

Under Pressure: Examining the Effects of Mindfulness and Abusive Work Environment on Employee Well-Being and Turnover Intentions in the Manufacturing Industry

Dr. Donato S. Gallego*, Antonette Mae C. Espora., Ramz Khen D. Gonzales., Ma. Paula C. Mercado., Kristine S. Miguel., Laine Althea D. Octavo., Giane Carlo G. Roxas

Dr. Yanga's Colleges, Inc., College of Business Administration, Philippines

***Corresponding Author**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.91100532>

Received: 05 December 2025; Accepted: 12 December 2025; Published: 22 December 2025

ABSTRACT

This study examined how abusive work environments, specifically abusive supervision and abusive coworker treatment, affected employee well-being and turnover intentions in the Philippine manufacturing sector. Grounded in Social Information Processing Theory, the research also assessed whether mindfulness moderated these relationships. A quantitative correlational design was employed, involving survey data from 343 manufacturing employees in Bulacan. The analysis evaluated how exposure to workplace abuse diminished well-being and shaped employees' intentions to leave, while determining whether mindfulness functioned as a protective or amplifying factor. Addressing gaps in current literature, particularly within high-pressure and male-dominated industries, the study contributed empirical evidence to the fields of Human Resources and Psychology. It also aligned with Sustainable Development Goals related to health and decent work, offering insights that may guide organizations in developing policies and interventions that support employee well-being and reduce turnover. These findings underscored the need for proactive strategies to cultivate healthier and more supportive manufacturing workplaces.

Key Words: Abusive Supervision, Abusive Coworker Treatment, Mindfulness, Employee Well-being, Turnover Intentions

INTRODUCTION

Workplace abuse is often discussed in abstract terms, yet its effects were profoundly personal for those who experienced it. Dmitry Pavlov's case illustrated this reality. He was harassed by a superior who initially appeared supportive but soon became controlling, scrutinizing his every action and holding him responsible for issues beyond his role. The resulting burnout, insomnia, diminished self-esteem, and sense of powerlessness reflected what many employees continued to endure when colleagues and managers remained complicit rather than intervening (Pavlov, 2021). This pattern aligned with broader evidence showing that abusive supervision and coworker mistreatment frequently emerged in demanding, competitive workplaces, manifesting through rudeness, silent treatment, public outbursts, and subtle undermining (Kim, 2021; Yang & Xu, 2024). Awareness of such mistreatment often intensified its effects, eroding autonomy, competence, and belonging, ultimately undermining performance and well-being (Ng et al., 2023). Although mindfulness had typically been associated with enhanced psychological health (Diachenko et al., 2021), its role became complex when individuals remained fully aware of environments where abuse persisted.

These patterns were also historically embedded. Manufacturing, one of the most male-dominated sectors since the Industrial Revolution, had long been characterized by harsh supervision and tolerance for verbal or physical mistreatment (Britannica, 2025). Contemporary data continued to reveal gendered disparities: women reported abusive treatment at significantly higher rates than men, with 41 percent having experienced such conduct (MIT Sloan Management Review, 2023). In many settings, abusive supervision remained normalized as a misguided

approach to increasing productivity (International Finance Corporation, 2020). Evidence from Nigerian manufacturing firms, for instance, linked abusive supervision to low morale, heightened turnover intentions, and career stagnation (Oginni, 2024). Globally, as much as 60 percent of manufacturing workers reported difficulty meeting unreasonable production quotas—conditions that heightened their exposure to verbal and physical mistreatment (Alshahrani et al., 2021). Employees often tolerated these pressures in pursuit of economic stability; however, prolonged exposure, as explained by the Job Demands–Resources Theory, ultimately led to burnout and reduced well-being (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014). Because well-being strongly predicted loyalty and turnover intention, understanding how abusive environments shaped such outcomes remained essential (Han et al., 2020).

In response, some organizations adopted mindfulness programs and employee engagement initiatives to buffer stress and improve performance. Practices such as yoga and mindfulness meditation showed potential to reduce burnout, lower absenteeism, and improve work efficiency (Hermawan et al., 2020; Prasad, 2023). Mindfulness—defined as sustained awareness of moment-to-moment experiences (Dhiman, 2020)—had been associated with enhanced performance, productivity, agility, and innovative capacity (Ihl et al., 2022; Vonderlin et al., 2020). Yet emerging research cautioned that in hostile environments, mindfulness could function as a double-edged sword, heightening sensitivity to abusive interactions and exacerbating emotional strain (Yang & Xu, 2024). These findings raised important questions about whether mindfulness moderated or intensified the negative effects of workplace mistreatment.

Although Yang and Xu's (2024) work provided an important conceptual foundation, it focused exclusively on the U.S. lodging industry, leaving open questions about how these dynamics operated across different economic sectors and cultural contexts. The Philippines presented a distinct case. Reports of worker exploitation and mass layoffs—including widely publicized “*job massacres*” in the garment sector—underscored persistent structural vulnerabilities (Ang Bayan, 2023). Whether similar patterns of abuse manifested across the broader Philippine manufacturing sector remained an urgent empirical gap.

This urgency became even clearer when situated within the economic and labor scale of Philippine manufacturing. Employing more than 3.41 million workers and accounting for over seven percent of the national labor force, the sector remained foundational to industrial development (CEIC Data, 2024; Textor, 2025). In provinces such as Bulacan—home to dense industrial zones and hundreds of manufacturing firms—manufacturing sustained a substantial share of local employment and contributed significantly to Central Luzon's economic output (CEIC Data, 2024). Given the production-driven nature of this work, employees were particularly vulnerable to supervisory pressure, quota-related strain, and organizational cultures that may have inadvertently tolerated abusive practices. Understanding how such conditions shaped employee well-being and turnover intentions was therefore both academically and economically consequential.

Anchored in Social Information Processing Theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), this study examined how employees interpreted and responded to abusive supervision and coworker mistreatment in manufacturing workplaces in Bulacan. It specifically investigated (1) the extent to which an abusive work environment—capturing both supervisory and coworker abuse—affected employee well-being, (2) the extent to which mindfulness moderated the relationships among abusive work environment, employee well-being, and turnover intentions, and (3) how employee well-being subsequently influenced turnover intentions. Through this examination, the study contributed to ongoing discussions in Human Resource Management and Psychology while supporting SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-Being) and SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) (United Nations, n.d.). Its findings aimed to promote humane workplaces and inform sustainable economic development.

LITERATURE REVIEW

An abusive work environment posed a pervasive threat to employee well-being, gradually undermining psychological health and increasing turnover intentions. Harmful behaviors from supervisors and coworkers—such as control, disrespect, and exclusion—created a toxic atmosphere that eroded mental health and intensified employees' desire to leave the organization (Özkan, 2021; Yang & Xu, 2024). These adverse effects often

manifested as emotional exhaustion, diminished engagement, and elevated turnover intentions, reflecting the complex interplay among workplace abuse, well-being, and decisions to stay or quit (De Clercq et al., 2022; Ali et al., 2022). Multiple factors mediated or moderated these relationships, shaping how individuals experienced and responded to mistreatment.

Among the various forms of abuse, supervisory mistreatment emerged as particularly harmful. Abusive leadership depleted essential psychological resources, such as optimism, and increased the likelihood of turnover. Seo and Chung (2019) showed that employees exposed to abusive supervision perceived fewer opportunities for future growth, which heightened their intention to resign. Similarly, coworker incivility weakened engagement, disrupted social bonds, and deepened withdrawal tendencies (Tricahyadinata et al., 2020; Peng et al., 2014).

Mindfulness had been proposed as a coping mechanism in such settings, yet its effects were highly context-dependent. In some cases, mindfulness helped employees regulate emotional responses and sustain engagement despite abusive conditions (De Clercq et al., 2022). In others, heightened awareness of negative interactions amplified distress (Burton & Barber, 2019). In supportive workplaces, mindfulness tended to enhance resilience and psychological well-being; however, in hostile environments, it could intensify sensitivity to toxic behaviors (Walsh & Arnold, 2020). These conflicting findings underscored the importance of examining mindfulness not as a uniformly protective factor but as a potentially ambivalent moderator.

The consequences of supervisory and coworker abuse often culminated in emotional exhaustion, which served as a central pathway linking mistreatment to turnover intentions. Prolonged exposure to toxic interactions contributed to burnout, particularly among individuals with lower self-esteem, who were more susceptible to workplace stressors (Ali et al., 2022). Organizational conditions also shaped how employees interpreted and reacted to abusive conduct. Perceived organizational support could buffer its negative effects, whereas perceptions of unfairness or violated expectations exacerbated harm (Seo & Chung, 2019).

A substantial body of evidence demonstrated that employee well-being was significantly affected by both abusive supervision (Hussain et al., 2020; Stempel & Rigotti, 2022) and harmful coworker behaviors (Tews et al., 2019; Ramdeo & Singh, 2019; Rahman, 2024). Mindfulness moderated these relationships by either helping employees manage stress or heightening their sensitivity to hostile interactions (De Clercq et al., 2022; Burton & Barber, 2019; Walsh & Arnold, 2020; Xue et al., 2022; Özkan, 2021). Negative experiences with supervisors (Seo & Chung, 2019; Haar et al., 2016; Ali et al., 2022) and coworkers (Peng et al., 2014; Matthieu & Babiak, 2016; Tricahyadinata et al., 2020) consistently predicted stronger turnover intentions, while well-being frequently served as the mechanism mediating these effects (Qasim et al., 2014; Siu et al., 2015; Arshad & Puteh, 2015).

Despite these insights, substantial research gaps remained—both empirical and contextual. Empirical gaps persisted because many studies relied on limited samples, underexplored populations, or untested variables (Baako & Arene, 2024). Stempel and Rigotti (2022) highlighted the need for gender-balanced approaches across varied occupational sectors, while De Clercq et al. (2022) emphasized incorporating variables such as burnout, involvement, and job satisfaction to enrich future analyses. Yang and Xu (2024), whose work served as a primary reference point, focused primarily on the service industry, leaving high-pressure, male-dominated environments such as manufacturing underexamined.

Contextual gaps emerged from differences in cultural norms, economic pressures, and social expectations. In the United States, employees increasingly prioritized psychological well-being: 92 percent viewed mental health as essential, and 33 percent reported turnover intentions, rising to 57 percent among those feeling unsupported (American Psychological Association, 2023). During the COVID-19 pandemic, emotionally draining workplaces accelerated attrition, particularly among millennial and Gen Z workers (Greenwood & Anas, 2021).

Filipino workers, however, demonstrated resilience shaped by distinct historical and economic conditions (Garay et al., 2020; Salas, 2023). Many endured extreme work environments out of economic necessity. For instance, Leandro Matti, a 59-year-old laborer, continued working in 42°C heat despite “no work, no pay” policies and inadequate benefits (Dipasupil, 2024). Economic constraints compelled many to pursue multiple jobs,

prioritizing survival over well-being (Bermudo, 2022). These realities indicated that findings from Western contexts could not be assumed to generalize to Filipino manufacturing workers, whose experiences were structured by different cultural expectations, resource constraints, and economic pressures.

Accordingly, the present study sought to address these gaps by examining how abusive supervision and coworker mistreatment shaped employee well-being and turnover intentions within the manufacturing sector in Bulacan. Recognizing that mindfulness could either buffer or intensify the effects of workplace abuse, the study investigated its moderating role in these relationships. By situating these dynamics within the lived realities of Filipino manufacturing employees, the study provided a nuanced understanding of how abusive work environments, psychological resources, and cultural-economic conditions intersected to influence well-being and turnover in a high-pressure, understudied context.

METHODOLOGY

This study used a quantitative correlational design to examine how abusive supervision and coworker mistreatment related to employee well-being and turnover intention, and whether mindfulness altered these effects. The design was appropriate because it enabled the analysis of naturally occurring workplace conditions without experimental manipulation. The research focused on manufacturing employees in Bulacan, a province with a substantial industrial workforce and diverse manufacturing firms, making it a suitable context for investigating mistreatment within high-pressure environments.

Participants were identified through purposive and snowball sampling to ensure alignment with the study's criteria: (1) 25–60 years old, (2) currently employed in Bulacan-based manufacturing companies, and (3) willing to participate. These non-probability techniques facilitated access to employees across various industrial zones where abusive practices and turnover pressures were recognized organizational concerns.

Data were collected using an online survey administered via Google Forms, supplemented by pen-and-paper questionnaires for respondents without digital access. The instrument consisted of 27 closed-statement items adapted from Yang and Xu (2024), measured on a 7-point Likert scale assessing abusive supervision, abusive coworker treatment, employee well-being, mindfulness, and turnover intention. The original scale demonstrated acceptable reliability, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients exceeding 0.70.

Data were analyzed using Hayes' PROCESS macro. Mediation hypotheses were tested through PROCESS Model 4 with bias-corrected bootstrapping, conducted separately for abusive supervision and abusive coworker treatment as independent variables, employee well-being as the mediator, and turnover intention as the outcome. Control variables (age, gender, employee classification, tenure, and manufacturing sector) were included to account for demographic and job-related influences. Moderated mediation hypotheses were examined using PROCESS Model 7, introducing mindfulness as the moderator. The Unconditional Interaction Test and the Index of Moderated Mediation were used to determine whether mindfulness altered both the direct and indirect effects of abusive treatment on turnover intention. This analytic strategy enabled a clear assessment of how abusive workplace conditions shaped employees' well-being and turnover intentions, and whether mindfulness functioned as a psychological buffer within manufacturing settings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Table 4.1.1. Demographic Profile of Manufacturing Employee Respondents (n = 343)

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	25-34	135	39.36%
	35-44	102	29.74%

	45-54	76	22.16%
	55-60	30	8.74%
Sex	Female	182	53.06%
	Male	161	46.94%
Employee Classification	Rank-and-file	265	77.26%
	Managerial	78	22.74%
Tenure	<6 months	34	9.91%
	6 months-1 year	82	23.91%
	3-5 years	110	32.07%
	6-10 years	76	22.16%
	10+ years	41	11.95%
Manufacturing Sector	Food	117	34.11%
	Metal	75	21.87%
	Garments	72	20.99%
	Chemical & Plastics	51	14.87%
	Textiles	28	8.16%

The majority of respondents were aged 25–34 (39.36%) and female (53.06%). Rank-and-file employees dominated the sample (77.26%), and most respondents had 3–5 years of tenure (32.07%). Food manufacturing employed the largest proportion of respondents (34.11%), followed by metal and garments. This profile establishes a clear context for interpreting subsequent analyses.

Table 4.1.2. Effects of Abusive Supervision and Coworker Behavior on Employee Well-Being and Turnover Intention

Predictor	Outcome	Coefficient (b)	p-value	Interpretation
Abusive Supervision	Employee Well-being	-0.252	<0.001	Negative effect; H1a supported
Abusive Supervision	Turnover Intention	0.547	<0.001	Positive effect; H1b supported
Employee Well-being	Turnover Intention	-0.249	<0.001	Negative effect; mediates H1b
Abusive Coworker Behavior	Employee Well-being	-0.120	0.041	Negative effect; H3 supported

Abusive Behavior	Coworker	Turnover Intention	0.574	<0.001	Positive effect; H4a supported
Employee Well-being		Turnover Intention	-0.307	<0.001	Negative effect; mediates H4a

Abusive supervision significantly decreased employee well-being and directly increased turnover intention. Similarly, abusive coworker behavior negatively influenced well-being and increased turnover intention. Employee well-being mediated the relationship between both forms of abuse and turnover intentions, supporting core hypotheses (H1a/b, H3, H4a).

Table 4.1.3. Mediation of Employee Well-Being on Turnover Intention

Independent Variable	Mediator	Dependent Variable	Indirect Effect (b)	p-value	Interpretation
Abusive Supervision	Employee Well-being	Turnover Intention	0.063	<0.001	Significant mediation
Abusive Coworker Behavior	Employee Well-being	Turnover Intention	0.037	<0.001	Significant mediation

Both abusive supervision and coworker behavior influenced turnover intentions indirectly through employee well-being. These results highlight the critical role of well-being as a mediator, emphasizing that abusive environments affect retention not only directly but also by eroding psychological health.

Table 4.1.4. Moderated Mediation: Effects of Abusive Supervision and Mindfulness on Employee Well-being

Predictor	B	SE	t	p
Abusive Supervision	-0.3681	0.0574	-6.414	<0.001
Mindfulness	-0.0293	0.0389	-0.753	0.5439
Interaction (Abusive Supervision × Mindfulness)	0.0975	0.0303	3.220	0.0012

Abusive supervision significantly reduced employee well-being. Mindfulness alone did not show a significant direct effect, but the interaction term was significant, indicating that mindfulness buffers the negative impact of abusive supervision on well-being. The model explained approximately 8.93% of the variance in well-being ($R^2 = 0.0893$, $F = 4.1296$, $p = 0.0001$).

Table 4.1.5. Moderated Mediation: Effects of Abusive Supervision and Mindfulness on Employee Well-being

Analysis	B	95% CI	Significance
Index of Moderated Mediation	-0.0242	[-0.049, -0.004]	Significant
Conditional Effect (High Mindfulness)	-0.503	[-0.703, -0.303]	Significant
Conditional Effect (Average Mindfulness)	-0.368	[-0.514, -0.223]	Significant
Conditional Effect (Low Mindfulness)	-0.218	[-0.342, -0.093]	Significant

The index of moderated mediation confirms that mindfulness significantly moderates the indirect effect of abusive supervision on turnover intention via well-being. Simple slope analysis shows that the buffering effect of mindfulness is strongest at high levels and weakest at low levels, though still statistically significant.

Table 4.1.6. Moderated Mediation: Effects of Abusive Coworker Behavior and Mindfulness on Employee Well-being

Predictor	B	SE	t	p
Abusive Coworker Behavior	-0.1088	0.0668	-1.629	0.1206
Mindfulness	-0.0800	0.0475	-1.684	0.1039
Interaction (Coworker × Mindfulness)	0.0295	0.0322	0.916	0.3461

Abusive coworker behavior did not significantly predict employee well-being, nor did mindfulness alone. The interaction term was also nonsignificant, suggesting mindfulness does not moderate the relationship between coworker abuse and well-being.

Table 4.1.7. Moderated Mediation: Effects of Abusive Coworker Behavior and Mindfulness on Turnover Intention

Analysis	B	95% CI	Significance
Direct Effect (Coworker → Turnover Intention)	0.5740	[0.446, 0.702]	Significant
Indirect Effect via Well-being	-0.3069	[-0.410, -0.203]	Significant
Interaction (Coworker × Mindfulness)	0.0295	[-0.035, 0.094]	Not Significant

While abusive coworker behavior significantly increased turnover intention, mindfulness did not moderate this effect. The interaction explained only 0.26% of variance (R^2 change = 0.0026, F = 0.8902, p = 0.3461), indicating the buffering effect of mindfulness is negligible in coworker abuse contexts.

Table 4.1.8. Research Hypotheses Acceptance Table

Hypothesis	Result
H1a: Abusive supervision is negatively related to employee well-being.	Supported
H1b: Abusive coworker treatment is negatively related to employee well-being.	Supported
H2a: Mindfulness moderates the relation between abusive supervision and employee well-being, such that the effect of abusive supervision on employee well-being is stronger for employees with high levels of mindfulness.	Not Supported
H2b: Mindfulness moderates the relation between abusive coworker treatment and employee well-being, such that the effect of abusive coworker treatment on employee well-being is stronger for employees with high levels of mindfulness.	Not Supported
H3a: Employee well-being mediates the relationship between abusive supervision and turnover intention, such that higher levels of abusive supervision reduce employee well-being, which in turn increases turnover intention.	Supported

H3b: Employee well-being mediates the relationship between abusive supervision and turnover intention, such that higher levels of abusive coworker treatment reduce employee well-being, which in turn increases turnover intention.	Supported
H4a: Mindfulness moderates the indirect relation between abusive supervision and turnover intentions (through employee well-being), such that the indirect relationship is stronger when mindfulness is higher	Supported
H4b: Mindfulness moderates the indirect relation between abusive coworker treatment and turnover intentions (through employee well-being), such that the indirect relationship is stronger when mindfulness is higher.	Not Supported

Table 4.1.8 presents the Research Hypotheses Acceptance Table, summarizing the variables and indicating whether the hypotheses are supported by the results. Based on the study's findings, all hypotheses are supported except for H2a, H2b, and H4b.

DISCUSSION

The findings showed that abusive supervision had a substantial negative impact on employee well-being, with higher levels of supervisory abuse associated with lower well-being. This result supported H1a, confirming that abusive supervision undermined employee well-being. These findings were consistent with prior studies indicating that supervisory mistreatment negatively affected both individual and organizational outcomes (Yang & Xu, 2024; Stempel & Rigotti, 2022; Hussain et al., 2020). Abusive coworker behavior also negatively influenced well-being, supporting H1b, although the effect was smaller and explained a modest portion of the variance. This aligned with evidence that coworker abuse exerts a weaker impact on employee well-being than supervisory abuse (Tews et al., 2019; Ramdeo & Singh, 2019; Rahman, 2024). In the Philippine manufacturing context, hierarchical structures and cultural resilience shaped these dynamics, amplifying the impact of supervisory abuse while moderating coworker effects, emphasizing the need for HR policies targeting leadership behavior and peer interactions.

Mindfulness did not significantly moderate the relationship between abusive supervision and well-being, leading to the rejection of H2a, and it did not significantly influence the relationship between abusive coworker behavior and well-being, leading to the rejection of H2b. These results suggested that individual coping mechanisms like mindfulness were ineffective in altering employees' well-being in response to abusive supervision or coworker mistreatment. Cultural factors, including resilience and tolerance for adversity, may have reduced the observable effect of mindfulness in this context (Garay et al., 2020).

Abusive supervision increased turnover intentions both directly and indirectly via diminished well-being, supporting H3a. Similarly, abusive coworker behavior raised turnover intentions directly and indirectly, supporting H3b, though effects were weaker than for supervisory abuse. Moderated mediation analysis revealed that mindfulness strengthened the indirect effect of abusive supervision on turnover intentions, supporting H4a, while mindfulness did not significantly alter the relationship between coworker abuse and turnover intentions, leading to the rejection of H4b. These outcomes highlighted that mindfulness functioned selectively as a buffer against supervisory abuse rather than peer mistreatment.

Overall, the results indicated a hierarchy in the impact of workplace abuse, with supervisory mistreatment producing stronger detrimental effects on well-being and turnover intentions than coworker abuse. They also emphasized the context-dependent effectiveness of individual resilience factors, particularly under hierarchical stressors. Practically, these findings underscored the importance of leadership training, anti-abuse policies, and organizational support systems designed to strengthen employee well-being and reduce turnover. Cultural nuances suggested that interventions should consider local workplace norms and employees' coping behaviors to ensure effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated how abusive work environments shaped employee well-being and turnover intentions within the Philippine manufacturing sector, while also assessing whether mindfulness moderated these relationships. The results demonstrated that abusive supervision exerted a strong and consistent negative effect on employee well-being, providing support for the study's central hypotheses regarding the harmful consequences of supervisory mistreatment. Abusive coworker behavior also reduced well-being, though its effect was comparatively weaker. These findings reinforced prior evidence that hierarchical abuse poses a more immediate threat to employee psychological functioning than peer-level mistreatment.

Mindfulness yielded limited moderating effects. Contrary to expectations, it did not buffer the impact of abusive supervision or abusive coworker behavior on well-being, leading to the non-support of H2a and H2b. The construct became meaningful only in the mediated pathway between abusive supervision and turnover intention, where higher mindfulness strengthened rather than weakened the indirect effect through diminished well-being. This pattern underscored mindfulness's complexity in adverse settings and resulted in the non-support of H4b. In contrast, findings supported the remaining hypotheses, including those establishing that employee well-being acted as a mechanism through which abusive supervision and coworker mistreatment elevated turnover intentions.

Overall, the study provided clear evidence that abusive supervision and coworker mistreatment reduced employee well-being and contributed to greater intention to leave, highlighting the urgent need for manufacturing organizations to adopt preventive and corrective strategies. The limited role of mindfulness suggested that individual coping capacities alone were insufficient to counter structurally embedded abusive dynamics.

Future research would benefit from methodological expansion using qualitative data, mixed-method triangulation, and longitudinal approaches to capture evolving patterns of abuse, coping, and turnover over time. Broader geographic coverage and larger sample sizes would also enhance generalizability, particularly across diverse regions beyond Bulacan. Conceptual extensions such as exploring alternative mediators (e.g., psychological capital, organizational justice) or contextual moderators (e.g., leadership style, organizational climate) would deepen understanding of why some employees withstand abusive contexts while others disengage or leave.

From a practical standpoint, the findings reaffirmed the need for systematic HR interventions in manufacturing settings. Strengthening grievance mechanisms, implementing clear anti-abuse policies, and cultivating open communication channels were essential steps in reducing toxic behaviors. Culturally aligned initiatives such as resilience-informed wellness programs or peer support systems could help sustain employee well-being, but these measures must complement, not replace, organizational responsibility to eliminate workplace abuse. Taken together, the study emphasized that safeguarding employee well-being and reducing turnover requires organizational reform, leadership accountability, and consistent reinforcement of respectful workplace norms.

REFERENCES

1. Ali, S., Yongjian, P., Shahzad, F., Hussain, I., Zhang, D., Fareed, Z., Hameed, F., & Wang, C. (2022). Abusive supervision and turnover intentions: A mediation-moderation perspective. *Sustainability*, 14(17), 10626. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141710626>
2. Alshahrani, M., Alfaisal, R., Alshahrani, K., Alotaibi, L., Alghoraibi, H., Alghamdi, E., Almusallam, L., Saffarini, Z., Alessa, S., Alwayel, F., Saffarini, L., Alrawdhan, A., Mapusao, C., Asonto, L. P., Alsulaibikh, A., & Aljumaan, M. (2021). Incidence and prevalence of violence toward health care workers in emergency departments: a multicenter cross-sectional survey. *International Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 14(1), 71. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12245-021-00394-1>
3. American Psychological Association. (2023). 2023 Work in America Survey. <https://www.apa.org/pubs/reports/work-in-america/2023-workplace-health-well-being>

4. Ang Bayan. (2023, October 7). Exploitation and job massacres in the garments industry. Philippine Revolution Web Central. <https://philippinerevolution.nu/2023/10/07/exploitation-and-job-massacres-in-the-garments-industry/>
5. Arshad, H., & Puteh, F. (2015). Determinants of turnover intention among employees. *Journal of Administrative Science*, 12(2).
6. Baako, A., & Arene, D. (2024). Strategic methods for emerging scholars: Identifying research gaps to enhance scholarly work. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 23(03), 679–683.
7. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). Job demands–resources theory. *Wellbeing* (pp. 1–28). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell019>
8. Bermudo, L. (2022, May 29). Popcom: Maraming Pinoy kailangan ng 2-3 trabaho para matustusan ang pamilya. *The Philippine Star*. <https://www.philstar.com/pilipino-star-ngayon/bansa/2022/05/29/2184503/popcom-maraming-pinoy-kailangan-ng-2-3-trabaho-para-matustusan-ang-pamilya>
9. Britannica. (2025). Industrial Revolution. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Industrial-Revolution>
10. Burton, J. P., & Barber, L. K. (2019). The role of mindfulness in response to abusive supervision. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 34(5), 339–352. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jmp-11-2018-0505>
11. CEIC Data. (2024, October 23). Philippines Labour Force Survey: Employment: by Industry, Occupation and Class. <https://www.ceicdata.com/en/philippines/labor-force-survey-employment-by-industry-occupation-and-class/employment-industry-manufacturing>
12. De Clercq, D., Jahanzeb, S., & Fatima, T. (2022). Abusive supervision, occupational well-being and job performance: The critical role of attention-awareness mindfulness. *Australian Journal of Management*, 47(2), 273–297.
13. Dhiman, S. K. (2020). *The Routledge Companion to mindfulness at work*. Routledge.
14. Diachenko, M., Smith, K. K., Fjorback, L., Hansen, N. V., Linkenkaer-Hansen, K., & Pallesen, K. J. (2021). Pre-retirement employees experience lasting improvements in resilience and well-being after Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 699088. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.699088>
15. Dipasupil, R. (2024, May 2). Workers Grapple With Extreme Heat as Poor Conditions, ‘No-Pay’ Schemes Persist. *Philippine Collegian*. <https://phkule.org/article/1202/workers-grapple-with-extreme-heat-as-poor-conditions-no-pay-schemes-persist>
16. Garay, G., Garay, M. C., & Martinez, H. (2020). Resilience Amidst Adversity: The Many Faces of Resilience in Filipinos. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 8(2), 327–335. <https://www.researchpublish.com/upload/book/paperpdf-1593090736>
17. Greenwood, K., & Anas, J. (2021, October 4). It’s a New Era for Mental Health at Work. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2021/10/its-a-new-era-for-mental-health-at-work>
18. Haar, J. M., de Fluiter, A., & Brougham, D. (2016). Abusive supervision and turnover intentions: The mediating role of perceived organisational support. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 22(2), 139–153. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2015.34>
19. Han, H., Ariza-Montes, A., Tirado-Valencia, P., & Lee, S. (2020). Volunteering attitude, mental well-being, and loyalty for the non-profit religious organization of volunteer tourism. *Sustainability*, 12(11), 4618. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12114618>
20. Hermawan, H., Thamrin, H. M., & Susilo, P. (2020). Organizational citizenship behavior and performance: The role of employee engagement. *Journal of Asian Finance Economics and Business*, 7(12), 1089–1097. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no12.1089>
21. Hussain, K., Abbas, Z., Gulzar, S., Jibril, A. B., & Hussain, A. (2020). Examining the impact of abusive supervision on employees’ psychological wellbeing and turnover intention: The mediating role of intrinsic motivation. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), 1818998. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1818998>
22. Ihl, A., Strunk, K., & Fiedler, M. (2022). Interpretations of mindfulness practices in organizations: A multi-level analysis of interpretations on an organizational, group, and individual level. *Organization* (London, England), 29(6), 1099–1132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508420968195>
23. International Finance Corporation. (2020). Addressing Gender-Based Violence and Harassment (GBVH) in the Manufacturing Sector. <https://www.ifc.org/content/dam/ifc/doc/mgrt/sectorbrief-addressinggbvh-manufacturing-july2020.pdf>

24. Kim, J. H. (2021). The Relationship between Employees' Work-Related Stress and Work Ability based on Qualitative Literature Analysis. *The Journal of Industrial Distribution & Business*, 12(7), 15–25.

25. Mathieu, C., & Babiak, P. (2016). Corporate psychopathy and abusive supervision: Their influence on employees' job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 91, 102–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.12.002>

26. MIT Sloan Management Review. (2023, March 14). New Research From MIT SMR Finds Women Are 41% More Likely to Experience Toxic Culture Than Men. PR Newswire. <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/new-research-from-mit-smr-finds-women-are-41-more-likely-to-experience-toxic-culture-than-men-301771485.html>

27. Ng, K., Franken, E., Nguyen, D., & Teo, S. (2023). Job satisfaction and public service motivation in Australian nurses: the effects of abusive supervision and workplace bullying. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 34(11), 2235–2264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2022.2070715>

28. Oginni, B. (2024). Influence of abusive supervision on employees' morale at work: Evidence from the manufacturing organisations in Nigeria. *Annals of Spiru Haret University Economic Series*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.26458/24118>

29. Özkan, A. H. (2021). Abusive supervision climate and turnover intention: Is it my coworkers or my supervisor ostracizing me? *Journal of Nursing Management*, 30(6), 1462–1469. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.13398>

30. Pavlov, D. (2021, May 7). My story of workplace abuse. LinkedIn. <https://www.linkedin.com/my-story-workplace-abuse-dmitry-pavlov/>

31. Peng, A. C., Schaubroeck, J. M., & Li, Y. (2014). Social exchange implications of own and CoWorkers' experiences of supervisory abuse. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1385–1405. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0080>

32. Prasad, E. (2023). Analysis of Mental Health Management for Industrial Workforce in Manufacturing Industries. *ICTACT Journal on Management Studies*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.21917/ijms.2023.0268>

33. Qasim, T., Javed, U., & Shafi, M. S. (2014). Impact of Stressors on Turnover Intention: Examining the Role of Employee Well-Being. *International Journal of Social, Education, Economics and Management Engineering*, 8(1).

34. Rahman, M. M. (2024). The interplay of abusive supervision and coworker incivility on the turnover intention of frontliners: a mediation effect of work stress. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 16(4), 876–897. <https://doi.org/10.1108/apjba-11-2022-0500>

35. Ramdeo, S., & Singh, R. (2019). Abusive supervision, co-worker abuse and work outcomes: procedural justice as a mediator. *Evidence-Based HRM A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*, 7(3), 325–341. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ebhrm-09-2018-0060>

36. Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23(2), 224–253. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392563>

37. Salas, E. B. (2023). Countries with the highest disaster risk worldwide in 2023. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1270469/disaster-risk-index-most-affected-countries/>

38. Seo, Y., & Chung, S. W. (2019). Abusive supervision, psychological capital, and turnover intention: Evidence from factory workers in China. *Relations industrielles*, 74(2), 377–404. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1062088ar>

39. Siu, O. L., Cheung, F., & Lui, S. (2015). Linking positive emotions to work well-being and turnover intention among Hong Kong police officers: The role of psychological capital. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16(2), 367–380. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-014-9513-8>

40. Stempel, C. R., & Rigotti, T. (2022). Threatening the self: The conditional indirect effect of abusive supervision on well-being. *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 7(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.16993/sjwop.124>

41. Tews, M. J., Michel, J. W., & Stafford, K. (2019). Abusive coworker treatment, coworker support, and employee turnover. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 26(4), 413–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051818781812>

42. Textor, C. (2025, November 29). Total number of people employed in the Philippines from 2016 to 2023. Statista. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/713140/philippines-number-of-employed-persons/>

43. Tricahyadinata, I., Hendryadi, Suryani, Zainurossalamia ZA, S., & Riadi, S. S. (2020). Workplace incivility, work engagement, and turnover intentions: Multi-group analysis. *Cogent Psychology*, 7(1), 1743627. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2020.1743627>
44. United Nations. (n.d.). The 17 goals. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>
45. Vonderlin, R., Biermann, M., Bohus, M., & Lyssenko, L. (2020). Mindfulness-based programs in the workplace: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Mindfulness*, 11(7), 1579–1598. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-020-01328-3>
46. Walsh, M. M., & Arnold, K. A. (2020). The bright and dark sides of employee mindfulness: Leadership style and employee well-being. *Stress and Health: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress*, 36(3), 287–298. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2926>
47. Xue, J., Wang, H., Chen, M., Ding, X., & Zhu, M. (2022). Signifying the Relationship Between Psychological Factors and Turnover Intention: The Mediating Role of Work-Related Stress and Moderating Role of Job Satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13.
48. Yang, W., & Xu, S. (Tracy). (2024). Should We Be More Mindful? The Joint Impact of an Abusive Work Environment and Mindfulness on Employee Well-Being and Turnover Intentions. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 48(4), 712-724. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10963480231156832>