Leadership Styles, Emotion Regulation, and Burnout

4 authors, including:

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Women's perception of leadership View project

Author Notes: Kara A. Arnold, Faculty of Business Administration, Memorial University, St John's, NL, Canada; Megan M. Walsh, Faculty of Business Administration, Memorial University, St John's, NL, Canada; Catherine E. Connelly, DeGroote School of Business, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada; Kathleen A. Martin Ginis, Department of Kinesiology, Faculty of Science, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada.

Correspondence concerning this article can be sent to Kara A. Arnold, Faculty of Business Administration, Memorial University, St. John's, NL, Canada, A1B 3X5; Internet: kara.arnold@mun.ca.

Leadership styles, emotion regulation and burnout

Abstract

This study investigated the potential impact of leadership style on leaders' emotional regulation strategies and burnout. Drawing on the full-range model of leadership and Conservation of Resources (COR) theory, we tested whether transformational, contingent reward, management by exception – active and – passive, or laissez-faire leadership exert direct effects on leaders' reported use of surface acting, deep acting, and genuine emotion. In turn, we hypothesized and tested the indirect effect of leadership on burnout through surface acting. Three waves of data from 205 leaders were analyzed using OLS regression. Transformational leadership predicted deep acting and genuine emotion. Contingent reward predicted both surface and deep acting. Management by exception – active and – passive predicted surface acting, and laissez faire predicted genuine emotion. The indirect effects of management by exception – active and – passive on burnout through surface acting were not significant. Indirect effects of transformational leadership and laissez-faire on burnout through genuine emotion, however, were significant. This study provides empirical evidence for the hypothesized relationships between leadership style, emotion regulation and burnout, and provides the basis for future research and theory building on this topic.

Keywords: transformational leadership, contingent reward, management by exception, laissez-faire, burnout, emotion regulation, conservation of resources theory, deep acting, surface acting, genuine emotion.

Leadership styles, emotion regulation and burnout

Stress and burnout from work-related demands are central concerns for organizations, because they carry a high cost due to outcomes such as increased turnover and decreased employee effort (e.g., Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004). Many studies have focused on employee stress, but an area of growing interest concerns *leader* stress (e.g., Courtright, Colbert, & Choi, 2014). We define leaders in the context of this study as those "influencing task objectives and strategies, influencing commitment and compliance in task behavior to achieve these objectives, influencing group maintenance and identification, and influencing the culture of an organization" (Yukl, 1989, p. 253). This study contributes to this emerging body of research by investigating how leadership styles affect leaders' emotion regulation strategies and subsequent burnout.

There is a growing recognition that leaders must display emotions to meet organizational goals (Gardner, Fischer, & Hunt, 2009; Rajah, Song, & Arvey, 2011). We expect that these emotional demands may be stressful for some leaders. Our specific focus is on transformational and transactional leadership styles, because they have been suggested as being relevant to emotion regulation (Humphrey, 2012). We investigate the role of emotion regulation strategies for the entire full-range leadership model and explain how a leader's style could lead to burnout.

We base our arguments on Conservation of Resources theory (COR; Hobfoll, 1989). We suggest that leaders will use different emotion regulation strategies due to differing levels of personal resources; some of these emotion regulation strategies will predict resource drain and burnout. In the sections that follow we define three types of

emotion regulation (surface acting, deep acting, and genuine emotion), and hypothesize how they relate to the leadership styles of interest in terms of potential resource drain or gain.

Leadership and emotion regulation

Emotion regulation strategies are "the processes by which individuals influence which emotions they have, when they have them, and how they experience and express these emotions" (Gross, 1998, p. 275). Two widely studied aspects of emotion regulation are surface acting and deep acting (Hochschild, 1983). Surface acting occurs when a person experiences a discrepancy between the emotions they need to display in a given situation and the emotions that they feel inside (Zapf, 2002). Deep acting, in contrast, occurs when a person actively regulates their internal emotions to align their feelings with what is required in a given situation (Sliter, Chen, Withrow, & Sliter, 2013). When using deep acting, one takes the time to actually feel the emotion that must be displayed (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Note that deep acting and surface acting are not orthogonal constructs. Individuals can use both deep acting and surface acting, and in some studies there have been weak positive correlations between the two (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002).

Although most emotion regulation is deliberate, individuals may also display authentic emotions that are appropriate to the situation (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, 2005). Genuine emotional expression is considered emotion regulation because it may still be necessary for individuals to use cognitive effort to *display* the spontaneously generated emotion appropriately. In this sense, surface acting and deep acting are considered compensatory emotion regulation strategies that are

used when one's genuine emotion does not match what is required in the situation (Diefendorff et al., 2005).

Emotion regulation may affect leaders in a unique way in comparison to service employees. Humphrey et al. (2008) propose that leaders must display a wide range of emotions in comparison to customer service workers. Leaders must express both positive and negative emotions at varying intensities, in contrast to customer service employees who are most often trained to act friendly. Leaders must also exercise a high level of judgement about how the emotions they display will affect their followers (Humphrey et al., 2008). We believe that the wider range of emotional competencies required for leaders will relate to their overarching leadership style; a leader's dominant style may be indicative of the levels of effort they dedicate to their own emotional displays. In the sections that follow, we outline how leadership styles are theoretically hypothesized to relate to emotion regulation, detail the methods used to test the hypotheses, summarize the results and discuss the findings.

Resources, leadership, and emotion regulation

The COR theory proposes that people generally try to build and maintain their resources, so it is threatening (i.e., stressful) to face the potential or actual loss of such resources (Hobfoll, 1989). Individuals actively seek to create and maintain resources by 'investing' them, and may use resources to replace others when they are lost. It is much more difficult for an individual to re-gain resources once they are depleted, although those with many resources are able to gain more easily (Hobfoll, 2002). When experiencing resource depletion, individuals become defensive as they seek to conserve the few resources they have (Byrne et al., 2013; Hobfoll, 1989).

Transformational leadership may be associated with a high level of personal resources. There are four components of being a transformational leader: individual consideration, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Many of these leadership behaviors are associated with emotional displays, and evidence suggests that transformational leadership's positive effects on followers is due, at least in part, to a focus on sharing positive emotions (Chuang, Judge & Liaw, 2012). Transformational leaders have been found to influence a wide range of positive organizational outcomes, such as individual and team performance (Wang, Oh, Courtright, & Colbert, 2011). Overall, transformational leaders may have an 'advantage' in terms of resource gain because their leadership style can create positive outcomes for followers, which is a positive reflection of their leadership. According to COR theory, having an abundance of resources means that transformational leaders would have the flexibility to use the emotion regulation strategies most suited to their styles and underlying goals. This would lead to a positive resource spiral for transformational leaders, as their personal orientation to leadership makes them able to gain even more resources through effective emotion regulation.

If a leader is highly transformational, then he or she will be more likely to make an attempt to empathize with and understand the emotional reactions that employees are expecting. This process would require deep acting, because being empathetic and taking the perspective of others are ways of creating required emotions. Transformational leaders may also engage in deep acting as a strategy to appear more confident (Humphrey et al., 2008). Consistent with transformational leadership theory, surface acting would not

be a desirable strategy, because it can be seen as a form of inauthenticity (Gardner et al., 2009).

Because they have an abundance of resources, transformational leaders would also be well positioned to use genuine emotion. Transformational leaders presumably have support from followers because of their effectiveness, so they would be able to display spontaneous emotion without worrying about resource loss. In addition, transformational leaders are more likely to be highly extraverted (Bono & Judge, 2004), which predicts the use of genuine emotion (Austin, Dore & O'Donovan, 2008). Factors such as the frequency and routine nature of interactions would apply to transformational leaders' use of genuine emotion as well. Frequent contact with people requires a greater need to regulate emotional displays (Morris & Feldman, 1996). The approach most likely for a transformational leader in frequent interactions would be deep acting, given the fact that they are sensitive to how their actions influence their followers. During periods without frequent interaction, leaders would use genuine emotion because there would be less need to regulate emotional displays (Morris & Feldman, 1996).

Transformational leaders may also be less likely to have routine, mundane interactions with followers because they often stimulate their followers and motivate them to think in new ways (Arnold & Loughlin, 2013). Diefendorff et al. (2005) argue that non-routine interactions would foster genuine emotional expressions because there is less likely to be a 'script' that individuals would adhere to in that case. Thus, transformational leaders would be more likely to use genuine emotion given the variety of tasks they deal with regularly. Taken together, these findings suggest that

transformational leaders would use genuine emotion and deep acting to influence

followers, and would be unlikely to surface act. Thus, we make the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1a: Transformational leadership positively predicts deep acting.

Hypothesis 1b: Transformational leadership positively predicts genuine emotion.

Transformational leadership is part of a full-range leadership model (e.g., Avolio,

2011) in which it is often contrasted with the pragmatic and task-oriented styles of

transactional leadership. Transactional leadership has three sub-styles: management by

exception (monitoring followers' mistakes), laissez-faire (avoiding involvement), and

contingent reward (rewarding followers' achievements; Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Contingent reward is considered to be the most positive and effective of the

transactional leadership styles. It is a constructive leadership style where leaders make

their expectations clear and offer rewards or recognition in return for task effort (Bass,

1990). It has been argued that the most effective managers are those who demonstrate

social and emotional skills (Riggio & Reichard, 2008), so contingent reward's

effectiveness likely relies partly on the use of emotion regulation to influence others.

Contingent reward is associated with several positive outcomes for followers,

such as increased job satisfaction (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Enacting contingent reward

will create some leader resources because of its moderately positive outcomes for

followers. However, while contingent reward is consistently hypothesized to yield

positive outcomes, these outcomes are lesser than those yielded from transformational

leadership (e.g., Avolio, 2011; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Without

the same level of resources as a transformational leader, contingent reward leaders would

be unlikely to have the same flexibility in using emotion regulation strategies. Contingent

reward leaders would be less likely to risk inappropriate (and therefore costly) emotional displays by using genuine emotion.

Contingent reward leaders may instead use a combination of surface acting and deep acting. To increase performance, these leaders would need to set goals and match their emotions to those desired in their followers (e.g., enthusiasm). Without a high level of resources, surface acting may be the best option for a contingent reward leader; it would require less time than deep acting and would be more controllable than genuine emotion (Zapf, 2002). Using surface acting, a contingent reward leader would be able to effectively direct follower's efforts without detracting from their true focus on the task. However, deep acting may also play a role in that contingent reward leaders sometimes do use psychological rewards, such as recognition or praise, in their management of others (Bass & Riggio, 2006). To use such rewards effectively, a moderate level of deep acting might be required (e.g., to give praise sincerely), because others can detect surface acting (Grandey, Foo, Groth, & Goodwin, 2012). Thus, we make the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 2a: Contingent reward positively predicts deep acting.

Hypothesis 2b: Contingent reward positively predicts surface acting.

Management by exception is considered a 'corrective' transactional style and is generally found to be ineffective in terms of improving the performance of followers (Bass & Riggio, 2006). This type of leader monitors mistakes or deviations from the norm and takes corrective action only in these instances (Bass & Riggio, 2006). This style can be active or passive; a management by exception – active (MBE-A) leader seeks out follower mistakes and "actively monitor[s] deviances from standards", whereas a

management by exception – passive (MBE-P) leader "wait[s] passively for deviances" and takes corrective action when they occur (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p.8).

Management by exception has been associated with increased negative outcomes for followers such as emotional exhaustion and workplace conflict (Doucet, Poitras, & Chênevert, 2009; Stordeur, D'hoore, & Vandenberghe, 2001). These negative effects suggest that management by exception leaders may scarcely use deep acting, perhaps because they typically have few resources to expend. [1] For instance, given that these leaders foster a high level of workplace conflict, this could reflect negatively on the leader in terms of fewer rewards and recognition. Their resulting low resource levels would make it difficult to use deep acting, because it would take more time and effort, so they may use more superficial forms of emotion regulation (i.e. surface acting).

It is also unlikely that a leader who uses management by exception would engage in genuine emotional expression. The leaders who are most likely to use genuine emotional expression have high levels of empathy and non-routine work interactions (Diefendorff et al., 2005; Humphrey et al., 2008). Management by exception's destructive outcomes suggests that these leaders may not be as empathetic as transformational leaders and likely have similar types of encounters with followers over time; they tend to foster negative feelings and do not take steps to mitigate these issues. We therefore make the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 3a: Management by exception – active positively predicts surface acting.

Hypothesis 3b: Management by exception – passive positively predicts surface acting.

---

[1] This is not to say that management by exception is inherently cruel or destructive. In fact, Bass and Riggio (2006) note that management by exception may be a leader's only option in a large organization where empathetic or emotional displays towards followers are not always possible.

Although laissez-faire leadership has been studied less than other leadership styles, there is some evidence to suggest that it may involve some emotion regulation. Laissez-faire leadership has been negatively associated with perceptions of leader effectiveness (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008) and leads to employee distress through workplace bullying (Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, Aasland, & Hetland, 2007). It also predicts higher levels of injuries at work (Kelloway, Mullen, & Francis, 2006).

The negative effects associated with laissez-faire leadership suggest that these leaders are likely to experience spiralling resource loss. In contrast to transformational or contingent reward leaders, who create positive outcomes, a laissez-faire leader creates a destructive environment where resource gain is increasingly difficult; resources are expended in avoiding interactions with followers (and dealing with the negative outcomes outlined above), which suggests that laissez-faire leaders have few resources to expend on emotion regulation. They would not engage in surface or deep acting, because these types of emotion regulation would require too much cognitive effort.

Instead, laissez-faire leaders may engage in genuine emotion because they do not have resources to expend on more laborious emotion regulation strategies, and because interaction with followers may be a rare occurrence. Diefendorff et al. (2005) suggest that "for nonroutine interactions, natural emotional displays may be more likely," (p. 344). In other words, when laissez-faire leaders do interact with followers, they will be most likely to use their spontaneous emotion. We hypothesize:

Hypothesis 4: Laissez-faire positively predicts genuine emotion.

Emotion regulation and burnout

Burnout, a specific outcome of stress, is typically defined by its dimensions, which are emotional exhaustion, depersonalization (treating people as objects), and diminished feelings of personal accomplishment (Maslach, 1982). According to COR theory, burnout occurs through prolonged periods of having few resources, which leads other resources to become compromised as well.

Leadership styles that predict surface acting may relate to burnout indirectly through the use of this emotion regulation strategy. Surface acting is likely to deplete leader resources and lead to a spiralling of resource loss. One well-established finding in the customer service emotion regulation research literature is that surface acting is linked with harmful outcomes related to individual well-being (e.g., Grandey, 2003). Surface acting is associated with emotional exhaustion, depersonalization (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011) as well as lower work performance (Hülsheger, Lang, & Maier, 2010). Thus, we make the following hypotheses:

> *Hypothesis 5a: Surface acting mediates the relationship between contingent reward and burnout.*

> *Hypothesis 5b: Surface acting mediates the relationship between management-by-exception-active and burnout.*

> *Hypothesis 5c: Surface acting mediates the relationship between management-by-exception-passive and burnout.*

In contrast, deep acting and genuine emotion are not as clearly linked to burnout or other indicators of impaired well-being. Deep acting has been related to positive outcomes, such as increased job performance, but is not necessarily predictive of psychological strain (Grandey, 2003). The positive outcomes related to deep acting may be balanced by simultaneous resource losses, making its effects on stress and strain difficult to detect (Hülsheger et al., 2010). Evidence currently suggests that it may also be

difficult to detect genuine emotions' effects, and much less empirical research has focused on the effects of genuine emotion. Although it would be assumed that a lack of emotional dissonance (implied by genuine emotion) would be a psychologically protective factor (Zapf, 2002), one study has found genuine emotion to be predictive of emotional exhaustion (Chu, 2002). Thus, while our analyses allowed for tests of indirect effects of leadership on burnout through deep acting and genuine emotion, we do not propose specific hypotheses regarding the indirect effects of leadership styles on burnout through deep acting and genuine emotion given conflicting evidence.

Methods

Sample

Participants were recruited through StudyResponse, a non-profit organization that links researchers to participants willing to take part in research studies (www.studyresponse.net). Participants responded to a survey three times, three months apart for each wave of data collection. At Time 1, control variables (burnout, number of years in supervisory role and negative affectivity) and measures of transformational, contingent reward, management by exception – active and – passive, and laissez-faire leadership were collected. Deep acting and surface acting data were collected at Time 2. Genuine emotion and burnout data were collected at Time 3.

At Time 1, 695 leaders were invited to participate. The criteria for inclusion in the study were that the individual was working full-time in a management role with direct reports. The final sample at Time 1 (after deleting responses that were incomplete) consisted of 268 individuals (response rate = 39%). All 268 respondents were invited to participate at Time 2 and 248 responded (response rate = 93%). All 248 from Time 2

were invited to participate at Time 3 and 205 responded (response rate = 83%). The final

sample consisted of 205 leaders.

The percentage of female leaders in the final sample was 39%. The average age

was 36.4 years. Average years in a supervisory role was 6.8 (range 6 months – 30 years),

and average number of direct reports was 23.2 (range 1-300). A wide range of industries

was represented, including manufacturing (41), business services/consulting (22),

construction (21), information technology (21), financial (14), wholesale (10), sales/retail

(10), engineering (8), education (5), and various smaller groups (38). Fifteen participants

did not report the industry they worked in. The majority (148) of participants were from

North America (USA – 143; Canada – 5). The next largest segment was from China (24)

or not reported (24). Four participants reported being from India, and one each from

Australia, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Puerto Rico.

Measures

Leadership. All leadership dimensions were measured using the Multifactor

Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1995). The MLQ was used with permission of

the copyright holder. Participants were asked to rate how often they engaged in each of

the behaviors specific to each dimension. Responses were made on a 5-point scale

ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always), where a higher score would

indicate that a respondent perceived himself or herself to engage in that leadership

behavior more frequently. Example items are: 'I get others to look at problems from

many different angles' (transformational), 'I discuss in specific terms who is responsible

for achieving performance targets' (contingent reward), 'I wait for things to go wrong

before taking action' (management by exception – passive), 'I focus attention on

irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards' (management by exception – active), 'I avoid getting involved when important issues arise' (laissez-faire). *Transformational leadership* was measured with 20 items. *Contingent reward, laissez-faire, and active and passive management by exception* were measured with four items each. Each of these measures of leadership dimensions has exhibited high reliability (alpha greater than .80 with larger samples; MBE-A can be found to be lower than other dimensions; Bass & Riggio, 2006). The reliability of these measures in the current study mirrors those found in past research. We followed the practice suggested by Bass & Riggio (2006) and combined the transformational items into one overall composite score, but we did not combine the transactional factors (contingent reward, management by exception – active and – passive, and laissez-faire).

Emotion regulation. Two forms of emotion regulation were measured using scales from Brotheridge and Lee (2003). Participants were asked to rate, on a scale from 1 (never) to 5 (always), how frequently they had to engage in each behavior during an average day at work. *Surface acting* was measured with three items: 'I resist expressing my true feelings', 'I pretend to have emotions that I don't really have', and 'I hide my true feelings about a situation'. *Deep acting* was measured with three items: 'I make an effort to actually feel the emotions that I need to display to others', 'I try to actually experience the emotions that I must show', and 'I really try to feel the emotions I have to show as part of my job'. A measure of *genuine emotion* from Diefendorff et al. (2005) was used. Participants were asked to think about 'employees' as individuals who report directly to them, and to indicate the extent of agreement with the following three items on a scale of 1=strongly disagree through 5=strongly agree: 'The emotions I express to

employees are genuine', 'The emotions I show employees come naturally', and 'The emotions I show employees match what I spontaneously feel'.

Work-related Burnout. Seven items from the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Kristensen, Borritz, Villadsen, & Christensen, 2005) were used to measure work burnout at Time 3. Respondents used a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (always) to indicate how often each of the items applied to them. Example items are: 'Do you feel worn out at the end of the day?', 'Do you feel that every working hour is tiring for you?', and 'Do you feel burnt out because of your work?'.

Control Variables. *Work-related burnout* at Time 1 (measured with the same scale as the work-related burnout from Time 3). *Supervisory experience* was measured in years (Time 1). Time in the role may have an influence on adaptation strategies to deal with stress, and hence on burnout. *Negative affectivity* was measured using the 10 negative items from the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule at Time 1 (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Negative affectivity is "a general dimension of subjective distress and unpleasurable engagement that subsumes a variety of aversive mood states" (Watson et al., 1988, p. 1063) and is often used as a control variable in stress research due to its tendency to inflate stressor/strain relationships (Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, & Webster, 1988). Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they feel certain ways in general on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). Examples of items are: distressed, afraid and guilty. The internal consistency of all measures was acceptable at all measurement time points (See Table 1).

Analysis

All hypotheses were tested using OLS regression using the PROCESS macro (located on the website www.afhayes.com; Version 2.12.1; Hayes, 2013) for SPSS. PROCESS allows for simultaneous testing of direct and indirect effects, and enables several mediators to be tested in the same model. Because only one independent variable can be examined at a time, five models were calculated to test the study hypotheses. Results of the analyses testing direct effects are shown in Tables 2 (H1a, H1b), 3 (H2a, H2b), 4 (H3a), 5 (H3b) and 6 (H4). Results of the tests of indirect effects (H5a, H5b, and H5c) are reported in the text. In addition, because PROCESS tests direct and indirect effects in the same model, we are able to report significant indirect effects in those cases where we have not made specific hypotheses (this applies in the case of genuine emotion as a mediator).

In all analyses burnout at Time 1, negative affectivity at Time 1, and number of years of supervisory experience (Time1) were inputted as covariates (i.e., controlled). Predictors (leadership style variables) were measured at Time 1, outcomes (in cases of direct effects) or mediators (in cases of indirect effects) at Time 2 (surface and deep acting) and Time 3 (genuine emotion), and outcome at Time 3 (burnout). Unstandardized coefficients are reported. Bootstrapping (5000 iterations) was used to test indirect effects and produce 95% bias corrected confidence intervals.

Results

Table 1 displays the means, standard deviations, reliabilities and correlations for all variables in the study.

Insert Table 1 about here

As can be seen from Table 2, Hypotheses 1a and 1b were supported.

Transformational leadership was significantly and positively associated with deep acting

(β = .44, p < .001) and genuine emotion (β = .27, p <.001). In addition, the indirect effect

of transformational leadership on burnout through genuine emotion (not hypothesized)

was significant (point estimate -.04; CI: -.09 to -.01).

Insert Tables 2 and 3 about here

The results in Table 3 show that both Hypotheses 2a and 2b were supported.

Contingent reward was significantly associated with both surface acting (β = .25, p < .001

and deep acting (β = .31, p < .001). However, the indirect effect of contingent reward on

burnout through surface acting was not significant (point estimate .02; CI: -.003 to .07).

Therefore, H5a was not supported as the bias corrected bootstrap 95% confidence

interval for surface acting based on 5000 bootstrap samples included zero.

Tables 4 and 5 outline the results related to the effects of management by

exception – active (H3a) and management by exception – passive (H3b). Hypothesis 3a

was supported with management by exception – active significantly positively related to

surface acting (β = .30, p < .001). Hypothesis 3b was also supported with management

by exception – passive significantly positively associated with surface acting (β = .41, p <

.001). The indirect effects of management by exception – active and – passive on burnout

through surface acting were not significant. Hence, neither H5b nor H5c were supported.

For both tests of these indirect effects, a bias corrected bootstrap 95% confidence interval

based on 5000 bootstrap samples included zero, suggesting that surface acting does not

mediate the relationship between management by exception – active or management by

exception – passive leadership and burnout (respectively point estimates: .02 and .03; CI: -.01 to .06 and -.01 to.08).

Insert Tables 4, 5 and 6 about here

Results related to laissez-faire are found in Table 6, and show that Hypothesis 4 was supported. Laissez-faire was significantly associated with genuine emotion expression (β = .21, p <.001). In addition, the indirect effect of laissez-faire on burnout through genuine emotional expression was significant (point estimate: -.03) and the confidence interval did not include zero (-.08 to -.003), suggesting that laissez-faire affects burnout indirectly through genuine emotion.

Discussion

This study examined how leadership styles are associated with emotion regulation strategies and burnout. We suggested, drawing on COR theory, that the outcomes associated with various leadership styles imply a differing ability and desire to use surface acting, deep acting, and genuine emotion expression as emotion regulation. In turn, we sought to test whether surface acting was resource draining in relation to leadership styles. We investigated the mediating effects of surface acting in explaining indirect effects of contingent reward, management by exception – active, and management by exception – passive style on burnout. Consistent with our expectations, we found that transformational leadership was significantly and positive associated with both deep acting and genuine emotion. We also found that contingent reward was significantly positively associated with both surface and deep acting. Those leaders who reported higher levels of management by exception – active and – passive were more

likely to surface act. In addition, leaders who reported using a laissez-faire style were likely to also report engaging in genuine emotion expression. We did not find support for the notion that surface acting is a mediator of the effects of contingent reward, management by exception – active or – passive on burnout. However, we did find that genuine emotion acts as a mediator with the indirect effects of transformational leadership and laissez-faire on burnout through genuine emotion being significant.

To our knowledge, this is the first study to empirically test how leadership styles relate to the use of emotion regulation strategies. Given recent interest in this topic (e.g., Humphrey, 2012), this is one of the main contributions of our study. Our investigation offers various theoretical implications. First, we support Humphrey et al.'s (2008) proposition that deep acting is strongly associated with transformational leadership. These leaders are likely to have an abundance of resources, such as follower support and positive performance (Judge & Piccolo, 2004), so they may be more equipped to engage in deep acting. Given the focus of transformational leadership on 'the good of the group', it could be that these leaders are cognizant of how their expressions of emotions affect followers, and therefore take the necessary time and put forth the effort to align their emotions with the situation. Transformational leaders appear to be willing to change their own feelings in order to align with the expectations of their followers.

The significant positive association we found between transformational leadership and genuine emotion supports the theoretical proposition that transformational leaders are also authentic leaders. Leaders who report more frequent transformational leadership behavior also report being more likely to express how they genuinely feel. Researchers may assume that genuine emotion is related to authenticity (and transformational leaders

are assumed to be authentic), yet this link has not been empirically established. The current findings begin to show support for this theoretical proposition. Our results, however, do not shed light on when transformational leadership is associated with each form of emotional regulation. Transformational leaders are those leaders who are committed to providing a positive working environment for their employees. However, presumably even transformational leaders are human, and will at times have emotions that are not going to be helpful when displayed. Future work should investigate this question qualitatively, in order to advance theory in this regard.

Leaders who use management by exception – active and – passive report increased use of surface acting as an emotional regulation strategy. Increased surface acting is usually associated with increased levels of burnout. Our findings showed that surface acting is not related significantly to burnout six months later. This finding is possibly inconsistent with those of previous studies, which find surface acting to be related to impaired employee well-being and negative job attitudes (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011). Does this mean our theory needs to be adjusted or are our data idiosyncratic? One potential explanation for this finding is that we measured these variables longitudinally, and perhaps the six-month time lag is responsible. The effects of surface acting may be shorter lived. Another possible explanation is that the majority of studies investigating the effects of surface acting use employees in service roles as participants. We used employees with supervisory experience and responsibility, and we investigated surface acting regarding their relationships with their employees. There may be something fundamentally different about this relationship that could explain our results. While we cannot know for certain, we suggest this is a finding that should be

corroborated with future work testing the type of relationship as a moderator of the surface acting – burnout relationship.

Leaders who report using laissez-faire leadership frequently report increased use of genuine emotion as an emotion regulation strategy. We suggest that this may be because they have fewer resources and are less equipped to engage in either type of acting. They are perhaps the epitome of the depleted leader (Byrne et al., 2013). The use of genuine emotion appears to be less effortful than either surface or deep acting; hence, a leader who is not actively engaged could use this strategy with little effort.

Our findings also suggest that the use of genuine emotion appeared to be a factor reducing burnout for leaders. Both transformational and laissez-faire leadership exerted a significant indirect effect on burnout though genuine emotion. We had not hypothesized indirect relationships regarding deep acting or genuine emotion as there was not enough past empirical support to assert how these emotional regulation strategies would operate. This finding is interesting, and does corroborate the notion that genuine emotional expression is less effortful (i.e. resource depleting) than surface or deep acting. However, the reasons for these indirect effects on burnout quite likely vary. For laissez-faire leaders, we propose that it is a function of lack of caring about outcomes and employees; for transformational leaders we propose that it is a function of the additional resources they possess and that they use these strategies in an effective balance that ensures their well-being and their employees' well-being. These are also questions that only future research can answer. The take away for those in leadership roles should be that while both styles relate indirectly to burnout, transformational leadership is recommended due to its other positive influences.

Limitations and future research

There are potential limitations to our study. First, we used self-report data from leaders, so it is possible that common method bias influenced the results. However, we followed the suggestions of Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee and Podsakoff (2003) in order to overcome the limitations of common method bias. We collected our dependent variables at three (deep and surface acting) and six (genuine emotion and burnout) months after first wave of data collection (leadership and control variables). Despite the strengths of a longitudinal design, we suggest that future work could use follower measures of transformational leadership as a way to mitigate the challenges posed by self-report measures. However, we note that the leaders' perceptions of their own behaviors may be more appropriate to our research questions than are follower perceptions (e.g., Ayman, Korabik, & Morris, 2009). Because of the cross sectional nature of our data we cannot make any definitive causal statements.

Due to concerns about participant burden, we were not able to include every variable of interest in our investigation. COR theory would suggest that leaders possess resources in addition to leadership style in the form of specific personality traits. For example, a leader high in extraversion might find it much less stressful to engage in the interpersonal contact required for emotional expression. Indeed, one previous study of customer service employees found that "emotion regulation is generally more difficult and less rewarding for introverts compared to extraverts" (Judge et al., 2009, p. 80). In that study, surface acting was associated with increased emotional exhaustion for both introverts and extraverts, but the association was significantly stronger for introverts. In addition, one of the emotion regulation strategies in our study was measured at Time 3,

the same time as the outcome of burnout. This limits our ability to associate this variable with burnout at a future point in time.

Future research would benefit from close investigation of emotional regulation strategies that have not garnered much attention to date. For example, both surface and deep acting have been the subject of extensive research (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011) whereas genuine emotion has not. Is genuine emotion a form of emotion regulation? Or is it conceptually differentiated in that it does not require the resources that both surface and deep acting do? In depth examination of how these forms of emotion regulation are similar and different, as well as more research focused on how these are enacted by leaders, is needed.

Finally, leaders may also have unique sources of resource drain, such as those who are higher than them in the organization's hierarchy setting specific display rules or allocating resources in a threatening way. Demands from senior person(s) within the organization could impact leader perceptions of the resources available. In addition, there may be specific contexts within which the leaders' role is inherently more stressful. Future work should investigate these contextual factors with a focus on how these influence emotion regulation[2]. Furthermore, future research should investigate more outcomes in addition to burnout and investigate these relationships in particular contexts. Specifically, it would be useful to test how leadership style relates to other resources, such as positive behaviours, to more fully reflect the spiraling of resource drain or gain that can occur for leaders who use a specific style. It would also be interesting to investigate leaders in inherently highly stressful environments.

---

[2] We thank an anonymous reviewer for this suggestion.

In conclusion, the results of this study suggest that the resources associated with leadership styles within the full-range model are predictive of varying emotion regulation strategies. This study contributes to the literature by empirically testing the relationships between emotion regulation strategies and burnout with a leader sample, demonstrating the influence leadership style has on both a leaders' reported display and regulation of emotions, and the impact this can have on leaders' own mental health over time.

References

Arnold, K. A., & Loughlin, C. (2013). Integrating transformational and participative versus directive leadership theories: Examining intellectual stimulation in male and female leaders across three contexts. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 34*(1), 67-84.

Ashforth, B., & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review*, *18*, 88-115.

Austin, E. J., Dore, T. C., & O'Donovan, K. M. (2008). Associations of personality and emotional intelligence with display rule perceptions and emotional labor. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *44*, 679-688.

Avolio, B. J. (2011). *Full Range Leadership Development*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

Ayman, R., Korabik, K., & Morris, S. (2009). Is transformational leadership always perceived as effective? Male subordinates' devaluation of female transformational leaders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(4), 852-879.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19-31.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. (2006). *Transformational Leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associated.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(5), 901-910.

Brief, A. P., Burke, M. J., George, J. M., Robinson, B. S., & Webster, J. (1988). Should negative affectivity remain an unmeasured variable in the study of job stress? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*(2), 193-198.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Grandey, A. A. (2002). Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of people work. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 60*(1), 17-39.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Lee, R. T. (2003). Development and validation of the Emotional Labor Scale. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, *76*, 365-379.

Byrne, A., Dionisi, A., Barling, J., Akers, A., Roberston, J., Lys, R., Wylie, J., & Dupre, K. (2013). The depleted leader: The influence of leaders' diminished psychological resources on leadership behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.09.003

Chu, K. (2002). The effects of emotional labor on employee work outcomes (Doctoral dissertation). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University: Virginia, US.

Chuang, A., Judge, T. A., & Liaw, Y. J. (2012). Transformational leadership and customer service: A moderated mediation model of negative affectivity and emotion regulation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *21*, 28-56.

Courtright, S. H., Colbert, A. E., & Choi, D. (2014). Fired up or burned out? How developmental challenge differentially impacts leader behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *99*(4), 681-696. doi: 10.1037/a0035790

Diefendorff, J. M., Croyle, M. H., & Gosserand, R. H. (2005). The dimensionality and antecedents of emotional labor strategies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *66*, 339-357.

Doucet, O., Poitras, J., & Chênevert, D. (2009). The impacts of leadership on workplace conflicts. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *20*(4), 340–354.

Gardner, W. L., Fischer, D., & Hunt, J. G. (2009). Emotional labor and leadership: A threat to authenticity? *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*(3), 466–482.

Grandey, A. A. (2003). When "the show must go on": Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*, 86-96.

Grandey, A., Foo, S. C., Groth, M., & Goodwin, R. E. (2012). Free to be you and me: A climate of authenticity alleviates burnout from emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *17*(1), 1–14.

Gross, J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology*, *2*, 271-299.

Halbesleben, J., & Buckley, M. (2004). Burnout in organizational life. *Journal of Management*, *30*(6), 859–879.

Hayes, A.F. (2013). *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach*. The Guilford Press: New York.

Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2008). An examination of "nonleadership": from laissez-faire leadership to leader reward omission and punishment omission. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(6), 1234–48.

Hobfoll, S E. (1989). Conservation of resources. A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *The American Psychologist*, *44*(3), 513–24.

Hobfoll, S. E. (2002). Social and psychological resources and adaptation. *Review of General Psychology, 6*(4), 307-324. doi: 10.1037//1089-2680.6.4.307

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hülsheger, U. R., & Schewe, A. F. (2011). On the costs and benefits of emotional labor: A meta-analysis of three decades of research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *16*(3), 361–89.

Hülsheger, U. R., Lang, J. W. B., & Maier, G. W. (2010). Emotional labor, strain, and performance: Testing reciprocal relationships in a longitudinal panel study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *15*(4), 505–21.

Humphrey, R. H. (2012). How do leaders use emotional labor ? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *33*(February), 740–744.

Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., & Hawver, T. (2008). Leading with emotional labor. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 23*(2), 151-168. doi: 10.1108/02683940810850790

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 755-768. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

Judge, T. A., Woolf, E. F., & Hurst, C. (2009). Is emotional labor more difficult for some than for others? A multilevel, experience sampling study. *Personnel Psychology, 62*, 57-88.

Kelloway, E. K., Mullen, J., & Francis, L. (2006). Divergent effects of transformational and passive leadership on employee safety. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *11*(1), 76–86.

Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K. B. (2005). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work & Stress, 19*(3), 192-207. doi: 10.1080/02678370500297720

Maslach, C. (1982). *Burnout: The cost of caring*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Morris, F. A., & Feldman, D. C. (1996). The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor. *Academy of Management Review, 21*, 986-1010.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 879-903

Rajah, R. E., Song, Z., & Arvey, R. D. (2011). Emotionality and leadership: Taking stock of the past decade of research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(6), 1107–1119.

Riggio, R. E., & Reichard, R. J. (2008). The emotional and social intelligences of effective leadership: An emotional and social skill approach. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *23*(2), 169–185.

Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*(1), 80–92.

Sliter, M., Chen, Y., Withrow, S., & Sliter, K. (2013). Older and (emotionally) smarter? Emotional intelligence as a mediator in the relationship between age and emotional labor strategies in service employees. *Experimental Aging Research*, *39*(4), 466–79.

Stordeur, S., D'hoore, W., & Vandenberghe, C. (2001). Leadership, organizational stress, and emotional exhaustion among hospital nursing staff. *Journal of advanced nursing*, *35*(4), 533–42.

Wang, G., Oh, I. S., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group & Organization Management*, *36*(2), 223–270.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A, & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*(6), 1063–70.

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management, 15*(2), 251-289.

Zapf, D. (2002). Emotion work and psychological well-being A review of the literature and some conceptual considerations, *Human Resource Management Review*, *12*, 237–268.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations for all study variables

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.Years supervisor (T1)	6.84	4.81	(--)											
2. Burnout (T1)	2.60	.77	.15*	(.87)										
3. NA (T1)	2.34	1.47	-.04	.71**	(.98)									
4. TFL (T1)	2.27	.73	.43**	.32**	.18**	(.95)								
5. CR (T1)	2.39	.72	.40**	.19**	.05	.87**	(.82)							
6. MBEA (T1)	1.68	.89	.10	.60**	.55**	.57**	.43**	(.78)						
7. MBEP (T1)	1.37	.95	-.08	.60**	.67**	.31**	.11	.65**	(.81)					
8. Laissez faire (T1)	1.09	1.08	-.04	.62**	.70**	.30**	.11	.64**	.87**	(.90)				
9. Surface acting (T2)	2.66	.92	.08	.63**	.61**	.40**	.25**	.60**	.65**	.63**	(.86)			
10. Deep acting (T2)	3.13	.73	.12	.40**	.36**	.47**	.33**	.41**	.44**	.41**	.64**	(.85)		
11. Genuine emotion (T3)	4.10	.60	.23**	-.25**	-.34**	.26**	.30**	.02	-.15*	-.08	-.19**	-.04	(.81)	
12. Burnout (T3)	2.45	.77	.14*	.79**	.69**	.30**	.14*	.56**	.53**	.56**	.60**	.37**	-.30**	(.88)

Notes: N=194 for correlations with years supervisor; all other cells N=205; * p < .05; **p<.01; NA= negative affectivity; TFL = transformational leadership; CR= contingent reward; MBEA/MBEP = management by exception − active and − passive; Cronbach alpha on diagonal.

Table 2: Direct and indirect effects model coefficients for effects of transformational leadership on burnout

	Consequent														
	Deep acting (T2; M)					Genuine emotion (T3; M)					Burnout (T3; Y)				
Antecedent	Coeff	SE	p	LLCI	ULCI	Coeff	SE	p	LLCI	ULCI	Coeff	SE	p	LLCI	ULCI
TFL (T1; X)	.44	.07	<.001	.31	.58	.27	.06	<.001	.15	.39	.08	.06	.09	-.02	.21
Deep acting (T2; M)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.01	.05	.85	-.12	.10
Genuine emotion (T3; M)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.16	.06	.01	-.27	-.04
Burnout (T1; C)	.12	.09	.17	-.05	.29	-.14	.08	.09	-.29	.02	.50	.06	<.001	.37	.63
Negative affectivity (T1; C)	.09	.04	.05	-.00	.17	-.12	.04	< .01	-.19	-.04	.15	.03	<.001	.09	.22
Years in supervisor role (T1; C)	-.01	.01	.19	-.03	.01	.01	.01	.16	-.01	.03	.01	.01	.16	-.00	.02
	$R^2 = .31$					$R^2 = .25$					$R^2 = .67$				
	$F(4,189) = 21.35, p < .001$					$F(4,189) = 15.69, p < .001$					$F(6,187) = 62.91, p < .001$				

Note. TFL = transformational leadership.
T1 = time 1, T2 = time 2, T3 = time 3.
X = independent, Y = outcome, M = mediator, C = covariate.
LLCI = lower level of confidence interval; ULCI = upper level of confidence interval.

Table 3: Direct and indirect effects model coefficients for effects of contingent reward on burnout

	Consequent														
	Deep acting (T2; M)					Surface acting (T2; M)					Burnout (T3; Y)				
Antecedent	Coeff	SE	p	LLCI	ULCI	Coeff	SE	p	LLCI	ULCI	Coeff	SE	p	LLCI	ULCI
CR (T1; X)	.31	.07	<.001	.18	.45	.25	.07	<.001	.10	.40	-.03	.05	.52	-.14	.07
Deep acting (T2; M)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.02	.06	.73	-.14	.10
Surface acting (T2; M)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	.09	.05	.10	-.02	.20
Burnout (T1; C)	.15	.09	.10	-.03	.33	.40	.10	<.001	.20	.59	.50	.07	<.001	.37	.63
Negative affectivity (T1; C)	.10	.05	.02	.02	.19	.22	.05	<.001	.12	.32	.16	.03	<.001	.09	.22
Years in supervisor role (T1; C)	-.00	.01	.75	-.02	.02	-.01	.01	.53	-.03	.02	.01	.01	.07	-.00	.03

$R^2 = .24$ $R^2 = .46$ $R^2 = .67$

$F(4, 189) = 14.73, p < .001$ $F(4, 189) = 39.93, p < .001$ $F(6, 187) = 60.69, p < .001$

Note. CR = contingent reward.

T1 = time 1, T2 = time 2, T3 = time 3.

X = independent, Y = outcome, M = mediator, C = covariate.

LLCI = lower level of confidence interval; ULCI = upper level of confidence interval.

Table 4: Direct and indirect effects model coefficients for effects of management by exception − active on burnout

	Consequent									
	Surface acting (T2; M)					Burnout (T3; Y)				
Antecedent	Coeff	SE	p	LLCI	ULCI	Coeff	SE	p	LLCI	ULCI
MBEA (T1; X)	.30	.07	<.001	.17	.44	.04	.05	.46	-.06	.13
Surface acting (T2; M)	--	--	--	--	--	.06	.05	.20	-.03	.16
Burnout (T1; C)	.30	.10	.002	.12	.50	.48	.07	<.001	.35	.62
Negative affectivity (T1; C)	.16	.05	.001	.06	.26	.15	.03	<.001	.09	.22
Years in supervisor role (T1; C)	.00	.01	.68	-.02	.02	.01	.01	.10	-.00	.02
	$R^2 = .48$					$R^2 = .66$				
	$F(4, 189) = 43.43, p < .001$					$F(5, 188) = 73.15, p < .001$				

Note. MBEA = Management by exception − active.

T1 = time 1, T2 = time 2, T3 = time 3.

X = independent, Y = outcome, M = mediator, C = covariate.

LLCI = lower level of confidence interval; ULCI = upper level of confidence interval.

Table 5: Direct and indirect effects model coefficients for effects of management by exception – passive on burnout

	Consequent									
	Surface acting (T2; M)					Burnout (T3; Y)				
Antecedent	Coeff	SE	p	LLCI	ULCI	Coeff	SE	p	LLCI	ULCI
MBEP (T1; X)	.41	.07	<.001	.27	.55	.00	.05	.96	-.10	.12
Surface acting (T2; M)	--	--	--	--	--	.07	.05	.15	-.03	.17
Burnout (T1; C)	.30	.10	.002	.11	.49	.49	.07	<.001	.36	.63
Negative affectivity (T1; C)	.09	.05	.08	-.01	.19	.15	.04	<.001	.09	.23
Years in supervisor role (T1; C)	.02	.01	.14	-.00	.03	.01	.01	.10	-.00	.03
	$R^2 = .51$					$R^2 = .66$				
	$F(4, 189) = 50.12, p < .001$					$F(5, 188) = 72.82, p < .001$				

Note. MBEP = Management by exception – passive.

T1 = time 1, T2 = time 2, T3 = time 3.

X = independent, Y = outcome, M = mediator, C = covariate.

LLCI = lower level of confidence interval; ULCI = upper level of confidence interval.

Table 6: Direct and indirect effects model coefficients for effects of laissez faire on burnout

		Consequent								
	Genuine emotion (T3; M)					Burnout (T3; Y)				
Antecedent	Coeff	SE	p	LLCI	ULCI	Coeff	SE	p	LLCI	ULCI
Laissez faire (T1; X)	.21	.05	<.001	.12	.31	.04	.04	.40	-.05	.13
Genuine emotion (T3; M)	--	--	--	--	--	-.14	.06	.02	-.25	-.02
Burnout (T1; C)	-.16	.08	.04	-.32	-.01	.50	.07	<.001	.37	.63
Negative affectivity (T1; C)	-.19	.04	<.001	-.27	-.10	.14	.04	<.001	.07	.22
Years in supervisor role (T1; C)	.03	.01	<.001	.02	.05	.02	.01	.02	.00	.03
	$R^2 = .24$					$R^2 = .66$				
	$F(4, 188) = 14.64, p < .001$					$F(5, 188) = 74.42, p < .001$				

Note. T1 = time 1, T2 = time 2, T3 = time 3.

X = independent, Y = outcome, M = mediator, C = covariate.

LLCI = lower level of confidence interval; ULCI = upper level of confidence interval.