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Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

The topic of emotions at work has been neglected for a long time in organizational research literature (Kiefer & Briner, 2006; Muchinsky, 2000). Lay beliefs supported by some early publications (e.g., Taylor, 1911; Whyte, 1956) have discounted or proscribed emotions at work, because they are seen as irrational, personal, and the best way to manage emotions in the workplace is not to have any (Taylor, 1911). However, recent years have seen an increasing interest in the study of emotions (Eifenbein, 2008, Mumby & Putnam, 1992; Rubin, Nunz & Bommer, 2005). “Affect is now increasingly considered in models of leadership. People have risen to the forefront as perhaps the most important resource for any organization within the context of a global knowledge economy” (Sy, Côté, & Saavedra, 2005, p. 304). This statement made by Sy et al., (2005) highlights the importance of affect (moods and emotions) in organizations and the historical neglect of emotions in the organizational literature. Some of the domains that have been researched include emotional labor (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003; Schaubroeck & Jones, 2000), and the connection between emotion and job satisfaction (Côté & Morgan 2002,) and job performance (Damen, Van Knippenberg, & Van Knippenberg, 2008).

For example, Diefendorff & Gosserand, (2003) presented a model of emotional labor that described the underlying causal mechanisms involved in
regulating emotional displays over times. These authors suggested that specific display rules lead to less variance in emotional displays and better job performance than general display rules. Cote and Morgan (2002) showed that the suppression of unpleasant emotions instigated by the organization culture decreased job satisfaction and also increased intentions to quit, while the amplification of pleasant emotions increased job satisfaction. Damen et al., (2008) showed that congruency between leader emotional displays and follower positive affect determined follower task performance and extra-role compliance.

The main explanations of this recent interest include the emergence of new paradigms in science (e.g., the concept of emotional intelligence, Goleman, 1995), the advent of new models (e.g., Weiss & Cropanzano's (1996) Affective Events Theory), the development of new measurement techniques (Clark, & Tellegen, 1988; Cropanzano & Weiss, 2003; Watson) and new ways to conceptualize behavior and feelings.

Some researchers (e.g., Rafeili and Worline, 2001; Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996) have proposed that considering emotions in organizational life is an important factor for understanding organizational attitudes and behaviors. However, as mentioned by Briner and Kiefer (2006), research into emotions at work is still very much an emerging field with many key issues remaining unexplored. Also, findings in many related areas such as leader emotional displays and work attitudes raised further interesting potential investigations (Fisher and Ashkanasy, 2000). The current paper seeks to investigate one of these:
the relationship between the supervisor emotional displays and employee turnover cognitions, and the effect of affective commitment, and trait affectivity [positive affectivity (PA), and negative affectivity (PA)] on this relationship.

The relationships between leader (supervisor) emotional displays and employee work lives has gained the interest of researchers during the last decade (Côté & Morgan, 2002; Fitness, 2000; Gaddis, Connelly, & Mumford, 2004; Lewis, 2000; Lord & Brown, 2004; Sy, Côté, & Saavedra, 2005; McColl-Kennedy and Anderson, 2002). However, despite the increasing interest in leadership and affect, empirical evidence for the role of affect in leadership processes is still scarce (Damen et al., 2008). Some research findings raised further questions that needed to be clarified such as gender differences and effectiveness of supervisor’s emotional displays (Lewis, 2000), the employee’s personality match and effectiveness of supervisor emotional displays (Damen et al., 2008), and the effectiveness of negative affect versus positive affect displays (Tiedens, 2002).

It also appeared that much of that research has focused on the supervisor emotional displays and its relationship with job performance in term of how it affects the worker’s daily production. For example Lewis (2000) showed that leader display of emotions has more positive effects on follower performance if the match between the valence of leader emotion and follower PA is strong rather than weak. Other researchers have investigated the relationship between the supervisor’s emotional displays with other constructs. For example, Sitter (2005)
showed that a leader’s ability to use emotion (express and appraise) contributed to organizational citizenship behavior.

Although empirical findings have been reported in the studies above, little is known about the extent to which the supervisor emotional displays affect turnover cognitions. Some scholars (e.g., Damen et al., 2008) have suggested looking into moderators to better understand the conflicting results found in research on relationships between supervisors emotions and their effect on employees.

In light of the limits reported and the importance of emotion in organization life, it appears interesting to conduct some empirical research on supervisor emotional displays and works attitudes, particularly turnover cognitions, and the effect on commitment and trait affectivity on this relationship. Thus, the present study proposes to explore the nature of the relationship between the supervisor’s emotional displays and employee turnover cognitions, and the potential moderating effect of organizational commitment (affective, normative, and continuance), and positive affectivity on this relationship.

The results of such research will likely benefit organizational settings as well as the employee. Fisher and Ashkanasy (2000) suggested that leader/colleague behavior were identified as potential causes of experienced emotions. Supervisors, then, can have a tremendous impact on the well being of their employees. It is likely that the nature of emotions the supervisor displays, or how employees perceive the emotions displayed by the supervisor, is an important
regulator of the employee’s attitudes at work, at least for workers who have regular contact with their supervisor.

Findings in the proposed study might help in regulating the display of supervisor’s emotions so that they are beneficial for the worker without hindering his or her performance, and also, contribute to the worker’s job satisfaction. Supervisor displays of negative emotions has shown to better job performance in certain cases (Tiedens, 2001), however, most studies advocate the display of positive affect of supervisors and leader for a better functioning of organizations. For example positive affect of supervisors is negatively linked to job satisfaction (Fox & Spector, 1999; Lee & Allen, 2002) and it seems reasonable that it linked to turnover cognitions. This suggests that in the long run the results might shed a light on leadership effectiveness.

On a more practical level, organizations greatly value retention and have to consider the costs of replacing valued employees, (Branch, 1998; Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Inderrieden, 2005; Lee & Maurer, 1997). Despite all the precaution taken for retention, turnover cost U.S. businesses billions of dollars per year (Rosch, 2001), and practices that promote retention can save even small companies millions of dollars annually (Mathis & Jackson, 2003). The findings in the proposed study might also help companies save a great deal of money on the dollar costs of turnover and other expenses related to cultivating retention practices.
Chapter 2
CONCEPTS DEFINITION AND THEORETICAL FRAME

Two emotion models are complementary to provide support to the hypotheses in this study: emotion contagion model and emotion regulation model. Analysis from the Affective Event Theory (AET) perspective, a relatively new model, will also be developed for a better understanding of emotions at work. Before elaborating on these models an understanding of the key variables in the research question is warranted; these include emotions, trait affectivity including Positive Affect (PA) and Negative Affect (NA), organizational commitment (affective, normative and continuance), and turnover cognitions.

Concepts Definition

*Emotions*

Researchers still debate exactly how emotion should best be defined. A working definition of emotion is used here as suggested by Hochschild (1990). The author defines emotions as “an awareness of four elements that we usually experience at the same time: (a) appraisals of a situation, (b) changes in bodily sensations, (c) the free or inhibited display of expressive gesture, and (d) a cultural label applied to specific constellations of the first three elements” (pp. 118-119).

Some consensus in regard to defining emotions involves more general descriptions of it: emotions represent evaluative cognitions (Kiefer et. al., 2006)
and "are organized psycho-physiological reactions to information and knowledge about the significance for personal well-being of relationships with the environment (most often another person)" (Lazarus, 1993, p. 25). There is also consensus that emotional states encompass both mood, the rather generalized feelings of happiness or sadness that we all experience from time to time (Eifeinbein, 2008; Oplatka, 2007) and affects. Affects are known to be more specific emotional states, such as joy, pride, fear, anger, or disgust, that result from specific occurrences in our environment (Oplatka, 2007). As mentioned by Lazarus (1993), anger, anxiety, fright, guilt, shame, happiness, pride, relief, hope, love, and compassion are conceived of as emotional states. Emotions can also be "caught" from others via empathy.

For the purposes of this study emotional processes are also considered. Emotion process begins with intrapersonal reactions when one is exposed to an eliciting stimulus, integrates the stimulus for its meaning and experiences a feeling state, and physiological changes such as attitudes, behaviors, cognitions and even facial cues. As consequences, secondary responses are triggered to regulate the emotions. This regulation is influenced by individual and group norms to override automatic processing (Grandey, 2000; Gross, 2001 as cited in Elfenbein, 2007).

More important in this study is the interpersonal processes the downstream consequences of emotional experience can result in externally visible behaviors and cues that become, in turn, the eliciting stimulus for interaction partners. This
communicative component of emotions renders our emotions visible to other people in different ways (tone, what we say, and bodily postures and gestures) as we communicate to others how we feel. Of course, as mentioned above, they are circumstances when we may not want to let others know how we are feeling or regulation might be limited or regulated by cultural, social, and organizational norms and rules and, therefore, moderate the expression through display rules (c.f., Elfenbein, Beaupré, Lévesque & Hess, 2007; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989).

Although experiencing and displaying some types of emotions can vary with cultures and social contexts, a considerable body of research supports the conclusion that the expression of emotion is largely universal and biologically evolved (Darwin, 1972/1965; Redican, 1982 as cited by Elfenbein et al., 2007). More recent research found support for the dialect theory of communicating emotion. For example Elfenbein et al., (2007) in their study on cultural differences in expression and recognition of posed facial expressions, found with participants from Quebec (North America) and Gabon (West Africa) that the two groups activated different muscles for the same expressions, and dialects emerged clearly in both sides for serenity, shame, contempt and also for anger, sadness, surprise, and happiness. For disgust, fear, and embarrassment, there were no differences between groups. That is, the display or expression of at least some emotions by an individual is well understood by others within and mostly beyond a culture.
**Trait affectivity: Positive Affect (PA) and Negative Affect (NA)**

Although emotions and moods are both affective states, moods are frequently distinguished from emotions by three features: intensity, duration and diffuseness. Moods compared to emotions are thought to be less intense, of longer duration and lacking specificity (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Ekman (1992) concluded that there are at least six basic emotions: anger, fear, sadness, enjoyment, disgust, and surprise; secondary emotions are derived from the combination of these primary emotions. Two dominant dimensions consistently emerge in studies of affective structures: Positive affectivity (basically good feelings) and Negative affectivity (basically bad feelings). Positive affectivity (PA) is characterized by such adjective as “energetic,” “exhilaration,” and “joy” while negative affectivity (NA) characterized by “anger,” “nervousness,” “anxiety,” “guilt,” “sorrow,” and so on. The PA/NA model has been very influential in the organizational sciences (Watson & Tellegen, 1988). For instance, Iles, Scott, and Judge (2006) demonstrated that PA has a significant impact on organizational citizenship behavior. Considering these insights, it is likely work attitudes will vary differently depending of an employee’s affective states.

**Organizational Commitment**

The person - organization attachments between employees and their organizations are well documented. One of the constructs most frequently investigated in this literature is organizational commitment (Luchak & Gellatly,
Commitment has been defined as a force that binds an individual to an entity or course of action (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed a theoretical model of organizational commitment that postulated the various linkages between three components of commitment and their antecedents, correlates and consequences. Their model is widely accepted today and is commonly known as Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model of organization commitment. In this model, the commitment that characterizes an employee's relationship with the organization has three separable components that develop independently and have different consequences for employee behavior. These components include continuance commitment, normative commitment, and affective commitment.

Continuance commitment refers to the extent to which the employee perceives that leaving the organization would be costly. Employees with strong continuance commitment remain because they have to do so. Normative commitment refers to the employee's feelings of obligation to the organization and the belief that staying is the "right thing" to do. Employees with strong normative commitment remain because they feel that they ought to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Affective commitment refers to the employee's emotional attachment to the organization, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with strong affective commitment remain with the organization because they want to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1991). These feelings are induced by the employee’s firsthand experience that the organization supports its employees,
treats them fairly, and enhances their sense of personal importance and competence by appearing to value their individual and collective contributions.

Employees who experience strong affective commitment feel a positive desire to remain with their organizations, whereas employees who report strong continuance commitment or strong normative commitment remain with their organizations to avoid the costs associated with leaving, or because of the internalized normative pressures to act in a way that meets organizational interests.

A number of researchers (e.g., Hunter & Thatcher, 2007; Sinclair, Tucker, Cullen & Wright, 2005) have found affective commitment and normative commitment (at lower level) positively related to a variety of work outcomes, including job performance and attendance, whereas the same relations with continuance commitment showed negligible or negative relations with the same outcomes (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002).

**Turnover Cognitions**

From a theoretical perspective, Sager, Griffeth, and Hom, (1998) suggested that turnover cognitions represent mental decisions intervening between an individual’s attitudes regarding a job and the stay-or-leave decision. Mobley (1977) conceived the prevailing perspective about turnover cognitions, wherein turnover cognitions occur in the following sequence: thinking of quitting --> intention to search --> intention to quit --> turnover. A number of researchers
Bozeman & Perrewé, 2001; Crossley, Bennett, Jex & Burnfield, 2007; Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007; Lance, 1991) have investigated the determinants of turnover based on Mobley’s (1977) model with interesting results. These studies supported that turnover cognitions are the most powerful predictors of actual turnover. Empirical evidence showed that one or more of the constructs (intention to leave or intention to quit or propensity to leave) precedes turnover behavior (Hom, Griffeth, & Sellaro, as cited in Yitzhak, 2008).

Although several studies have supported Mobley’s (1977) general structure (Bannister & Griffeth, 1986; Hom, Caranikas-Walker, Prussla, & Griffeth, 1992), subsequent research has also revised Mobley’s model. For instance Sager et al., (1998) revised Mobley's model by positing intention to search as the primary precursor of turnover instead of intention to quit, suggesting that employees may intend to quit a job before intending to search for another. Also, the unfolding model (Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Lee, Gerhart, Weller & Trevor, 2008) includes variables such as job related shock, pursuit of nonwork alternatives or unsolicited job offers. On the other side, while much of the research has focused on constructs such as job satisfaction, or perceived organizational support as direct causes of turnover, recent research has acknowledged emotion at the work place accounting for a great deal of variance in turnover, at least for a sizable portion of the leavers (Bass, 1990; Conger & Kanungo, 1998, O’Neil, Vandenberg, DeJoy, & Wilson, 2009; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Given the above clarifications on the key variables in interest,
the following section examines the theoretical basis for the postulates in this study.

Theoretical Frame

*Mood Contagion Theory and Mood Regulation Theory.*

Mood contagion and emotion regulation theoretical models provide support to the hypotheses in this argument. Based on the description of emotion provided earlier, this study argues that supervisors transmit their moods to subordinates through mood contagion. Neumann and Strack (2000), refer to mood contagion as a mechanism that induces a congruent mood state through the observation of another person’s public display of mood. Researchers have described mood contagion and the related process of emotional contagion as a two-stage process (Barsade, 2002; Neumann & Strack; 2000, Sy et al., 2005). In the first stage, individuals unintentionally mimic the public displays of mood of others. Chartrand and Bargh (1999) refer to this a chameleon effect and showed evidence that participants in a social interaction subconsciously mimic the smiling activity of their partners. In the second stage of the mood contagion, mimicking facial, vocal, or postural behaviors leads one to experience the moods that are associated with those behaviors. For instance anger elicits negative mood while a smile elicits positive mood. Empirical evidence of mood contagion have been reported (Hatfield et al., 1994; Kelly Barsade, 2001 as cited by Sy et al., 2005). In sum, mood contagion can be seen as a mechanism that hinges on the
unintentional imitation of another person's emotional behavior, which in turn activates a congruent mood state in the observer.

Given that mood states are induced in the observers as individuals unintentionally imitate the emotional expressions of other people (Neumann & Strack, 2000), it seems reasonable that supervisor emotional displays would elicit congruent emotions in employees who are exposed to these emotion states. Thus, the mood contagion theory provides a rationale explaining how supervisor negative mood and emotion can be induced in subordinates. In addition, emotion regulation theory (Grandey, 2000; Gross, 1998b) postulates that individuals are motivated to avoid or eliminate the experience of negative emotions, because those emotions tax or exceed the physiological and psychological resources of the individual (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988; Gross, 1998a). As a regulation strategy, individuals will attempt to attenuate or eliminate the experience of negative emotions by engaging in behaviors that allow them to distract themselves from the distressing feelings. According to this perspective, turnover intentions and absenteeism can be viewed as emotional regulation strategies involving avoidance (Gross, 1998a). By showing that individuals are motivated to escape unpleasant emotional experiences, emotion regulation theory offers a rationale for why exposure to supervisor negative emotional display (such as anger or disgust), employees would develop turnover intentions. A number of researchers have linked emotion at work with turnover intentions as noted earlier, and considerable
research has also supported the finding that propensity to leave is predictive of actual turnover (Hom, Griffeth, & Sellaro, as cited in Yitzhak, 2008).

Supervisor Emotional Displays as a Source of Affective Events in the Workplace

The relationship between supervisor emotional displays and turnover cognitions are also examined from the perspective of Affective Events Theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1988). The Affective Event theory (AET) is relatively recent, it specifies that it is important to measure not only “cognitive evaluations” of the job as traditional job attitudes models do, but also to measure “affective reactions” in the prediction of “affectively driven behaviors. The AET model focuses on the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work; it directs attention towards events as proximal causes of affective reactions. This view also supports the hypotheses in this study as it seems relevant in explaining how supervisor’s negative emotional displays can affect the employee’s turnover cognitions.

The supervisor’s attitudes and behaviors at work are laden with emotions, and these emotions are communicated to the subordinates in different ways. For example, a supervisor asking a subordinate to undertake a task or assignment will do so by communicating some sort of emotion that can be expressed in different ways, including anger, anxiety, frustration, gratitude or urgency. As these supervisor and subordinates interactions take place (supervisor giving orders, assignments, critics, or encouragement) the supervisor displays emotions that have affective significance for the subordinate and can generate an emotional
reaction or mood change with subsequent work attitude change. Cues of these emotions can transpire through bodily postures, gestures, or tone of the voice. Displays of emotions can be transferred to subordinates and can be perceived as negative (frustration or anger) or positive (gratitude) and likely to cause respectively negative responses such as withdrawal cognitions and turnover or positive work attitudes such as Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) or job satisfaction. Thus, it seems reasonable to consider supervisor emotional displays as sources of affective events at work, or at least, something that can trigger affect driven behaviors encompassing turnover cognitions in employees.
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LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DERIVATION

A Body of Research with Mixed Results

Some recent studies have investigated supervisor emotion displays in terms of how they relate to job attitudes and job performance (Damen, Van Knippenberg & Van Knippenberg, 2008; George, 1995; Lewis, 2000; Sy, Côté, & Saavedra, 2005), yet many of the findings remain nebulous in what conclusions can be drawn. Some of these studies focused on the influence of the leader emotional displays on the followers; however, these studies need more empirical evidences to understand the processes (cf., George, 1995; Sy, Côté, & Saavedra, 2005).

For instance Sy et al., (2005) found that when leaders were in a positive mood, in comparison to a negative mood, individual group members experienced more positive and less negative moods. Also, followers exhibited more coordination and expended less effort than followers with leaders in a negative mood. However, the authors acknowledged that at this point, they are unable to make definitive statements about the precise mechanisms that underlie the effects of the mood of the leader, nor can they tell the duration of the effects of these moods.

Lewis (2000) investigated the influence of a leader's display of either sadness or anger on follower emotional responses. His findings suggested that
when the leader expressed angry emotions followers responded with higher negative activation (nervousness) and lower activation (relaxation). He also reported that at CEO level, the using of negative emotional tones in communication was seen as less effective than using neutral tones, and an interaction of the leader's gender and emotional tone had a significant effect on assessment of leader effectiveness. Most research on the differences between men and women finds significant differences regarding emotion expression and experience (Eagly & Johnson as cited in Lewis, 2000). Also, women were evaluated as less effective when exhibiting more masculine styles for example, anger is associated with masculinity.

Focusing on leader effectiveness, Rubin, Munz and Bommer (2005) showed evidence that leader agreeableness is positively associated with leader transformational leadership (known as the most active and effective form of leadership) behavior, and also, leader positive affectivity is positively associated with leader transformational leadership behavior. However the authors mentioned that further inquiry into interactions between emotion and personality would be productive.

As can be seen, the studies above advocate the display of positive affect of the leader for a better functioning of organizations. However, critical questions remain unanswered, thus offering avenues for productive future research.

On another note, while the studies have suggested that the display of positive affect may be more effective for employees’ work attitudes
(performance, satisfaction, supervisor effectiveness) than the display of negative affect, other evidence has suggested that the display of negative emotions may also be effective, or may even be more effective in influencing others than the display of positive emotions (Tiedens, 2001; Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004a, 2004b). For instance, Tiedens (2001), endorsing this view, stated that people expressing anger are seen as dominant, strong, competent, and smart, but also less warm, friendly, and nice. Therefore, the evidence suggests that the expressions of negative emotions create complex social impressions that are neither entirely negative nor entirely positive. The author showed that although one of the costs of anger expression is that the expresser is perceived as less likable, in the business and political contexts, the likeability of these targets did not affect status conferral (Tiedens, 2001). Similar research has pointed out the efficiency of negative emotions (Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004a, 2004b as cited in Damen et al., 2008).

Considering the above analyses, it is apparent that although research on the topic acknowledges the effect on supervisor emotional displays on subordinates, the processes and the consequences on subordinates are unclear and await further empirical research to be fully understood.

Second, there seems to be a consensus in the recent literature on emotions in organizations, regarding the importance of the topic and the need for more empirical research (Fisher, 2000; George, 2000; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee; Muchinsky, 2000; Sy et al., 2005). For instance, Goleman et al., (2001) suggested
that it is critical to understand the effects of leaders’ emotions on the subordinates, as they may influence the way subordinates feel, think, and act. As a consequence, most of the studies urged other scientists for more investigations to advance knowledge in the intricate process of leaders’ emotion on subordinates work attitudes (George, 2000; Goleman et al., 2001; Damen et al., 2008).

In addition the effects of the supervisors emotional displays on turnover has not been fully addressed. Most of the studies have looked into the effects of leader emotional displays on variables such as job performance (e.g., Damen et al., 2008) or leader effectiveness (e.g., Lewis, 2000). Although interesting findings have been documented on the relationship between supervisor emotions and job performance, or leader’s effectiveness, the effects of these emotions on other job attitudes have not been tested directly, though some studies have addressed the relationship between supervisory style (e.g., Maertz, Griffeth, Campbell, & Allen, 2008), or supervisor support (e.g., Rhoades et al., 2001) and turnover, little is known about supervisor’s emotional displays in terms of how it relates to turnover cognitions.

The present paper addresses three questions investigating the relationships between supervisor emotional displays and turnover cognitions. The first will examine the connection between supervisor emotional displays (positive or negative) and the subordinate’s turnover cognitions. The second question will investigate how organizational commitment (affective, normative, continuance) can impact the relationship between the supervisor’s emotional displays and
subordinate’s turnover cognitions, and finally, the third question will examine the effect of subordinate affective traits, particularly positive affect (PA) on the relationship between supervisor emotional displays and turnover cognitions.

Supervisor Emotional Displays and Employee Turnover Cognitions

This study posits that supervisor emotional display influences subordinate’s turnover cognition and there is support for this argument in empirical literature. Recent studies indicate that emotions at the workplace have an important effect on employee attitudes and behaviors (O’Neil, Vandenberg, DeJoy, & Wilson, 2009). Leadership theorists have argued that a leader’s expression of positive emotion can have inspirational and motivational consequences (Bass, 1990; Conger & Kanungo, 1998). On the other hand, negative emotion may have the potential to adversely impact a subordinate’s emotional state with detrimental consequences for the employee as well as the organization (Lee & Allen, 2002, O’Neil et al., 2009). For example, researchers have linked workplace negative emotions, such as anger, to a number of negative outcomes, including violence and hostility (Folger & Baron, 1996), antisocial behaviors such as theft, job stress, and burnout, absenteeism (Bauer & Green, 1996; Chen and Spector, 1992) and also with turnover (Graen, Liden. & Hoel, 1982; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Research also showed that the workplace has been identified as one of the most interpersonally frustrating contexts that people have to deal with (Allcorn, 1994; Bensimon, 1997, as cited in Fitness, 2000). It might, therefore, be expected that anger, in particular, will be a
frequently experienced or expressed workplace emotion. This argument is 
supported by frustration-aggression principle stating that frustration creates anger, 
which can generate aggression (Miller, 1941).

Research has also supported that individuals are most likely to transmit 
their emotions to others when they are able to express their emotions to others 
(Hatfield et al., as cited in Sy et al., 2005). Furthermore, Lewis (2000) showed 
evidence that subordinates readily ascertain leaders affective displays. Also, lower 
status individuals more often catch the moods of higher status individuals than 

An explanation is that a powerful person (supervisor) have more opportunities to 
express and transmit his/her moods because they influence and control the 
employee’s time, the resources, and the interactions, whereas the subordinate is 
more likely to attend to the person in power because they depend more on him 
than vice versa. These findings suggest that supervisors are more likely to be 
transmitters of emotions based on their power and subordinates are likely to be 
receivers of emotions.

With respect to the insight provided on mood contagion and mood 
regulation models, supervisor’s negative emotional displays (such as anger, 
disgust) is likely to cause a negative emotional response. On the other hand 
supervisor’s positive emotional displays is likely to cause a positive emotional 
response of a subordinate.
Although these two models provide a rationale to support this argument, the hypothesis described in this study are also congruent with research on other causes of employee turnover. For instance, based on organizational support theory, perceived organizational support (POS) has far been found to be associated with turnover intention (Allen et al., 1999; Guzzo, Noonan, & Elron, 1994; Rhoades et al., 2001; Wayne, Shore & Liden, 1997). Research has shown that different types of perspectives are related to POS, including job conditions, personality, human resources practices and particularly supervisor support (Settoon, Bennett & Liden, 1996). Reliable relationships between supervisor support and POS have been demonstrated (Settoon et al., 1996) and supervisor emotional displays are likely to affect one’s perception of supervisor support.

Taken together, these analyses suggest that the supervisor’s emotional displays will affect turnover cognitions in employees who are regularly exposed to them in such a way that negative displays (anger, disgust, hostility) will be associated with increased turnover intention, and positive displays (enthusiasm, excitement, intellectual stimulation) with an opposite effect, thus, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1a: Supervisor negative emotional displays will be positively associated with turnover cognitions.

Hypothesis 1b: Supervisor positive emotional displays will be negatively associated with turnover cognitions.
Organizational Commitment, Supervisor Emotional Displays and Turnover Cognitions

This section addresses the role of organizational commitment in the relationship between supervisor emotional displays and subordinate turnover cognitions. The psychological state that characterizes the employee’s relationship with the organization and the implications for decisions to continue or discontinue is different for the three approaches in organizational commitment (affective, normative, and continuance) Meyers and Allen (1993) find all three forms of commitment to the occupation correlated negatively with intention to leave the nursing profession.

Employees who are affectively committed are known to have a sense of belonging and identification to the organization which increases their involvement in the organization’s activities, their willingness to pursue the organization’s goals, and their desire to remain with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). With respect hypothesis 1a, it is expected that high affective commitment will lessen the effect of supervisor negative emotional displays on subordinates work attitudes.

Past research provides support for this argument. According to Meyer, Becker and Vandenberghhe (2004) the nature of one’s motivational mindset depends on the extent to which the behavior is focused on personal advancement, growth, and accomplishment (promotion focus) rather than security, safety and responsibility (prevention focus). A variety of antecedents of affective commitment have been reported in research. These include personal
characteristics, structural characteristics, job-related characteristics and work experiences (Mowday et al., 1982). Meyer and Allen (1997) concluded that supportiveness, fairness, personal importance, and personal competence exert the strongest influence on affective commitment.

Given that these antecedents essentially bind people to organizations and consequently allows them to achieve goals and growth, it seems likely that individuals with high level of affective commitment would be more motivated to ignore certain types of workplace frustrations (i.e. exposure to supervisor negative emotion) than those with lower level of affective commitment.

Other research results suggest that compared to other forms of commitment, an employee affectively committed shows an emotional bond to his/her organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). As such, affective commitment has been considered as an important determinant of dedication and loyalty and has been associated with positive work attitudes such as performance, and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). On the other side, recent research has reported the negative association between affective commitment and work attitudes such as absenteeism, performance, and turnover (Hunter & Thatcher, 2007; Sinclair, Tucker, Cullen, Wright, 2005; Siu, 2003, Riketta, 2008).

Furthermore, given that organizational commitment has been found to be a moderator of stress–strain relationships in Western societies (Donald & Siu, 2001; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), it might be expected a greater likelihood that employees with a high level of affective organizational commitment would have more
resources to cope with the distress caused by the exposure to negative emotional displays from one’s supervisor. Affective commitment might thus be viewed as an attitude that protects the employee from the effects of negative emotion.

In light of these analyses, it seems reasonable to believe that affective commitment can act as a buffer in the relationships between supervisor emotional displays and employee turnover cognition, thus the third hypothesis was made as follows:

Hypothesis 2a: Affective commitment will moderate the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions. Supervisor negative emotional displays will be more positively associated with turnover cognitions when affective commitment is relatively low and less associated with turnover cognitions when affective commitment is relatively high.

The same type of relationship between supervisor emotional displays and normative commitment is also expected. Antecedents of normative commitments include personal characteristics, socialization experiences, and organizational investments. Indeed, research has supported a strong correlation between affective commitment and normative commitment, especially for work experiences variables (Allen et al., 1991; Meyer et al., 1993; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, Topolnisky, 2002). According to Meyer et al., (2002), the correlation between the affective commitment and normative commitment is often quite strong. Some investigators have questioned the utility of retaining normative commitment as a separate scale (e.g., Ko, Price, Mueller, 1997). Others argued
that, despite their high correlation, affective and normative commitment demonstrate sufficiently different correlations with other variables, especially variables purported to be outcomes of commitment, that both are worth retaining (e.g., Cohen, 1996; Meyer et al., 1993). Meyer et al., (2002) argued that positive experiences that contribute to strong affective commitment might also contribute to a feeling of obligation to reciprocate, and therefore contribute to normative commitment. In addition, normative commitment (as well as affective and continuance) correlates negatively with intention to leave (Meyer et al., 1993). Based on this argumentation it is hypothesized that

Hypothesis 2b: Normative commitment will moderate the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions. Supervisor negative emotional displays will be more positively associated with turnover cognitions when normative commitment is relatively low and less associated with turnover cognitions when normative commitment is relatively high.

Antecedent variables of continuance commitments include personal characteristics, alternatives, and investments. In contrast to affective commitment, continuance commitment refers to commitment based on the employee’s recognition of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Employees with strong continuance commitment, then, remain with the organization because they have to do so. Like affective commitment, continuance commitment generally was correlated as expected with their hypothesized antecedent variables more than
normative commitment (Allen et al., 2002). It is expected that continuance commitment will influence the nature of the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions in the same direction than affective and normative commitments do. However, it is expected that supervisor emotional displays will have even a weaker effect on turnover cognitions for subordinates with high continuance commitment than these with high affective or normative commitment.

Support for these arguments can be found in previous research. A meta analysis of antecedents variables related to the three approaches of work commitment has shown a strong correlations between work experiences (particularly organizational support) with affective commitment and at a lower level to normative commitment (.42 to .52). No significant correlation with Continuance commitment was found (cf. Allen et. al., 2002). Of the work experience variables, perceived organizational support has the strongest positive correlation with affective commitment. As stated earlier, reliable relationships between supervisor support and POS have been demonstrated (Settoon et al., 1996) and supervisor emotional displays may be an aspect of supervisor support.

These findings suggest that supervisor emotional displays are more likely to influence work experience variables (such as organization support, supervisor support) and consequently more likely to influence affective and normative commitments compared to continuance commitment (more highly correlated with
availability of alternatives and investment variables). Thus the following hypotheses are made:

Hypothesis 2c: Continuance commitment will moderate the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions. Supervisor negative emotional displays will be more positively associated with turnover cognitions when continuance commitment is relatively low and less associated with turnover cognitions when continuance commitment is relatively high.

Hypothesis 2d: The relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions will be weaker for subordinates with high scores in continuance commitment than those with high score in affective commitment.

Hypothesis 2e: The relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions will be weaker for subordinates with high scores in continuance commitment than those with high score in normative commitment.

Subordinate Affective State, Supervisor Emotional Displays and Employee Turnover Cognitions

In this section it is proposed that subordinate affective traits (Positive affect and Negative affect) will play a moderating role in the relationship supervisor emotional displays on employee turnover cognitions. As noted earlier, affect plays a key role in organizational functioning (Brief & Weiss, 2002; George & Brief, 1996; Judge & Ilies, 2004). Positive affectivity (PA) refers to the tendency to experience intense pleasant feelings. At the high pole, enthusiasm and excitement anchor the dimension (Cropanzano et al., 2003). PA includes both
emotions, as specific, interruptive, and intense feelings; and moods, as relatively lower intensity, longer lasting, and more diffuse feeling states with often less clearly identifiable causes (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). On the other hand, negative affectivity (NA) refers to the tendency to experience intense unpleasant feelings. At the high pole such feelings as anxiety and anger tend to be present. At the low pole these negative feelings tend to be absent (Cropanzano et al., 2003).

A great deal of studies have documented affective traits as an important moderating factor in predicting organizational attitudes and behavior (Anderson & Thompson, 2004; Damen et al., 2008; Judge & Ilies, 2004). For instance, Damen et al., (2008), showed that the effectiveness of follower’s job performance is moderated by the affective match between the follower’s positive affect (PA) and the leaders’ emotional displays. They showed that for followers high in positive affect (PA), appeals accompanied by positive emotional displays are relatively more effective for follower job performance than are appeals accompanied by negative emotional displays. Conversely, for followers low in PA, appeals accompanied by positive emotional displays are relatively less effective than are appeals accompanied by negative emotional displays.

From a theoretical standpoint, network theory (Bower 1981) states that people may have stronger and a greater number of connections among emotional experiences that are congruent with their affective states. That is, to a person’s affective states, will correspond a congruent information processing and retrieval of information. For instance, positive mood states are thought to increase the
accurate perception of positive stimuli and the tendency to make positive judgments and retrieve positive memories. A great deal of studies have supported this view (Ilies, Scott, & Judge, 2006; Judge & Ilies, 2004). It is expected that an employee is likely to be more tolerant of a negative emotional display from a supervisor if the employee him or herself generally holds a negative affect mood.

These combined insights suggest that individuals are more sensitive and more open to experiences that are congruent with their own affective states. Individuals would have better relationships with others who have a congruent affective state and would be more strongly persuaded by them. Individuals will therefore be differently affected by others’ negative or positive emotional displays, depending on their own affective states. Also, much research (Barsade et al., 2000, Watson, Clark, McIntyre, & Hamaker, 1992, Damen et al., 2008) has showed that PA may affect responses to stimuli to a larger extent that NA. As such, the focus in this study is specifically on the role of PA in the relationship. In accord with these results, it is expected a moderating effect of employee PA on the relationship supervisor emotional displays and turnover cognitions, thus it is stated that:

Hypothesis 3: Subordinate Positive Affect (PA) will moderate the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions. Supervisor negative emotional displays will be more positively associated with turnover cognitions for subordinates high in PA and less associated with turnover cognitions for subordinates low in PA.
Job Satisfaction as a Control Variable

Generally, job satisfaction is defined as an employee’s affective reactions to a job based on comparing actual outcomes with desired outcomes (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). Mostly, job satisfaction is recognized as a multifaceted construct that includes employees’ feelings about a variety of both intrinsic and extrinsic job elements (Howard & Frink, 1996). For Porter and Steers (1973), the extent to which an employee is satisfied with his/her job reflects the cumulative level of met worker expectations (e.g., pay, promotion, autonomy) for which he/she has preferential value. The range and importance of these preferences vary across individuals but when the accumulations of unmet expectations become sufficiently large, there is a decrease of job satisfaction, and a greater probability of withdrawal behavior (Pearson, 1995). Research has showed an empirical relationship between job satisfaction and number of work attitude with most of them focused on job performance, employee commitment, absenteeism, and intentions to quit, and actual turnover has been the focus of some research (Agho, Mueller, & Price, 1993). In particular, satisfaction with the facets of meaningful work and promotion opportunities were significant predictors of intentions to leave an organization. Although across studies the proportion of variance in turnover explained by levels of satisfaction may be less than four percent (Hom & Griffeth, 1995; Lee, Mitchell, Holtom, McDaniel, & Hill, 1999), it is reasonable that we control for this variable in the present study.
It is important to mention that the purpose of this study is not to study the relationship regarding job satisfaction; rather, to look at the unique contribution of study variables above and beyond job satisfaction. Therefore, it will only be used as a control variable in this study.
Chapter 4  
METHODOLOGY  

Participants  

The requirements to meet before taking part in this study were as follows: The participant must be a regular employee in any occupation with the criteria that they are working in formal and direct working relationship with a supervisor. They should also have worked for at least 6 months in the current position. Treatment of participants was in accordance with the “Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct” (American Psychological Association, 1992).

All the participants for this study were selected from the human subject pool of the CSUS Department of Psychology. A total of 214 people participated in the study. From these, 10 cases were eliminated mostly for insufficient work time or work experience, 204 cases remained including 162 females (79.40%) and 42 males (20.6%). In this sample, 172 (84.31%) stated they work part time, i.e., 30 or less hours per week including 43 (21.1%) participant working less than 16 hours per week. Two people did not answer this question. The other, 30 participants (14.7%) were working full time (more than 30 hour a week). The participants were relatively young with 192 (94.1%) under 26 years old. A total of 151 (74%) participants were working as staff members, only 3 were working at the upper management level. Twenty eight (14.2%) of the participants stated they supervised other people while 173 (84.8%) stated they did not. For ethnicity, 95
(46.6%) were White, 39 (19.1%) were Asian/Pacific Islander, 27 (13.2%) were Hispanic/Latino, 21 (10.3%) were Black, 10 (4.9%) were Native American, and 12 (5.9%) identified as other.

**Procedures**

Eligible participants signed up to attend data collection sessions in laboratory rooms at the CSUS Department of Psychology, where they completed the survey. After signing a consent form, volunteers were required to provide demographic information and information pertaining to their work situation as part of the survey. Participants could also drop in to complete the survey if they had not pre-registered for a session. After completion of the survey, they were thanked for their cooperation and provided a debriefing form with an electronic mail address to contact the researcher should they have any questions or comments. An electronic mail address was requested to the participant interested in the results of the study to have the results sent to him/her.

**Measures**

*Demographics*

Participants were asked to provide information regarding gender, age, ethnicity, job tenure, job position (i.e., are they working as a staff member or in management including assistant management, middle management, and upper management). They were also asked to provide the number of working hours per week (see appendix A).
Turnover Cognitions

To measure this variable, three cognitive process variables used by Luchak and Gellaty (2007) were used based on their ties to actual turnover (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Mobley, 1977; Sager et al., 1998 as cited in Luchak & Gellaty, 2007). A slight modification was made so that participants responded to items using a 5-point scale instead of 7 point scale used by Luchack and Gellaty (2007). Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement on a 5-point scale (1 = almost never to 5 = almost always) on items such as how often over the past year they had thoughts of quitting or how often over the past year they had intended to quit.

Responses to the three items were averaged to form a composite measure of turnover cognitions. Coefficient alpha reliability was .88 for this scale.

Affective, Normative, and Continuance Commitments to the Organization

The three approaches of organizational commitment were assessed using the 18-item revised organization commitment scale (6 items per subscale) developed by Meyer, et al., (1993). Meyer and Allen (1997) stated that coefficient alpha estimates for this measure are almost always .70 or higher, with a median reliability of .85. Construct validity is also supported, with results of confirmatory factor analyses indicating that all approaches can be empirically distinguished from one another (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer, Allen, & Gellatly, 1990; Shore & Tetrick, 1991) as well as from other related constructs such as job satisfaction, and occupational commitment (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). Participants
responded utilizing a 5-point scale with anchors ranging from 1 (“Strongly Disagree”) to 5 (“Strongly Agree”). An example item for affective commitment subscales is “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this department”. Three items in this subscale were originally reverse coded and were consequently recoded. These items are “I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my department”, “I do not feel emotionally attached to this department”, and “I do not feel like part of the family at my department.” Coefficients alpha for the affective commitment subscale in this study is $\alpha = .81$.

An example item for continuance commitment is “Right now, staying with my department is a matter of necessity as much as desire”. Coefficients alpha for continuance commitment subscale in this study was relatively low, $\alpha = .55$. An example item for normative commitment is “I owe a great deal to my organization.” The item “I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer” was originally reverse coded and has been recoded. Reliability coefficients obtained for normative commitment is $\alpha = .79$.

**Employee Positive Affect and Negative Affect**

The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS), developed by Watson, Clark, and Tellegen (1988), was used to measure the subordinate affective trait. The questionnaire contains 10 adjectives reflecting negative emotional states (*distressed, upset, guilty, scared, hostile, irritable, ashamed, nervous, jittery, and afraid*) and 10 adjectives reflecting positive emotional states...
(attentive, interested, alert, excited, enthusiastic, inspired, proud, determined, strong and active).

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they generally experienced each feeling on a five-point scale (1, “not at all”; 5, “extremely”) during the last year. The PANAS is widely used in organizations, alpha reliabilities are all acceptably high for PA (α = .88) and NA (α = .87). Watson et al., (1988) noted that this interval can be defined to represent state affect ranging from momentary states, single days, weeks, to years, with 'generally feel that way' representing trait affect. An interval of a year was used in this study. Coefficient alpha in this study are .84 and .83 for PA and NA, respectively.

Supervisor Emotional Displays

PANAS was used to assess supervisor emotional displays. The PANAS scale as described above has been updated to measure supervisor emotional displays. The same adjectives in the original form were used. The only difference using it in this instance is that the emotional displays was not considered with regard to the self; instead, the subordinate (employee) reported the extent to which he/she perceived the dispositional affect of the supervisor at work by indicating to what extent the 20 adjectives described the supervisor affect at work during the last six weeks. Respondents indicated their responses on a five-point scale (1, “not at all”; 5, “extremely”). Coefficient alpha in this study was .91 and .84 for PA and NA, respectively, with PA as supervisor positive emotional displays and NA as supervisor negative emotional displays.
Job Satisfaction

The six-item version of Brayfield and Rothe’s (1951) measure of overall job satisfaction was used. The original version has 18 items but the six-item version has been used by a number of researchers (cf. Agho, Mueller, & Price, 1993; Agho, Price, & Mueller, 1992; Aryee, Fields, & Luk, 1999; Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998). Coefficient alpha values for the six-item version in these studies ranged from .83 to .90.

Responses are obtained on a five-point Likert scale, where 5 = Strongly agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Undecided; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly disagree. An example item is “I am satisfied with my job for the time being.” The item “I am often bored with my job” was reverse coded and has been recoded. Coefficient alpha in this study is .88 for this scale.
Variables in the study were obtained by computing the average of the scores of items for each scale and subscale. Table 1 displays descriptive statistics.

Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics of Variables in the Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean scale</th>
<th>Mean of summed score</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>36.38</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affect</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Posit. Emot.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>34.88</td>
<td>8.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>17.99</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization commitment</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>54.12</td>
<td>11.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover cognitions</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N*=204; Mean scale column corresponds to an average on a five point likert scale; Sup. Posit. Emot. = Supervisor Positive Emotional Displays; Sup. Neg. Emot. = Supervisor Negative Emotional Displays
Table 2

*Correlations Matrix of Variables in the Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emp. Posit. Affect</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emp. Neg. Affect</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sup. Posit. Emot.</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affect. Comm.</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cont. Comm.</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Norm. Comm.</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Org. Comm.</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Turnover Cog.</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>-.65**</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01
Note. Emp. Posit. Affect = employee Positive Affect; Emp. Neg. Affect = Employee Negative Affect; Sup. Posit. Emot. = Supervisor positive emotional displays; Sup. Neg. Emot. = Supervisor negative emotional displays; Affect. Comm. = Employee affective commitment; Cont. Comm. = Employee continuance commitment; Norm. Comm. = Employee Normative Commitment; Org. Comm. = Employee organization commitment (overall); Turnover Cog. = Employee Turnover Cognitions. Values between parentheses are reliability coefficients α. * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Hypothesis 1a predicts that supervisor negative emotional displays will be positively associated with turnover cognitions, and hypothesis 1b predicts that supervisor positive emotional displays will be negatively associated with turnover cognitions.

Table 2 displays the results of a correlation analysis between the variables in the study. As can be seen, hypothesis 1a was supported based on the correlation results. A positive and significant relationship was found between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions ($r = .30, p < 0.01$). That is, a high score in supervisor negative emotional displays was associated with a high score in turnover cognitions. Also, a negative relationship was found between supervisor positive emotional displays and turnover cognitions as predicted in hypothesis 1b ($r = -.41, p < 0.01$). A high score on supervisor positive emotional displays was associated with a low score in turnover cognitions.

As shown in Table 2, the control variable, job satisfaction, was also correlated with turnover cognitions ($r = -.65, p < 0.01$). For further investigation the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions was tested through a regression analysis with job satisfaction as a control variable. Table 3 shows the results of this analysis.
Table 3

*Summary of Regression Analysis with Supervisor Negative Emotional Displays and Job Satisfaction Predicting Turnover Cognitions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE b</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>pr²</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[13.10, 17.28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>[-.02, .10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>[.46, -.32]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>75.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 204. CI = Confidence Interval for b; Sup. Neg. Emot. = Supervisor Negative Emotional Displays*

The “enter” method was used for this analysis. The results of this analysis show that when job satisfaction is controlled for, supervisor negative emotional displays is no longer a significant predictor of turnover cognition (p = .157). That is, in this model, the variance in turnover cognition accounted for uniquely by supervisor negative emotional displays is not statistically significant. Table 3 also shows the squared partial correlation coefficients (the correlation between the independent variable and the dependent variable when all remaining independent variables have been controlled for). The squared partial correlation coefficient of supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions is low (pr² = .01). This means that when job satisfaction is first allowed to account for whatever
turnover cognitions it can then supervisor negative emotional displays can account for 1% of the remaining turnover cognitions. Job satisfaction account for 37% of remaining turnover cognitions when supervisor negative emotional displays is controlled for ($pr^2 = .37$).

The relationship between supervisor positive emotional displays and turnover cognitions was also tested the same way with job satisfaction controlled for. Table 4 shows a summary of the statistics for this regression analysis. The results of this analysis show that supervisor positive emotional displays remains a significant predictor of turnover cognition when job satisfaction is controlled for, ($t = -2.54, p = .012, 95\% CI = -.10$ to $-.01$). That is, in the model, the unique variance in turnover cognition accounted for supervisor positive emotional displays is statistically significant. Supervisor positive emotional displays account for 3% of remaining turnover cognitions when job satisfaction is controlled for ($pr^2 = .03$). Job satisfaction accounts for 33% of turnover cognitions when supervisor positive emotional displays variable is controlled for.
Table 4

Summary of Regression Analysis with Supervisor Positive Emotional Displays and Job Satisfaction Predicting Turnover Cognitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE b</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>pr²</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>[15.89, 19.21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Posit. Emot.</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>[-.10, -.01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>[-.43, -.29]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .44

F = 79.50

Note. N = 204. CI = Confidence Interval for b; Sup. Posit. Emot. = Supervisor Positive Emotional Displays

A summary of the results for hypothesis 1a and hypothesis 1b is as follows: Although supervisor emotional displays (both negative and positive) showed a significant correlation with turnover cognitions, the variance in turnover cognitions explained only by supervisor negative emotional displays with job satisfaction in the equation is not significant. Hypothesis 1a was therefore partially supported. On the other hand, the variance in turnover cognitions explained only by supervisor positive emotional displays with job satisfaction in the equation is significant; hypothesis 1b was therefore supported.
Hypothesis 2a predicts that affective commitment would moderate the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions. Further, supervisor negative emotional displays will be more positively associated with turnover cognitions when affective commitment is relatively low and less associated with turnover cognitions when affective commitment is relatively high. Therefore, analyses for hypothesis 2a concerned testing for the moderating effect of affective commitment on the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions. The moderator hypothesis would be supported if the interaction between affective commitment and supervisor negative emotional displays is supported. In addition, Barron and Kenny (1986) suggested that it is desirable that the moderator variable be uncorrelated with both the predictor and the criterion (the dependent variable) to provide a clearly interpretable interaction term. In that case when the interaction is significant we know that the moderator variable has an effect on the relationship between the predictor and the criterion variable.

Several authors recommend centering the variables to avoid multicollinearity issues with regression analysis, because the product term is often correlated with the component parts used to define the product term (Jaccard & Turrisi, 2003). That is completed by subtracting the mean from each of the values on the variable (Variable – Mean of the Variable). Therefore, the predictor and moderator variables were centered prior to running the regression analysis. Table 5 shows a summary of results.
Table 5

*Summary of Statistics with predictor Supervisor Negative Emotional Displays and moderator Affective Commitment Predicting Turnover Cognitions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE b</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>pr²</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>[7.68, 8.49]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>[.01, .15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect. Comm.</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>[-.38, -.22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot. ×</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.01, -.01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect. Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As can be seen on table 5, the model significantly predicted turnover cognitions. \( F(3, 203) = 26.43, p < .001. \) Additionally, the squared multiple correlations is \( R^2 = 0.28 \) meaning that about 28% of turnover cognition was explained by the independent variables in the model. Although both centered supervisor negative emotional displays, and affective commitment are significant predictors of turnover cognitions (\( p=.018, \) and \( p=.000, \) respectively). However, the interaction between supervisor negative emotional displays and affective commitment was not significant, therefore, hypothesis 2a was not supported.
Hypothesis 2b predicted that normative commitment will moderate the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions. Further, supervisor negative emotional displays will be more positively associated with turnover cognitions when normative commitment is relatively low and less associated with turnover cognitions when normative commitment is relatively high. This hypothesis tests for moderation like the previous hypothesis, though with normative commitment as the moderator. The predictor and the criterion variables are the same, supervisor negative emotional displays, and turnover cognitions, respectively. The variables were centered as in the previous analysis, the interaction term was computed and the regression analysis was performed. The results are reported in Table 6.
Table 6

Summary of Statistics with Predictor Supervisor Negative Emotional Displays and moderator Normative Commitment Predicting Turnover Cognitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE b</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$pr^2$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>[7.67, 8.49]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>[.05, .18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm. Comm.</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>[-.33, -.17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot. × Norm. Comm.</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.01, -.11]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$ .24
$F$ 20.64 .000


As can be seen, the model significantly predicts turnover cognitions, $F(3, 203) = 20.64, p < .001$. In addition, the multiple correlation value $R^2 = .24$ meaning that the model accounts for about 24% of turnover cognitions. However, the simple effect terms are significant but not the interaction term. Therefore, hypothesis 2b was not supported.

Hypothesis 2c posited that continuance commitment will moderate the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover
cognitions. Furthermore, supervisor negative emotional displays will be more positively associated with turnover cognitions when continuance commitment is relatively low and less associated with turnover cognitions when continuance commitment is relatively high. This hypothesis like the last two, tests for moderation. The difference is that the moderator in this case is continuance commitment. The predictor (supervisor negative emotional displays) and the criterion variable (turnover cognition) are the same. A summary of the results is reported in Table 7.
Table 7

Summary of Statistics with Predictor Supervisor Negative Emotional Displays and Moderator Continuance Commitment Predicting Turnover Cognitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE b</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>pr²</th>
<th>95.0% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>[7.63, 8.51]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>[.10, .24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Comm.</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>[-.21, .01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot. × Cont. Comm.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.01, .03]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 204. CI = Confidence Interval for b; Sup. Neg. Emot. = Supervisor negative emotional displays; Cont. Comm. = Employee Continuance Commitment

As showed in Table 7, the model as a whole significantly predicts turnover cognitions, $F(3, 203) = 8.37, p < .01$. Also, the multiple correlation squared $R^2 = .11$ meaning that about 11\% of the turnover cognitions was explained by the predictors in the model. However, the interaction term is not significant, therefore, hypothesis 2c was not supported.
Hypothesis 2d predicted that the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions will be weaker for subordinates with high scores in continuance commitment as compared to those with high scores in affective commitment. Hypothesis 2d, unlike the three last hypotheses tested, involves three predictors feeding in the equation to predict the criterion variable, and was therefore tested with the use of a three way interaction. A regression analysis was performed with the criterion variable as turnover cognitions and the three predictors of supervisor negative emotional displays, continuance commitment, and affective commitment. Supervisor negative emotional displays variable is treated as a predictor and the two other variables as moderating the effect of this predictor variable.

The regression equation that captures a three-way interaction with a regression analysis is as follows: \[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_1 X_2 + \beta_5 X_1 X_3 + \beta_6 X_2 X_3 + \beta_7 X_1 X_2 X_3 + e, \] with \( \beta_0 \) a constant, \( \beta_1 \) to \( \beta_3 \) the weights of the three predictors variables, \( \beta_4 \) to \( \beta_7 \) the weights of all possible pairwise product terms among the three predictor variables, and \( \beta_7 \) the weight of the product term of the three predictors variables. \( e \) is the error term. Table 8 shows a summary of the results of the regression analysis. The independent variables in the model account for 30% in predicting turnover cognitions (\( R^2 = 0.30 \)). The model as a whole is significant in predicting turnover cognitions, \( F(3,203) = 12.20, p < .01 \). However, the interaction term between the three predictor variables is not significant. Thus hypothesis 2d was not supported.
Table 8

Statistics for Supervisor Negative Emotional Displays, Continuance Commitment, and Affective Commitment Predicting Turnover Cognitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE b</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>pr²</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>[7.58, 8.42]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>[.01, .15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Comm.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.13, .09]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect. Comm.</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>[-.38, -.22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot. × Cont. Comm.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>[-.00, .03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot. × Affect. Comm.</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.14, .01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Comm. × Affect. Comm.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.18, .02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot. × Cont. Comm.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.00, .00]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = .30 \]

\[ F = 12.20 \]

Hypothesis 2e posited that the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions will be weaker for subordinates with high score in continuance commitment than those with high score in normative commitment. The variables were mean-centered and the regression analysis was conducted using the “enter” method and a second three-way interaction was tested. Supervisor Negative Emotional displays, continuance commitment, and normative commitment are the predictors. Turnover cognitions is the criterion variable. A summary of the regression analysis is reported on table 9.

As shown in table 9, the ANOVA test for the model is significant $F(7,203) = 9.38, p < .01$. The multiple squared multiple correlation $R^2 = .25$ meaning that all the independent variables in the model account for 25% in predicting turnover cognitions. The interaction term account for .1% of remaining turnover cognitions when all other predictors are controlled for ($pr^2 = .01$). However, hypothesis 2e was also rejected. As can be seen, the interaction term between the three predictor variables was not significant ($p = .233$).
Table 9

Statistics for Supervisor Negative Emotional Displays, Continuance Commitment, and Normative Commitment Predicting Turnover Cognitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE b</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>pr²</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[7.56, 8.45]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>[.03, .18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Comm.</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.08, .15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm. Comm.</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>[-.34, -.17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot. × Cont. Comm.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.00, .03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot. × Norm. Comm.</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.02, .01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Comm. × Norm. Comm.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.02, .02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot. × Cont. Comm.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.00, .01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot. × Norm. Comm.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.00, .01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was stated in hypothesis 3 that subordinate positive affect (PA) will moderate the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions. Further, supervisor negative emotional displays will be more positively associated with turnover cognitions for subordinates high in PA and less associated with turnover cognitions for subordinates low in PA.

The employee positive affect variable was mean centered to create a new variable. Also, the interaction term between the potential moderator variable and the predictor supervisor negative emotional displays was the computed product term of the two centered variables (i.e., employee positive affect and supervisor negative emotional displays). Table 10 shows a summary of the results for the standard regression analysis.
Table 10

Summary of the Statistics for Predictor Supervisor Negative Emotional Displays and Moderator Positive Affect Predicting Turnover Cognitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE b</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>pr²</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>[7.68, 8.52]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>[.09, .22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>[-.23, -.09]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot. × Posit. Affect</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.00, .02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 204. CI = Confidence Interval for b; Sup. Neg. Emot. = Supervisor Negative Emotional Displays; Posit. Affect = Employee Positive Affect

The model predicts turnover cognitions, $F(3,203) = 16.59, p < .01$. Also, $R^2 = 0.20$, meaning that about 20% of turnover cognitions is explained by the predictors in the model (supervisor negative emotional displays, employee positive affect). As shown in Table 10, the interaction term is not significant ($p = .118$), however, it approaches significance. The interaction term shows a relatively larger partial correlation coefficient ($pr^2 = .01$), meaning that it accounts for 1% of remaining turnover cognitions when other predictors are controlled for. Also, a larger effect size was obtained in this analysis. The effect size of the
interaction is the amount of incremental variance explained by the interaction term after the first order effects have been controlled. It is estimated by calculating the difference between the multiple correlation squared obtained with the first order effect \( R^2 = .19 \) from the one obtained with the interaction added \( R^2 = .20 \) (table 10). The effect size for this interaction is .01. This value is below the small interaction effect size which is .02 according to Cohen’s (1992) classification of interaction effect size. Thus, hypothesis 3, stating that subordinate positive affect (PA) will moderate the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions, was not supported.

Because the \( p \) value was close to significant for hypothesis 3, the decision was made to examine the interaction graphically at three different levels of the moderator: high, medium, and low. These measures correspond in this study to +1 SD, zero SD (centered at mean), and -1 SD, respectively for employee positive affect variable. Figure 1 shows the plot of simple slopes obtained at the three levels. The predictor is on the X axis, and the criterion on the Y axis. The levels of the potential moderator are plotted on separate lines between the interval from -1.5 SD to +1.5 SD on the X axis.
Figure 1

Plots of Simple Slopes with Positive Affect tested as a Moderator of the relationship between Supervisor Negative Emotional Displays and Turnover Cognitions

On Positive Affect the solid line represents one SD below the mean, the line in the middle represents zero SD, and the dashed line represents one SD above the mean. Some amount of interactions is shown on Figure 1. The steepness of the plot for those high in PA looks larger than those low in PA. That is, the effect of supervisor negative emotional displays on turnover cognitions
appears somewhat stronger for those high on positive affect than those low on positive affect. See details of generating the plots in Appendix B.

Testing for Mediation: Post-hoc Testing

According to Baron and Kenny (1986) moderator variables are typically introduced when there is an unexpectedly weak or inconsistent relation between a predictor and a criterion variable. Mediation, on the other hand, is best done in the case of a strong relation between the predictor and the criterion variable. To establish mediation, Baron and Kenny proposed a series of regression analyses where the three following conditions must hold: (a) the independent variable must affect the proposed mediator in the first equation; (b) the independent variable must be shown to affect the dependent variable in the second equation; and (c), the proposed mediator must affect the dependent variable in the third equation. If these three conditions all hold in the predicted direction, then the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable must be less in the third equation than in the second. A full or perfect mediation holds if the independent variable has no effect when the mediator is controlled for. If the predictor is still significant, the finding supports partial mediation.

Given that in this study, supervisor negative emotional displays (predictor) was correlated with the dependent variable, turnover cognitions \( (r = .30, p < .01) \), and organization commitment correlated to turnover cognitions \( (r = -.46, p < .01) \), it seemed useful to test the variables already tested as moderators, but this time as mediators. These are post-hoc tests, not specified in the original hypotheses. Thus,
a series a regression analyses were performed as indicated above to test the mediating effect of each of affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment, and employee positive affect on the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions. That is, testing hypothesis 2a, hypothesis 2b, hypothesis 2c, and hypothesis 3 and this time the moderator was a mediator, a summary of result in table 11.
Table 11

Summary of Statistics for Predictor Supervisor Negative Emotional Displays and Mediator Affective Commitment Predicting Turnover Cognitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE b</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>pr²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Affect. Comm. regressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>22.78</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Turnover Cog. regressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Turnover Cog regressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on Sup. Neg. Emot. and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affect. Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affect. Comm.</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of this testing, affective commitment and normative commitment satisfied the requirements for mediators in the three steps. As can be seen in Table 11, all three steps of the regression analysis are significant, for step 1 to step 3, $F(1, 203) = 21.69, p < .01$, $F(1, 203) = 19.86, p < .01$, $F(2, 203) = 39.83, p < .01$, respectively. That shows that supervisor negative emotional displays significantly predicted turnover cognitions (direct effect), and also predicted affective commitment. It also predicted turnover cognitions when affective commitment is controlled but held a relatively smaller effect (indirect effect). This indirect effect can be calculated. Judd and Kenny (1981) suggested computing the difference between the two coefficients obtained between step 2 and step 3. That is $.30 - .15 = .15$. This value represents the change in turnover cognitions for every unit change in supervisor negative emotional displays that is mediated by affective commitment. Preacher & Leonardelli (2006) have prepared a set of online calculation tool for mediation tests including the Sobel test that was used to calculate significance of this mediation analysis. The Sobel test (two-tailed) was significant (test statistic = 3.97, $SE = .02, p < .01$). This result supports the idea that the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognition is partially mediated by affective commitment. The effect of affective commitment reduces the simple effect of supervisor negative emotional displays on turnover cognitions.
Table 12 displays the regression analysis results with normative commitment as mediator. Step 3 is significant, showing that supervisor negative emotional displays also predicted normative commitment $F (1, 203) = 6.87, p < .01$ and still predicted turnover cognitions when normative commitment is controlled, $F (2, 203) = 31.04, p < .01$. The indirect effect in this case is $0.30 - 0.23 = 0.07$. This value represents the change in turnover cognitions for every unit change in supervisor negative emotional displays that is mediated by normative commitment. The Sobel test was also significant for this analysis test statistic $= 2.40, SE = .015, p <.01$ (two-tailed).
Table 12

Summary of Statistics for predictor Supervisor Negative Emotional Displays and mediator Normative Commitment predicting Turnover Cognitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE b</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$p^2$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Turnover Cog. regressed on Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. Neg. Emot.</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norm. Comm.</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 6
DISCUSSION

Although there has been some empirical research on the relationship between supervisor emotional displays and employee work attitudes, very little is known about the way supervisor emotional displays affect employee turnover cognitions. This study expanded this area of research by testing predictions about supervisor emotional displays, particularly negative displays, and employee turnover cognitions. Three organizational commitment types and employee positive affect were investigated as potential moderators in this relationship, followed by post-hoc analyses with the potential moderators retested as mediators.

Discussion

It has been shown that supervisor negative emotional displays were positively correlated with turnover cognitions, and supervisor positive emotional displays were negatively correlated to turnover cognitions, as expected. However, job satisfaction was also highly correlated with turnover cognitions. When job satisfaction was taken into account, the results showed that supervisor negative emotional displays were no longer a significant predictor of turnover cognitions, whereas supervisor positive emotional displays were still significant in predicting turnover cognitions. Thus, this study adds more evidence that supervisor
emotional displays influence employee turnover cognitions, at least to some extent.

Other studies have also shown that it is not entirely apparent which factors influence the relationship between supervisor emotional displays and turnover cognitions. Following up with Damen et al.’s (2008) suggestion to look into eventual moderators, the extent to which affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment, and employee positive affect function as potential moderators of this relationship was tested.

Research has reported the association between affective commitment and work attitudes such as absenteeism, performance, and turnover (Hunter & Thatcher, 2007; Sinclair, Tucker, Cullen, Wright, 2005; Siu, 2003; Riketta, 2008). Affective commitment is also considered as an important determinant of dedication and loyalty. Based on these findings, it was expected that affective commitment would buffer the effect of supervisor negative emotional displays on turnover cognitions. Supervisor negative emotional displays was expected to be more positively associated with turnover cognitions when affective commitment is relatively low and less associated with turnover cognitions when affective commitment is relatively high. This hypothesis was not supported.

Several sources can explain this lack of support. Among these, the sample used warrants some discussions. As mentioned earlier, the majority of the sample was students working part time, with little work experience and relatively short work tenure. An assessment of organizational commitment among workers with
longer work tenure and experience in the same organization is more likely to yield reliable results than results obtained from the sample in this study as described above (short work tenure, young, less skilled). The reasoning is that a longer time spent in an organization is likely to be an indicator of some sort of commitment. This might have biased the results and consequently threatened the generalizability. This threat may also have been larger than normal since the human subjects pools used was limited to students from a few undergraduate psychology classes in the major; no other major was included. In addition, participation was voluntary with a half hour courses credit incentive. This also might have biased the results as students are motivated to obtain their credit and there was no proof that the participants met the criteria to participate in the study other than what he or she provided.

The sample was also female-dominated and that may also increase the generalizability threat as gender difference are show in emotions expressions and emotion experiences (cf. Lewis, 2000). In sum, the sample used was not a typical representation of the work force and the results might have been biased due to the lack of a more rigorous way of selecting participants, causing a legitimate threat to the generalizability.

Based on previous findings it was stated that normative commitment will moderate the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions in the same direction as affective commitment. The two types of commitment share most of the antecedents. This hypothesis was also not
supported. Therefore, the arguments developed above for lack of support for a
moderating effect of affective commitment can be used to explain the results
obtained with normative commitment as a moderator, notably the problems raised
with the sample.

Unlike affective commitment and normative commitment, most of the
antecedent variables of continuance commitment are more calculative. They
include personal characteristics, alternatives, and investments. Research has
supported that while work experiences are correlated with affective commitment
and at a lower level to normative commitment (Allen et al., 2002); no significant
correlation with continuance commitment was found. Based on these findings, it
was predicted that although continuance potentially moderates the relationship
between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions
(hypothesis 2c), this relationship will be weaker for individuals with high scores
in continuance commitment than those with high scores in affective commitment
(hypothesis 2d). Following the same logic it was also predicted that the
relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover
cognitions would be weaker for individuals with high scores in continuance
commitment than those with high scores in normative commitment (hypothesis
2e).

Continuance commitment did not significantly moderate the relationship
between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions. In
addition to the problems mentioned with the sample used in this study, another
explanation of the lack of support of hypothesis 2c lies in the work motivations of students. Many have work contracts with limited terms; that status combined with the scarcity of financial resources for many of students could be reason to limit their thoughts about turnover, regardless of the supervisors emotional displays. It is also important to mention that this scale (unlike the other scales) yielded a low reliability coefficient in this study, threatening the interpretability of the related analyses.

With none of affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance significantly moderating the relationships between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions, a lack of support for hypotheses 2d and 2e was observed. That is, a weaker moderating effect of a high level of continuance commitment compared to a high level of affective commitment, and normative commitment, respectively, was not likely, given the lack of support of the three previous hypotheses. Again here it would be interesting to retest these hypotheses in organizations with samples obtained from different sources that could be more representative of the US work force.

Previous research showed that a person’s affective state corresponds with congruent information processing and retrieval of information (c.f. Ilies, Scott, & Judge, 2006; Judge & Ilies, 2004). It was therefore, hypothesized that an employee is likely to be more tolerant of negative emotional displays from a supervisor if the employee generally holds a negative mood. The test was not significant, but a relatively greater level of significance for the interaction term
between supervisor negative emotional displays with employee positive affect was found in the direction of the predictions. Again, it is suggested that if this study is repeated on a different sample, such as participants from one or two occupational groups rather than a student population, the research might yield stronger conclusions. It is expected that employee of occupational groups are likely to be qualified workers; it is also likely to find employees with a greater work tenure in this population comparing to the sample used in this study. Work attitudes might be different from this population compared to the sample used in this study.

It is also important to notice that numerous researchers (e.g., Evans, 1985; Morris, Sherman & Mansfield, 1986 as cited in Aguinis, 1995) argue that tests of hypotheses pertaining to the effects of moderators in moderator multiple regression analysis often have very low statistical power. In consequence Type II statistical error rates are high in these studies. According to Aguinis, factors detrimental to statistical power in these analyses include (1) variable distributions, (2) operationalizations of criterion and predictor, (3) predictor intercorrelation, and (4) sample size. Possible courses of action when a researcher determines a low power situation have been suggested but most of them raise issues. For example Aguinis suggested to increase sample size, but researchers may be limited by practical considerations to do so. Also, low power can be compensated by increasing the Type I error rate above the traditional levels, for example to $\alpha = .10$. However, researchers may be reluctant to raise the pre-set significance
level above .05. According to other research, the size of the interaction effect should be estimated before data collection (Aguinis, 1995; Frazier, Tix, & Barron, 2004). In this case an adequate sample size based on the estimated effect size will maximize the chances of detecting significant interaction effects. Based on Cohen’s (1992) conventions a small effect size in multiple regressions corresponds to $R^2$ value of .02, a medium effect size corresponds to $R^2$ value of .13, and a large effect size corresponds to $R^2$ value of .26.

Given the results obtained with the moderation tests, a post-hoc test was conducted using the previously moderator variables as a mediator variables. Affective commitment and normative commitment appear to significantly mediate the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions. Thus, the mediation test showed clearly that affective commitment diminishes the strength of the relationship between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions to a certain extent. In other words, an individual with high affective commitment will be less affected by supervisor negative emotional displays in terms of considering turnover. This is important as it indicates once again that turnover can be reduced in organizations by bolstering employees’ affective commitment. The same results were observed with normative commitment as a moderator but at a lower level.

Limitations and Future Research

Although some results of this study are in congruence with previous findings, notably supervisor emotional displays correlated with turnover
cognitions, the organizational commitment variables did not significantly moderate this relationship. Some limitations to this study deserve specific mention. First the participants were all students selected from the human subjects pool of the CSUS department of psychology. This population is certainly not representative of the typical employee in an organization as the work reality (habits, motivations, status) of students is different in many respects from that of employees in other parts of the workforce. Weaknesses of the sample are reported as follows: The majority was part time workers with relatively limited work experience, the sample was largely female-dominated and relatively young, participation was voluntary with employment status and work tenure self reported, supervisor emotional displays (positive and negative) were reported by the participants and the measure of supervisor emotional displays was obtained by adapting the PANAS which measures positive and negative affect. All these factors may threaten both the internal and external validity of this study.

Because the sample was based exclusively on a student sample, it is recommended that further replication is needed before drawing firm conclusions on the hypotheses tested in this study. It is suggested that future research use samples from a different part of workforce, for example the use of participants from one or two occupational group(s), such as nurses, for instance. It would also be interesting to use different and greater amounts of work tenure than used in this study. This is suggested because turnover may vary based on work tenure and level of skills. For example, a more highly skilled worker pursing a career and
aware of his or her marketable skills might be more likely to consider turnover when unfavorable work conditions (i.e., supervisor negative emotional displays) are present. This worker’s skills are valuable enough to risk leaving, given the reasonable expectations that he or she might be hired elsewhere; this is less likely for an unskilled and temporary worker as in the current sample. With the statistical power issues raised when testing the effects of moderators in multiple regression analysis, it is recommended that future research set the effect size needed and an adequate sample to maximize the chances to find significant interactions effects, if any.

In addition, for this study the participants reported the way he or she perceived supervisor emotional displays. Given that responses were made anonymously, it was expected that participants would be more likely to provide honest assessments. However, in light of the comments made above about the scale used, it is recommended that future research use a different approach to measure supervisor emotional displays. For instance a multisource data for this measure would certainly warrant a better reliability. The PANAS was updated to measure this variable. In this instance emotional displays was not considered with regard to the self; instead, the employee reported the extent to which he/she perceived the dispositional affect of the supervisor at work. A direct report from supervisors might warrant a better reliability. Finally, with the encouraging results showed with the tests using types of organizational commitment as mediators
instead of moderators it is recommend these analyses be repeated for different samples.

Conclusion

This study investigated aspects of emotions in organizations, a relatively recent area of research. The most important finding is that supervisor positive emotional displays significantly predicted turnover cognitions, even with job satisfaction controlled for. Supervisor emotional displays (negative and positive) variables were correlated with turnover cognitions, supervisor negative emotional displays was not a significant predictor of turnover cognition when job satisfaction was controlled for. In addition, the post-hoc analyses of organizational commitment variables as mediators helps shed some light on the importance of the mediator relationship.
APPENDIX A

Demographic Questions

The following questions concern your position and other personal information. Completion of this information is voluntary and confidentially is assured. No individual data will be reported. THANK YOU!

1. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

2. What is your age group?
   - Under 26
   - 26 - 35
   - 36 - 45
   - 46 – or older

3. Please indicate which of the below category describes best your current position
   - Upper management
   - Middle management
   - Assistant management
   - Staff (Not a supervisor)
   - Other: __________
   - 
   - 
   -
4. How many hours do you spend working per week for your current position?

.................................................................

5. How long have you worked for your Immediate Supervisor?

............................Years .....................Months

6. Are you currently a supervisor for anyone?

☐ Yes

☐ No

7. What is your ethnicity?

☐ White

☐ Hispanic / Latino

☐ Asian/Pacific Islander

☐ Native American

☐ Black/African

☐ Other:________

American
APPENDIX B

Generating the Plots of Simple Slopes

The Equations Used

Three regression equations at 3 reference points for the moderator variable Positive Affect were obtained (at the mean, at + standard deviation, and -1 standard deviation) corresponding at medium, high and low levels of the positive affect variable. The equations are as follows:

Centered at the Mean

Predicted TurnCog(PA@0sd) = 8.101 + (.157)(Sup. Neg. Emot.) + (-.162)(PA) + (.009)(Inter)

Centered at +1SD

Predicted TurnCog(PA@0sd) = 7.085 + (.210)(Sup. Neg. Emot.) + (-.162)(PA) + (.009)(Inter)

Centered at -1SD

Predicted TurnCog(PA@0sd) = 9.117 + (.103)(Sup. Neg. Emot.) + (-.162)(PA) + (.009)(Inter)

(TurnCog = Turnover cognitions, Sup. Neg. Emot. = supervisor negative emotional displays, Inter = interaction term between supervisor negative emotional displays and turnover cognitions, PA = positive affect).

The Range of the Plot

The range for plot is between ± 1.5 SD. The predictor supervisor negative emotional displays has a SD value of 6.40281 as shown in Table 1. That is, + 1.5
standard deviation units corresponds to a value of supervisor negative emotional displays of \(6.40281 \times 1.5\), the product is 9.604215.

Similarly, \(-1.5\) standard deviation units corresponds to a value of \(-9.604215\) for supervisor negative emotional displays.

*Representing the Plots*

To plot the simple slopes the dependent variable (turnover cognitions) is placed on the Y axis, the predictor (supervisor negative emotional displays) is on the X axis, and the levels of the moderator variable (Positive Affect) are depicted by separate lines. These are straight lines so we just need to compute two data points for each line to be plotted.

Centering Positive Affect variable caused the drop out of the second and the third terms in the above equations when calculating the data points to represent the plots of simple slopes.

*SPSS Syntax to plot the Simple Slopes in 2-D*

```spss
compute loPA = 9.117 + .103 * SNED.
compute avPA = 8.101 + .157 * SNED.
compute hiPA = 7.085 + .210 * SNED.
temporary.
select if ((SNED ge -9.604215) and (SNED le 9.604215)).
graph
  /scatterplot(overlay)=pSuNaC pSuNaC pSuNaC
```
with loPA avPA hiPA (pair)
/title="Regression of Turnover Cognitions on centered

Positive Affect".

SNED = is the supervisor negative emotional displays variable.
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