

## **AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP, LEADER ANGER AND FOLLOWER JOB OUTCOMES: A COMPARISON OF ANGRY VS. NON-ANGRY LEADERS**

**Nevra BAKER<sup>1</sup>**

### **Abstract**

This study investigates the effects of authentic leadership and leader anger on follower job outcomes of affective organizational commitment, trust in leader, and job satisfaction. In order to test the hypotheses of the study, an experiment and a survey were conducted, respectively. In the experiment, four different fictive leader types were constructed, and respondents were asked to answer questions about these leaders with the assumption that they worked with these fictional leaders. The findings of this study reveal that authentic leaders aroused higher levels of affective organizational commitment, trust in leader, and job satisfaction by their followers as compared to inauthentic leaders. Furthermore, both authentic and inauthentic leaders who displayed anger aroused lower levels of affective organizational commitment and trust in leader by their followers as compared to their counterparts who did not; and only authentic leaders who displayed anger aroused lower levels of job satisfaction as compared to their non-angry counterparts.

**Keywords:** Authentic Leadership, Leader Anger, Affective Organizational Commitment, Trust In Leader, Job Satisfaction

**JEL Classification:** L20, L29, M10

## **OTANTİK LİDERLİK, LİDER ÖFKESİ VE TAKİPÇİ İŞ SONUÇLARI: ÖFKELİ VE ÖFKELİ OLMAYAN LİDERLERİN BİR KARŞILAŞTIRMASI**

### **Öz**

Bu çalışmanın amacı, otantik liderlik ve lider öfkesinin, takipçi iş sonuçlarından örgütsel duygusal bağlılık, lidere güven ve iş memnuniyeti üzerine olan etkilerini araştırmaktır. Çalışmanın hipotezlerini test etmek amacıyla, sırasıyla bir deney ve bir anket uygulanmıştır. Deneyde, dört farklı hayali lider tipi resmedilmiştir ve katılımcılardan, betimlenen liderlerle çalıştıkları varsayımı ile, bu liderler hakkındaki soruları cevaplamaları istenmiştir. Bu araştırmanın bulgularına göre, otantik liderler, otantik olmayan liderlere göre daha yüksek derecede örgütsel duygusal bağlılığa, lidere güvene ve iş memnuniyetine yol açarlar. Ayrıca, lider öfkesi hem otantik hem de otantik olmayan liderler için, takipçilerinde daha düşük derecede örgütsel duygusal bağlılığa ve lidere güvene sebep olurken, yalnızca otantik liderler için daha düşük derecede iş memnuniyetine yol açmaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Otantik Liderlik, Lider Öfkesi, Örgütsel Duygusal Bağlılık, Lidere Güven, İş Tatmini

**JEL Sınıflaması:** L20, L29, M10

---

<sup>1</sup> Asst. Prof., Altınbas University, Business School, Department of International Trade, [nevra.baker@altinbas.edu.tr](mailto:nevra.baker@altinbas.edu.tr), ORCID: 0000-0002-5557-8235

## **1. Introduction**

Authentic leadership is among the most prominent theories in leadership. Its antecedents and outcomes have been investigated by various researchers (e.g., Bennis, 2003; Eriksen, 2009; Peus, Wesche, Streicher, Braun, & Frey, 2012). In their studies, Bennis (2003) and Eriksen (2009) found that self-knowledge is an antecedent of authentic leadership.

According to Peus et al. (2012), self-consistency is another antecedent for authentic leadership. As to the outcomes of authentic leadership, Peus et al. (2012) found that follower satisfaction with supervisor, follower organizational commitment, and follower extra-effort were among the consequences of this leadership style. In addition, Ilies, Morgeson, and Nahrgang (2005) proposed in their study that stronger identification with the leader, more favorable emotional states and elevated levels of self-realization, along with higher intrinsic motivation, self-esteem, and creativity will be among the follower outcomes of authentic leadership. Furthermore, Kiersch and Byrne (2015) put forth that authentic leadership was adversely related to employee stress and intentions to quit the job and positively related to organizational commitment both at the individual and group levels.

While former studies have primarily revealed the effect of authentic leadership on follower job outcomes (e.g., Laschinger, Wong, & Grau, 2012; Wong & Laschinger, 2013; Wong & Cummings, 2009; Wang & Hsieh, 2013), and the effect of leader anger on leadership outcomes (e.g., Lewis, 2000; Madera & Smith, 2009; Lindebaum & Fielden, 2011; Kant, Skogstad, Torsheim, & Einarsen, 2013), there is a lack of research on the combined effect of authentic leadership and leader anger on follower job outcomes. With this study, the author aims to contribute to the leadership literature by delineating the combined effect of authentic leadership and leader anger on the three follower job outcomes of affective organizational commitment, trust in leader, and job satisfaction.

## **2. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development**

### **2.1. The Relationship between Authentic Leadership, Leader Anger, and Follower Affective Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment by followers has been ascertained in a number of studies as a result of authentic leadership (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004; Jensen & Luthans, 2006; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008). Affective organizational commitment is defined as the employee's positive sentimental adherence to and identification with the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Avolio and Gardner (2005) put forth that we can comprehend the correlation between authentic leadership and follower affective organizational commitment by means of the hypothetical mechanisms of favorable social exchanges and individual and social identification of the follower with the leader. Authentic leaders communicate in an open and non-defensive way - and therefore exhibit themselves to followers as defenseless (Leroy, Palanski, & Simons, 2012). This mutual, reliant relationship among leaders and followers also lay out individual and social identification between followers and leaders (Walumbwa, Christensen, & Hailey, 2011). Followers will recognize, appreciate, and cherish their leader's personality, desires, and demands (personal identification), along with their role-position as a leader and thereof as an ambassador for the entire organization (social identification).

In the Turkish context, a study by Gündoğdu and Islamoğlu (2012) found that there is a positive relationship between authentic leadership and follower job related affective well-being. Again in Turkey, empirical studies by Ayca (2016), Cosar (2011), Gül & Alacalar (2014), and Yasbay (2011) found a significant positive relationship between authentic leadership and follower affective commitment towards the organization.

As a result of the personal and social identification with their authentic leaders, and in parallel to the previous studies, the author suggests that followers will feel greater affective commitment towards their organization. Therefore, the author came up with the following hypothesis:

H1. Authentic leaders will arouse higher affective organizational commitment by their followers as compared to inauthentic leaders.

Anger causes negative social behaviors. For example, Wubben, De Cremer, and Van Dijk (2009) found that anger displays breed lower levels of collaboration and brought about retaliatory actions (Van Kleef and Cote, 2007). In parallel, Gibson and Callister (2010) put forth that angry people are inclined to retaliatory actions such as hostility, alienation and abstention. Also, Lerner and Tiedens (2006) observed that angry people had a tendency to put blame on others.

The first dependent variable of this study, namely affective organizational commitment was defined as the employee's positive sentimental adherence to and identification with the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990). According to the author of this study, followers will not be able to establish a positive sentimental adherence towards their organization if feel alienated from their leader because of his/her angry behavior. Moreover, the author of this research is convinced that it might not be easy for followers to adhere to and identify with a leader who puts blame on others. Former studies also showed a relationship between leader anger and negative follower outcomes. For example, Van Kleef, Homan, and Cheshin (2009) found that work teams that had angry leaders developed negative emotions and lower levels of attachment to these leaders.

In the light of the arguments listed above, the author of this study claims that in case of authentic leaders, leader anger will diminish the positive effect of authentic leadership and therefore will result in diminished levels of follower affective organizational commitment as compared to followers who imagine having an authentic leader who is at the same time anger-neutral. Also, in case of inauthentic leaders, the author believes that leader anger will worsen the already negative effect of the lack of authenticity by the leader and will therefore result in lower levels of follower affective organizational commitment. Therefore, the author puts forth the following hypothesis:

H2. Authentic and inauthentic leaders who display anger will bring about lower levels of affective organizational commitment by their followers in comparison to their counterparts who do not.

## **2.2. The Relationship between Authentic Leadership, Leader Anger, and Follower Trust In Leader**

Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt and Camerer (1998) defined trust as a “psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another” (p. 395).

According to Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995), the best track to comprehend the reason why a certain side will have more or lesser trust is to think about the characteristics of the trustee, who can be a leader, for instance. Mayer et al. (1995) specified three qualities of a trustee that are crucial for the growth of trust: ability, benevolence, and integrity. Furthermore, according to Dirks and Ferrin (2002), the opinion that a trustor tries to form about the trustee (e.g., a leader) is based on the existence of properties such as honesty, integrity, dependability, credibility, competence, and predictability (Dietz & denHartog, 2006). In addition to these properties, Islamoğlu, Yurtkoru, Börü, and Birsal (2012) found that the dimensions of altruism, compassion, and harmoniousness contributed to the characteristics of a trustworthy person. Furthermore, the findings of the study by Saracer, Karacay-Aydin, Asarkaya, and Kabasakal (2012) which revealed that authentic leadership was recognized as important and valuable in gaining the trust of followers in Middle Eastern countries, including Turkey, provide empirical evidence from the Turkish context.

In line with the Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) and in line with the previous studies, the author suggests that because authentic leaders set a good example of exalted ethical norms, justice, and honesty, they will raise the degree of trust of their followers and their readiness to work with the leader for the advantage of the organization. As a result, the author came up with the following hypothesis:

H3. Authentic leaders will arouse higher trust in leader by their followers as compared to inauthentic leaders.

Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) suggested that anger displays were perceived as being far from leader role ideals because they signaled an inadequacy in terms of emotional control (Goleman, 1998) and self-confidence (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). In addition, anger displays that accuse others and hold them responsible for unfavorable outcomes (Lerner & Tiedens, 2006) can be perceived as unfair and give rise to anger backfires (Elfenbein, 2007). Moreover, Lelieveld, Van Dijk, Van Beest, and Van Kleef (2012) and Wubben et al. (2009) argue that anger displays mostly result in mutual anger.

The second dependent variable of this study, namely trust has been defined as a “psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another” (Rousseau et al., 1998, p. 395). The author of this study claims that if followers perceive anger displays by their leaders as unfair, then this situation will argue against the definition because the author thinks that in such a case, followers will not accept vulnerability if they think that their leader is accusing them without a valid reason.

Former studies have pointed out that displays of anger result in a decline in trust (Lerner & Tiedens, 2006). For instance, previous research has come up with the finding that when followers feel that their leaders' emotional expressions are inappropriate, their trust in the leader decreases (Gardner, Fischer, & Hunt, 2009).

In the light of the arguments listed above, the author of this study claims that in case of authentic leaders, leader anger will diminish the positive effect of authentic leadership and therefore will result in diminished levels of follower trust in leader as compared to followers who imagine having an authentic leader who is at the same time anger-neutral. Also, in case of inauthentic leaders, the author believes that leader anger will worsen the already negative effect of the lack of authenticity by the leader and will therefore result in lower levels of follower trust in leader. Thus, the author puts forth the following hypothesis:

H4. Authentic and inauthentic leaders who display anger will bring about lower levels of trust in leader by their followers in comparison to their counterparts who do not.

### **2.3. The Relationship between Authentic Leadership, Leader Anger, and Follower Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction has been portrayed as a “pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 1304). Theory puts forward that authentic leadership should have a positive relation to job satisfaction (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, et al., 2005). For instance, Ilies, Morgeson, and Nahrgang (2005) announced that authentic leaders potentially have a favorable effect on followers’ behaviors in that this kind of leaders makes sure that followers’ self-determination is encouraged. Also, research has indicated that such leaders are more effective at breeding intrinsic employee motivation (Deci, Connell, & Ryan, 1989). By increasing their self-determination and motivation, we put forth that authentic leaders will contribute to their followers’ positive job experiences, which will result in greater follower job satisfaction.

The study by Gezer (2015) in the Turkish context found a significant positive relationship between each of the components of authentic leadership, that are relational transparency, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and self-awareness, and follower job satisfaction. Also, the study by Ayca (2016) in the Turkish tourism sector revealed that job satisfaction is an outcome of authentic leadership.

In line with the above discussion, the author proposes the following hypothesis:

H5. Authentic leaders will arouse higher job satisfaction by their followers as compared to inauthentic leaders.

A study by Dasborough (2006) revealed that employees remembered negative affective events that they experienced with their leaders (such as anger) better than positive affective events. They remembered a higher number and diversity of negative emotions than positive emotions and with greater intensity. Again in former studies, anger has been linked with un-inspirational leadership (Waldman, Balthazard, and Peterson, 2011), leader despotism (Kant, Skogstad, Torsheim, & Einarsen, 2013) and lower leader effectiveness (Lewis, 2000).

The third dependent variable of this study, namely job satisfaction has been defined by Locke (1976, p. 1304) as a “pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences”. According to the author of this study, negative affective events caused by leader anger that are recalled by employees very vividly will inhibit the establishment of a positive emotional state which would lead to job satisfaction. In parallel to this suggestion, former research by Glomb and Hulin (1997) found out that leaders who expressed anger were rated lower both in satisfaction with supervisor and in effectiveness.

In the light of the arguments listed above, the author of this study claims that in case of authentic leaders, leader anger will diminish the positive effect of authentic leadership and therefore will result in diminished levels of follower job satisfaction as compared to followers who imagine having an authentic leader who is at the same time anger-neutral. Also, in case of inauthentic leaders, the author believes that leader anger will worsen the already negative effect of the lack of authenticity by the leader and will therefore result in lower levels of follower job satisfaction. Thus, the author comes up with the following hypothesis:

H6. Authentic and inauthentic leaders who display anger will bring about lower levels of job satisfaction by their followers in comparison to their counterparts who do not.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1. Research Design**

With the aim of testing the effects of authentic leadership and leader anger on the follower job outcomes of affective organizational commitment, trust in leader, and job satisfaction, four two-by-two experiments were executed to different groups of respondents. The experiments consisted of two paragraphs. The first paragraph depicted a hypothetical authentic leader or a hypothetical inauthentic leader. After the first paragraph, a negative situation about a project that the fictional leader is leading is depicted. The second paragraph depicted the same hypothetical leader as displaying angry or not displaying anger about the negative situation. Before undertaking the study, a pilot study was run with 12 academic respondents who were grouped evenly into the four groups of the study in order to locate potential problems subject to the differentiation between the four groups.

Relevant items of the Organizational Leader Authenticity Scale by Henderson and Brookhart (1996) have been used in an attempt to describe the authentic or the inauthentic leader, and relevant items of the Spielberger's Stait-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (1988) have been utilized with the aim of describing the display of the angry or non-angry behavior of the fictional leader. In order to describe the fictional authentic leader, relevant items of the Organizational Leader Authenticity Scale by Henderson and Brookhart (1996) have been used as they are; and in order to describe the fictional inauthentic leader, relevant items of the same scale have been negatively worded. Example items used for the description of the authentic leader are: "[The leader] often pays attention to team members during the project, but he does not behave like a know-it-all", "[The leader] listens to the ideas and suggestions of team members, and he is open to criticism", and "Overall, he is a successful supervisor, however, if he makes mistakes, he accepts and learns from them". Example items used for the description of the inauthentic leader are: "[The leader] is not very honest in face-to-face interactions with team members", "His beliefs and actions are not consistent, and he manipulates team members", and "If something is wrong in the organization, [the leader] certainly puts the blame on one of the team members".

In order to describe the fictional leader as expressing anger, relevant items of Spielberger's Stait-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (1988) have been used as they are; and in order to describe the fictional leader as being non-angry, relevant items of the same scale have been negatively worded. Example items used for the description of the angry leader are: "During a meeting where this situation was being declared, [the leader] suddenly got angry and started shouting", "He said that this was an unacceptable situation which had to be battled", and "When talking, he forgot his manners and punched on the table". Example items used for the description of the non-angry leader are: "During a meeting where this situation was being declared, [the leader] kept calm and did not raise his voice", "He calmly said that this was an unacceptable situation which had to be battled", "To the end of the meeting, he held a speech to staff members summing up the situation, thanked everyone and ended the meeting".

Because the respondents were Turkish speakers, the items of the related instruments have been translated into the Turkish language beforehand.

The participants were asked to first read the two paragraphs depicting the fictional leaders, and then they were asked to answer the survey questions with the assumption that they were working with the described hypothetical leader. The survey consisted of questions related to the job outcomes of affective organizational commitment, trust in leader, and job satisfaction. Affective Commitment Scale by Meyer et al. (1993), Trust In Supervisor Scale by Inelmen (2009), and the shorter version of the job satisfaction scale by Brayfield and Rothe (1951) shortened by Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger (1998) have been employed in the questionnaire, respectively. Affective Organizational Commitment Scale by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) consists of eight items. Example items are “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization”, “I would feel like 'part of the family' at my organization”, and “I would feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization”. Trust In Supervisor Scale by Inelmen (2009) also consists of eight items. Some example items are “I would have confidence that my supervisor would protect me when I am right”, “What my supervisor says and does, would totally overlap”, and “I would believe that my supervisor evaluates me only with my job performance”. The shorter version of the job satisfaction scale by Brayfield and Rothe (1951) consists of five items with the example items of “I would be fairly well satisfied with my job”, “Most days I would be enthusiastic about my work”, and “I would find real enjoyment in my work”.

### **3.2. Sample**

In this study, a population of employees working in the services sector in Istanbul was targeted. The population size is estimated as roughly 100,000. Accordingly, at a significance level of .05, the sample size should be 383 employees (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009). In order to meet this target, the author tried to reach 400 service sector employees. Convenience sampling method is used with respondents who met criteria such as easy accessibility and the willingness to take part in the experiment (Dörnyei, 2007). Having obtained a response rate of 13%, a total of 53 employees working in the services industry were contacted, making up 4 different groups. The average age of the employees is 30.25 and 60.4% of the respondents are male. The majority of the respondents are high school graduates with 49.1%, followed by a 45.3% of university graduates, and 3.8% of the respondents have a master's degree. The respondents have been working for 8.45 years on average with an average tenure of 4.25 years. 24.5% of the respondents are working in the finance sector, 18.9% are employed in the food sector, 15.1% are from the retail sector, 5.7% are working in the textile sector, again 5.7% are serve the health sector, another 5.7% operate in the tourism sector, and the residual 24.5% of the respondents are employed in the electronics, transportation, energy, and customer services industries.

### **3.3. Exploratory Factor Analysis**

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) is conducted in order to find out the strength of the association between the study variables, which involves an exploratory description of the data, or the preparation of the data for further analysis (Janssens, Wijnen, De Pelsmacker, & Van Kenhove, 2008, p.245). Therefore, for each of the scale items used to test the hypotheses, an Exploratory Factor Analysis is carried out to see to how many previously unknown dimensions, referred to as variables, the scale items are reduced.

In addition to EFA, the results of KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity are provided for each scale in order to validate the appropriateness of data for EFA analysis. KMO measure provides information about the patterns and intercorrelations between the variables of the study by indicating their factorability, and Bartlett's test is used for assessing the overall significance of the correlation matrix so that variables of the study are related to each other. If the KMO measure is above the value of 0.50 and Bartlett's test of Spher Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham icity is significant, then EFA is justified (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2010).

As seen in Table 1, all 8 items of the Affective Organizational Commitment Scale by Meyer et al. (1993) load under one factor, having loadings higher than threshold limit 0.7 (Hair et al., 2010).

**Table 1:** Factor Analysis Results for Affective Organizational Commitment

Items	Loadings
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	.88
I would enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.	.81
I would really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	.87
I would not think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.	.80
I would feel like 'part of the family' at my organization.	.86
I would feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization.	.84
This organization would have a great deal of personal meaning for me.	.86
I would feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.	.88
Variance explained (%)	72.45
KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy	.95
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (sig.)	.00

As seen in Table 2, all eight items of the Trust In Supervisor Scale by Inelmen (2009) load under one factor with loadings greater than threshold limit 0.7 (Hair et al., 2010).

**Table 2:** Factor Analysis Results for Trust In Leader

Items	Loadings
I would know that my supervisor would reward me when I do something successful.	.88
I would believe that my supervisor evaluates me only with my job performance.	.84
I would have confidence that my supervisor would protect me when I am right.	.89
I would believe that my supervisor deserves his/her position.	.90
There would be some job related matters which I would rather consult with my supervisor rather than with my supervisor's manager.	.80
What my supervisor says and does, would totally overlap.	.87
I would not feel uneasy with my supervisor's authority.	.87
I would have confidence in my supervisor's requests and suggestions.	.88
Variance explained (%)	74.93
KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy	.95
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (sig.)	.00

As observed in Table 3, all five items of the Job Satisfaction Scale by Judge et al. (1998) load under one factor, due to loadings above threshold limit 0.7.

**Table 3:** Factor Analysis Results for Job Satisfaction

Items	Loadings
I would be fairly well satisfied with my job.	.89
Most days I would be enthusiastic about my work.	.88
Each day of work would seem like it passes by fast.	.87
I would find real enjoyment in my work.	.90
I consider my job pleasant.	.92
Variance explained (%)	79.34
KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy	.87
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (sig.)	.00

### 3.4. Reliability Analysis

Reliability is the extent to which scales give consistent results on repeated trials. It demonstrates internal consistency, whose level is reflected by Cronbach's alpha measure. For high internal consistency, Cronbach's alpha is expected to be above the threshold limit 0.70 (Hair et al., 2010).

As seen in Table 4, all the scale items have high reliabilities that are greater than 0.9. Therefore, no items of the used scales were deleted.

**Table 4:** Reliability Analysis Results for Study Variables

Variable	Number of items	Loadings
Affective commitment	8	.95
Trust in leader	8	.95
Job satisfaction	5	.94

### 3.5. Hypothesis Testing

Because there are four independent samples in this study, where in each case two independent groups will be compared with each other, and the measurement level is interval, independent samples t-test is used to analyze the differences between groups in terms of the dependent variables follower affective organizational commitment, trust in leader, and job satisfaction.

First, the sample size has been divided into two groups – authentic and inauthentic leader - in order to be able to test the first two hypotheses of this study. With the aim of distinguishing these two groups from the original four groups of the study (Groups 1-4); the authentic leader group has been named as Group A, and the inauthentic leader group has been named as Group B. To form Group A, Group 1 and Group 2 have been merged, and to form Group B, Group 3 and Group 4 have been merged before undertaking the independent samples t-test. Table 5 and Table 6 below show the group statistics and the independent samples t-test results for Group A and Group B:

**Table 5:** Group Statistics for Group A (Authentic Leader) and Group B (Inauthentic Leader)

Dependent variables	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Affective org. commitment	Authentic leader	27	3.53	.96	.19
	Inauthentic leader	26	1.93	.37	.07
Trust in leader	Authentic leader	27	4.03	.60	.12
	Inauthentic leader	26	2.05	.29	.06
Job satisfaction	Authentic leader	27	3.41	1.01	.19
	Inauthentic leader	26	1.87	.30	.06

**Table 6:** Independent Samples t-Test Results for Group A (Authentic Leader) and Group B (Inauthentic 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.	90% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Affective org. commitment	Equal variances assumed	74.90	.00	7.92	51	.00	1.60	.20	1.26	1.93
	Equal variances not assumed			<b>8.03</b>	<b>33.85</b>	<b>.00</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>.20</b>	<b>1.26</b>	<b>1.93</b>
Trust in leader	Equal variances assumed	46.13	.00	15.25	51	.00	1.98	.13	1.76	2.19
	Equal variances not assumed			<b>15.43</b>	<b>38.15</b>	<b>.00</b>	<b>1.98</b>	<b>.13</b>	<b>1.76</b>	<b>2.19</b>
Job satisfaction	Equal variances assumed	138.96	.00	7.47	51	.00	1.54	.21	1.19	1.88
	Equal variances not assumed			<b>7.59</b>	<b>30.70</b>	<b>.00</b>	<b>1.54</b>	<b>.20</b>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>1.88</b>

As observed from Table 5 and Table 6, Group A and Group B consist of 27 and 26 respondents, respectively. Table 6 demonstrates that equal variances are not assumed for affective organizational commitment ( $p < .05$ ), trust in leader ( $p < .05$ ), and job satisfaction ( $p < .05$ ). Independent samples t-test revealed that there is a significant difference between Group A and Group B in terms of affective organizational commitment ( $t = 8.03$ ,  $p < .05$ ), trust in leader ( $t = 15.43$ ,  $p < .05$ ), and job satisfaction ( $t = 7.59$ ,  $p < .05$ ). As observed from Table 5 and Table 6, in terms of all dependent variables of affective organizational commitment, trust in leader, and job satisfaction, Group A has significantly higher means (3.53, 4.03, and 3.41, respectively) as compared to Group B (1.93, 2.05, and 1.87, respectively). Thus, hypotheses H1 (Authentic leaders will arouse higher affective organizational commitment by their followers as compared to inauthentic leaders), H3 (Authentic leaders will arouse higher trust in leader by their followers as compared to inauthentic leaders), and H5 (Authentic leaders will arouse higher job satisfaction by their followers as compared to inauthentic leaders) are supported.

Table 7 and Table 8 show the group statistics and the independent samples t-test results for Group 1 and Group 2:

**Table 7:** Group Statistics for Group 1 (Angry Authentic Leader) and Group 2 (Non-Angry Authentic Leader)

Dependent variables	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Affective org. commitment	Angry authentic leader	14	2.66	.33	.09
	Non-angry authentic leader	13	4.46	.24	.07
Trust in leader	Angry authentic leader	14	3.49	.24	.06
	Non-angry authentic leader	13	4.61	.09	.02
Job satisfaction	Angry authentic leader	14	2.49	.20	.05
	Non-angry authentic leader	13	4.40	.32	.09

**Table 8:** Independent Samples t-Test Results for Group 1 (Angry Authentic Leader) and Group 2 (Non-Angry Authentic 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.	90% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Affective org. commitment	Equal variances assumed	1.45	.24	16.06	25	.00	-1.80	.11	-1.99	-1.61
	Equal variances not assumed			16.27	23.40	.00	-1.80	.11	-1.99	-1.61
Trust in leader	Equal variances assumed	5.72	.03	15.96	25	.00	-1.11	.07	-1.23	-1.00
	Equal variances not assumed			16.44	16.58	.00	-1.11	.07	-1.23	-1.00
Job satisfaction	Equal variances assumed	1.75	.20	18.85	25	.00	-1.91	.10	-2.09	-1.74
	Equal variances not assumed			18.56	20.23	.00	-1.91	.10	-2.09	-1.74

Table 9 and Table 10 show the group statistics and the independent samples t-test results for Group 3 and Group 4:

**Table 9:** Group Statistics for Group 3 (Angry Inauthentic Leader) and Group 4 (Non-Angry Inauthentic Leader)

Dependent variables	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Affective org. commitment	Angry inauthentic leader	13	1.74	.30	.08
	Non-angry inauthentic leader	13	2.13	.35	.10
Trust in leader	Angry inauthentic leader	13	1.95	.29	.08
	Non-angry inauthentic leader	13	2.15	.27	.07
Job satisfaction	Angry inauthentic leader	13	1.85	.33	.09
	Non-angry inauthentic leader	13	1.89	.28	.08

**Table 10:** Independent Samples t-Test Results for Group 3 (Angry Inauthentic Leader) and Group 4 (Non-Angry Inauthentic 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.	90% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Affective org. commitment	Equal variances assumed	.41	.53	<b>-3.05</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>.01</b>	<b>-.39</b>	<b>.13</b>	<b>-.60</b>	<b>-.17</b>
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.05	23.42	.01	-.39	.13	-.60	-.17
Trust in leader	Equal variances assumed	.01	.92	-1.85	24	.08	-.20	.11	-.39	-.02
	Equal variances not assumed			<b>-1.85</b>	<b>23.81</b>	<b>.08</b>	<b>-.20</b>	<b>.11</b>	<b>-.39</b>	<b>-.02</b>
Job satisfaction	Equal variances assumed	.71	.41	-.39	24	.70	-.05	.12	-.25	.16
	Equal variances not assumed			-.39	23.38	.70	-.05	.12	-.25	.16

As seen in Table 7 and Table 9, Group 1 consists of 13 respondents, and Groups 2, 3, and 4 consist of 13 respondents each. Table 8 demonstrates that equal variances are assumed for affective organizational commitment ( $p > .10$ ) and job satisfaction ( $p > .10$ ), and equal variances are not assumed for trust in leader ( $p < .10$ ). Independent samples t-test revealed that there is a significant difference between Group 1 and Group 2 in terms of affective organizational commitment ( $t = -16.06$ ,  $p < .10$ ), trust in leader ( $t = -16.44$ ,  $p < .10$ ), and job satisfaction ( $t = -18.85$ ,  $p < .10$ ). As observed from Table 7 and Table 8, in terms of all dependent variables of affective organizational commitment, trust in leader, and job satisfaction, Group 1 has significantly lower means (2.66, 3.49, and 2.49, respectively) compared to Group 2 (4.46, 4.61, and 4.40, respectively).

Table 10 demonstrates that equal variances are assumed for affective organizational commitment ( $p > .10$ ), trust in leader ( $p > .10$ ), and job satisfaction ( $p > .10$ ).

Independent samples t-test revealed that there is a significant difference between Group 3 and Group 4 in terms of affective organizational commitment ( $t = -3.05$ ,  $p < .10$ ) and trust in leader ( $t = -1.85$ ,  $p < .10$ ). However, there is no significant difference between the two groups for job satisfaction ( $t = -0.39$ ,  $p > .10$ ). In terms of affective organizational commitment and trust in leader, the mean values for Group 3 (1.74 and 1.95, respectively) are significantly lower than the mean values of Group 4 (2.13 and 2.15, respectively). Thus, the hypotheses H2 (Authentic as well as inauthentic leaders who display anger will bring about lower levels of affective organizational commitment by their followers in comparison to their counterparts who do not), and H4 (Authentic as well as inauthentic leaders who display anger will bring about lower levels of trust in leader by their followers in comparison to their counterparts who do not) are supported at a 90% confidence interval. However, the hypothesis H6 (Authentic as well as inauthentic leaders who display anger will bring about lower levels of job satisfaction by their followers in comparison to their counterparts who do not) is only partially supported.

#### 4. Discussion and Conclusion

As hypothesized and found in H1, H3, and H5, authentic leaders aroused higher levels of affective organizational commitment, trust in leader, and job satisfaction by their followers as compared to inauthentic leaders. These findings of the study are in consistency with the current research that displayed the positive effect of authentic leadership on follower job outcomes of affective commitment, job satisfaction, trust, work engagement, task performance, and organizational citizenship behavior (e.g., Fallatah & Laschinger, 2016; Hsieh & Wang, 2015; Semedo, Coelho, & Ribeiro, 2016; Azanza, Gorgievski, Moriano, & Molero, 2018; Wei, Li, Zhang, & Liu, 2019). Study by Fallatah and Laschinger (2016) revealed that managers who demonstrated were more likely to enhance new graduate nurses' job satisfaction. Hsieh and Wang (2015) found out the positive effects of supervisor-perceived authentic leadership on employee trust and employee work engagement. Research undertaken by Semedo et al. (2016) discovered that authentic leadership influences employees' attitudes of affective commitment and job resourcefulness, and their creativity. Most recently, Azanza et al. (2018) came up with the finding that sales managers' authentic leadership style as perceived by employees significantly predicted salespeople's work engagement and psychological capital, and study by Wei et al. (2018) revealed that authentic leadership positively relates to followers' task performance and organizational citizenship behavior.

As hypothesized and found in H2, H4, and H6, both authentic and inauthentic leaders who displayed anger aroused lower levels of affective organizational commitment and trust in leader by their followers as compared to their counterparts who did not; and only authentic leaders who displayed anger aroused lower levels of job satisfaction as compared to their non-angry counterparts.

Former studies put forth that the display of negative emotions by leaders have unfavorable effects on the way that they were perceived by their followers. To begin with, Lewis (2000) found that expressions of anger and sadness by leaders had a substantial adverse impact on the appraisal of leader effectiveness by followers. Another study by Van Kleef, Homan, Beersma, and van Knippenberg (2010) revealed that anger evokes further negative concepts such as hostility and conflict. Furthermore, the findings of the study by Madera and Smith (2009) suggest that leader anger resulted in follower negative affect in a crisis.

The empirical study by Gaddis, Connelly, and Mumford (2004) highlights that negative leader affect led to poorer assessments of leader effectiveness and poorer quality performance. Moreover, research by Newcombe and Ashkanasy (2002) revealed that positive leader affect brought about more positive appraisals of the leaders than negative leader affect.

Considering the findings of the former research and in line with the results of this research, the author proposes that the display of anger by authentic leaders might neutralize their favorable image from the perspective of their followers and thereby lead to poorer job outcomes. An explanation for this suggestion might be that because negative emotions are linked with further unfavorable stereotypes and indicate an avoidance inclination, individuals might want to detach themselves from individuals who are displaying negativity (Eberly & Fong, 2013). Furthermore, negative affective reactions are more powerful when the anger expression is considered as irrelevant (Van Kleef, Homan, & Cheshin, 2012). The display of anger by authentic leaders is discordant with their positive image and accordingly will be considered as irrelevant from the point of view of their followers.

In accordance with the previous studies and the findings of this study, the author puts forth that the display of anger by the inauthentic leader might add to the unfavorable image of this inauthentic leader from the perspective of the followers. Still, in opposition to the assumptions of this study, the findings revealed that followers who assumed that they were actually working with the described inauthentic angry leader did not show significantly lower job satisfaction. In such as case, the author comes up with the idea that job satisfaction should have other work-related components that might have been considered more important by the participants than the mere expression of anger.

This research contributes to the leadership and emotions literatures by clarifying the joint effect of authentic leadership and leader anger on follower job outcomes of affective organizational commitment, trust in leader, and job satisfaction. This research is, to the author's knowledge, the first to bring the concepts of authentic leadership and leader emotional expressivity of anger together, and therefore shall contribute to the progress of leadership research.

With regard to the shortcomings of this study, because it is a cross-sectional study, data relating to the long term of the hypothesized relationships are not available. Moreover, because the data of this study is only collected from Istanbul, the Turkish culture might have an effect on the findings and thus they might not be generalized to other cultural settings. Hence, the author recommends that similar studies can be conducted in diverse cultures. Moreover, further research examining the combined effect of authentic leadership and leader anger on different follower job outcomes can be undertaken. Also, the combined effect of the leader emotional expressivity of other discrete leader emotions with authentic leadership on follower job outcomes can be studied.

## References

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315-338.
- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 801-823.
- Ayca, B. (2016). Otantik liderlik davranışının iş tatmini ve örgütsel bağlılığa etkisinin incelenmesi ve otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma (Doctoral thesis, Halic University, Istanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp>
- Azanza, G., Gorgievski, M., Moriano, J., & Molero, F. (2018). Influencing salespeople's work outcomes through authentic leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39(7), 926-944.
- Bennis, W. (2003). On becoming a leader. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing.
- Blau, P. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley.
- Brayfield, A., & Rothe, H. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35, 307-311.
- Coşar, S. (2011). Otantik liderlik kavramı ve ardılları üzerine bir araştırma (Master's thesis, Kara Harp Okulu, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from [http://www.kho.edu.tr/Dokuman/enstitu/tezler/Serkan\\_Cosar.pdf](http://www.kho.edu.tr/Dokuman/enstitu/tezler/Serkan_Cosar.pdf)

- Dasborough, M.T. (2006). Cognitive asymmetry in employee emotional reactions to leadership behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 163-178.
- Deci, E. L., Connell, J. P., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Self-determination in a work organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(4), 580-590.
- Dietz, G., & denHartog, D. N. (2006). Measuring trust inside organisations. *Personnel Review*, 35(5), 557-588.
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Metaanalytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611-628.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Eberly, M.B., & Fong, C.T. (2013). Leading via the heart and mind: The roles of leader and follower emotions, attributions and interdependence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 696-711.
- Elfenbein, H. (2007). Emotion in organizations: A review and theoretical integration. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 1(1), 315-386.
- Eriksen, M. (2009). Authentic leadership: Practical reflexivity, self awareness, and self-authorship. *Journal of Management Education*, 33(6), 747-771.
- Fallatah, F., & Laschinger, H. K. S. (2016). The influence of authentic leadership and supportive professional practice environments on new graduate nurses' job satisfaction. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 21(2), 125-136.
- Gaddis, B., Connelly, S., & Mumford, M. D. (2004). Failure feedback as an affective event: Influence of leader affect on subordinate attitude and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 663-686.
- Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). Can you see the real me? A self based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 343-372.
- Gardner, W. L., Fischer, D., & Hunt, J. G. (2009). Emotional labor and leadership: A threat to authenticity? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 466-482.
- George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 53, 1027-1055.
- Gezer, A. (2015). Otantik liderlik davranışlarının iş tutumlarına etkisi: Mersin ili finans sektöründe bir saha araştırması (Master's thesis, Toros University, Mersin, Turkey). Retrieved from <http://openaccess.toros.edu.tr/bitstream/handle/123456789/64>
- Gibson, D. E., & Callister, R. R. (2010). Anger in organizations: Review and integration. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 66-93.
- Glomb, T. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1997). Anger and gender effects in observed supervisor-subordinate dyadic interactions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 72, 281-307.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Gül, H. & Alacalar, A. (2014). Otantik liderlik ile izleyicilerin duygusal bağlılıkları ve performansları arasındaki ilişkiler üzerine bir araştırma. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2(5), 540-550.
- Gündoğdu, Z. & Islamoğlu, G. (2012). Otantik liderlik davranışının çalışanların işe ilişkin duygusal iyilik algıları üzerindeki katkısı ve yöneticiye güvenin bu ilişki üzerindeki şartlı rolü. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 20th National Management & Organizations Congress (Turkey), Izmir, Turkey (pp. 282-286). Izmir, Turkey: Dokuz Eylül University Faculty of Business.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Henderson, J.E. & Brookhart, S.M. (1996). *Organizational Leader Authenticity Scale (OLAS)*.

- Hsieh, C. C., & Wang, D. S. (2015). Does supervisor-perceived authentic leadership influence employee work engagement through employee-perceived authentic leadership and employee trust? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(18), 2329-2348.
- Ilies, R., Morgeson, F. P., & Nahrgang, J. D. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: Understanding leader-follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 373-394.
- İnelmen, K. (2009). Role of trust in mediating the effects of satisfaction and commitment on employee performance. *Boğaziçi Journal*, 23(1-2), 55-73.
- İslamoğlu, G., Yurtkoru, E. S., Börü, D., & Birsal, M. (2012). Güvenilir insane tanımı değişiyor mu? Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 20th National Management & Organizations Congress (Turkey), Izmir, Turkey (pp. 282-286). Izmir, Turkey: Dokuz Eylül University Faculty of Business.
- Janssens, W., Wijnen, K., De Pelsmacker, P., & Van Kenhove, P. (2008). *Marketing Research with SPSS*. New York: Prentice Hall Financial Times.
- Jensen, S. M., & Luthans, F. (2006). Relationship between entrepreneurs' psychological capital and their authentic leadership. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 18(2), 254-273.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 17-34.
- Kant, L., Skogstad, A., Torsheim, T., & Einarsen, S. (2013). Beware the angry leader: Trait anger and trait anxiety as predictors of petty tyranny. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 106-124.
- Kiersch, C.E., & Byrne, Z. S. (2015). Is being authentic being fair? Multilevel examination of authentic leadership, justice, and employee outcomes. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 22(3), 292-303.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter?. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5, 48-60.
- Laschinger, H. K. S., Wong, C. A., & Grau, A. L. (2012). The influence of authentic leadership on newly graduated nurses' experiences of workplace bullying, burnout and retention outcomes: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 49(10), 1266-1276.
- Lelieveld, G., Van Dijk, E., Van Beest, I., & Van Kleef, G.A. (2012). Why anger and disappointment affect other's bargaining behavior differently: The moderating role of power and the mediating role of reciprocal and complementary emotions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(9), 1209-1221.
- Lerner, J. S., & Tiedens, L. Z. (2006). Portrait of the angry decision maker: How appraisal tendencies shape anger's influence on cognition. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 19(2), 115-137.
- Leroy, H., Palanski, M. E. & Simons, T. (2012). Authentic Leadership and Behavioral Integrity as Drivers of Follower Commitment and Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107(3), 255-264.
- Lewis, K. M. (2000). When leaders display emotion: How followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 221-234.
- Lindebaum, D. & Fielden, S. (2011). 'It's good to be angry': Enacting anger in construction project management to achieve perceived leader effectiveness. *Human Relations*, 64(3), 437-458.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The cause and nature of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

- Madera, J. M., & Smith, D. B. (2009). The effects of leader negative emotions on evaluations of leadership in a crisis situation: The role of anger and sadness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(2), 103-114.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organization trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-734.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538-551.
- Newcombe, M. J., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2002). The role of affect and affective congruence in perceptions of leaders: An experimental study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 601-614.
- Peus, C., Wesche, J.S., Streicher, B., Braun, S., & Frey, D. (2012). Authentic leadership: An empirical test of its antecedents, consequences, and mediating mechanisms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107, 331-348.
- Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1987). Expression of emotion as part of the work role. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 23-37.
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 393-404.
- Saracer, B. E., Karacay-Aydin, G., Asarkaya, C., and Kabasakal, H. (2012). Linking the worldly mindset with an authentic leadership approach: an exploratory study in a Middle Eastern context. In S. Turnbull, P. Case, G. Edwards, D. Schedlitzki, & P. Simpson (Eds.), *Worldly leadership: Alternative wisdoms for a complex world* (pp. 206-222). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research methods for business students* (5th edition). London: Prentice Hall.
- Semedo, A. S. D., Coelho, A. F. M., & Ribeiro, N. M. P. (2016). Effects of authentic leadership, affective commitment and job resourcefulness on employees' creativity and individual performance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 37(8), 1038-1055.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1988). *Professional manual for the state-trait anger expression inventory*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment resources.
- Sy, T., Côté, S., & Saavedra, R. (2005). The contagious leader: Impact of the leader's mood on the mood of group members, group affective tone, and group processes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 295-305.
- Van Kleef, G.A., & Cote, S. (2007). Expressing anger in conflict: When it helps and when it hurts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1557-1569.
- Van Kleef, G. A., Homan, A. C., Beersma, B., van Knippenberg, D., van Knippenberg, B., & Damen, F. (2009). Searing sentiment or cold calculation? The effects of leader emotional displays on team performance depend on follower epistemic motivation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(3), 562-580.
- Van Kleef, G. A., Homan, A. C., Beersma, B., & van Knippenberg, D. (2010). On angry leaders and agreeable followers: How leaders' emotions and followers' personalities shape motivation and team performance. *Psychological Science*, 21(12), 1827-1834.
- Van Kleef, G. A., Homan, A. C., & Cheshin, A. (2012). Emotional influence at work: Take it EASI. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 2, 311-339.
- Waldman, D. A., Balthazard, P. A., & Peterson, S. J. (2011). Leadership and neuroscience: Can we revolutionize the way that inspirational leaders are identified and developed? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 25(1), 60-74.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34(1), 89-126.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Christensen, A. L., & Hailey, F. (2011). Authentic leadership and the knowledge economy. *Organizational Dynamics*, 40(2), 110-118.

- Wang, D. S., & Hsieh, C. C. (2013). The effect of authentic leadership on employee trust and employee engagement. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 41(4), 613-624.
- Wei, F., Li, Y., Zhang, Y., & Liu, S. (2019). The Interactive Effect of Authentic Leadership and Leader Competency on Followers' Job Performance: The Mediating Role of Work Engagement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153(3), 763-773.
- Wong, C. A., & Cummings, G. G. (2009). The influence of authentic leadership behaviors on trust and work outcomes of health care staff. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(2), 6-23.
- Wong, C. A., & Laschinger, H. K. S. (2013). Authentic leadership, performance, and job satisfaction: the mediating role of empowerment. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69(4), 947-959.
- Wubben, M. J., De Cremer, D., & Van Dijk, E. (2009). How emotion communication guides reciprocity: Establishing cooperation through disappointment and anger. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(4), 987-990.
- Yaşbay, H. (2011). Otantik liderlik ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi (Master's thesis, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir, Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp>
- Yukl, G. A. (2005). *Leadership in organizations*, 6<sup>th</sup>ed.. New York: Prentice Hall.

## Appendix A

### Fictional Leader Description for Group 1 (Angry Authentic Leader)

Ali is the team leader in a services company. He is often pays attention to team members during the project, but he does not behave like a know-it-all. He listens to the ideas and suggestions of team members, and he is open to criticism. Overall, he is a successful supervisor, however, if he makes mistakes, he accepts and learns from them. Ali is honest in face-to-face interactions with team members. His beliefs and actions are consistent, and he does not manipulate team members. If something is wrong in the organization, Ali certainly does not put the blame on one of the team members. He accepts responsibility for his own actions and for the progress of the organization, but he also supports that authority is delegated to team members.

Ali's department has been working on a project for 8 months. Due to some problems with the project, an important restriction has been put to the budget that had been set apart for Ali's department. Therefore, Ali's department has now to accomplish more with less resources. During a meeting where this situation was being declared, Ali suddenly got angry and started shouting. He said that this was an unacceptable situation which had to be battled. When talking, he forgot his manners and punched on the table. He had difficulty in controlling his anger and his behavior, he lost his patience and started cursing.

## Appendix B

### Fictional Leader Description for Group 2 (Non-Angry Authentic Leader)

Ali is the team leader in a services company. He is often pays attention to team members during the project, but he does not behave like a know-it-all. He listens to the ideas and suggestions of team members, and he is open to criticism. Overall, he is a successful supervisor, however, if he makes mistakes, he accepts and learns from them. Ali is honest in face-to-face interactions with team members. His beliefs and actions are consistent, and he does not manipulate team members. If something is wrong in the organization, Ali certainly does not put the blame on one

of the team members. He accepts responsibility for his own actions and for the progress of the organization, but he also supports that authority is delegated to team members.

Ali's department has been working on a project for 8 months. Due to some problems with the project, an important restriction has been put to the budget that had been set apart for Ali's department. Therefore, Ali's department has now to accomplish more with less resources. During a meeting where this situation was being declared, Ali kept calm and did not raise his voice. He calmly said that this was an unacceptable situation which had to be battled. To the end of the meeting, he held a speech to staff members summing up the situation, thanked everyone and ended the meeting.

## **Appendix C**

### **Fictional Leader Description for Group 3 (Angry Inauthentic Leader)**

Ali is the team leader in a services company. He does not often pay attention to team members during the project, and when he does, he behaves like a know-it-all. He does not listen to the ideas and suggestions of team members, and he is very defensive of criticism. Overall, he is a successful supervisor, however, if he makes mistakes, he does not accept and learn from them. Ali is not very honest in face-to-face interactions with team members. His beliefs and actions are not consistent, and he manipulates team members. If something is wrong in the organization, Ali certainly puts the blame on one of the team members. He also does not support that authority is delegated to team members.

Ali's department has been working on a project for 8 months. Due to some problems with the project, an important restriction has been put to the budget that had been set apart for Ali's department. Therefore, Ali's department has now to accomplish more with less resources. During a meeting where this situation was being declared, Ali suddenly got angry and started shouting. He said that this was an unacceptable situation which had to be battled. When talking, he forgot his manners and punched on the table. He had difficulty in controlling his anger and his behavior, he lost his patience and started cursing.

## **Appendix D**

### **Fictional Leader Description for Group 4 (Non-Angry Inauthentic Leader)**

Ali is the team leader in a services company. He does not often pay attention to team members during the project, and when he does, he behaves like a know-it-all. He does not listen to the ideas and suggestions of team members, and he is very defensive of criticism. Overall, he is a successful supervisor, however, if he makes mistakes, he does not accept and learn from them. Ali is not very honest in face-to-face interactions with team members. His beliefs and actions are not consistent, and he manipulates team members. If something is wrong in the organization, Ali certainly puts the blame on one of the team members. He also does not support that authority is delegated to team members.

Ali's department has been working on a project for 8 months. Due to some problems with the project, an important restriction has been put to the budget that had been set apart for Ali's department. Therefore, Ali's department has now to accomplish more with less resources.

During a meeting where this situation was being declared, Ali kept calm and did not raise his voice. He calmly said that this was an unacceptable situation which had to be battled. To the end of the meeting, he held a speech to staff members summing up the situation, thanked everyone and ended the meeting.

## Appendix E

### Survey Form for Groups 1-2-3-4

SECTION-1: Considering that you are working in a company where the above described leader is working and he is your immediate supervisor, please indicate the level of your agreement with the below statements by writing the suitable number next to the corresponding statements (1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Neither agree nor disagree, 4: Agree, 5: Strongly agree).

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization. \_\_\_\_\_
2. I would enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it. \_\_\_\_\_
3. I would really feel as if this organization's problems are my own. \_\_\_\_\_
4. I would not think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one. \_\_\_\_\_
5. I would feel like 'part of the family' at my organization. \_\_\_\_\_
6. I would feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization. \_\_\_\_\_
7. This organization would have a great deal of personal meaning for me. \_\_\_\_\_
8. I would feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. \_\_\_\_\_
9. I would know that my supervisor would reward me when I do something successful. \_\_\_\_\_
10. I would believe that my supervisor evaluates me only with my job performance. \_\_\_\_\_
11. I would have confidence that my supervisor would protect me when I am right. \_\_\_\_\_
12. I would believe that my supervisor deserves his/her position. \_\_\_\_\_
13. There would be some job related matters which I would rather consult with my supervisor instead of my supervisor's manager. \_\_\_\_\_
14. What my supervisor say and does, would totally overlap. \_\_\_\_\_
15. I would not feel uneasy with my supervisor's authority. \_\_\_\_\_
16. I would have confidence in my supervisor's requests and suggestions. \_\_\_\_\_
17. I would be fairly well satisfied with my job. \_\_\_\_\_
18. Most days I would be enthusiastic about my work. \_\_\_\_\_
19. Each day of work would seem like it goes by fast. \_\_\_\_\_
20. I would find real enjoyment in my work. \_\_\_\_\_
21. I would consider my job pleasant. \_\_\_\_\_

SECTION-2: Please state your answers to the questions below:

1. Please indicate your gender: Female \_\_\_\_\_ Male \_\_\_\_\_

2. Please indicate your age: \_\_\_\_\_ years

3. Please indicate your level of education:

Elementary school graduate \_\_\_\_\_

High school graduate \_\_\_\_\_

University graduate \_\_\_\_\_

Higher education (Master's degree, PhD) \_\_\_\_\_

4. Please indicate the sector of the company you are currently working for:

Education \_\_\_\_\_

F&B \_\_\_\_\_

Retail services \_\_\_\_\_

Customer services \_\_\_\_\_

Financial services \_\_\_\_\_

Other (please indicate) \_\_\_\_\_

5. For how long have you been working in the company you are currently working for? \_\_\_\_\_ years

6. For how long have you been working in total? \_\_\_\_\_ years

The survey is over. Thank you for your participation.