultural dimensions comparison table which distinguished these two countries e.g. Australia and Pakistan on multiple dimensions from each other and furthermore, it provide an important future research direction for an empirical investigation of subordinate's perception of supervisory abuse in these two countries e.g. Australia and Pakistan. Furthermore, study limitations and future research directions have also been discussed in this paper.

Keywords: abusive supervision, national culture, power distance, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance, long-term orientation

1. Introduction

The dark-side of a leadership 'Abusive Supervision' referred by Tepper (2000, p. 178) is the '…subordinates' perception of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviours, excluding physical contact'. The supervisory abuse in an organizational context falls in the domain of 'Abuse' which is of two kinds and which is even evident from the Tepper's definition of abusive supervision whose definition is based upon 'verbal and non-verbal behaviour, excluding physical contact' (Tepper, 2000, p. 178) means that there is another type of abuse called physical abuse (Keashly, Trott, & MacLean, 1994; Yıldız, 2007). These behaviours (abuses) are common in an organizational context but non-physical (verbal and non-verbal) are more common and frequent than physical (Yıldız, 2007). Physical abuse includes throwing things, punching, beating, threatening with weapons, and so forth. It has negative effects on the subordinate's performance and satisfaction (Keashly et al., 1994). While, non-physical abuse is speaking roughly and rudely with subordinates in order to disgrace them, publicly insulting and hurting their feelings, and so forth (Neuman & Baron, 1998). More specifically, the domain of abusive supervision includes breaking promises, withholding important information, rudeness, threats, public criticism, the silent treatment, inconsiderate actions, ridiculing in front of others, the use of disparaging language, and general intimidation tactics (Bies & Tripp, 1998, 2005; Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002). However, it is not one time show but is a sustained display of such abusive behaviour (Tepper, 2000). This argument is also supported by P. Harvey, Stoner, Hochwarter, and Kacmar (2007) and S. Harvey and Keashly (2003).

To highlight the differences in the perceptions of employees in different cultural contexts, it has been argued (Beyer, 1999; Conger, 1999; Dickson, Den Hartog, & Mitchelson, 2003; Pillai, Scandura, & Williams, 1999) that

the leadership style that is effective in the United States may not be effective in another country. From this standpoint, it is comprehensible that the needs for further study regarding employees' perceptions of abusive supervision in another cultural setting are desirable especially in a developed versus a developing country context. This is particularly the case given that the majority of the work to date has been done from a US and western perspective (Ashforth, 1994, 1997; Bowling & Michel, 2011; Namie & Namie, 2009; Neuman & Baron, 1998; Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al., 2009; Tepper, Duffy, Henle, & Lambert, 2006; Tepper, Henle, Lambert, Giacalone, & Duffy, 2008; Tepper, Moss, & Duffy, 2011; Tsapatsis, 2012), therefore it is argued that the work in the domain of abusive supervision is principally conducted by Americans, in an American and western cultural context and settings, which may not be applicable in other cultural settings especially in developing countries. Therefore, the researcher has tried to highlight and identified the cultural differences in context of Hofstede's cultural dimensions, in these two countries e.g. Australia and Pakistan that how the subordinates in these two totally different cultural contexts perceive supervisory abuse.

1.1 The Concept of National Culture

Culture plays an important role in predicting and observing the behaviour of different groups of people (David & Linda, 2013; Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 1991; Segall, 1986). Because cultural values and human behaviour are interrelated with each other, cultural values play an important role in distinguishing human behaviour from one group to another (Hofstede, 1994). Scholars from sociology, psychology and anthropology have pondered and argued the term 'culture' in their own fields of study which demonstrates its importance in human life.

Culture began with the creation of human life in this world. An earlier definition of culture was presented by Edward Taylor in 1871. He argued that culture is made up of the values, e.g., knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, customs, etc., acquired by man being member of a society (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952). Arnold, Tinker, and Lowry (1969) argued that it is a study of excellence and fineness. While, Parsons (1964) view it as a complex external symbol structure. Hofstede (1980) linked it to the human behaviour of a group of people. He argued that it is collective programming of mind which distinguishes one group of people from another. Shweder (1991) stated that people live in the world differently, which distinguishes them from one another.

While discussing culture, the famous definition of Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952, p. 181) cannot be ignored. They defined thus:

'Culture consists of pattern, explicit and implicit, of and for behaviour acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artefacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, and on the other as conditioning elements of further action'.

In this context, M. Harris (1971, 1975) takes the position that culture develops around the life-way and life-style acquired through socialization and is based upon the ways of thinking, feeling and acting that are part of society. Culture is all learned and shared behaviours that are found among human beings (Miller, 2005).

The Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) definition of culture above dominates other definitions of culture. Their definition is based upon historical analysis and their consideration of more than 150 definitions of culture while they were compiling their own. It is the most comprehensive definition of culture to date. The authenticity and acceptability of their definition is evident from the fact that their definition of culture is the most widely used and cited among the community of scholars throughout the world. Furthermore, Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) have carried out analysis and critical review of their definition of culture and they have identified six elements within the definition. These are: (1) Enumerative-descriptive (a list of the content of culture); (2) Historical (emphasising social heritage and traditions); (3) Normative (a focus on ideal behaviour); (4) Psychological (learning, habits, adjustment, problem solving); (5) Structural (a focus on cultural patterns or organisation); (6) Genetic (symbols, ideas and artefacts). Apart from this explanation of the culture's evaluation and history, the researcher in the appended below section tried to explain and highlight the Hofstede's cultural dimensions so as to give a brief introduction to the readers regarding the Hofstede's cultural dimensions and further its impact on the subordinate's perception of their supervisory abuse.

1.2 Frameworks for Understanding National Culture: Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

Hofstede (1980) developed a framework to link culture and organisational behaviour and that is considered the most useful framework for a scholarly community. His framework is based upon a comprehensive research involving 160,000 participants (managers and employees) from 53 countries throughout the world. The response rate was 117,000 questionnaires. He added that national culture is a criterion for judging differentiation between

attitudes and values within an organisation. He focused upon attitudes and values rather than individual's position, age, gender etc.

Hofstede et al. (1991, p. 5) defined national culture as '…the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another'. He argued that people's national character reflects their cultural mental programing. His contribution to the present field of cross-cultural studies is the 4-D model (four dimensions of national culture) which he later extended to a 5-D model (five dimensions of national culture). Hofstede, during his stay at IBM between 1978 and 1983, developed the 4-D model of national culture to differentiate people's behaviour, attitudes and values across four dimensions: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism versus collectivism, masculinity versus femininity. He extended this model to a 5-D model by adding one more dimension, long-term versus short-term orientation in life. Hofstede and his colleagues have now added two more dimensions: indulgence versus restrain and monumentalism versus self-effacement (Hofstede, Hofstede, Minkov, & Vinken, 2008). Appended below is a brief introduction of these cultural dimensions.

1.2.1 Power Distance

The power distance refers to '…the extent to which a society accepts the fact that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally' (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45) .The concept of power distance is based upon the measure of the interpersonal power and influence between a subordinate and superior. Less powerful members perceive that power within an organization is unequally distributed (Hofstede, 2001). This is linked with the values of less powerful and more powerful members of society and reflected in their organization life. This is very important while measuring or exploring a phenomenon in an organization. In high power distance cultures, employees may face and endure some undesirable and/or abusive behavior from their superiors due to unequal distribution of power (Kang & Jensen, 2009).

1.2.2 Uncertainty Avoidance

The concept of uncertainty is based upon a situation in which anything can happen to anyone and one cannot predict or control it (Hofstede, 2001).

1.2.3 Individualism / Collectivism

Individualism is to think and watch oneself while collectivism is to stay in a group and take care of one another. Hofstede (2001, p. 210) defined these terms as 'Individualism stands for a society in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after him/herself and his/her immediate family only'. While Collectivism stands for 'a society in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, which throughout people's lifetimes continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty'.

1.2.4 Masculinity / Femininity

The term masculinity refer to 'the dominant gender role pattern in the vast majority of both traditional and modern societies: the patterns of male assertiveness and female nurturance' (Hofstede, 2001, p. 280). The societies that are dominated by males, assertive, competitive and tough are an example of masculinity while societies that are dominated by the values typical of females caring, nurturing and concern for relationships and living environment (Hofstede, 1997). Swaidan and Hayes (2005) argued the characteristics of both gender in society, can distinguish one culture from another. He added that the masculine individuals are assertive and aggressive while feminine individuals are modest, caring, humble and nurturing.

1.2.5 Short-Term / Long-Term Orientation in Life

Short-term and long-term was the fifth dimension which Hofstede and Bond (1988) identified as an extension of 4-D model (four dimension of culture). They called this new dimension as 'Confucian dynamism' and the focus of this new dimension was on time, truth, prudence and thrift. Short-term and long-term orientation is closely linked with the society's point of view of time. As, some people are future oriented while others are present oriented. The western researchers labeled this dimension as 'time orientation' due to the tendency they show towards long or short-term orientation in their lives (Hofstede, 2001).

1.2.6 Indulgence / Restrain

Indulgence and Restrain is one of the two new dimensions developed by Hofstede et al. (2008) as a sixth dimension of the culture. Indulgence is based upon the concept of where some society allows individuals for free fulfillment of some desires and feelings i.e. socialization, amusement with friends, spending, consumption and sex. While, restraint dimension of culture restrict individuals from such fulfillment and where individuals cannot freely enjoy their lives.

1.2.7 Monumentalism / Self-Effacement

The seventh new dimension of culture monumentalism and self-effacement are extremes of one another. Monumentalish refers to the society attitude and behavior where people are rewarded for their monument proud, metaphorically speaking behavior while self-effacement refers to the society attitude and behavior where people are rewarded for their unpretentious, shy, down-to-earth attitude and behavior (Hofstede et al., 2008).

2. Impact of National Culture on Subordinate's Perception of Abusive Supervision

While exploring abusive supervision in a cross-cultural setting, the researcher took into account the Hofstede (1998, p. 16) three core questions. These are 'What are we comparing? Are nations suitable units for this comparison? Are the phenomenon we look at functionally equivalent?'. Similar questions were suggested by Drenth and Den Hartog (1999, p. 489) while conducting cross-cultural studies. 'First, do organisations located in different countries differ with respect to organisational characteristics, behaviour of members or the interrelationship between these two, and second, can these differences be explained in terms of culture?'. Peterson, Quintanilla, and Ruiz (2003) stressed the elements of etics (things that are universal to all cultures) and emics (things that are unique to a culture). Accordingly the present research highlighted the themes that are universal across all cultures, and those that are to each culture i.e., Australian and Pakistani in terms of abusive supervision.

Taking into account the element of universality while studying cross-cultural phenomenon, Lonner (1980) identified several types of 'universal' relationships, including: the simple universal, which is unvarying in nature throughout the world especially when the means are the same across cultures. The variform universal is the existence of general statement and principle across cultures but its representation may vary across cultures. Here culture plays a moderating role in the relationships. The functional universal means that correlations between variables are the same across culture. This universality was further extended by Bass (1997) by adding two more types in the typology of universality. He argued that the variform functional universal occurs when there exists a relationship between two variables, but magnitude of this relationship varies across cultures. The systematic behavioural universal, explains the if-then relationship across cultures. It further explains the consistency and invariability across culture.

Every culture has its own norms and values (Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999; Hofstede, 1980, 2001) which play an important role in shaping people's behaviour and perception about a phenomenon – especially when the phenomenon is a subjective one; e.g., abusive supervision as defined by its most authentic and agreed-upon definition 'Abusive supervision refers to subordinates' perception of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of the hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviours, excluding physical contact'(Tepper, 2000, p. 178). Among four characteristics of abusive supervision identified by Harris, Harvey, and Kacmar (2011) 'subjective assessment' wholly depends upon an employee's perception individually in an organisation as some subordinates may perceive a supervisor as abusive and some may not.

To highlight the differences in the perceptions of employees in different cultural contexts, it has been argued (Beyer, 1999; Conger, 1999; Dickson et al., 2003; Pillai et al., 1999) that the leadership style that is effective in the United States may not be effective in another country. From this standpoint, it is comprehensible that the needs for further study regarding employees' perceptions of abusive supervision in another cultural setting are desirable especially in a developed versus a developing country context. This is particularly the case given that the majority of the work to date has been done from a US and western perspective (Ashforth, 1994, 1997; Bowling & Michel, 2011; Namie & Namie, 2009; Neuman & Baron, 1998; Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al., 2009; Tepper et al., 2006; Tepper et al., 2008; Tepper et al., 2011; Tsapatsis, 2012), therefore it is argued that the work in the domain of abusive supervision is principally conducted by Americans, in an American and western cultural context and settings, which may not be applicable in other cultural settings especially in developing countries.

Kang and Jensen (2009) examined the influences of power distance and collectivism on abusive supervision and found a positive relationship between high power distance and the subordinate's perception of abusive supervision, while they further reported collectivism playing a moderating role between the relationship of perceived abusive supervision to its negative consequences. Cultures with high power distance create more abusive supervision and subordinates consider such behaviour normal. In cultures dominated by high power distance, supervisors normally used to have more authority which motivated them towards an authoritarian management style and hence the common practice of authoritarian management style becomes a norm and value of a culture. This authoritarian management style is defined by Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang, and Farh (2004, p. 91) as a 'supervisor's behaviour that asserts absolute authority and control over subordinates and demands unquestionable obedience from subordinates'. In countries with high power distance, abusive supervision is

practiced lawfully towards subordinates (Tepper, 2007). But contrary to this assertion, Lian, Ferris, and Brown (2012) reported that subordinates in a high power distance culture perceive less likely their supervisor's abusive behaviour as unfair. Similarly, Lin, Wang, and Chen (2013) reported that subordinates in high power distance culture respond less negatively to supervisory abuse. In a similar vein, Wang, Mao, Wu, and Liu (2012) reported less interactional injustice of abused employees in a high power distance culture.

According to Triandis (1995), in individualistic cultures, people considered themselves as independent parts of society and are motivated by their own rights, preferences and needs, while in collectivist cultures, people considered themselves part of a whole, e.g., a family, tribe, nation, etc., and are motivated by the norms and duties of the collective group. Therefore it is argued that due to the sensitive nature of individuals in individualistic cultures, the effects of abusive supervision would be more pronounced as compared to individuals in a collectivist culture, As Hu, Wu, and Wang (2011) compared two opposite cultures, i.e., the United States and Taiwan, in terms of power distance and individualism/collectivism. They found that the United States is high in individualism and low in power distance while Taiwan is high in power distance and collectivism (Hofstede, 2013), and as a result individuals in each country respond differently to abusive supervision. In a society like Taiwan, abusive supervision is favoured due to it being high in power distance (Cheng et al., 2004) as compared to the United States. It is worthwhile, to mention another important study of Kernan, Watson, Chen, and Kim (2011) in which they investigated three cultural dimensions (e.g. power distance, achievement orientation and benevolence) and found support for the moderating impact of achievement orientation and benevolence on the relationship of abusive supervision and few outcome variables e.g. job satisfaction, job involvement, well-being, and perceived organizational support.

2.1 Prevalence of Abusive Supervision Studies in Western Cultural Context

The studies mentioned in the table below, have been selected on the basis of their relevance to the present study, their journal ranking, and their number of citations. The researcher has mentioned abusive supervision studies conducted mostly in a single cultural context, appended below in tabulated form. As Lines (2008, p. 73) cited in his book, Smith (1994) discussed abuse in these words 'The exact definition of abuse depends upon the social and cultural context'. This helped the researcher to identify the opportunity for the present cross-cultural study, as very few studies to date have been conducted in such a context, especially in a developed versus developing country context such as Australia and Pakistan. While, Ng (2010) conducted a qualitative study in two developed countries (USA and Australia). She conducted this comparative study on the similarity of their economies, cultures and historical traditions. Recent research has identified a need to conduct a study comparing two different cultural contexts (Jian, Kwan, Qiu, Liu, & Yim, 2011). Therefore, the present study seeks to compare the culture of a developed country with that of a developing country in the context of employees' perceptions and experiences of supervisory abuse at work.

The table 1 provides sound justification and support for the present research as by conducting this study of abusive supervision in a cross-cultural context, as the majority of the studies in this domain have been conducted in the USA and western countries while there is a need for cross-cultural comparison especially in the cultural context of developed versus developing countries. In order to achieve this purpose, the researcher with the help of prior research has developed some propositions.

Table 1. Summary of studies showing lack of cross-cultural understandings of the phenomenon of supervisory abuse at work in cross-cultural context and prevalence of quantitative approach

Papers	Sample Size	Research Design	Country of Study	Findings
Tepper (2000)	341	Supervised employees, two-wave (6 months), single-source	United States	Abusive supervision is positively correlated with turnover, lower job and life satisfaction, lower normative and affective commitment, and higher continuance commitment, conflict between work and family, and psychological distress.
Zellars et al. (2002)	373	Supervisor-subordinate dyad, two source, cross-sectional		Abusive supervision is positively correlated with subordinate's OCB, those subordinates who define OCB as extra role behaviour.
S. Aryee, Li-Yun, Zhen	178	Supervisor-subordinate dyad,	China	The supervisor's high authoritarian leadership style moderated the relationship between supervisor's

Author	N	Methodology	Country	Findings
Xiong, and Debrah (2007)		cross-sectional, multisource		perceived interactional justice and abusive supervision.
Burris, Detert, and Chiaburu (2008)	499 Study 1 234 Study 2	Cross-sectional, single-source, Longitudinal (two weeks), single-source	United States	Psychological detachment is significantly correlated to voice and mediates relationships between leadership (LMX and abusive supervision) and voice.
P. Harvey et al. (2007)	715	Working employees, cross-sectional, single source	United States	The low PA (positive affect) employees when restrained from ingratiation tactics face higher level of job tension, emotional exhaustion and turnover intention.
Hoobler and Brass (2006)	210	Subordinate, supervisor, family member triads, cross-sectional, multi-source		The supervisor's psychological contract breach is positively correlated with subordinates and supervisors' family member's perceived abusiveness.
Mitchell and Ambrose (2007)	427	Supervised employees, cross-sectional, single-source	United States	Abusive supervision is positively related to supervisor directed deviance and this relationship is even stronger when subordinates hold higher negative reciprocity beliefs.
Tepper, Duffy, and Shaw (2001)	See Tepper, 2000		United States	The relationship between abusive supervision and a subordinate's dysfunctional resistance was moderated by a subordinate's personality traits. This relationship was stronger for subordinates who were high in conscientiousness and low in agreeableness.
Tepper et al. (2006)	See Zeller et al, 2002			The relationship between supervisor's procedural justice and subordinate's perceived abusiveness was mediated by supervisor's depression and this relationship was stronger for subordinate's high in negative affectivity.
K. J. Harris, Kacmar, and Zivnuska (2007)	204	Automotive employees, cross-sectional, multi-source	United States	Abusive supervision is negatively related to two out of three performance ratings, e.g., formal and supervisor's ratings, while meaning of work moderated this relationship between abusive supervision and all performance ratings.
Tepper et al. (2008)	243 Study 1 247 Study 2	Supervised employees, 2-wave Employees from 68 work groups, cross-sectional	United States	The effects of abusive supervision on organisational deviance are stronger, coupled with mediating effects of affective commitment and when co-workers perform more acts of organisational deviance.
Thau, Bennett, Mitchell, and Marrs (2009)	377 Study 1 1477 Study 2	Supervised employees, single-source, cross-sectional Supervised employees, single-source, cross-sectional	United States	In study 1, the relationship between abusive supervision and workplace deviance was stronger for employees who perceived management style highly authoritarian while study 2 completely supported the UMT (uncertainty management theory) in that this relationship is stronger for the employees who perceived a high level of uncertainty in management style.
Tepper et al. (2009)	797 Study 1 356 Study 2	Cross-sectional, single-source, Longitudinal (two weeks), single-source	United States	The relationship between abusive supervision and a subordinate's organisational deviance and supervisor-directed deviance is significant when subordinate's job intention is high. Furthermore, this relationship is stronger towards supervisory deviance than organisational deviance.
Bamberger and Bacharach (2006)	1473	Blue-collar workers from 55 work units, cross-sectional, multi-source	United States	There is positive correlation between abusive supervision and subordinate's drinking problem and this relationship is stronger when subordinates are low in agreeableness and conscientiousness.

| **Tepper, Moss, Lockhart, and Carr (2007)** | Qualitative Literature Review | United States | The author conducted a qualitative literature review regarding the antecedents and consequences of abusive supervision at work and reported that to date majority of studies have been conducted in terms of its antecedents and consequences. |

2.2 Selection of Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions for Present Study

The researcher's selection of Hofstede's cultural dimensions as a criteria for comparing the Australian and Pakistani cultures, in terms of subordinate's perception of their supervisory abuse that how two different cultural countries individuals (subordinates) perceive their supervisory abuse differently in an organizational context, is based upon these reasons.

(a) The majority of studies conducted in the domain of abusive supervision have used Hofstede's cultural dimensions for comparing the cultures (Cheng et al., 2004; Hu et al., 2011; Kang & Jensen, 2009).

(b) Hofstede (2013) shows data from 93 countries against his 5-D model. For the present study, the researcher has compared Australian and Pakistani cultures on the dimensions that follow as compared to Hofstede. The following table shows that Australia and Pakistan are totally different, in fact rather opposite in cultural aspects, especially with regard to individualism/collectivism, power distance and long-term orientation. The table provides solid ground for comparing two different cultures in a context of abusive supervision.

Table 2. Hofstede's 5-D model of cultural comparison

5-D Model	**Australia**	**Pakistan**
Power Distance	36	55
Individualism	90	14
Masculinity	61	50
Uncertainty Avoidance	51	70
Long-term Orientation	31	0

Source: Adopted from Hofstede (2013).

(c) The majority of studies in the domain of abusive supervision have been conducted in the context of developed and western countries (Ashforth, 1994, 1997; Bowling & Michel, 2011; Namie & Namie, 2009; Neuman & Baron, 1998; Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al., 2009; Tepper et al., 2006; Tepper et al., 2008; Tepper et al., 2011; Tsapatsis, 2012), while in the present study, the researcher tried to identify the cultural differences between developed and developing countries, i.e., Australia and Pakistan, one representing western culture and the other representing the eastern culture.

(d) There are very few studies conducted in Australian context e.g. (Grice, Sheehan, McCarthy, Barker, & Henderson, 2003; Kiazad, Restubog, Zagenczyk, Kiewitz, & Tang, 2010; Ng, 2010) and in Pakistani context e.g. (Bashir & Hanif, 2011; Gadit & Mugford, 2008; Imran, 2010; Khan, Qureshi, & Ahmad, 2010; Mukhtar et al., 2010; Khan, 2014). The researcher has tried to identify some abusive supervision studies in a tabulated form that have been conducted in different countries and cultures. Here it is important to mention that most of the studies have been conducted in a single cultural context while there is a need for a cross-cultural study especially in a developed and developing country context e.g. Australia and Pakistan. As these both countries are totally different from each other on the basis of their economic situation, religion and especially on their cultural grounds.

Table 3. Abusive supervision studies conducting in different countries

S/No.	Countries	Studies
1	China	(Samuel Aryee, Chen, Sun, & Debrah, 2007; Jian et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2012; Wei & Si, 2013; Xiaqi, Kun, Chongsen, & Sufang, 2012; Xu, Huang, Lam, & Miao, 2012)
2	North America	(Tepper, 2000; Tepper 2007; Tepper et al., 2009; Tepper et al., 2006; Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, & Ensley, 2004; Tepper, Duffy, et al., 2001; Tepper et al., 2008; Tepper, Lockhart, & Hoobler, 2001; Tepper et al., 2011; Tepper et al., 2007; Ashforth, 1994, 1997; Baron & Neuman, 1998; Bowling & Michel, 2011; Carpenter, Geletkanycz, & Sanders, 2004; Christmas, 2007; DelBel, 2003; Dupré, Inness, Connelly, Barling, & Hoption, 2006; Namie & Namie, 2009; Tsapatsis, 2012)
3	Australia	(Grice et al., 2003 ; Ng, 2010 ; Kiazad et al., 2010)
4	United Kingdom	(Turnbull, 1995; Deborah, 2000; McMillan, 1995)
5	Pakistan	(Khan et al., 2010, Khan, 2010; Khan, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c ; Imran, 2010; Mukhtar et al., 2010; Bashir & Hanif, 2011; Gadit & Mugford, 2008)
6	Israel	(Dana Yagil, 2006)
7	Turkey	(Yıldız, 2007)
8	Germany	(Zapf, Knorz, & Kulla, 1996)
9	Slovenia	(Duffy, Michelle, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002)
10	Philippines	(Rafferty & Restubog, 2011; Kiazad et al., 2010)
11	Spain	(Mariano & María, 2008)
12	Taiwan	(Hu et al., 2011)

That's why on the basis of their cultural dissimilarities, the researcher has tried to identify and proposed differences in the perceptions of the employees regarding abusive supervision which is even evident from the table 2 of the Hofstede's 5-D Model of Cultural Comparison. The score of these cultural dimensions e.g. power distance, Individualism, Masculinity, Uncertainty Avoidance, Long-term Orientation shows the differences in these two cultures. Based upon these cultural dimensions dissimilarities between these two cultures, the researcher developed the appended below propositions.

Proposition 1: High power distance employees will be less likely to perceive their supervisory abusive while low power distance employees will be more likely to perceive their supervisory abuse.

Proposition 2: High individualistic cultural employees will be more likely to perceive their supervisory abusive while low individualistic cultural employees will be less likely to perceive their supervisory abuse.

Proposition 3: High masculinity cultural employees will be less likely to perceive their supervisory abusive while low masculinity cultural employees will be more likely to perceive their supervisory abuse.

Proposition 4: High uncertainty avoidance cultural employees will be less likely to perceive their supervisory abusive while low uncertainty avoidance cultural employees will be more likely to perceive their supervisory abuse.

Proposition 5: High long-term orientation cultural employees will be less likely to perceive their supervisory abusive while low long-term orientation cultural employees will be more likely to perceive their supervisory abuse.

3. Conclusion

Most of the literature on abusive supervision has focused on its antecedents, consequences and the factors and reasons for its occurrence, while, most of the research studies have adopted a positivist and quantitative research approach. There is a lack of understanding of the subordinate's perception of their supervisory abuse in a cross-cultural context. In this regard, the researcher has discussed abusive supervision at work from its historical perspective and tried to compare two different cultural countries e.g. Australia and Pakistan on the basis of Hofstede's cultural dimensions.

In order to demonstrate a national culture's impact on subordinate's perception of supervisory abuse, the author defined the concept of national culture through some prominent scholars' studies of how national cultures evolve

and how cultural differences occurred by employing (Hofstede, 1980, 2013) cultural dimensions which view different cultures through defined cultural dimensions which work like a lens to understand the differences between cultures. Then the researcher have linked the culture with the present study and discussed the impact of national culture on subordinate's perception of supervisory abuse, as the predominant focus upon US contexts limited our appreciation of how employees in different cultural contexts may experience and understand the issues of abusive supervision. Comparing Australia and Pakistan represented a useful conceptual and literature review approach to surface anticipated differences in employees' experiences and understandings of abusive supervision.

4. Limitations/Future Research Directions

In terms of study limitations and future research directions, this study is not flawless as earlier mentioned that this study is a conceptual and literature review paper which highlighted the issue of abusive supervision which is prevalent in all countries and all cultures of the world. In most of the cross-cultural studies of abusive supervision, they have taken into account for empirical testing only few cultural dimensions while in the present study the researcher have identified totally two different countries which is evident from the Hofstede's cultural dimension's score of the both countries e.g. Australia and Pakistan. No doubt, all the western and eastern countries are different from each other in context of their cultural differences but for the present study, the researcher have selected the countries that are distinct from each other in terms of economic conditions as Australia is a developed country while Pakistan is a developing country, in terms of religion and language which play a vital role in shaping their cultural differences. As there is a huge gap between these two countries in context of Hofstede's cultural dimension, so there is a good future research direction for empirical studies to be conducted into these two countries, such as the Australia and Pakistan.

References

Arnold, M., Tinker, C., & Lowry, H. (1969). *Poetical Works: Ed. by CB Tinker and HF Lowry*. Oxford University Press.

Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L. Y., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 191–201. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.191

Aryee, S., Li-Yun, S., Zhen, X. C., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and Outcomes of Abusive Supervision: Test of a Trickle-Down Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 191–201.

Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations, 47*(7), 755-778. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001872679404700701

Ashforth, B. (1997). Petty Tyranny in Organizations: A Preliminary Examination of Antecedents and Consequences. *Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration/Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 14*(2), 126–140.

Bamberger, P. A., & Bacharach, S. B. (2006). Abusive supervision and subordinate problem drinking: taking resistance, stress and subordinate personality into account. *Human Relations, 59*(6), 723–752.

Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1998). Workplace aggression - The iceberg beneath the tip of workplace violence: Evidence on its froms, frequency, and targets. *Public Administration Quarterly, 21*(4), 446–464.

Bashir, A., & Hanif, R. (2011). Prevalence and Forms of Workplace Bullying among Telecommunication Personnel in Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 3*(5), 634–647.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist, 52*(2), 130.

Beyer, J. M. (1999). Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 307–330.

Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (1998). Two faces of powerless: Coping with tyranny. In R. M. K. M. A. Neale (Ed.), *Power and influence in organizations* (pp. 203–219). CA: Thousand Oaks.

Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (2005). The Study of Revenge in the Workplace: Conceptual, Ideological, and Empirical Issues. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 65–81). Washington, DC US: American Psychological Association.

Bowling, N. A., & Michel, J. S. (2011). Why do you treat me badly? The role of attributions regarding the cause of abuse in subordinates' responses to abusive supervision. *Work & Stress, 25*(4), 309–320.

Burris, E. R., Detert, J. R., & Chiaburu, D. S. (2008). Quitting Before Leaving: The Mediating Effects of Psychological Attachment and Detachment on Voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(4), 912–922.

Carpenter, M. A., Geletkanycz, M. A., & Sanders, W. G. (2004). Upper Echelons Research Revisited: Antecedents, Elements, and Consequences of Top Management Team Composition. *Journal of Management, 30*(6), 749–778.

Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., Wu, T. Y., Huang, M. P., & Farh, J. L. (2004). Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 7*(1), 89–117.

Christmas, K. (2007). Human resource solutions. Workplace abuse: finding solutions. *Nursing Economic, 25*(6), 365–367.

Conger, J. A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's perspective on these developing streams of research. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 145–179.

Dana, Y. (2006). The relationship of service provider power motivation, empowerment and burnout to customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Service Industry Management, 17*(3), 258–270.

David, M., & Linda, J. (2013). *Culture and Psychology* (5th ed.). CA, USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Deborah, L. (2000). An analysis of workplace bullying in the UK. *Personnel Review, 29*(5), 593–610.

DelBel, J. C. (2003). De-escalating workplace aggression. *Nursing Management, 34*(9), 31–34.

Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Dorfman, P. W. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 219–256.

Dickson, M. W., Den Hartog, D. N., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2003). Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(6), 729–768. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.002

Drenth, P. J. D., & Den Hartog, D. N. (1999). Culture and organizational differences. In W. J. Lonner, D. L. Dinnel, D. K. Forgays & S. A. Hayes (Eds.), *Merging past, present, and future in cross-cultural psychology: Selected papers from the Fourteenth International Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology* (pp. 489–502). Lisse Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger Publishers.

Duffy, E., Michelle, K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social Undermining in the Workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(2), 331–351.

Dupré, K. E., Inness, M., Connelly, C. E., Barling, J., & Hoption, C. (2006). Workplace aggression in teenage part-time employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5), 987–997. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.987

Gadit, A. A. M., & Mugford, G. (2008). A pilot study of bullying and harassment among medical professionals in Pakistan, focussing on psychiatry: need for a medical ombudsman. *Journal of Medical Ethics, 34*(6), 463–466. http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jme.2007.021832

Grice, T., Sheehan, M., McCarthy, P., Barker, M., & Henderson, M. (2003). Workplace bullying: Issues, impacts and interventions. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 55*, 125–125.

Harris, K. J., Harvey, P., & Kacmar, K. M. (2011). Abusive supervisory reactions to coworker relationship conflict. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*(5), 1010–1023. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.07.020

Harris, K. J., Kacmar, K. M., & Zivnuska, S. (2007). An investigation of abusive supervision as a predictor of performance and the meaning of work as a moderator of the relationship. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 252–263.

Harris, M. (1971). Culture, man, and nature: an introduction to general anthropology: Crowell New York.

Harris, M. (1975). Culture, people, and nature: an introduction to general anthropology: Crowell New York.

Harvey, P., Stoner, J., Hochwarter, W., & Kacmar, C. (2007). Coping with abusive supervision: The neutralizing effects of ingratiation and positive affect on negative employee outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 264–280.

Harvey, S., & Keashly, L. (2003). Predicting the risk for agression in the workplace: Risk factors, self-esteem and time at work Social Behavior & Personality. *An International Journal, 31*(8), 807–814.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Vol. 5). Sage Publications, Incorporated.

Hofstede, G. (1994). Management scientists are human. *Management science, 40*(1), 4–13.

Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and organizations: software of the mind.* New York, USA: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (1998). A case for comparing apples with oranges. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 39*(1), 16.

Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: SAGE Publications, Incorporated.

Hofstede, G. (2013). The Hofstede Center. Retrieved 10 Aug, 2013, from http://geert-hofstede.com/

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1988). The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth. *Organizational Dynamics, 16*(4), 5–21.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (Vol. 2). McGraw-Hill London.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., Minkov, M., & Vinken, H. (2008). Values survey module 2008. Retrieved from http://www.geerthofstede.nl/media/253/VSM08English. doc

Hoobler, J. M., & Brass, D. J. (2006). Abusive Supervision and Family Undermining as Displaced Aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5), 1125–1133.

Hu, C., Wu, T. Y., & Wang, Y. H. (2011). Measurement Equivalence/Invariance of the Abusive Supervision Measure Across Workers From Taiwan and the United States. *Journal of Psychology, 145*(2), 111–131.

Imran, N. J., M. Haider, I. I., & Masood, Z. (2010). Bullying of junior doctors in Pakistan: a cross-sectional survey. *Singapore Med J, 51*(7), 592–595.

Jian, Z., Kwan, H. K., Qiu, Q., Liu, Z. Q., & Yim, F. H. K. (2011). Abusive supervision and frontline employees' service performance. *The Service Industries Journal, 32*(5), 683–698.

Kang, J. H., & Jensen, J. M. (2009). *Cultural Matters in Entrepreneurial Firms: Abusive Supervision and Its Consequences.* Washington.

Keashly, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L. M. (1994). Abusive Behavior in the Workplace: A Preliminary Investigation. *Violence and Victims, 9*(4), 341–357.

Kernan, M. C., Watson, S., Chen, F. F., & Kim, T. G. (2011). How cultural values affect the impact of abusive supervision on worker attitudes. *Cross Cultural Management, 18*(4), 464-484. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13527601111179528

Khan, S. N., Qureshi, I. M., & Ahmad, H. I. (2010). Abusive Supervision and Negative Employee Outcomes. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 15*(4), 490–500.

Khan, S. N. (2010). Impact of Authentic Leaders on Organization Performance. *International Journal of Business and Management, 5*(12), 167-172.

Khan, S. N. (2014a). Qualitative Research Method - Grounded Theory. *International Journal of Business and Management, 9*(11), 224-233.

Khan, S. N. (2014b). Qualitative research method - Phenomenology. *Asian Social Science, 10*(21), 298-310.

Khan, S. N. (2014c). A step towards distinction between supervisory impulsive and strategic abuse. *Asian Social Science, 10*(21), 281-297.

Kiazad, K., Restubog, S. L. D., Zagenczyk, T. J., Kiewitz, C., & Tang, R. L. (2010). In pursuit of power: The role of authoritarian leadership in the relationship between supervisors' Machiavellianism and subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervisory behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality, 44*(4), 512–519. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2010.06.004

Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions. Papers. Peabody Museum of Archaeology & Ethnology, Harvard University.

Lian, H., Ferris, D. L., & Brown, D. J. (2012). Does Power Distance Exacerbate or Mitigate the Effects of Abusive Supervision? It Depends on the Outcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(1), 107–123.

Lin, W., Wang, L., & Chen, S. (2013). Abusive Supervision and Employee Well-Being: The Moderating Effect of

Power Distance Orientation. *Applied Psychology, 62*(2), 308–329. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2012.00520.x

Lines, D. (2008). *The Bullies: Understanding Bullies and Bullying* (1st ed.). London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.

Lonner, W. J. (1980). The search for psychological universals. In H. C. Traindis & W. W. Lambert (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 143–204).

Mariano, M. P., & María, I. S. S. (2008). Workplace mobbing and effects on workers' health. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 11*(1), 219–227.

McMillan, I. (1995). Losing control... bullying in the workplace. *Nursing Times, 91*(15), 40.

Miller, B. D. (2005). CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY, 3/e.

Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive Supervision and Workplace Deviance and the Moderating Effects of Negative Reciprocity Beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(4), 1159–1168.

Mukhtar, F., Daud, S., Manzoor, I., Amjad, I., Saeed, K., Naeem, M., & Javed, M. (2010). Bullying of medical students. *J Coll Physicians Surg Pak, 20*(12), 814–818.

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2009). U.S. Workplace bullying: Some basic considerations and consultation interventions. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 61*(3), 202–219. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0016670

Neuman, J., & Baron, R. (1998). Workplace voilence and workplace aggression: Evidence concerning specific forms, potential csuses, and preferred targets. *Journal of Management, 24*(3), 391–419.

Ng, A. (2010). "Chasing Rainbows": Challenging Workplace Bullyeng in Australia and the United States. *Journal of Workplace Rights, 15*(2), 213–228.

Parsons, T. (1964). Evolutionary universals in society. *American Sociological Review*, 339–357.

Peterson, M. F., Quintanilla, & Ruiz, S. A. (2003). Using emics and etics in cross-cultural organizational studies: Universal and local, tacit and explicit. *Cross-Cultural Management: Foundations and Future*, 73–101.

Pillai, R., Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A. (1999). Leadership and Organizational Justice: Similarities and Differences across Cultures. *Journal of International Business Studies, 30*(4), 763–779.

Rafferty, A. E., & Restubog, S. L. D. (2011). The Influence of Abusive Supervisors on Followers' Organizational Citizenship Behaviours: The Hidden Costs of Abusive Supervision. *British Journal of Management, 22*(2), 270–285.

Segall, M. H. (1986). Culture and behavior: Psychology in global perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 37*(1), 523–564.

Shweder, R. A. (1991). *Thinking through cultures: Expeditions in cultural psychology*. Harvard University Press.

Smith, P. K. S. S. (1994). School Bullying: Insights and Perspectives.

Swaidan, Z., & Hayes, L. A. (2005). Hofstede Theory and Cross Cultural Ethics Conceptualization, Review, and Research Agenda. *Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge, 6*(2), 10–15.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(2), 178–190. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1556375

Tepper , B. J. (2007). Abusive Supervision in Work Organizations: Review, Synthesis, and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management, 33*(3), 261–289. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300812

Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., Breaux, D. M., Geider, S., Hu, C., & Hua, W. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 109*(2), 156–167. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.03.004

Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Henle, C. A., & Lambert, L. S. (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(1), 101–123.

Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Hoobler, J., & Ensley, M. D. (2004). Moderators of the relationships between coworkers' organizational citizenship behavior and fellow employees' attitudes. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(3), 455–465.

Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive

supervision and subordinates' resistance. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(5), 974–983.

Tepper, B. J., Henle, C. A., Lambert, L. S., Giacalone, R. A., & Duffy, M. K. (2008). Abusive Supervision and Subordinates' Organization Deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(4), 721–732.

Tepper, B. J., Lockhart, D., & Hoobler, J. (2001). Justice, citizenship, and role definition effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(4), 789–796.

Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., & Duffy, M. K. (2011). Predictors of abusive supervision: Supervisor perceptions of deep-level dissmiliarity, relationship conflict, and subordinate performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 54*(2), 279–294.

Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., Lockhart, D. E., & Carr, J. C. (2007). Abusive supervision, upward maintenance communication, and subordinates' psychological distress. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(5), 1169–1180.

Thau, S., Bennett, R. J., Mitchell, M. S., & Marrs, M. B. (2009). How management style moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and workplace deviance: An uncertainty management theory perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 108*(1), 79–92.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism & collectivism: New directions in social psychology.: Westview Press, US.

Tsapatsis, M. (2012). Michael Tsapatsis. *Angew Chem Int Ed Engl, 51*(36), 8926. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/anie.201202071

Turnbull, J. (1995). Violence. Hitting back at the bullies. *Nursing times, 91*(3), 24–27.

Wang, W., Mao, J., Wu, W., & Liu, J. (2012). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance: the mediating role of interactional justice and the moderating role of power distance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 50*(1), 43–60. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7941.2011.00004.x

Wei, F., & Si, S. (2013). Tit for tat? Abusive supervision and counterproductive work behaviors: The moderating effects of locus of control and perceived mobility. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 30*(1), 281–296. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10490-011-9251-y

Xiaqi, D., Kun, T., Chongsen, Y., & Sufang, G. (2012). Abusive supervision and LMX: Leaders' emotional intelligence as antecedent variable and trust as consequence variable. *Chinese Management Studies, 6*(2), 257–270.

Xu, E., Huang, X., Lam, C. K., & Miao, Q. (2012). Abusive supervision and work behaviors: The mediating role of LMX. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(4), 531–543.

Yıldız, S. (2007). A 'New' Problem in the Workplace: Psychological Abuse (Bullying). *Journal of Academic Studies, 9*(34), 113–128.

Zapf, D., Knorz, C., & Kulla, M. (1996). On the relationship between mobbing factors, and job content, social work environment, and health outcomes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5*(2), 215–237.

Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *J Appl Psychol, 87*(6), 1068–1076.

Copyrights