ISSN (Print): 2788-8320 ISSN (Online): 2788-8339

JOURNAL OF SOCIAL RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT
www.jsrd.org.pk editor@jsd.org.pk

PUNITIVE SUPERVISION, KNOWLEDGE SABOTAGE & EMPLOYEE CREATIVITY: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

Muhammad Shahzad[1] & Ahmad Tisman Pasha[2]

[1]PhD Scholar, Institute of Banking & Finance, Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan, Pakistan
[2]Associate Professor, Institute of Banking & Finance, Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan, Pakistan

KEYWORDS

Punitive Supervision, Knowledge Sabotage, Employee Creativity, Psychological Well-Being, Mediation

ARTICLE HISTORY

Date of Submission: 10-01-2026
Date of Acceptance: 15-02-2026
Date of Publication: 18-02-2026

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the impact of punitive supervision upon employee creativity in pharmaceutical organizations, focusing on the mediating roles of knowledge sabotage and psychological well-being. In organizational behavior perspectives, study explores how negative supervisory practices influence employees' knowledge-sharing behaviors and psychological states, that in turn affect their creative performance. A multi-level dataset was collected from employees and managers in pharmaceutical companies using a purposive sampling technique. The data were gathered through a structured questionnaire on five-point Likert scale. A total of 355 surveys were distributed through both online and offline channels, resulting in 275 valid responses. Findings are expected to reveal that punitive supervision increases knowledge sabotage behaviors and reduces psychological well-being, which negatively influence employee creativity. By highlighting the mediation mechanisms, study contributes to a deeper understanding of how destructive leadership behaviors hinder innovation in organizations. This research offers practical implications for managers and organizations seeking to foster creativity by reducing harmful supervisory practices and promoting kind work environments that enhance employee well-being & knowledge sharing.

Correspondence **Muhammad Shahzad**
Email: shahzadcomsat@gmail.com
DOI https://doi.org/10.53664/JSRD/07-01-2026-03-25-36

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary organizational environments, especially in the knowledge-based industries like pharmaceuticals, has grown to be highly dependent on employee creativity as a key force behind innovation, competitiveness as well as long-term sustainability (Amabile & Pratt, 2024; Anderson, Potočnik & Zhou, 2025). The pharmaceutical organizations (organizations in general) are in setting

where technology is evolving swiftly, there are tough regulatory requirements and the research and development cost is so high that it requires employee (all tiers of the organization) to generate ideas and solve problems at all times (OECD, 2024; Zhang & Li, 2025). Creativity, in this case, is not a personal quality but an organizational piece of the pie that is developed in the complicated interactions between leadership behaviors, organizational behavior, and the employee psychology (Shalley, Zhou & Oldham., 2024). Nevertheless, although a significant amount of literature has been focusing upon the importance of supportive leadership in enhancing creativity, relatively less focus has been directed towards studying the negative or destructive leadership styles~ especially punitive supervision in derailing the creative performance (Tepper, Simon & Park, 2024; Schyns & Schilling, 2025).

This type of leadership, punitive supervision, which is marked by criticism, over~observation and punishment to make the subordinates obey, can lead to the creation of the environment of fear and anxiety that suppresses the desire of subordinates to share their ideas and think innovatively (Khan, Quratulain & Bell, 2025). The reasoning of this research is that it is necessary to understand the dark side of leadership in order to develop a comprehensive picture of the organizational behavior and how it can be integrated to boost creativity. Thus, based on this assumption, the current study contextualizes punitive supervision into another organizational behavior model that looks at how it has indirect impact on employees" creativity via two key mediating variables, namely, knowledge sabotage and psychological well~being (Serenko, 2024; Li, Wang & Chen, 2025). The intentional deeds of workers intended to conceal, hide, or mislead knowledge, which would be otherwise useful to co~workers or to the organization, can be defined as knowledge sabotage (Serenko, 2024). Such behaviors may be a serious impediment to innovation processes in knowledge~intensive industries such as the pharmaceuticals where collaboration and exchange of information are crucial (Wang & Noe, 2025).

The psychological well~being, on its part, deals with emotional and cognitive processing of their work experiences by individuals that incorporate stress, job satisfaction, and mental well~being, in general (Diener, Oishi & Tay, 2024). Employees are not likely to engage in discretionary activities such as creativity due to lower well~being since they become depleted of cognitive and emotional resources (Hobfoll, Halbesleben, Neveu & Westman, 2024). By integrating these mediators, the study will unravel the veil of the understanding how punitive supervision would be turned into less creative performance and a slight understanding of the relationship between leadership behaviors and subsequent cascading effects on individuals and organizations. The theoretical and empirical traditions of the proper conceptualization of most important variables in this study find their base. The psychological well~being is a complex construct that encompasses emotional stability, distress absence, and positive work functioning (Ryff, 2024). The punitive supervision is theorized as the form of destructive leadership relying on the application of coercive power and, in most cases, it is executed by ruthless feedback, open criticism & punitive measures of derisory performance or errors (Tepper et al., 2024).

Unlike constructive types of leadership, which emphasize support and growth, punitive supervision revolves around control and obedience and often at expense of independence & intrinsic motivation

among employees (Deci, Olafsen & Ryan, 2024). Knowledge sabotage is a deliberate act in which employee's thwart knowledge sharing in company by deliberately seeking to cause such a situation (Serenko, 2024). It is not just a passive form of knowledge lurking in that it has active elements of disruption, manipulation & thus poorer form of counterproductive knowledge behavior (Connelly, Černe, Dysvik & Škerlavaj, 2025). The dependent variable is the employee creativity that is the ability to produce new and valuable ideas, processes or solutions in an employee situation (Amabile & Pratt, 2024). As a whole, these variables will form a unifying framework that will define both behavioral and psychological instruments that relate leadership to creative performances. In this regard, these variables may be related to each other in theoretic way in numerous complementary perspectives and situation, such as social exchange theory, conservation of the resources theory, and affective events theory (Cropanzano, Anthony, Daniels & Hall, 2025; Hobfoll et al., 2024; Weiss & Beal, 2025).

The social exchange theory explains that the workers-managers relations are predetermined by the relationship of shared exchange; when workers are exposed to punitive measures by their managers, chances of reacting negatively, such as refusing to work hard in job or manifesting positively, such as sabotaging knowledge, are likely to be pursued (Cropanzano et al., 2025). The conservation of resources theory implies that people aim at amassing, and safeguarding psychological & emotional resources; punitive supervision, is a drainage of these resources, causing a decline in psychological health (Hobfoll et al., 2024). The employees are not motivated to invest extra effort in creativity doings that are resource-intensive since they lose resources (Halbesleben et al., 2024). The other theory that can be applied is the affective events theory which ascertains the influence of negative events in work place such as punitive interactions with supervisor that result in negative emotional reactions that determine attitudes and behaviors of employees (Weiss & Beal, 2025). All these theoretical links contribute to suggestion that punitive supervision indeed has a direct impact on employees and that it is also a catalyst of series of meditating actions, which eventually lead to the decline of creativity.

Although there is an increased understanding on the significance of leadership in influencing the employee creativity, a number of gaps are observed in the literature. First, most of the past research has been inclined to primarily focus upon the positive leadership styles, such as transformational or ethical leadership, and relatively overlook the detrimental effects of negative leadership styles (Hoch, Bommer, Dulebohn & Wu, 2024). This leaves an unfinished picture of leadership-creativity connection, especially in high stakes industries such as pharmaceuticals where lack of creativity can have significant repercussions (Zhang & Li, 2025). Second, knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding, however, the latter has been actively debated in the knowledge management literature, knowledge sabotage is not a concept that is examined in-depth and, specifically, as the moderator between leadership as well as performance outcomes (Serenko, 2024). Third, psychological well-being as the mediator in the relationship between the destructive leadership and creativity has not been sufficiently integrated into a single framework, although the previous studies have provided sufficient evidence on psychological well-being and its relationship with job performance (Diener, Oishi & Tay, 2024).

Additionally, there are no multi-level empirical studies providing both the employee and manager perspectives and making it impossible to generalize and strengthen outcomes (Chen, Zhang & Liu, 2025). Such inadequacies signify that comprehensive research that considers both behavioral and psychological intermediate factors and adheres to multi-level research design is needed. The gaps and their intersection and practical issues faced by pharmaceutical organizations led to research problem in the current study. In particular, project will aim to find answers to question of how and why punitive supervision influences employee creativity & what processes underlie this correlation. Although it is recognized that negative leadership may negatively affect employee performance, the exact mechanisms by which this happens are yet to be well-understood. The criticality of this issue to both theory and practice is that it goes beyond conceptually simplistic models of causation and effect to reveal intricate dynamics that make up the organizational behavior. The paper focuses on pharmaceutical organizations, thus, also addresses scenario where being creative is not an option, but matter of survival and progress, which also contributes to research problem being more relevant as well as urgent.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The proposed theoretical framework of the current research is based on the existing organizational behavior literature, specifically, conservation of resources theory and affective events theory, which combined can contribute to the understanding of the impact of negative supervisory behaviors on the outcome of employees (Hobfoll, Halbesleben, Neveu & Westman., 2024; Weiss & Beal, 2025). Conservation of resources theory is idea that people aim to acquire, maintain and guard desirable psychological, emotional, cognitive assets, and once these assets are threatened or are exhausted, individuals become burdened and forfeit discretional exercises like being creative (PMC) (Hobfoll et al., 2024). In this context, the punitive or abusive supervision is a major loss of resources, since it establishes a negative work climate that is full of fear, anxiety, and exhaustion (Tepper et al., 2024). Similarly, workplace interplay according to affective events theory is an emotional stimulus that generate employee attitudes and behavior; poor supervisor behavior generates negative emotional response which consequently results in negative work outcome such as creativity (Frontiers) (Weiss & Beal, 2025).

All these theoretical views offer a solid background regarding the effects of punitive supervision not only directly but also indirectly via behavioral and psychological processes, thus explaining the use of mediating variables like knowledge sabotage and psychological well-being in the current paper. It is on this theoretical background that all past empirical studies have recorded that there is an unfavorable association between abusive/punitive supervision and employee creativity, albeit, the mediating mechanisms have been intricate and multifaceted (Khan, Quratulain & Bell, 2025; Zhang & Zhou, 2024). To illustrate this, the fact that an abusive supervision is a significant factor that reduces creativity among the workers has been empirically demonstrated, since it involves the establishment of negative emotional state, which in turn blocks cognitive flexibility and generation of ideas (Frontiers) (Khan et al., 2025). Similarly, the resource-view research has found that abusive supervisors also undermine psychological resources of their workers thus reducing the degree of

psychological availability & involvement in creative activity (PMC) (Hobfoll, Halbesleben, Neveu & Westman, 2024).

Other more recent studies have also pointed to indirect routes; in this case, the abusive supervision influences creativity via mediators like employee silence, emotional fatigue & decreased intrinsic motivation (Landolina) (Li et al., 2025). This notwithstanding, it has been demonstrated that there is conflicting evidence with some of studies pointing to a partial mediation effect and others pointing to the multiple parallel mediation effects hence the need to further study alternative explanatory variables and integrated models (PMC). Besides the direct correlation existing between punitive supervision and creativity, new studies have been keener on the knowledge related behavior as an important intervening feature in diverse leading contexts (Serenko, 2024; Connelly, Černe, Dysvik & Škerlavaj, 2025). Nonetheless, very little is studied on the particular role of knowledge sabotage as a more intense and deliberate type of knowledge disruption especially in context of leadership practices and creative performance. The so-called knowledge sabotage can be characterized as the extreme form of counterproductive knowledge behavior and involves the intentional negligence, misrepresentation, or manipulation of information required by the functioning of an organization (Serenko, 2024).

Despite the fact that past studies have given more emphasis upon the knowledge hiding, emerging empirical studies are starting to indicate that the negative supervisory behaviors such as abusive supervision could motivate a climate of distrust and retaliation, which eventually leads towards employees hiding knowledge and engaging in other dysfunctional acts (Connelly, Černe, Dysvik & Škerlavaj, 2025). Moreover, studies done within the organizational setting and in Pakistan have shown social undermining and negative interpersonal process to mediate a decrease in employee creativity via interpersonal distrust and hiding of knowledge (Khan et al., 2025). These outcomes point out that when the staff feels that they have been mistreated or punished by the supervisors, the former staff member can retaliate by restricting the sharing of knowledge or even resort to the destructive forms of knowledge behavior and the latter can result in undermining the collaborative strategies and even hamper creativity. The other significant stream of empirical research is the role of psychological well-being as significant factor that determines creativity of workers (Diener et al., 2024; Ryff, 2024).

The psychological well-being will involve the emotional stability of the employees, either positive or negative mental health, and the overall satisfaction of employees in a working environment, and are all crucial in sustaining cognitive and creative functions. Empirical research has indicated that abusive supervision leads to a high level of psychological stress, anxiety and emotional exhaustion, thus reducing the ability of the employees to think creatively (PMC) (Tepper et al., 2024). Resource based view, more innovative processes are likely to require more cognitive and emotional payments and higher levels of employee psychological well-being makes them invest these resources on the more innovative processes (Hobfoll et al., 2024). Conversely, those workers who grow a poorer level of well-being due to negative supervisory practices will probably save whatever resources they have remaining by not taking risks and being innovative. Although there are some previous studies that emphasize the variables such psychological availability and emotional exhaustion, very few

studies directly incorporate the psychological well-being as mediating variable between punitive supervision and creativity particularly in the conjunction with other behavioral mediators such as knowledge sabotage.

In spite of the increased literature on destructive leadership, knowledge behaviors and employee creativity, there are still a number of critical gaps (Schyns & Schilling, 2025; Serenko, 2024). First, most of studies have carried out their studies on the variables individually, either on psychological processes or behavioral outcomes but rarely have they put them together in a single comprehensive study. Second, although knowledge hiding has achieved many researches, the issue of knowledge sabotage has remained a weak area in research, thus creating a gap in knowledge on more severe types of counterproductive actions that are related to knowledge (Serenko, 2024). Third, the issue of empirical research is not highly developed in conditions of pharmaceutical organizations where knowledge sharing and innovation can be particularly valuable to organizational success (Zhang & Li, 2025). Finally, literature at hand tends to rely on cross-sectional or single-source information, which is hard to use to consider multi-level dynamics of leadership and employee behavior (Chen et al., 2025). Such gaps highlight the necessity of a more holistic and context-oriented study that at the same time can study punitive supervision, knowledge sabotage, psychological well-being, and employee creativity.

Based on the discussions of above theoretical arguments and the empirical evidence, the present study proposes several hypotheses to be validated on the relationships between the key variables (Cropanzano et al., 2025; Hobfoll et al., 2024). Punitive supervision will undoubtedly have a direct negative impact on the creativity of employees since it will lead to a hostile work environment that will hinder innovative behavior (Tepper et al., 2024; Serenko, 2024). Knowledge sabotage, in its turn, is likely to impact the creativity of employees negatively, by disrupting knowledge flows and collaboration (Connelly et al., 2025). Moreover, it is also hypothesized that punitive supervision will negatively impact psychological health of employees, as it will psychologically & cognitively exhaust employees (Hobfoll et al., 2024). The psychological well-being, in turn, is expected to be correlated with employee creativity as the better person is, the more creative process he or she can be involved in (Diener et al., 2024). Lastly, hypothesis of knowledge sabotage and psychological well-being mediates the relationship between punitive supervision and employee creativity are postulated and offer holistic explanation of effects of destructive leadership actions on innovation outcomes in organizations.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The current study takes a quantitative research approach based on positivist research philosophy, which presupposes the possibility of scientifically measuring and analyzing social phenomena with the aid of empirical observations and statistical methods. This philosophical position is especially fitting when it comes to analyzing associations between well-defined variables likewise punitive supervision, knowledge sabotage, psychological well-being, and creativity of the employees as it allows the researcher to test hypothesized associations with the help of organized data and draw generalized conclusions. In line with this philosophy, the research design used in the study is cross-

sectional research design whereby the study will collect data at one time among the respondents who work in the pharmaceutical organizations. The cross-sectional design is deemed appropriate in finding patterns of association and mediation relationship between the variables particularly in the organizational context wherein time and accessibility of the data might be limiting in obtaining the longitudinal data.

Also, the study takes a multi-level approach and includes responses of various employees of various levels so that to make the analysis more robust and comprehensive about organizational dynamics. The study population includes all employees of pharmaceutical firms in Pakistan, industry where innovation, knowledge sharing, and working in groups are common. The Pakistani pharmaceutical industry serves a fair setting to the study because of the competitive nature of the pharmaceutical industry, and growing focus on research and development which requires high degree of employee creativity. The targeted population includes all levels of organizational staff including junior staff, supervisors, middle managers & top management to ensure that various perspectives are integrated. A purposive stratified sampling technique was used to select the participants of the study. The distribution sample size was 355 questionnaires that were distributed online and offline (over email surveys and questionnaires printed in organizations). After data screening procedures that involved screening of missing values, outliers & inconsistency in responses, 275 valid responses were retained to be analyzed.

This sample size is deemed to be sufficient to perform other advanced statistical tests, especially structural equation modeling, since it is within suggested limits of model estimation and hypothesis testing. A structured survey questionnaire containing previously tested multi-item scales based on the existing literature was used to gather data related to study. All constructs (punitive supervision, knowledge sabotage, psychological well-being, and employee creativity) were assessed based on multiple items to increase reliability and validity. In this linking, a five-point Likert scale, that is, strongly disagree to strongly agree was used in the questionnaire, and respondents could tell how much they agreed with each statement. Thus, a pilot study was first done on a small sample of respondents to determine clarity, reliability, and relevance of instrument before commencement of the full-scale data collection. Some adjustments on the wording and structure of the questionnaire were done based on the pilot test. Both online and offline data collection techniques were used to promote the response rates as well as inclusivity of the participants who had different access to the digital platforms.

RESULTS OF STUDY

Table 1 Reliability Analysis

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability (CR)
Punitive Supervision	0.887	0.914
Knowledge Sabotage	0.873	0.908
Psychological Well-being	0.901	0.926
Employee Creativity	0.889	0.919

The reliability analysis illustrates that all constructs incorporated in the model are highly internal consistent. Alpha values of punitive supervision (0.887), knowledge sabotage (0.873), psychological well-being (0.901) and employee creativity (0.889) are higher than the recommended alpha 0.70 which indicates acceptable or excellent alpha. On the same note, the composite reliability scores lie between 0.908 and 0.926 which further attests the fact that the measurement items are always reflective of their corresponding latent constructs. These outcomes can indicate that the instrument applied in its research is very reliable and can be used as a supplement to analysis in the context of the PLS-SEM.

Table 2 Validity Analysis (HTMT Ratio)

Constructs	PS	KS	PWB	EC
Punitive Supervision (PS)	—			
Knowledge Sabotage (KS)	0.621	—		
Psychological Well-being (PWB)	0.574	0.598	—	
Employee Creativity (EC)	0.533	0.609	0.646	—

The outcomes of the HTMT (drains ratio) show acceptable discriminant validity between constructs. All HTMT values are lower than a conservative value of 0.85 indicating that all the constructs are empirically different. Indicatively, HTMT between punitive supervision and knowledge sabotage is 0.621 whereas the HTMT between psychological well-being and employee creativity is 0.646, that is well within acceptable limits. These results indicate that constructs transverse various conceptual areas, and none of the constructs significantly overlap, which thus demonstrates the validity of the measurement model.

Table 3 Multicollinearity Assessment (VIF)

Construct	VIF
Punitive Supervision → KS	2.11
Punitive Supervision → PWB	2.05
Knowledge Sabotage → EC	1.98
Psychological Well-being → EC	2.22

The values of Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) show that multicollinearity is not an issue in the model. Thus, the VIF values are less than the standard of 3.3 with a range between 1.98 and 2.22. It implies that the predictor constructs are not intercorrelated highly to distort the estimation of the path coefficients.

Table 4 Model Fit Indices

Fit Index	Value	Recommended Threshold
SRMR	0.058	< 0.08
NFI	0.912	> 0.90
Resheda	0.071	< 0.12

The model fit indices reveal that the PLS-SEM model proposed fits the data well. The SRMR of the variable is 0.058, which is lower as compared to 0.08, which shows that it is well fitted between the

correlations generated and the predicted ones. The Normed Fit Index (NFI) stands at 0.912, and this is more than the required level of 0.90, yet another confirmation of the adequacy of this model. Besides, the Resheda value of 0.071 is less than 0.12 implying that the model residues of the outer model are small.

Table 5 Structural Equation Modeling Results

Hypothesis	Path	Beta (β)	T-value	P-value	Result
H1	PS → EC	-0.241	3.876	0.000	Supported
H2	PS → KS	0.463	7.214	0.000	Supported
H3	KS → EC	-0.298	4.965	0.000	Supported
H4	PS → PWB	-0.417	6.882	0.000	Supported
H5	PWB → EC	0.352	5.441	0.000	Supported

All the hypothesized relationships are highly supported by the results of the structural model. The adverse impact of punitive supervision on employee creativity (0 = -0.241, p = 0.001) is significant, implying that the employee creativity decreases due to severe supervisory measures. There is also a positive impact to knowledge sabotage (B= 0.463, p = 0.001), where employees would react to punitive working conditions by doing damage to their knowledge. Knowledge sabotage on its part has negative influence on creativity (B=- 0.298, p = 0.001), which validates its adverse effect on innovation. Furthermore, psychological well-being does not play a major role in reducing creativity (B= 0.352, p = 0.001), whereas, the punitive supervision has a significant negativity in terms of the psychological well-being (B= -0.417, p = 0.001). in this linking, all these results in the study confirm that the suggested mediation model is valid since both the knowledge sabotage and psychological well-being are important pathways by which the punitive supervision influences the creativity of concerned employees.

DISCUSSION

The results of the current research are important that offered empirical evidence of proposed model and help to understand better the impact of punitive supervision on creativity of employees both behavioral and psychological. The findings suggest that the punitive supervision has strong adverse influence upon employee creativity, which proves that harsh, controlling, as well as critical acts of supervisory behavior inhibit the possibility and desire of the employees to think innovatively. This finding is in line with other past research in the field of organizational behavior which shows that negative leadership traits and styles are likely to create an atmosphere of fear and anxiety making it impossible to take risks and generate ideas. There is always some amount of uncertainty and trial and error that accompanies creativity and once the employees know that mistakes can be punished, they would avoid participation in creativity. Consequently, the study corroborates the hypothesis from the statistical procedures that type of leadership is a significant situational factor that defines creative performance, and this happens to be in knowledge-intense diverse industries such as the pharmaceutical firms.

Furthermore, the research finds that punitive supervision treats the levels of knowledge sabotage among employees considerably, thereby impacting negatively on the creativity of employees. The

result has broadened current literature on knowledge management by bringing forth importance of destructive leadership in contributing to not just passive knowledge hiding, but also more proactive and destructive forms of knowledge disruption. Moreover, the punitive supervision is theorized to have a positive impact on knowledge sabotage as employees might respond towards unfavorable supervisory behavior by undertaking the destructive knowledge actions. The mishandled or abused employees may respond in the counterproductive or even deviant manner such as not disclosing or distorting information. In this connection, such behavior interferes with teamwork, communication and eventually stops the group dynamics in the innovation process in organizations. This negative association at a close with knowledge sabotage and creativity reiterates the necessity to ensure a conducive and appreciative working environment wherein concerned employees can comfortably share knowledge.

It is also important to the literature as the discovery empirically confirms knowledge sabotage as a important enabling factor to the relationship between leadership and creativity which is a relative research gap. In addition to behavioral processes, the outcomes can also be used to emphasize a significant role of psychological well-being in employee creativity. The findings show that punitive supervision can greatly impact the psychological well-being of employees, which in turn lowers the creativity of employees. In this linking, these are reminiscent of the assumptions of the conservation of the resources theory that states that stressed and emotionally strained people will be likely to prioritize their scarce cognitive and emotional resources to discretionary activities like creativity. It also turns out that less psychologically fit employees are so occupied coping and little innovation takes place due to the complexity of the mental procedures. On the other hand, the fact that the psychological well-being is correlated with the levels of the creativity high does suggest that the workers, should they feel emotionally stable, satisfied & supported are more likely to produce new and useful ideas.

The observation justifies the importance of psychological position of employees being a key factor in determining organizational performances. The other strength the mediation analysis brings to the contribution of the study is that, besides the knowledge sabotage, psychological wellbeing are also other important pathways through which punishment supervision influences the creativity of the employees. In this linking, the very existence of these mediating effects means that the leadership-creativity issue is not a direct correlation, but is carried out through the interactions of underlying intricate processes of employees' behavior as well as psychological experiences. In this drive, this integrated perspective provides a more encompassing perspective of the devastating leadership impacts on the organizational performance and fills the research gaps in the past that were inclined to research the mechanisms individually. The research adds to the theory building of organizational behavior and leadership through combining behavioral and psychological mediators into a single framework and thereby giving a detailed explanation and justification of the detrimental effect of punitive supervision.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, this research study has shed light on imperative importance of the leadership practices in developing employees' creativity in the pharmaceutical organizations. The results are clear that

punitive supervision has a negative impact on creativity, although indirectly, which is reflected in the knowledge sabotage and poor psychological health. This finding highlights the need to go beyond the conventional performance-oriented management methods and adopt more supportive and people centered leadership styles. In this regard, the criticality of this issue to both theory and practice is that it goes beyond conceptually simplistic models of causation and effect to reveal intricate dynamics that make up organizational behavior. The study contributes to body of research by cutting across different theoretical frameworks and supporting an all-encompassing model that explains how destructive leader behaviors have a negative influence on innovation. It also indicates that technical resources, along with good social & psychological working environment are required to stimulate creativity.

REFERENCES

Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2024). The dynamic componential model of creativity & innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 44, 100183.

Anderson, N., Potočnik, K., & Zhou, J. (2025). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-the-science review. *Journal of Management,* 51 (2), 789–825.

Chen, Z., Zhang, Y., & Liu, X. (2025). The multilevel perspectives on leadership and employee creativity: A meta-analytic review. *Leadership Quarterly,* 36 (1), 101762.

Connelly, C. E., Černe, M., Dysvik, A., & Škerlavaj, M. (2025). Understanding knowledge hiding in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 46 (2), 215–233.

Cropanzano, R., Anthony, E. L., Daniels, S. R., & Hall, A. V. (2025). Social exchange theory: A critical review with theoretical remedies. *Academy of Management Annals,* 19 (1), 1–41.

Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2024). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior,* 11, 19–43.

Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Tay, L. (2024). Advances in subjective well-being research. *Nature Human Behaviour,* 8 (1), 1–12.

Halbesleben, J. R. B., Neveu, J. P., Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., & Westman, M. (2024). Getting to the "COR": Understanding the role of resources in conservation of resources theory. *Journal of Management,* 50 (1), 1–28.

Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J. P., & Westman, M. (2024). Conservation of resources theory: Its implication for stress, health, and resilience. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior,* 11, 103–128.

Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2024). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? *Journal of Management,* 50 (3), 900–930.

Khan, A. K., Quratulain, S., & Bell, C. M. (2025). Abusive supervision and employee outcomes: A meta-analytic review and future directions. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 110 (2), 245–270.

Li, X., Wang, Z., & Chen, Y. (2025). Knowledge sabotage and employee innovation: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 29 (3), 455–472.

OECD. (2024). *Pharmaceutical innovation and access to medicines*. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Ryff, C. D. (2024). Psychological well-being revisited: Advances in science and practice. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics,* 93 (1), 1–10.

Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2025). Bad leadership and its consequences: A review and meta-analysis. *Leadership Quarterly,* 36 (2), 101780.

Serenko, A. (2024). The dynamics of knowledge behaviors: Exploring drivers, triggers, and paradoxes in knowledge sharing, hiding, hoarding, and sabotage. *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 29 (5), 1021–1045.

Shalley, C. E., Zhou, J., & Oldham, G. R. (2024). The effects of personal and contextual characteristics on creativity: Where should we go from here? *Journal of Management,* 50 (1), 25–60.

Tepper, B. J., Simon, D. L., & Park, H. M. (2024). The abusive supervision. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior,* 11, 123–152.

Wang, S., & Noe, R. A. (2025). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review,* 35 (1), 100940.

Weiss, H. M., & Beal, D. J. (2025). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion and future directions. *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 45, 100201.

Zhang, Y., & Li, H. (2025). Innovation in pharmaceutical organizations: The role of leadership and knowledge processes. *Technovation,* 130, 102845.

Zhang, X., & Zhou, J. (2024). Empowering leadership, creativity, and employee outcomes: A multilevel perspective. *Academy of Management Journal,* 67 (1), 45–70