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The Effect of Leader Positive Affectivity on Team Member Turnover Intention and Team Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Abstract This paper develops two models to investigate the effect of team leader positive affectivity (PA) on team member turnover intention and team organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), at the individual and team levels, respectively. A two-wave longitudinal study was conducted involving a survey of 58 team leaders and 174 team members in a large Chinese telecom company across a three-month period. We found that team members’ organization-based self-esteem (OBSE) at Time 1 mediates the relationship between team leader PA at Time 1 and team member turnover intention at Time 2, whereas team aggregated OBSE at Time 1 mediates the relationship between leader PA at Time
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1 Introduction

In their review of the literature on emotion and leadership, Barsade and Gibson (2007) pointed out that this is an exciting emerging area, and called for more empirical studies to gain a better understanding of the role of emotion in leadership effectiveness. Personality traits related to emotions are considered to be especially important among successful leaders (e.g., George, 1995; Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991). Research shows that a leader’s positive affectivity, a personality trait that is closely related to emotions, is related to the leader’s own satisfaction and health and group performance (e.g., George, 1995; Little, Simmons, and Nelson, 2007), and that leaders who demonstrate positive affect typically receive favorable ratings from their followers (Newcombe and Ashkanasy, 2002). However, such research has not been found in Asia. The present study aims to fill this gap in the literature by conducting a systematic investigation of the impact of leader positive affectivity on team member attitudes and behaviors in a Chinese context, at both the individual and team levels. Furthermore, we examine the mediating process, that is, why and how leader positive affectivity has an impact on follower attitudes and behaviors, which has not been addressed to date.

Integrating the conservation of resources (COR) theory (Hobfall, 1988, 1989) and the social exchange theory, we investigate whether team members internalize positive treatment by their leader as a kind of resource, which results in favorable attitudes and outcomes at both the individual and the team level. The two theories together constitute a useful lens through which to examine the nature of the effect of leader positive affectivity on followers. Based on this theoretical foundation, the present paper also explores the possible mediating role played by team member organization-based self-esteem (OBSE) in the relationship between team leader positive affectivity and team member turnover intention and team OCB. In this way, we enrich the understanding of the emotional aspects of leadership in China. In the following sections, we propose individual- and
cross-level models of the mediating effect of OBSE on the relationship between team leader positive affectivity and team member turnover intention and group OCB. A longitudinal study is described, and the results are discussed.

2 Theory and Hypotheses

2.1 Positive Affectivity

Positive affectivity is considered a personality trait (Watson, 1988; Watson and Clark, 1984). People with a high level of positive affectivity (PA) perceive events and individuals in a generally positive and enthusiastic manner (Iverson, Olekalns, and Erwin, 1998). Existing studies show that a high level of positive affectivity influences the attitudes and behaviors of the high PA person (George, 1995), including self-reported levels of happiness (Lyubomirsky, King, and Diener, 2005), health (Little, Simmons, and Nelson, 2007), and job satisfaction (Connolly and Viswesvaran, 2000), and others, leading to positive job outcomes, such as better individual and team performance (Van Kleef, Homan, Beersma, Knippenberg, Knippenberg, and Damen, 2009; Damen, Knippenberg, and Knippenberg, 2008). It is possible that PA leaders may induce favorable job attitudes and behaviors among followers. We argue that the positive affect of leaders is a positive energy that is shared interpersonally, exerting positive impacts on followers individually and collectively.

The COR theory provides a new theoretical model to explain the ways in which positive affect acts as a resource. Hobfoll (2001, 2002) identified four key resources: self-efficacy, self-esteem, optimism, and social support. Social support can be divided into two categories: emotional (empathy and caring) and tangible (e.g., provide information about the stress situation that aids the employee in dealing with it) (Kaufmann and Beehr, 1986). Having sufficient resources enables employees to maintain positive attitudes and behaviors, and to cope with various types of job demands. Team leaders are “important others” in building up the various resources of team members. For example, they can enhance the self-efficacy, self-esteem, and optimism of subordinates by providing positive feedback (emotional support) and concrete guidelines related to job duties (tangible support) (Sarason, Sarason, Shearing, and Pierce, 1987).
2.2 Cross-Level Model: Team Member (Individual) OBSE as a Mediator

Leader positive affect influences team member attitudes (George and Bettenhausen, 1990; Barsade, 2007). Compared to their low PA counterparts, high PA leaders tend to be more positive about team members and their capabilities (George, 1995), and view themselves more positively and feel that they are important to the organization.

Pierce and Gardner (2004) argued that the messages sent by important, or significant, others in a social environment constitute one origin of OBSE. The respect demonstrated toward subordinates by management is one of such messages (Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, and Dunham, 1989). OBSE, a notion that was introduced by Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, and Dunham (1989), reflects the self-perceived value that individuals have of themselves as important, competent, and capable within their employing organizations. Only when employees have a high level of job-related self-efficacy, have a high level of self-esteem within their organization, and are optimistic about their status and work will they have a high level of OBSE. Thus, OBSE is a good representation of the important resources described in COR theory. Positive affectivity not only serves as a signal of the well-being of the sender (team leader in this context), but also contributes to greater resources among senders (team leaders). It helps people to think, feel, and act in ways that promote both resource building and involvement with approach goals (Lyubomirsky, King, and Diener, 2005). High PA leaders tend to be keen on establishing communication and friendship. As a result, team members feel that they are taken seriously and treated well, their psychological resources are enriched, and a sense of dignity and respect is engendered among them. In this way, the OBSE of team members is enhanced and enriched. Based on the foregoing discussion, we propose:

**Hypothesis 1**: Leader positive affectivity is positively related to team member OBSE.

When team members receive positive energy from their team leader, and OBSE is enhanced through positive interactions, positive work attitudes naturally develop. We concentrate our investigation on turnover intention, which is an important indicator of job attitude and organizational concerns. Turnover intention represents the employee’s willingness to continue to be a member of the
team and the organization. As noted, team leader positive affectivity may convey positive energy to team members and induce positive job attitudes. Therefore, we propose:

**Hypothesis 2**: Leader positive affectivity is positively related to team member turnover intention.

**Hypothesis 3**: Team member OBSE mediates the relationship between leader positive affectivity and team member turnover intention.

![Fig. 1 A Cross-Level Model of the Effect of Team Leader Positive Affectivity on Team Member Organization-Based Self-Esteem (OBSE) and Team Member Turnover Intention](image)

2.3 Team-Level Model: Team (Collective) OBSE as a Mediator by Integrating COR Theory and Social Exchange Theory to Predict Team OCB

The positive affect of team leaders not only have an effect on individual team members, but may also positively influence team-level outcomes by building up shared resources among the whole team. PA leaders are likely to be optimistic about their future (Forgas and Bower, 1987; Kavanagh and Bower, 1985). Optimism makes leaders more positive about the situations that they encounter. Such positive attitudes and psychological resources can be transmitted to team members (Barsade, 2002; Barsade and Gibson, 2007), and such positive emotions/positive affectivity carries the capacity to “transform individuals for the better, making them healthier and more socially integrated, knowledgeable, effective and resilient” (Fredrickson, 2004: 1373). As a result, the whole team will be more positive and optimistic, which creates a type of team-level resource that helps the team to be more cohesive and thus able to cope better with various demands. We apply team (collective) OBSE as a representative/proxy of team resources to tackle the black box of the effect of leader positive affectivity on team outcomes. Collective esteem is rooted in social identity (Tajfel and Turner,
and based on group opinions of self-worth. Team OBSE, therefore, reflects the collective sense of self-worth of team members as a result of resource investment and retention, according to COR theory. We therefore propose:

**Hypothesis 4**: Leader positive affectivity is positively related to team OBSE.

### 2.4 Integrating COR Theory and Social Exchange Theory to Predict Team OCB

COR theory is a useful new perspective through which we are able to better understand the impact of team leader positive affectivity on team members. On the other hand, however, the mechanism of COR has not yet been fully uncovered. The problem is that COR theory addresses reactions to job demands; that is, it explains mainly behavior concerning task performance. However, at the team level, teamwork is the crucial issue. Team organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is an important team behavioral outcome, which is critical in team building and success. The social exchange theory, a widely applied model, facilitates the understanding of interpersonal interactions, including team dynamics. In the following, we integrate the COR theory and the social exchange theory to examine how the positive affectivity of leaders influences team OCB. We first outline the similar focus on resources of the two theories, and then compare their assumptions, strengths, and weaknesses and put forward our viewpoint so as to illuminate the hypotheses, taking team OCB as the dependent variable.

First, in both theories, resources play a central role in the influence process. COR theory rests on the assumption that there is a risk of resource loss, and that such loss is more salient than resource gain. According to COR theory, leaders can transform their team or organization into a resource caravan, imbue team members with resources, and facilitate internal resource transactions to meet organizational missions (Hobfoll, 1988, 1998, 2011). As mentioned, leader positive affectivity can act as a kind of resource shared within the team. That is, a personal resource is transformed into a team one.

The social exchange theory emphasizes the exchange of resources (Blau, 1964). It views organizations as arenas for long-term, mutual social transactions between employees and the organization (Cropanzano and Prehar, 1999; Greenberg and Scott, 1996). Social exchange research has expanded to address
the relationships among multiple constituencies, including member exchanges with teams, leaders, and organizations (Berg and Wiebe, 1993; Cole et al., 2002; Coyle-Shapiro and Conway, 2004). Foa and Foa (1980) proposed six kinds of resources: money, goods, services, information, status, and love. The positive affectivity of team leaders serves as a kind of resource that may be reciprocated in kind or differently by team members, for example, in the form of commitment or contribution to the team. In other words, team members will reciprocate in either in-role or extra-role ways for the positive resources received from team leaders.

Second, whereas COR theory explains why resources are conserved, social exchange theory explains why reciprocation is expected after resources are received. By integrating the two perspectives, we can attain a better picture of resource processes. Social exchange theory is powerful in terms of explaining the consequences of exchange, through the principle of reciprocity. However, it is limited in terms of identifying the antecedents of exchange or explaining why some resources become content/currency for exchange. COR theory is complementary in this regard. According to COR theory, resources act as investments to protect entities from resource loss (Brotheridge and Lee, 2002; Hobfoll, 2011), so resources can be exchanged if they are conserved. Simply put, the investment of positive affectivity by leaders among team members and the team as a whole will result in the conservation of resources, in the form of individual and team OBSE. This theory explains the transformation and delivery characteristics of resources, which social exchange theory cannot.

However, COR theory cannot fully explain the consequences of resource conservation. According to Ng and Feldman (2011), the motivation to acquire and retain resources arises from the hedonism of individuals. In this logic, because the resources of individuals are limited, OCB performance is paradoxical (Bergeron, 2007). That is, because of resource constraints, team members will usually consider the tradeoff between performing OCB and executing their tasks as specified in their job description.

Thus, team members may be reluctant to perform OCB unless they consider that doing so represents another type of resource investment (i.e., helping others/the team will ultimately benefit oneself), which will allow them to conserve their resources in the long run. If OCB can be considered a kind of long-term investment for a future social-emotional return, then COR theory is
transformed from being a relatively passive, self-focused perspective to a proactive, other-oriented one.

Social exchange theory is helpful in explaining the aforementioned apparent paradox. It makes clear that team members become involved in group OCB to discharge the obligation of positive treatment by the team leader.

Third, we integrate COR theory and social exchange theory to advance the notion that team OBSE plays a mediating role in the relationship between leader positive affectivity and team OCB. According to COR theory (Hobfoll, 2001, 2002), positive emotional expression by team leaders is associated with greater investment of social resources (Fredrickson, 2003, 2004), as reflected in higher levels of team (collective) OBSE and respect and recognition received. Based on the foregoing discussion, we propose:

**Hypothesis 5**: Leader positive affectivity is positively related to team OCB.

**Hypothesis 6**: Team OBSE mediates the relationship between leader positive affectivity and team OCB.

![Fig. 2 A Team-Level Model of the Effect of Team Leader Positive Affectivity on Team Organization-Based Self-Esteem (OBSE) and Team Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)](image)

### 3 Method

#### 3.1 Sample and Procedures

The data were collected at nine branches of China Mobile’s division in northern China (Division J) in two time waves (the end of October 2007 and the end of January 2008) across a three-month period.

The respondents comprised frontline customer service officers (team members) and their team leaders (labeled “monitors” by the company) employed in various customer service shops. The primary tasks of the customer service officers are to (1) sell company products to customers, (2) handle customer inquiries, and (3) provide other services (e.g., repairs, refer customers to other company units) upon customer request.
Questionnaires were sent out to 58 leaders and 252 team members. With the help of the human resource (HR) director of the HR office of the Jilin province division, the questionnaires were sent directly to the leaders and subordinates of each branch. The response rates for Times 1 and 2 are 85% and 77%, respectively. After matching responses across the two time waves, the final dataset includes the data of 174 team members (70% of the total sample) and 58 team leaders who reported at Times 1 and 2.

Men made up 98% of the sample of team members. Team members responding to the survey ranged in age from 19 to 35 years, with an average age of 24 years (SD = 2.8). On average, team members had worked for the company 2.8 years (SD = 1.7). Nearly all (98%) had finished high school, with 48% stating that they had graduated from junior college and 6% stating that they had obtained a college degree. The leader sample has a similar sex composition, with 95% males. The age of team leaders ranged from 22 to 44, with an average age of 30 (SD = 6.5). Leaders had worked for the company for an average of 8 years (SD = 5.3). Among them, 48% had finished junior college, and 22% had graduated from college.

Adopting a two-wave longitudinal design, we measured team leader positive affectivity and team member OBSE at Time 1, and team member turnover intention and team OCB at Time 2.

Positive affectivity and OBSE were self-reported by team leaders, who also evaluated the turnover intention of team members. Positive affectivity, emotional intelligence, OBSE, and group OCB were self-reported by team members.

3.2 Predictor Measure

*Leader positive affectivity (PA).* To minimize the possibility of common method variance, leaders self-reported their level of positive affectivity. Positive affectivity was measured by the three-item scale employed by Iverson, Olekalns, and Erwin (1998) and Yoon and Thye (2000), which is adapted from the original scale of Watson et al. (1988). The respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5) the extent to which they viewed positively various aspects of their life. A sample item of this scale is “I usually find ways to liven up my days.” The coefficient alpha in the study was 0.67.
3.3 Outcome Measures

**Team member turnover intention.** Turnover intention was measured using three items developed by Rusbolt et al. (1988) with the same five-point Likert-type scale response format (1 = “strongly disagree”; 5 = “strongly agree”). Team leaders evaluated the turnover intention of team members. A sample item is “When working conditions here decline, (this team member) thinks a lot about quitting.” The reliability of this scale was 0.92.

**Team OCB.** We directly abstracted the team OCB scale from Schneider’s (1990) 22-item team climate scale (team OCB is one of the dimensions). The five-item scale includes five-point descriptive equivalents ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5). A sample item is “(Our team members) are willing to help each other in organizationally relevant tasks.” The coefficient alpha of this scale was 0.79.

3.4 Mediator Measure

**Organization-based self-esteem (OBSE).** The OBSE scale developed by Pierce et al. (1989) is well accepted and has good psychological properties. It consists of ten items, each of which reflects the extent to which people believe that they are valuable, worthwhile, effectual members of their employing organizations (Pierce et al., 1989). For this study, we directly adopted the scale in the survey of team members. Items are rated using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5). A sample item is “I count around here.” The coefficient alpha of the scale was 0.84.

3.5 Control Variables

Because team member OBSE and turnover intention may be influenced by the emotional intelligence (EI) and positive affectivity of individual team members, we controlled for these variables in order to focus on team leader positive affectivity and partial out alternative explanations. We also controlled for demographic variables including the age and sex (dummy coded 1 and 0 for male and female, respectively) of team members and team leaders. In addition,
because team leaders who have a high level of OBSE themselves might exert an influence on the OBSE of team members, we controlled for team leader OBSE. We translated the scales, which were originally in English, into Chinese using the standard back-translation method (Brislin, 1980).

**Emotional intelligence (EI).** The 16-item Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS; Wong and Law, 2002) was used to evaluate the EI level of team members. Respondents were asked to rate four items under each of the four EI dimensions, and again a five-point Likert-type response format was used. The coefficient alpha for the EI scale was .95. A recent study showed that the scale is more appropriate for Chinese respondents than are Western-developed EI scales (Law, Wong, Huang, and Li, 2008).

### 3.6 Analysis

**Aggregation to team level and results.** Team member OBSE and team OCB are team-level constructs, but the data were from three team members in each team at the individual level. To test the appropriateness of the aggregation to the team level, we calculated within-group inter-rater reliabilities for these two measures using $R_{wg}$, ICC (1), and ICC (2) (James, 1982; Bliese, 2000). An $R_{wg}$ value greater than 0.70 is good evidence for aggregation, and an ICC (1) value higher than 0.05 is considered sufficient to warrant aggregation (Bliese, 2000). ICC (2) values higher than 0.70 are good, and those higher than 0.50 are tolerable (Klein and Kozlowski, 2000). The results show that team OBSE and team OCB $R_{wg}$ scores are higher than 0.88 and 0.70, both exceeding the 0.70 requirement. In addition, both of these two measures passed the ICC (1) test, the ICC(1) score is 0.21 for team OBSE and 0.36 for team OCB. For the ICC(2) test, team OCB is as high as 0.63, however, team OBSE is 0.44, a little bit than the 0.50 threshold. Since the $R_{wg}$ and ICC(1) tests are good, we aggregated the two measures to team level accordingly.

**Hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) analysis.** HLM analysis was used to test the first set of hypotheses (Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3), which involve multilevel variance (individual and team level) (Bryk and Raudenbush, 1992; Hofmann, 1997; Bliese, 2000).

To ensure that there was sufficient variance across all teams, we ran a null
model in the HLM analysis with turnover intention as the dependent variable. The result was $\chi^2 = 1184.11 (p < 0.01)$, which supported cross-level analysis.

To test the mediating role of team member OBSE in the relationship between team leader positive affectivity and team member turnover intention (Hypothesis 3), we followed the procedure suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986). According to Zhang, Zyphur, and Preacher (2009), in multilevel mediation models such as the 2-1-1 model, the within-group effect in the 1-1 relationship can cause confounded estimates of multilevel mediation effects, which exist only at Level 2. Following their suggestion regarding group mean centering (Zhang, Zyphur, and Preacher, 2009), we abstracted the group mean of OBSE from the respective OBSE scores, and termed it “OBSE_min” at Level 1, and included the group mean of OBSE at Level 2, naming it “OBSE_group mean.”

The sigma square and level-two residual Tau represent respectively the within-group and the between-group variance of the dependent variables. Our results showed that the between-group variance of turnover intention in Models 2 and 3 ($\tau = 0.51$) was higher than the within-group variance ($\tau = 0.11$).

We then adopted hierarchical regression analyses to test Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 (team level).

4 Results

The descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and correlations) of all of the variables at the individual and team levels are reported in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. At the individual level, leader positive affectivity is positively correlated with team member OBSE ($r = 0.24, p < 0.01$) and turnover intention ($r = –0.29, p < 0.01$) (Table 1). These results support Hypotheses 1 and 2.

At the team level, leader positive affectivity is associated with team OBSE at Time 1 ($r = 0.28, p < 0.05$), and team OCB at Time 2 ($r = 0.28, p < 0.05$). Thus, Hypotheses 4 and 5 are supported.

In Table 3, all of the independent variables and controls are centered around their grand mean and HLM analysis is performed. Consistent with Hypotheses 1 and 2, team leader positive affect is found to be positively related with team member OBSE ($\gamma = 0.15, p < 0.05$) in Model 1 and negatively correlated with turnover intention ($\gamma = –0.51, p < 0.01$) in Model 2. The mediation effect proposed in Hypothesis 3 is partially supported, as after introducing team
### Table 1  Means, Standard Deviation, Correlations, and Reliabilities at the Individual Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SAGE</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SSEX</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. WAGE</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. WSEX</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PA</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EI</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SOBSE</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SPA</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. OBSE</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. T2SEXIT</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. T2GOCB</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SAGE means leader’s age; SSEX means leader’s sex; WAGE means subordinate’s age; WSEX means subordinate’s sex; PA means subordinate’s positive affectivity; EI means subordinate’s emotional intelligence; SOBSE means leader’s organization-based self-esteem; SPA means leader’s positive affectivity; OBSE means subordinate’s organization-based self-esteem; T2SEXIT means time 2 turnover intention; and T2GOCB means time 2 group organizational citizenship behavior. T1 and T2 refer to the first and the second survey, respectively.

Numbers in parentheses on the diagonal are the coefficient alphas. N = 174; * indicates p < 0.05; ** indicates p < 0.01.
### Table 2  Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations at the Team Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAGE_MEAN</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSEX_MEAN</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>−0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAGE_MEAN</td>
<td>23.80</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>−0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_MEAN</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>−0.32∗∗</td>
<td>−0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_MEAN</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>−0.09</td>
<td>−0.18</td>
<td>0.36∗∗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA_MEAN</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>−0.16</td>
<td>−0.13</td>
<td>−0.15</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSE_MEAN</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>−0.06</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.23+</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.35∗∗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2GOCB_MEAN</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>−0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>−0.03</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>0.28†</td>
<td>0.32∗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SAGE_MEAN means aggregated leader’s age; SSEX_MEAN means aggregated leader’s sex; WAGE_MEAN means aggregated subordinate’s age; PA_MEAN means aggregated subordinate’s positive affectivity; EI_MEAN means aggregated subordinate’s emotional intelligence; SPA_MEAN means aggregated leader’s positive affectivity; and T2GOCB_MEAN means aggregated time 2 group organizational citizenship behavior. T1 and T2 refer to the first and the second survey, respectively. Numbers in parentheses on the diagonal are the coefficient alphas. N = 58; * indicates p < 0.05; ** indicates p < 0.01.

### Table 3  Main and Mediation Hypothesis Testing of the Effect of Team Leader Positive Affectivity on Team Member Organization-Based Self-Esteem and Team Member Turnover Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Model 1: Organization-based Self-esteem</th>
<th>Model 2: Turnover intention</th>
<th>Model 3: Turnover intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organization-based Self-esteem</td>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td>WSEX</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WAGE</td>
<td>0.03∗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>0.19∗∗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>0.11†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td>SSEX</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAGE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOBSE</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OBSE_group mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>0.15∗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td></td>
<td>OBSE_min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigma_square (within-group variance)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tau (between-group variance)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: + indicates p < 0.10; * indicates p < 0.05; ** indicates p < 0.01.

The group mean of OBSE abstracted from the respective OBSE score is termed “OBSE_min” at Level 1.

The group mean of OBSE in Level 2 is termed “OBSE_group_mean” at Level 2.
member OBSE, the effect of leader positive affectivity on turnover intention drops but remains significant ($\gamma = -0.50, \ p < 0.01$). After abstracting the group mean to avoid error (Zhang et al., 2009), the effect on team member OBSE is significant ($\gamma = 0.36, \ p < 0.10$).

Table 4 shows the results for the main hypotheses of the effect of leader positive affectivity on team OCB and the mediation effect through team OBSE at Time 1. Models 1 and 2 show that leader positive affectivity predicts team OBSE ($\beta = 0.35, \ p < 0.01$) and team OCB ($\beta = 0.28, \ p < 0.05$). Thus, Hypotheses 4 and 5 are fully supported. After introducing the mediator, team OBSE, in Model 3, the regression coefficient of the effect of leader positive affectivity on team OCB becomes nonsignificant ($\beta = 0.19, \ p > 0.10$), which indicates the full mediation of team OBSE. Hence, Hypothesis 6 is supported.

Table 4 Main and Mediation Hypothesis Testing of the Effect of Team Leader Positive Affectivity on Team Organization-Based Self-Esteem (OBSE) and Team Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Model 1: Team OBSE</th>
<th>Model 2: Team OCB</th>
<th>Model 3: Team OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$SPA$</td>
<td>$0.35^{**}$</td>
<td>$0.28^*$</td>
<td>$0.19$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td>$OBSE_{MEAN}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0.25^+$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>$0.12^{**}$</td>
<td>$0.08^*$</td>
<td>$0.13^+$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>$0.12^{**}$</td>
<td>$0.08^*$</td>
<td>$0.05^+$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>$7.63^{**}$</td>
<td>$4.42^*$</td>
<td>$3.34^+$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$df1, df2$</td>
<td>$1, 56$</td>
<td>$1, 54$</td>
<td>$1, 53$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $+$ indicates $p < 0.10$; $*$ indicates $p < 0.05$; ** indicates $p < 0.01$.

5 Discussion

“Leadership is both rational and emotional” (Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy, 2005: 8). Based mainly on the COR perspective, the current study sheds light on the importance of leader affectivity, a topic that has been neglected in the literature. Our findings suggest that leaders with a high level of positive affectivity enhance team member OBSE by transmitting messages of respect and recognition. According to the COR theory, such messages constitute a kind of emotional...
resource that is delivered from the team leader to team members. Such a resource affects not only individual work outcomes, such as turnover intention, but also team OCB. The impact of leader positive affect is found to be mediated by individual OBSE, consistent with the COR model. Our paper integrates the COR theory and the social exchange theory and contributes to the two streams of the theoretical literature in two ways. First, social exchange theory explains well the reciprocal nature of resources, extending the COR theory. Second, the COR theory is limited by its linking resource retention with hedonism; OCB, however, is a job outcome that is associated with altruism. Our study shows that the COR theory can be “altruistic” and proactive if we consider OCB to be another type of investment. Third, our research provides insights into the possible refinement of the COR theory in a more dynamic direction; that is, the total amount of individual resources is not necessarily constrained, but rather can be enriched. This notion is consistent with the broaden-and-build theory (Fredrickson, 2004), which argues that positive emotions broaden people’s momentary thought-action repertoires, and consequently build intellectual, physical, social, and psychological resources for the future (Fredrickson, 2003, 2004).

In addition, the study contributes to the COR literature by exploring the black box of the ways in which leader positive affectivity influences individual turnover intention and team OCB. Positive leaders express respect for and recognize the efforts of team members, and these positive messages enhance the self-esteem of team members in the long run, which in turn has a positive impact on team OCB and a negative one on turnover intention.

Our findings have practical implications. On one hand, managers should consciously focus on building up the OBSE of their subordinates, and be aware of the significant, positive effects of positive ways of thinking and acting. On the other hand, organizations should select and train high PA managers to fill leadership positions to enhance the OCB of teams.

This study is relevant to Asian context. Due to the relatively weak degree of institutionalization (Xin and Pearce, 1996), Chinese employees may rely more on the leaders and interpersonal relationship. Thus, we expect the influences of leaders’ characteristics and behaviors will have stronger effect on followers. This is therefore a good research setting and sample. On the other hand, paternalistic leadership is a prevalent managerial style in Eastern cultures, such as China.
(Redding and Wong, 1986; Westwood, 1997). It has been found that benevolence, personal concern, and emotional support are as important as authority in this leadership style (Redding and Wong, 1986; Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008). This also suggests that the emotions and emotion-related traits of leaders in Asia may be important.

5.1 Limitations

This study has a number of limitations that should be pointed out when interpreting the results. First, although a longitudinal survey was conducted, the mediator, OBSE, and outcome variable, group OCB, were self-reported by team members. Objective measures of individual performance and team effectiveness would be preferable.

Second, we did not measure negative affectivity. Wanberg, Bunce, and Gavin (1999) and Irving and Coleman (1999) found that people with a high degree of negative affectivity tend to focus on the unfair aspects of situations, experience negative emotional states, and are more likely to perceive situations as unfair than are their counterparts with a low degree of such affectivity. Negative and positive affectivity are two dimensions that need to be taken into consideration in future research.

Third, the data came from branches affiliated with a China Mobile division, which is relatively low in the company hierarchy, and in which team characteristics and the influence that leaders exert on team members might be more obvious. It would be worthwhile to examine whether the findings are generalizable to different organizational levels.

5.2 Future Studies

Beyond the proposed research directions, much more work needs to be done on this subject. In this study, we established a model in which leader positive affectivity impacts team member turnover intention and team-level OCB through the mediation of team member and team-level OBSE. The effects of contextual factors (e.g., job characteristics and culture) and group member characteristics (e.g., positive affectivity) were not taken into account. It would be meaningful
for future researchers to examine the effects of those variables. In addition, future studies could consider different hierarchies and different industries to reexamine our hypothesized model and test its validity and generalizability. It would be worthwhile to examine the impact of different types of affective variables (including dispositional affect [positive and negative affectivity], that is, mood and emotions) on dyadic relationships, team relations, and organizational leadership.

The emotional intelligence of leaders has been proven to predict employee attitudes and outcomes (Law, Wong, and Song, 2004). It would be useful to see whether positive affectivity and emotional intelligence have joint effects on job outcomes, using the COR model as the theoretical framework.

To illustrate the mediating process, we have integrated the COR theory and the social exchange theory. We look forward to contributing further to theories used in the examination of the areas of emotion and leadership, by integrating and/or extending them.
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