

THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLES AND EMOTIONAL LABOR ON PERCEIVED SUPERVISOR SUPPORT AND PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT

Nevra BAKER*

Abstract

The aim of this study is to compare transformational leadership with the two other leadership styles of transactional and laissez-faire leadership in terms of their effects on perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support. The second aim of this study is to compare the contribution of deep acting with the contribution of surface acting to all three leadership styles in terms of their effects on the two dependent variables. To test the hypotheses of the study, an experiment was designed where six fictional leader types were designated. Then, the respondents were asked to complete a questionnaire about their self-foreseen levels of perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support, imagining that they were actually working with the designated fictional leader. The findings of the study reveal that transformational leaders arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support compared to transactional and laissez-faire leaders. Moreover, transactional and laissez-faire leaders who display deep acting arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support compared to their counterparts displaying surface acting. Lastly, laissez-faire leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to laissez-faire leaders who display surface acting.

Keywords: Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Laissez-Faire Leadership, Perceived Supervisor Support, Perceived Organizational Support.

LİDERLİK TARZI VE DUYGUSAL EMERİN ALGILANAN YÖNETİCİ DESTEĐİ VE ALGILANAN ÖRGÜT DESTEĐİ ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı, dönüştürücü liderliği, algılanan yönetici desteđi ve algılanan örgütsel destek üzerindeki etkileri açısından işlemsel ve serbest bırakıcı liderlik tarzı ile karşılaştırmaktır. Bu çalışmanın ikinci amacı, derin oyunculuğun iki bağımlı deđişken üzerindeki etkileri açısından her üç liderlik tarzına olan katkısını, yüzeysel oyunculuğun katkısı ile karşılaştırmaktır. Araştırmanın hipotezlerini test etmek için altı hayali lider tipinin betimlendiđi bir deney yapılmıştır. Lider tanımlarını okuduktan sonra, katılımcılara, betimlenen hayali liderle çalıştıkları

*Asst. Prof., Istanbul Aydın University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Business Management, nbakerarapoglu@aydin.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5557-8235>

varsayımıyla, kendi tahmin ettikleri algılanan yönetici desteği ve algılanan örgütsel destek düzeyleri hakkında bir anket verildi. Araştırmanın bulguları, dönüşümcü liderlerin, işlemsel ve serbest bırakıcı liderlere kıyasla daha yüksek düzeyde algılanan yönetici desteği ve algılanan örgütsel destek uyandırdığını göstermektedir. Bundan başka, derinden rol yapan işlemsel ve serbest bırakıcı liderler, yüzeysel davranan akranlarına kıyasla daha yüksek düzeyde algılanan yönetici desteği uyandırırılar. Son olarak, derin oyunculuk sergileyen serbest bırakıcı liderler, yüzeysel oyunculuk sergileyen serbest bırakıcı liderlere kıyasla daha yüksek düzeyde algılanan örgütsel destek uyandıracaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Dönüşümcü Liderlik, İşlemsel Liderlik, Serbest Bırakıcı Liderlik, Algılanan Yönetici Desteği, Algılanan Örgütsel Destek*

Introduction

There is a wide body of recent literature on the characteristics and outcomes of three leadership styles: transformational leadership (Purwanto, 2022; Teetzen, Bürkner, Gregersen, & Vincent-Höper, 2022; Purwanto, Purba, Bernarto, & Sijabat, 2021), transactional leadership (Jacobsen, Andersen, Bollingtoft, & Eriksen, 2022; Udin, Dananjoyo, & Isalman, 2022), and laissez-faire leadership (Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, Aasland, & Hetland, 2007; Yang, 2015; Chaundry & Javed, 2012). Additionally, there is research on emotional labor, which includes deep acting (Grandey, 2003; Huang, Chiaburu, Zhang, Li, & Grandey, 2015; Nesher, Shoshan, & Venz, 2022) and surface acting (Ozcelik, 2013; Grandey, 2003; Bhave & Glomb, 2016)

While some research has combined the concepts of perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006; Newman, Thanacoody, & Hui, 2012; Puah, Ong, & Chong, 2016), there is limited investigation on studying them together as outcomes of the three leadership styles. This study aims to contribute to the existing literature by exploring the impact of the three leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) along with emotional labor involving deep acting and surface acting on both dependent variables: perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support. Although there are studies that have taken the concepts of perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support together (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006; Newman, Thanacoody, & Hui, 2012; Puah, Ong, & Chong, 2016), the literature is relatively silent on studying them together as outcomes of the three leadership styles. The aim of this study is to add to the current literature by examining the effects of the three leadership styles of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership together with emotional labor of deep acting and surface acting on the both dependent variables of perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

1.1. The Effects of the Three Leadership Styles on Perceived Supervisor Support and Perceived Organizational Support

Burns (1978) put forward the constructs of transformational and transactional leadership. Transformational leaders are characterized by four factors which are called the four I's of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration (Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991). Idealized influence and inspirational leadership occur when the leader projects a positive future and explains how it can be achieved, serves as a role model, sets high standards of performance, and displays perseverance and trust (Avolio et al., 1991). Intellectual stimulation occurs when the leader assists followers in becoming more resourceful. Individualized consideration comes into play when leaders take into account their followers' individual needs, provide support, and act as mentors. Transformational leaders elevate the morale, motivation, and ethics of their followers. Intellectual stimulation takes place when the leader helps followers to become more resourceful. Individualized consideration comes into the picture when leaders take their followers' individual needs into consideration, support them, and mentor them. Transformational leaders boost the morale, motivation, and morals of their followers (Bass, 1999).

Transactional leaders serve their followers' immediate self-interests (Bass, 1999). Transactional leaders are characterized by two factors which are contingent reward and active and passive forms of management-by-exception. Contingent reward takes place when the leader explains to followers what they need to do in order to be rewarded. Active management-by-exception occurs when the leader observes the followers' performance and takes corrective action in case the followers cannot perform up to the standards (Bass, 1999). Passive management-by-exception takes place when the leader waits for problems to come up before taking corrective action (Bass, 1999).

Laissez-faire leadership or nonleadership is displayed when managers refrain from making decisions, give up responsibility, and do not exercise their authority (Bass & Avolio, 1993). Laissez-faire leadership is delineated as typically disregarding problems and employee demands (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008). Bass and Avolio (1990) portray laissez-faire leadership as the non-existence of leadership, staying away from of interference, or both. They put forth that decisions are often postponed; feedback, rewards, and involvement are missing; and there is no effort to encourage followers or to acknowledge and fulfill their demands.

Eisenberger et al. (2002) defined supervisor support as the degree to which employees think that their supervisor is concerned with their welfare, appreciate their efforts, and are mostly supportive. According to Cheung and

Wong (2011), leader support is a concept which is related to transformational leadership. Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta, and Kramer (2004) put forth that leader support consists of task support and relation support. While leader task support is about securing the sufficiency of resources for job execution, leader relations support is about the leaders' interest in the socio-emotional needs of their followers. Leader task support relates to retaining or enhancing operations that assist task accomplishment, for example the functional arrangement of undertakings and assets, explaining role requirements and job performance criteria, organizing knowledge, and handling issues. On the other hand, leader relations support refers to keeping or ameliorating collaborative interpersonal relations that develop confidence and commitment. In order to accomplish this, leaders listen carefully to their followers with the aim of better realizing their worries, rendering support, inspiring them and assisting them.

Thus, the author comes up with the below hypotheses:

H1. Transformational leaders will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to transactional leaders.

H2. Transformational leaders will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to laissez-faire leaders.

Eisenberger et al. (1986, p. 501) defined perceived organizational support (POS) as "the extent to which employees perceive that their contributions are valued by their organization and that the firm cares about their well-being". Eisenberger et al. (1986) also put forth that perceived organizational support is related to organizational support theory which encompasses the organization's tendency to satisfy employees' socioemotional needs. Correspondingly, perceived organizational support ensures that the organization stands by its employees as they carry out their tasks and deal with tense circumstances (George et al., 1993). In addition, Eisenberger et al. (1986) maintain that perceived organizational support is associated with fair treatment. In this direction, Shore and Shore (1995) suggest that being equitable in the allocation of organizational resources will have a considerable effect on perceived organizational support.

According to Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964), employees appreciate job rewards much more if they are given with the freewill of the organization rather than with the pressure of exterior forces like unions. In parallel, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) argue that discretionary job rewards like job enrichment, promotions, and compensation give rise to perceived organizational support if they are regarded by employees as discretionary rewards. Consequently, trust will be established between the organization and the employees which will result in long-term mutual accountabilities in the long run (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Thus, the author comes up with the below hypotheses:

H3. Transformational leaders will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to transactional leaders.

H4. Transformational leaders will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to laissez-faire leaders.

1.2. The Effects of Emotional Labor on the Relationship between the Three Leadership Styles, Perceived Supervisor Support, and Perceived Organizational Support

Hochschild (1983) introduced the term “emotional labor” and categorized emotional labors by levels of “acting.” According to Glomb and Tews (2004), emotional labor necessitates that employees suppress their authentic emotions with the aim of expressing emotions which relate to work role expectations. Grandey (2003) discusses that when employees are involved in deep acting, they try to change their feelings in order to comply with the desirable emotional expressions with the aim of appearing authentic. Hence, deep acting is also named as “faking in good faith” (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). This good faith is expected to exist in employees who identify with their work roles (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Furthermore, Grandey (2000) suggests that employees need to be able to regulate their emotions in order to display deep acting.

On the other hand, Grandey (2003) puts forth that when employees are engaged in surface acting, they need to alter their emotional expressions without modifying their genuine feelings which will lead to emotional dissonance, or the stress experienced when emotional displays and feelings are in conflict (Hochschild, 1983). As a consequence, surface acting is also named as “faking in bad faith” (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987) because the employee complies with the expected display rules with the intention of not losing the job but not with the intention to serve the customer or the organization (Grandey, 2003).

Thus, the author of this study comes up with the below hypotheses:

H5. Transformational leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to transformational leaders who display surface acting.

H6. Transactional leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to transactional leaders who display surface acting.

H7. Laissez-faire leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to laissez-faire leaders who display surface acting.

H8. Transformational leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to transformational leaders who display surface acting.

H9. Transactional leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to transactional leaders who display surface acting.

H10. Laissez-faire leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to laissez-faire leaders who display surface acting.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research Design

To test the hypotheses of the study, six three-by-two experiments each of which contained two paragraphs were conducted. In the first paragraph, a fictional transformational, transactional or laissez-faire leader was described. The second paragraph described the same leader displaying either surface acting or deep acting.

In order to describe transformational leadership, twelve items of the Multifactor Leadership Form 6S (MLQ-6S) developed by Bass and Avolio (1992) were utilized. Example items used for the description of the transformational leader are: “[The leader] makes others feel good to be around him”, “[The leader] expresses with a few simple words what they could do and should do as a team”, “[The leader] enables others to think about old problems in new ways”, and “[The leader] helps others develop themselves” (Bass & Avolio, 1992). In order to describe transactional leadership, six items of the Multifactor Leadership Form 6S (MLQ-6S) developed by Bass and Avolio (1992) were utilized. Example items used for the description of the transactional leader are: “[The leader] tells others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work”, “[The leader] provides recognition/rewards when others reach their goals”, “[The leader] is satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards”, and “As long as things are working, [the leader] does not try to change anything” (Bass & Avolio, 1992). In order to describe laissez-faire leadership, three items of the Multifactor Leadership Form 6S (MLQ-6S) developed by Bass and Avolio (1992) were utilized. Items used for the description of the laissez-faire leader are: “[The leader] is content to let others continue working in the same ways always”, “Whatever others want to do is OK for [the leader]”, and “[The leader] asks no more of others than what is absolutely essential” (Bass & Avolio, 1992).

In order to describe the fictional leader as displaying surface acting or deep acting, relevant items of the Emotional Labour Scale by Brotheridge and Lee (1998) have been used. Example items used for the description of the surface acting leader are: “When [the leader] feels angry or distressed while dealing with another person, he puts an act so that the other person does not understand that he is angry or distressed.”, “When [the leader] is

dealing with a client, he tries to reflect the appropriate emotion to the client even if he does not feel that way”, and “During interactions with clients, [the leader] shows an effort not to let the other party know what he truly thinks” (Brotheridge & Lee, 1998). Example items for the description of the deep acting leader are: “Even when dealing with angry clients, [the leader] tries to consider things from their perspective while talking to them”, “[The leader] sincerely puts an effort to be the person that the client wants him to be”, and “While [the leader] is trying to demonstrate himself as cheerful when helping clients, he actually starts to feel cheerful after a while” (Brotheridge & Lee, 1998).

The respondents were asked to complete a survey in order to assess their potential level of perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support, assuming that they were actually working with the described fictional leader (Baker, 2019a; Baker, 2019b; Baker, 2020). This survey contained the items of the Supervisor Support Scale developed by Papper (1983) and used by Bezrukova, Spell, and Perry (2010), and Perceived Organizational Support Scale developed by Eisenberger, Hungtington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986) and used by Eva, Robin, Sendjaya, Van Dierendonck and Liden (2019).

2.2. Sample

The target population of this study is university students in Turkey. In the academic year of 2022-2023, there are 6,950,142 university students in Turkey. At the 90% confidence level, the estimated sample size is calculated to be 271. Employing convenience sampling, which is a non-probability sampling method, the researcher could reach 72.33% of the estimated sample size, namely 196 students studying at Istanbul Aydin University throughout the fall semester of 2022, where and when she was teaching five different courses. All the respondents were eligible for the quasi-experiment since they were studying business administration and related fields; therefore they were familiar with the content of the quasi-experiment. In addition, because this study was in the form of a quasi-experiment, which does not represent a real-life case, students who were not yet part of the workforce could easily contribute to the study.

To undertake this study, a positive decision report has been obtained from the Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee of Istanbul Aydin University with the number 2023/02.

Sample characteristics of the study can be summarized as follows: The average age of the respondents is 23.08, ranging from 17 to 49. One hundred and three (52.6%) of the contacted employees are male. Seventy-eight (39.8%) of the respondents are freshmen, eight (4.1%) are sophomores, twenty-nine (14.8%) are junior students, and forty-nine (25%) are senior students, and thirty-two (16.3%) are graduate students pursuing their master of business administration. Eighty-three (42.3%) of the respondents are

studying business administration, forty-five (23%) are international trade students, thirty-five (17.9%) of the respondents are from the aviation management department, thirty (15.3%) are political science and international relations students, two (1%) of the respondents are studying engineering and one respondent (.5%) is studying economics. One hundred and thirty-two Turkish students (67.3%) account for the majority of the respondents, whereas the rest are international students from a variety of countries such as Jordan, Iran, Morocco, Syria, Yemen, and others.

Table 1. Sample Characteristics

Demographic Characteristics N = 196	Mean	S.D.	Category	Frequency	Valid Percent
Age	23.08	5.00			
Gender			Male	103	52.6%
			Female	93	47.4%
Department			Business administration	83	42.3%
			International trade	45	23%
			Aviation management	35	17.9%
			Political science and international relations	30	15.3%
			Engineering		
			Economics	2	1%
Grade				1	.5%
			Freshmen	78	39.8%
			Sophomore	8	4.1%
			Junior	29	14.8%
			Senior	49	25%
Nationality			MBA	32	16.3%
			Turkish	132	67.3%
			Jordanian	7	3.6%
			Iranian	7	3.6%
			Moroccan	5	2.6%
			Syrian	5	2.6%
			Yemenese	5	2.6%
			Romanian	4	2.0%
		Others	31	15.8%	

2.3. Exploratory Factor Analysis

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) is administered with the aim of determining the strength of the relationship between the study variables. In 290

order to assess the suitability of data for EFA analysis, the results of KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity are demonstrated for each scale (Baker, 2019a; Baker, 2019b; Baker, 2020). As observed in Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4, the KMO measures are above 0.50 and Bartlett's Tests of Sphericity are significant, therefore the data is suitable for EFA (Hair et al., 2010).

Factor loadings of the Perceived Supervisor Support Scale by Papper (1983) can be observed in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Factor Analysis Results for Perceived Supervisor Support

Items	Loadings
1. My supervisor would give me emotional support	.72
2. My supervisor would not be indifferent to my problems	-.09
3. My supervisor would make work life easier for me	.67
4. My supervisor could be relied on when things would get tough at work	.77
5. My supervisor would help solve work-related problems	.73
6. My supervisor would be good to work with	.77
7. My supervisor would stand by when I needed help	.82
8. My supervisor would do anything to help	.67
9. My supervisor would help solve personal problems	.52
Variance explained (%)	45.49
KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy	.86
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (sig.)	.00

As seen in Table 2 above, items 2 and 9 have very low factor loadings. Therefore, these two items are deleted and the exploratory factor analysis is run again. The results of the exploratory factor analysis for perceived supervisor support with the remaining seven items can be seen in Table 3 below:

Table 3. Factor Analysis Results for Perceived Supervisor Support

Items	Loadings
1. My supervisor would give me emotional support	.71
3. My supervisor would make work life easier for me	.68
4. My supervisor could be relied on when things would get tough at work	.80
5. My supervisor would help solve work-related problems	.75
6. My supervisor would be good to work with	.77
7. My supervisor would stand by when I needed help	.82
8. My supervisor would do anything to help	.66

Variance explained (%)	55.39
KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy	.88
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (sig.)	.00

As seen in Table 3 above, the remaining seven items of perceived supervisor support, having a variance explained of 55.39%, a KMO of .88, and a significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, load under one factor.

Factor loadings of the Perceived Organizational Support Scale by Eisenberger et al. (1986) can be observed in Table 4 below:

Table 4. Factor Analysis Results for Perceived Organizational Support

Items	Loadings
1. The organization would value my contribution to its well-being.	.57
2. If the organization could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary, it would do so.	.41
3. The organization would fail to appreciate any extra effort from me.	.53
4. The organization would strongly consider my goals and values.	.68
5. The organization would ignore any complaint from me.	.26
6. The organization would disregard my best interests when making decisions that would affect me.	.55
7. Help would be available from the organization when I would have a problem.	.76
8. The organization would really care about my well-being.	.70
9. The organization would be willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.	.68
10. Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice.	.61
11. The organization would be willing to help me when I would need a special favor.	.57
12. The organization would care about my general satisfaction at work.	.72
13. If given the opportunity, the organization would take advantage of me.	.17
14. The organization would show very little concern for me.	.53
15. The organization would care about my opinions.	.76
16. The organization would take pride in my accomplishments at work.	.63
17. The organization would try to make my job as interesting as possible.	.55
Variance explained (%)	39.08
KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy	.89
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (sig.)	.00

As seen in Table 2 above, items 2, 5 and 13 have very low factor loadings. Therefore, these three items are deleted and the exploratory factor analysis is run again. The results of the exploratory factor analysis for

perceived organizational support with the remaining fourteen items can be seen in Table 5 below:

Table 5. Factor Analysis Results for Perceived Organizational Support

Items	Loadings
1. The organization would value my contribution to its well-being.	.57
3. The organization would fail to appreciate any extra effort from me.	.51
4. The organization would strongly consider my goals and values.	.69
6. The organization would disregard my best interests when making decisions that would affect me.	.54
7. Help would be available from the organization when I would have a problem.	.77
8. The organization would really care about my well-being.	.71
9. The organization would be willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.	.69
10. Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice.	.59
11. The organization would be willing to help me when I would need a special favor.	.58
12. The organization would care about my general satisfaction at work.	.74
14. The organization would show very little concern for me.	.50
15. The organization would care about my opinions.	.77
16. The organization would take pride in my accomplishments at work.	.64
17. The organization would try to make my job as interesting as possible.	.57
Variance explained (%)	40.90
KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy	.89
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (sig.)	.00

As seen in Table 5 above, the remaining fourteen items of perceived organizational support, having a variance explained of 40.90%, a KMO of .89, and a significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, load under one factor.

2.4. Reliability Analysis

As observed in Table 6, both scale items have higher reliabilities than 0.80. Accordingly, no scale items were eliminated.

Table 6. Reliability Analysis Results for Study Variables

Variable	Number of items	Loadings
Perceived Supervisor Support	9	.80
Perceived Org. Support	17	.85

2.5. Hypothesis Testing

Prior to beginning with the hypothesis testing, a normality analysis of the variables of this study has been carried out. To assess normality, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test has been undertaken. The results of the normality analysis can be seen in Table 7 below:

Table 7. Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test Results

		PSS	POS
N		196	196
Normal Parameters	Mean	3.7422	3.2696
	Std. Deviation	.60902	.44193
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.121	.099
	Positive	.098	.099
	Negative	-.121	-.084
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.224	1.007
Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)		.100	.263

As seen in the above table, the variables of the study are normally distributed, as both have p-values greater than .05. Therefore, an independent samples t-test has been undertaken to demonstrate the differences between the six groups. The names of the groups and their explanations are stated below:

- Group 1: Deep Acting Transformational Leader
- Group 2: Surface Acting Transformational Leader
- Group 3: Deep Acting Transactional Leader
- Group 4: Surface Acting Transactional Leader
- Group 5: Deep Acting Laissez-Faire Leader
- Group 6: Surface Acting Laissez-Faire Leader
- Group A: Transformational Leader (Group 1 and Group 2 merged)
- Group B: Transactional Leader (Group 3 and Group 4 merged)
- Group C: Laissez-Faire Leader (Group 5 and Group 6 merged)

Table 8 and Table 10 below show the group statistics for Group A and Group B, and Group A and Group C, respectively. Table 9 and Table 11 show the independent samples t-test results for Group A and Group B, and Group B and Group C, respectively:

Table 8. Group Statistics for Group A (Transformational Leader) and Group B (Transactional Leader)

Dependent variables	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Perceived Supervisor Support	Transformational leader	67	4.20	.71	.09
	Transactional leader	69	3.86	.76	.09
Perceived Organizational Support	Transformational leader	67	3.85	.58	.07
	Transactional leader	69	3.50	.64	.08

Table 9. Independent Samples t-Test Results for Group A (Transformational Leader) and Group B (Transactional Leader)

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Diff.	Std. Error Diff.	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper	
Perceived Supervisor Support	Equal variances assumed	.04	.84	2.67	134	.01	.34	.13	.09	.59
	Equal variances not assumed			2.68	133.88	.01	.34	.13	.09	.59
Perceived Organizational Support	Equal variances assumed	.11	.74	3.31	134	.00	.35	.11	.14	.56
	Equal variances not assumed			3.31	133.36	.00	.35	.11	.14	.56

As demonstrated in the tables above, Group A and Group B comprise 67 and 69 respondents, respectively. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances revealed that equal variances are assumed for perceived supervisor support ($p > .05$), and for perceived organizational support ($p > .05$). Independent samples t-test demonstrated that there is a significant difference between Group A and Group B in terms of both dependent variables of perceived supervisor support ($t = 2.67, p < .05$), and perceived organizational support ($t = 3.31, p < .05$). In terms of both dependent variables of perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support, the mean values for Group A (4.20 and 3.85, respectively) are significantly higher than the mean values for Group B (3.86 and 3.50, respectively). Accordingly, hypotheses H1 (Transformational leaders will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to transactional leaders) and H3 (Transformational leaders will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to transactional leaders) are supported.

Table 10. Group Statistics for Group A (Transformational Leader) and Group C (Laissez Faire Leader)

Dependent variables	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Perceived Supervisor Support	Transformational leader	67	4.19	.71	.09
	Laissez faire leader	60	3.88	.79	.10
Perceived Organizational Support	Transformational leader	67	3.85	.58	.07
	Laissez faire leader	60	3.57	.71	.09

Table 11. Independent Samples t-Test Results for Group A (Transformational Leader) and Group C (Laissez-Faire Leader)

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Diff.	Std. Error Diff.	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper	
Perceived Supervisor Support	Equal variances assumed	.74	.39	2.39	125	.02	.32	.13	.06	.58
	Equal variances not assumed			2.38	119.83	.02	.32	.13	.05	.58
Perceived Organizational Support	Equal variances assumed	1.24	.27	2.41	125	.02	.28	.12	.05	.50
	Equal variances not assumed			2.39	114.79	.02	.28	.12	.05	.51

As demonstrated in the tables above, Group A and Group C are composed of 67 and 60 subjects, respectively. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances revealed that equal variances are assumed for perceived supervisor support ($p > .05$), and for perceived organizational support ($p > .05$). Independent samples t-test demonstrated that there is a significant difference between Group A and Group C in terms of both perceived supervisor support ($t = 2.39, p < .05$) and perceived organizational support ($t = 2.41, p < .05$). In terms of both dependent variables of perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support, the mean values for Group A (4.19 and 3.85, respectively) are significantly higher than the mean values for Group B (3.88 and 3.57, respectively). Accordingly, hypotheses H2 (Transformational leaders will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to laissez-faire leaders) and H4 (Transformational leaders will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to laissez-faire leaders) are supported.

Table 12 and Table 13 below show the group statistics and the independent samples t-test results for Group 1 and Group 2:

Table 12. Group Statistics for Group 1 (Deep Acting Transformational Leader) and Group 2 (Surface Acting Transformational Leader)

Dependent variables	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Perceived Supervisor Support	Deep acting transformational leader	32	4.22	.69	.12
	Surface acting transformational leader	35	4.17	.74	.13
Perceived Organizational Support	Deep acting transformational leader	32	3.75	.58	.10
	Surface acting transformational leader	35	3.94	.58	.10

Table 13. Independent Samples t-Test Results for Group 1 (Deep Acting Transformational Leader) and Group 2 (Surface Acting Transformational Leader)

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Diff.	Std. Error Diff.	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Perceived Supervisor Support	Equal variances assumed	.01	.92	.27	65	.79	.05	.18	-.30	.40
	Equal variances not assumed			.27	64.98	.79	.05	.18	-.30	.40
Perceived Organizational Support	Equal variances assumed	.01	.93	-1.36	65	.18	-.19	.14	-.48	.09
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.36	64.62	.18	-.19	.14	-.48	.09

As observed from the tables above, Group 1 and Group 2 consist of 32 and 35 subjects, respectively. According to the results of the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, equal variances are assumed for perceived supervisor support ($p > .05$), and for perceived organizational support ($p > .05$). Independent samples t-test revealed that there is not a significant difference between Group 1 and Group 2 in terms of perceived supervisor support ($t = .27, p > .05$) and perceived organizational support ($t = -1.36, p >$

.05). Accordingly, hypotheses H5 (Transformational leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to transformational leaders who display surface acting) and H8 (Transformational leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to transformational leaders who display surface acting) are not supported.

Table 14 and Table 15 below show the group statistics and the independent samples t-test results for Group 3 and Group 4:

Table 14. Group Statistics for Group 3 (Deep Acting Transactional Leader) and Group 4 (Surface Acting Transactional Leader)

Dependent variables	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Perceived Supervisor Support	Deep acting transactional leader	36	4.06	.74	.12
	Surface acting transactional leader	33	3.64	.72	.13
Perceived Organizational Support	Deep acting transactional leader	36	3.62	.68	.11
	Surface acting transactional leader	33	3.37	.58	.10

Table 15. Independent Samples t-Test Results for Group 3 (Deep Acting Transactional Leader) and Group 4 (Surface Acting Transactional Leader)

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Diff.	Std. Error Diff.	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Perceived Supervisor Support	Equal variances assumed	.26	.61	2.35	67	.02	.42	.18	.06	.77
	Equal variances not assumed			2.36	66.81	.02	.42	.18	.06	.77
Perceived Organizational Support	Equal variances assumed	1.02	.32	1.62	67	.11	.25	.15	-.06	.56
	Equal variances not assumed			1.63	66.66	.11	.25	.15	-.06	.55

As seen in the tables above, Group 3 and Group 4 are made up of 36 and 33 respondents, respectively. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances suggests that equal variances are assumed for perceived supervisor support ($p > .05$), and for perceived organizational support ($p > .05$). Independent

samples t-test demonstrates that there is a significant difference between Group 3 and Group 4 in terms of perceived supervisor support ($t = 2.35, p < .05$) but not a significant difference between the two groups in terms of perceived organizational support ($t = 1.62, p > .05$). Accordingly, hypothesis H6 (Transactional leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to transactional leaders who display surface acting) is supported but hypothesis H9 (Transactional leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to transactional leaders who display surface acting) is not supported.

Table 16 and Table 17 below show the group statistics and the independent samples t-test results for Group 5 and Group 6:

Table 16. Group Statistics for Group 5 (Deep Acting Laissez-Faire Leader) and Group 6 (Surface Acting Laissez-Faire Leader)

Dependent variables	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Perceived Supervisor Support	Deep acting laissez-faire leader	32	4.12	.66	.12
	Surface acting laissez-faire leader	28	3.60	.83	.16
Perceived Organizational Support	Deep acting laissez-faire leader	32	3.81	.65	.11
	Surface acting laissez-faire leader	28	3.30	.68	.13

Table 17. Independent Samples t-Test Results for Group 5 (Deep Acting Laissez-Faire Leader) and Group 6 (Surface Acting Laissez-Faire Leader)

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Diff.	Std. Error Diff.	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper	
Perceived Supervisor Support	Equal variances assumed	.64	.43	2.66	58	.01	.51	.19	.13	.90
	Equal variances not assumed			2.62	51.47	.01	.51	.20	.12	.91
Perceived Organizational Support	Equal variances assumed	1.02	.32	3.00	58	.00	.51	.17	.17	.86
	Equal variances not assumed			2.99	55.96	.00	.51	.17	.17	.86

As demonstrated in the tables above, Group 5 and Group 6 comprise 32 and 28 respondents, respectively. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances revealed that equal variances are assumed for perceived supervisor support ($p > .05$), and for perceived organizational support ($p > .05$). Independent samples t-test demonstrated that there is a significant difference between Group 5 and Group 6 in terms of perceived supervisor support ($t = 2.66, p < .05$) and in terms of perceived organizational support ($t = 3.00, p < .05$). Accordingly, hypotheses H₇ (Laissez-faire leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to laissez-faire leaders who display surface acting) and H₁₀ (Laissez-faire leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to laissez-faire leaders who display surface acting) are supported.

Table 18. Summary of Hypothesized Relationships

No.	Hypothesized Statement	
H1:	Transformational leaders will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to transactional leaders	Supported
H2:	Transformational leaders will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to laissez-faire leaders	Supported
H3:	Transformational leaders will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to transactional leaders	Supported
H4:	Transformational leaders will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to laissez-faire leaders	Supported
H5:	Transformational leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to transformational leaders who display surface acting	Not supported
H6:	Transactional leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to transactional leaders who display surface acting	Supported
H7:	Laissez-faire leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to laissez-faire leaders who display surface acting	Supported
H8:	Transformational leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to transformational leaders who display surface acting	Not supported

H9:	Transactional leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to transactional leaders who display surface acting	Not supported
H10:	Laissez-faire leaders who display deep acting will arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support as compared to laissez-faire leaders who display surface acting	Supported

3. DISCUSSION

As hypothesized and found in H1, H2, H3, and H4, transformational leaders arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support as compared to transactional and laissez-faire leaders. This finding is consistent with the findings of previous studies such as research by Chen and Wu (2020) which found that transformational leadership has resulted in the development of a higher level of perceived supervisor support. Study by Liaw et al. (2010) revealed that transformational leadership indirectly enhanced employee customer orientation through employee-perceived supervisor support. Görgens-Ekermans and Roux (2021) found that perceived supervisor support was significantly affected by the idealized influence dimension of transformational leadership. Suifan, Abdallah, and Al Janini (2018) found that transformational leadership positively affects perceived organizational support. Lin et al. (2015) found that transformational leadership contributes significantly to supervisor support. Stinglhamber et al. (2015) found that transformational leadership is positively related to perceived organizational support. Results of a study by Dinc, Zaim, Hassanin, and Alzoubi (2022) show that inspirational motivation and individual consideration dimensions of transformational leadership employees perceived organizational support. Skogstad et al. (2007) found that laissez-faire leadership was positively correlated with role conflict, role ambiguity, and conflicts with coworkers.

As hypothesized and found in H6, transactional leaders who display deep acting arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support as compared to their counterparts who display surface acting. In parallel, as hypothesized and found in H7 and H10, laissez-faire leaders who display deep acting arouse higher levels of perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support as compared to their counterparts who display surface acting. This finding is commensurate with the previous research by Mesmer-Magnus, DeChurch, and Wax (2011) who found that deep acting was positively associated with perceived supervisor support. Similarly, Goussinsky and Livne (2016) found that supervisor support was negatively associated with surface acting.

However, contrary to expectations in H5 and H8, transformational leaders who display deep acting do not arouse higher levels of perceived

supervisor support and perceived organizational support as compared to their counterparts who display surface acting. This finding might indicate that transformational leadership has such a positive effect on both dependent variables that the presence of emotional labor in form of surface or deep acting does not make a significant difference. Again, contrary to expectations in H9, transactional leaders do not arouse higher levels of perceived organizational support in comparison to their counterparts who display surface acting.

Conclusion

This research aims to contribute to the literature on leadership and emotions by demonstrating the combined effect of the transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles and emotional labor on perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support. The results of this study suggest that transformational leadership brings about higher levels of perceived supervisor and organizational support and compared to the expression of surface acting, the expression of deep acting arouses higher levels of perceived supervisor and perceived organizational support for laissez-faire leaders, and higher levels of perceived supervisor support for transactional leaders.

This study is, to the best of the author's knowledge, the first to bring the three leadership styles of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership and emotional labor together and therefore shall add to the advancement of leadership and emotions literatures.

The limitations of this research encompass that it is an experimental study, and the described leaders are fictional, therefore data pertaining to real-life examples are not available. In addition, the data is obtained from students studying at Istanbul Aydın University who have not begun their work-life yet, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings. Consequently, it is recommended that a similar study can be undertaken in real work-life settings. Other than this, supplementary research investigating the combined effect of the three leadership styles and emotional labor on alternative outcomes can be conducted. Moreover, the combined effect of emotional labor with other leadership styles can be studied.

Hakem Değerlendirmesi: Dış Bağımsız

Yazar Katkısı: Nevra Baker %100

Destek ve Teşekkür Beyanı: Çalışma için destek alınmamıştır.

Etik Onay: Bu çalışmanın gerçekleştirilmesi amacıyla, İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Etik Kurulu'ndan izin alınmıştır (02.03.2023 / 02) alınmıştır.

Çıkar Çatışması Beyanı: Çalışma ile ilgili herhangi bir kurum veya kişi ile çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır.

Peer Review: Independent double-blind

Author Contributions: Nevra Baker 100%

Funding and Acknowledgement: No support was received for the study.

Ethics Approval: Ethics committee approval (02.03.2023 / 02) was obtained from Istanbul Aydin University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee for the purpose of carrying out this study approval.

Conflict of Interest: There is no conflict of interest with any institution or person related to the study.

References

- Amabile, T. M., Schatzel, E. A., Moneta, G. B., & Kramer, S. J. (2004). Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Leader support. *Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 5-32.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.003>
- Ashforth, B. E. & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review*, *18*, 88-115. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1993.3997508>
- Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (1991). Leading in the 1990s: The four I's of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, *15*, 9-16.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/03090599110143366>
- Baker, N. (2019a). The moderating effect of leader anger on the relationship between leader-member exchange and follower job outcomes. *Business and Management Studies: An International Journal*, *7*(2), 781-794. <https://doi.org/10.15295/bmij.v7i2.1099>
- Baker, N. (2019b). The combined effect of leader-member exchange and leader optimism on follower job outcomes. *Business and Management Studies: An International Journal*, *7*(5), 2525-2555.
<https://doi.org/10.15295/bmij.v7i5.1262>
- Baker, N. (2020). Authentic leadership, leader anger and follower job outcomes: A comparison of angry vs. non-angry leaders. *Beykoz Akademi Dergisi*, *8*(2), 106-126.
<https://doi.org/10.14514/byk.m.26515393.2020.8/2.106-126>
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *8*(1), 9-32.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398410>
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, *14*(5), 21-27. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090599010135122>
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1992). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire - Short Form 6S*. Binghamton, NY: Center for Leadership Studies.

- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1993). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bezrukova, K, Spell, C. & Perry, J. (2010). Violent splits or healthy divides? Coping with injustice through faultlines. *Personnel Psychology*, *63*, 719-751. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01185.x>
- Bhave, D. P., & Glomb, T. M. (2016). The role of occupational emotional labor requirements on the surface acting-job satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Management*, *42*(3), 722-741. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313498900>
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Brotheridge, C., & Lee, R. T. (1998, August). On the dimensionality of emotional labour: Development and validation of the Emotional Labour Scale. Paper presented at the First Conference on Emotions in Organizational Life, San Diego.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Chaudhry, A. Q., & Javed, H. (2012). Impact of transactional and laissez faire leadership style on motivation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *3*(7). <https://doi.org/10.30845/ijbss>
- Chen, T. J. & Wu, C. M. (2020). Can newcomers perform better at hotels? Examining the roles of transformational leadership, supervisor-triggered positive affect, and perceived supervisor support. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, *33*, 100587. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2019.100587>
- Cheung, M. F. Y. & Wong, C. (2011). Transformational leadership, leader support, and employee creativity. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *32*(7), 656-672. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731111169988>
- Dawley, D. D., Andrews, M. C., & Bucklew, N. S. (2008). Mentoring, supervisor support, and perceived organizational support: What matters most? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *29*(3), 235-247. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730810861290>
- Dinc, M. S., Zaim, H., Hassanin, M., & Alzoubi, Y. I. (2022). The effects of transformational leadership on perceived organizational support and organizational identity. *Human Systems Management*, *41*(6), 699-716. <https://doi.org/10.3233/HSM-211563>
- Eisenberger, R., Hungtington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*, 500-507. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of*

Applied Psychology, 87, 565-73.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.565>

- Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., Van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111-132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004>
- Görgens-Ekermans, G. & Roux, C. (2021). Revisiting the emotional intelligence and transformational leadership debate: (How) does emotional intelligence matter to effective leadership?. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19, 1279. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v19i0.1279>
- George, J., Reed, T., Ballard, K., Colin, J., & Fielding, J. (1993). Contact with AIDS patients as a source of work-related distress: Effects of organizational and social support. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 157-171. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256516>
- Glomb, T. M. & Tews, M. J. (2004). Emotional labor: A conceptualization and scale development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 1-23. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(03\)00038-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00038-1)
- Goussinsky, R. & Livne, Y. (2016). Coping with interpersonal mistreatment: the role of emotion regulation strategies and supervisor support. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 24(8), 1109-1118. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12415>
- Grandey, A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 95-110. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.95>
- 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. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 46(1), 86-96. <https://doi.org/10.5465/30040678>
- 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), 1234-1248. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0012875>
- Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Huang, J. L., Chiaburu, D. S., Zhang, X. A., Li, N., & Grandey, A. A. (2015). Rising to the challenge: Deep acting is more beneficial when tasks are appraised as challenging. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(5), 1398-1408. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0038976>

- Jacobsen, C. B., Andersen, L. B., Bøllingtoft, A., & Eriksen, T. L. M. (2022). Can leadership training improve organizational effectiveness? Evidence from a randomized field experiment on transformational and transactional leadership. *Public Administration Review*, 82(1), 117-131. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13356>
- Liaw, Y. J., Chi, N. W., & Chuang, A. (2010). Examining the mechanisms linking transformational leadership, employee customer orientation, and service performance: The mediating roles of perceived supervisor and coworker support. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25, 477-492. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9145-x>
- Lin, P. Y., MacLennan, S., Hunt, N., & Cox, T. (2015). The influences of nursing transformational leadership style on the quality of nurses' working lives in Taiwan: a cross-sectional quantitative study. *BMC Nursing*, 14(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-015-0082-x>
- Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., DeChurch, L. A., & Wax, A. (2011). Moving emotional labor beyond surface and deep acting: A discordance-congruence perspective. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 2(1), 6-53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386611417746>
- Nesher Shoshan, H., & Venz, L. (2022). Daily deep acting toward coworkers: An examination of day-specific antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(1), 112-124. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2555>
- Newman, A., Thanacoody, R., & Hui, W. (2012). The effects of perceived organizational support, perceived supervisor support and intra-organizational network resources on turnover intentions: A study of Chinese employees in multinational enterprises. *Personnel Review*, 41(1), 56-72. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481211189947>
- Ozcelik, H. (2013). An empirical analysis of surface acting in intra-organizational relationships. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(3), 291-309. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1798>
- Papper, E. (1983). *Individual and organizational effects of perceived workload* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Bowling Green State University.
- Puah, L. N., Ong, L. D., & Chong, W. Y. (2016). The effects of perceived organizational support, perceived supervisor support and perceived co-worker support on safety and health compliance. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, 22(3), 333-339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10803548.2016.1159390>
- Purwanto, A. (2022). The role of transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior on SMEs employee performance. *Journal of Industrial Engineering & Management Research*, 3(5), 39-45. <https://doi.org/10.7777/jiemar>

- Purwanto, A., Purba, J. T., Bernarto, I., & Sijabat, R. (2021). Effect of transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitments on organizational citizenship behavior. *Inovbiz: Jurnal Inovasi Bisnis*, 9(1), 61-69. <https://doi.org/10.35314/inovbiz.v9i1.1801>
- Rafaeli, A. & Sutton, R. I. (1987). Expression of emotion as part of the work role. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 23-37. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1987.4306444>
- Rhoades, L. & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
- Shanock, L. R., & Eisenberger, R. (2006). When supervisors feel supported: relationships with subordinates' perceived supervisor support, perceived organizational support, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3), 689-695. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.689>
- Shore, L. M. & Shore, T.H. (1995). Perceived organizational support and organizational justice. In R. S. Cropanzano & K. M. Kacmar (Eds.), *Organizational Politics, Justice, and Support: Managing the Social Climate of the Workplace* (pp. 149-164). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- 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. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.80>
- Stinglhamber, F., Marique, G., Caesens, G., Hanin, D., & De Zanet, F. (2015). The influence of transformational leadership on followers' affective commitment: The role of perceived organizational support and supervisor's organizational embodiment. *Career Development International*, 20(6), 583-603. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-12-2014-0158>
- Suifan, T. S., Abdallah, A. B., & Al Janini, M. (2018). The impact of transformational leadership on employees' creativity: The mediating role of perceived organizational support. *Management Research Review*, 41(1), 113-132. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/MRR-02-2017-0032>
- Teezen, F., Bürkner, P. C., Gregersen, S., & Vincent-Höper, S. (2022). The mediating effects of work characteristics on the relationship between transformational leadership and employee well-being: A meta-analytic investigation. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(5), 3133. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19053133>
- Udin, U., Dananjoyo, R., & Isalman, I. (2022). Transactional leadership and innovative work behavior: Testing the mediation role of knowledge

sharing in distribution market. *Journal of Distribution Science*, 20(1), 41-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15722/jds.20.01.202201.41>

Yang, I. (2015). Positive effects of laissez-faire leadership: Conceptual exploration. *Journal of Management Development*, 34(10), 1246-1261. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2015-0016>