

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告 期末報告

上司對部屬之認知信任、權力距離與不當督導之關係

計畫類別：個別型計畫
計畫編號：MOST 102-2410-H-004-154-SSS
執行期間：102年08月01日至103年12月31日
執行單位：國立政治大學企業管理學系

計畫主持人：胡昌亞
共同主持人：黃瑞傑
計畫參與人員：博士班研究生-兼任助理人員：王豫萱

處理方式：

1. 公開資訊：本計畫涉及專利或其他智慧財產權，2年後可公開查詢
2. 「本研究」是否已有嚴重損及公共利益之發現：否
3. 「本報告」是否建議提供政府單位施政參考：否

中華民國 104 年 04 月 01 日

中文摘要：本研究計畫欲探討主管對部屬之認知信任、主管與部屬之權力距離，以及不當督導之關係。本研究假設主管對部屬之認知信任與不當督導有負向關係。此外，主管之權力距離會調節前述關係，造成低權力距離主管前述的負向關係較強。而部屬之權力距離則調節不當督導與情緒耗竭之正向關係，造成低權力距離部屬此正向關係較強。本研究採用兩階段之主管與部屬對偶問卷設計，共收集 285 份有效資料，並以多元迴歸分析進行假設檢驗。研究結果顯示，主管的認知信任與部屬所知覺的不當督導行為有顯著的負向關聯性，且不當督導行為會完全中介認知信任與部屬情緒耗竭之間的關係，但部屬及主管的權力距離，均未對上述關係有顯著的調節效果。此外，本研究的補充分析也發現，主管的認知信任會完全中介主管情感信任與不當督導行為之間的關係，顯示認知信任對不當督導行為具有關鍵性的影響。

中文關鍵詞：認知信任、權力距離、不當督導

英文摘要：This study intends to address the research calls in the abusive supervision literature by examining a supervisor-related antecedent of abusive supervision and the boundary conditions that may moderate the relationship between the antecedent and consequence of abusive supervision. Specifically, the study investigates the following three hypotheses: first, whether supervisors' cognitive trust in subordinates negatively relates to abusive supervision; second, whether such relationships will be moderated by supervisors' power distances, such that the above negative relationship is stronger for low power distance supervisors; and third, whether subordinates' power distances will moderate the positive relationship between abusive supervision and emotional exhaustion. 285 dyadic survey packages were collected from two time points. The results of hierarchical linear regression were used to analyze proposed hypotheses. I found that supervisors' cognitive trust in subordinates relates negatively to subordinates' emotional exhaustion, and this relationship was fully mediated by cognitive trust. However, I did not find the moderation effects, neither supervisors' nor subordinates' power distances. The additional analysis showed that

cognitive trust fully mediated the relationship between supervisors' affective trust and abusive supervision. This study indicated the important role of cognitive trust in abusive supervision.

英文關鍵詞： Cognitive Trust, Power Distance, Abusive Supervision

科技部專題研究計畫成果報告

上司對部屬之認知信任、權力距離與不當督導之關係

Cognitive Trust in Subordinate, Power Distance, and Abusive Supervision

計畫編號：102-2410-H-004-154-SSS

執行期限：102年08月01日至103年12月31日

主持人：胡昌亞 國立政治大學企業管理學系教授

計畫參與人員：王豫萱 國立政治大學企業管理研究所博士候選人

一、中文摘要

本研究計畫欲探討主管對部屬之認知信任、主管與部屬之權力距離，以及不當督導之關係。本研究假設主管對部屬之認知信任與不當督導有負向關係。此外，主管之權力距離會調節前述關係，造成低權力距離主管前述的負向關係較強。而部屬之權力距離則調節不當督導與情緒耗竭之正向關係，造成低權力距離部屬此正向關係較強。本研究採用兩階段之主管與部屬對偶問卷設計，共收集 285 份有效資料，並以多元迴歸分析進行假設檢驗。研究結果顯示，主管的認知信任與部屬所知的不當督導行為有顯著的負向關聯性，且不當督導行為會完全中介認知信任與部屬情緒耗竭之間的關係，但部屬及主管的權力距離，均未對上述關係有顯著的調節效果。此外，本研究的補充分析也發現，主管的認知信任會完全中介主管情感信任與不當督導行為之間的關係，顯示認知信任對不當督導行為具有關鍵性的影響。

關鍵字：認知信任、權力距離、不當督導

二、英文摘要

This study intends to address the research calls in the abusive supervision literature by examining a supervisor-related antecedent of abusive supervision and the boundary conditions that may moderate the

relationship between the antecedent and consequence of abusive supervision. Specifically, the study investigates the following three hypotheses: first, whether supervisors' cognitive trust in subordinates negatively relates to abusive supervision; second, whether such relationships will be moderated by supervisors' power distances, such that the above negative relationship is stronger for low power distance supervisors; and third, whether subordinates' power distances will moderate the positive relationship between abusive supervision and emotional exhaustion. 285 dyadic survey packages were collected from two time points. The results of hierarchical linear regression were used to analyze proposed hypotheses. I found that supervisors' cognitive trust in subordinates relates negatively to subordinates' emotional exhaustion, and this relationship was fully mediated by cognitive trust. However, I did not find the moderation effects, neither supervisors' nor subordinates' power distances. The additional analysis showed that cognitive trust fully mediated the relationship between supervisors' affective trust and abusive supervision. This study indicated the important role of cognitive trust in abusive supervision.

Keywords: Cognitive Trust, Power Distance, Abusive Supervision

三、研究動機與目的

Growing research interest in “negative behaviors” in organizations has led to a shift in the focus of leadership literature, from merely effective leadership behaviors to both positive and negative sides of leadership (Tepper, 2000, 2007). Among the many negative leadership concepts proposed, abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000) has attracted much research attention during the past several years (Tepper, 2007; Tierney & Tepper, 2007). Since the publication of Tepper’s (2000) pioneer work, more than ten articles have been published in top-tier journals (e.g., Aryee, Chen, Sun, & Debrah, 2007; Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002a; Tepper, 2000, 2007; Tepper, Duffy, Henle, & Lambert, 2006; Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, & Ensley, 2004; Tepper, Duffy, & Shaw, 2001; Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002).

As the focus of the abusive supervision has been subordinate outcomes, the antecedents of abusive supervision received relatively little research attention (Tepper, 2007). One area that deserves more research attention is the supervisor-related antecedents of abusive supervision as such focus may provide managerial implications regarding to how to decrease the occurrence of abusive supervision. To respond to this research gap, I examined the relationship between the supervisor’s cognitive trust in the subordinate and abusive supervision. The choice of supervisor’s cognitive trust is based on the following two reasons. First, when an individual is lack of trust in the target person, it leads to hostile or defensive behaviors of the individual toward the target person (Gurtman, 1992; McAllister, 1995). Second, cognitive-based trust is often related to or derived from job related performance

in workplaces. As bad performance may lead to a supervisor’s disciplinary behaviors and disciplinary may be perceived as abusive supervisor by some subordinates (Wu & Hu, 2009), it is reasonable to expect a negative relationship between a supervisor’s cognitive-based trust in the subordinate and abusive supervision. Finally, the development of interpersonal affect is based on a cognitive mechanism. Research on trust has highlighted that cognitive trust is often perceived as the antecedent of affective trust (Lewis & Weigert, 1985; McAllister, 1995). Therefore, it is reasonable to use first examine the role of a supervisor’s cognitive trust in the subordinate in abusive supervisor.

In addition to examine a supervisor-related antecedent of abusive supervision, I also examined moderating effects of supervisor’s and subordinate’s power distance orientation. This is because power distance reflects the acceptance of unequal power distribution in organizations (Hofstede, 1980) and power distance that operationalized at the individual level may be related to an individual’s desire to maintain social distance and to demonstrate the authority given by the position that the individual occupied. I expect the supervisor’s power distance moderates the relationship between trust and abusive supervision, and subordinate’s power distance moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and employee’s emotional exhaustion. Under such a condition, it is possible that the relationship between trust and abusive supervision of high power distance supervisors are different from the relationship for low power distance supervisors. Furthermore, the negative relationship between abusive

supervision and employee's emotional exhaustion were stronger for employees with lower power distance orientation.

四、文献探討

Abusive Supervision

Tepper (2000) defined abusive supervision as "subordinates' perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behavior, excluding physical contact" (p.178). The definition indicates several special qualities of abusive supervision. First, abusive supervision is a subjective perception of employees, and therefore, different employees may have different perceptions of the same behaviors from the same manager. Second, for a subordinate to perceive a supervisory behavior as abusive supervision, the subordinate has to perceive this behavior as hostile. For example, when a manager demands strongly that an employee must follow instructions and timelines while working on a project, the employee may experience discomfort. However, such behavior may not necessarily be perceived as abusive supervision because the employee may not perceive that the manager has hostile intentions. Another example would be that a manager not only discredits an employee's hard work on a presentation, but also makes negative and rude comments about the employee's excellent presentation. Such behaviors from a manager are usually perceived as hostile and therefore result in abusive supervision. Third, the demonstration of abusive supervision is ongoing, not just occasional. In other words, hostile behaviors of abusive supervision are common elements in the daily interaction between the supervisor and the subordinate. Fourth, the hostile behaviors can be verbal

or nonverbal. However, it does not include physical contact. Therefore, taunts and mocks from the supervisor (verbal behaviors) or rude gestures from the supervisor (non-verbal behaviors) are examples of abusive supervision. However, physical attacks or harassment are not examples of abusive supervision.

Although other scholars propose similar constructs to abusive supervision, there are several differences between these constructs and abusive supervision. For example, both abusive supervision and petty tyranny (Ashforth, 1994) mention negative attitudes or behaviors of supervisors toward subordinates. Additionally, both constructs indicate that these negative attitudes and behaviors often lead to discomfort for the subordinate. However, Ashforth (1994) emphasized that the motivation of such negative attitudes and behaviors are the supervisors' intentions to display power or to control subordinates, not necessarily a result of hostile intentions, which is a necessary condition for abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000). Abusive supervision also shares similarities with authoritarian leadership, including such examples as discrediting the subordinate in front of other people (Farh & Cheng, 2000). However, the focus of authoritarian leadership has been the role of traditional Chinese culture in the development of authoritarian leadership, and how the psychological process of establishing authority (*Li-Wei*) affects a leader's demonstration of authoritarian leadership. Whether or not the leader displays hostility is not the focus of authoritarian leadership. In short, the supervisor's hostility is a critical element in abusive supervision. For an employee to experience abusive supervision, the

supervisor must be perceived as harboring hostile intentions by the subordinate.

Supervisors' Cognitive Trust and Abusive Supervision

Although hostility of the supervisor is a critical element in abusive supervision, the role of a supervisor's perception of a subordinate in abusive supervision has yet to be studied. Among the many constructs that reflect the interaction between a supervisor and subordinate, trust appears to be particularly relevant as trust in another has profound influence on manager-subordinate relationship and the job attitude and performance of individuals (Brower, Lester, Korsgaard, & Dineen, 2009; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; McAllister, 1995).

According to McAllister (1995), when a person has low cognitive trust in another individual, the former may take steps to manage the uncertainty for self-protection. One can take two types of strategy: control-based monitoring and defensive behavior. Control-based monitoring is close monitoring of another individual's behavior, and defensive behavior relates to additional efforts to plan ahead or to ensure a back-up plan is readily available (Ashforth & Lee, 1990). Supervisor may apply these means to protect their personal interests and assure the minimal level of employee's performance. However, the proposed model of McAllister's study was not proved because of the combined measure of monitoring and defensive behavior couldn't be distinct from cognition-based trust within the SEM model (McAllister, 1995).

Actually, little empirical research has examined the role of the supervisor's trust in subordinate (Colquitt, Scott, & LePine, 2007; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). To extend the

theoretical framework of trust research, I illustrated the relationship between supervisor's cognitive trust in subordinate and hostile behavior of supervisor.

According to early works of trust, people who trust others more are less likely to cheat and steal. The high truster is more likely to give other people a second chance, but the low truster is probably feel that negative behaviors are necessary for defensive reasons (Rotter, 1980). Furthermore, when a supervisor has low cognitive trust in a subordinate, the supervisor tends to doubt the quality of the subordinate's job performance. Consequently, the supervision may be more likely to engage in disciplinary behaviors to gain control over the situation (Ashforth, 1994). When a supervisor who has low trust in subordinate, the supervisor may easily engage in negative behaviors that are related to abusive supervision, such as direct blaming and shout to subordinate's face, or to protect himself or herself using defensive actions such as go behind subordinates back, deception or do petty tricks (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007). To manage the uncertainty owing to low cognitive trust in a subordinate, the supervisor is likely to engage in disciplinary and defensive behaviors which can be easily perceived as abusive supervision by the subordinate. Accordingly, I hypothesize as follows:

H1: Supervisors' cognitive trust in subordinates relates negatively to abusive supervision.

Supervisor Power Distance as a Moderator

There is growing research interest in the role that cultural values play in work behaviors. Indeed, Tepper (2007) called for more research regarding the role of national

cultures in abusive supervision, and specifically, whether it is more common to observe abusive supervision in high power distance societies than in low power distance societies. At a national cultural level, power distance refers to the acceptance of unequal power distribution in organizations (Hofstede, 1980). Although the concept of power distance was originally proposed at the national level, researchers have found that power distance can be operationalized at an individual level as well (Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000; Dorfman & Howell, 1988; Farh, Hackett, & Liang, 2007; Kirkman, Lowe, & Gibson, 2006). According to Clugston et al. (2000), power distance at the individual level refers to “the extent to which an individual accepts the unequal distribution of power in institutions and organizations” (p. 9). Power distance at the individual level is particularly relevant to the current study because both power distance and abusive supervision are relevant to power imbalances embedded within supervisor-subordinate relationships.

A person who has higher power distance orientation would believe higher status individual (i.e., supervisor) as person who is inherently superior to lower status individual (i.e., subordinate), but a person who has lower power distance considers the differences between superiors and subordinates may be changed. For example, somebody who today is one’s subordinate may become his or her boss tomorrow (Hofstede, 2001, p. 102). Thus supervisors with high power distances are inclined to expect to keep social distances from their subordinates and expect them to wield power over subordinates (Hofstede, 1980). High power distance supervisors may believe that their subordinates should feel obligated to commit to their superiors and to

their organizations (Clugston et al., 2000). Furthermore, they may be more reliant on hierarchal stratification in the organization and prefer pervasive symbols of status and authority, which can induce the justification of practicing abusive supervision (House, 1988). Since abusive supervision involves the gain of a sense of control over subordinates, supervisors of high power distances may practice abusive supervision, even if they trust their subordinates. By practicing abusive supervision, supervisors demonstrate their power over subordinates and maintain a certain social distance from their subordinates.

This may be especially obvious when the subordinates are highly competent and may be perceived as a potential threat to the supervisor. A number of studies suggest that Chinese leaders tend to emphasize subordinates’ loyalty over their competence (Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang, & Farh, 2004; Cheng, Farh, Chang, & Hsu, 2002). When a subordinate is exceptionally competent, the supervisor may perceive a threat of being displaced by the subordinate. This feeling may be particularly strong for supervisors with high power distances, who want to make an authoritative and competent impression on their subordinates (Farh & Cheng, 2000). In order to maintain the image of authority, these supervisors may practice abusive supervision against competent subordinates. Based on the above arguments, I hypothesize:

H2: Supervisors’ power distance moderate the negative relationship between cognitive trust in subordinates and abusive supervision such that the negative relationship will be weaker for high power distance supervisors.

Subordinate Power Distance as a Moderator

A supervisor's trust in the subordinate is likely to affect the action the supervisor takes to the subordinate, which in turn is likely to influence the subordinate's behavior and attitude. On the basis of previous research works, the positive relationship between abusive supervision and subordinate emotional exhaustion has been found (Wu & Hu, 2009). In this study, I suggest that subordinates' power distances may influence the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinate emotional exhaustion.

Emotional exhaustion is a state of physical and emotional depletion, which occurs when the emotional demands exceed the extent of an individual's capability to afford during interpersonal interactions at work (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Burke & Richarsen, 2001; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). The emotional demands from supervisor increase subordinate's perceptions of mistreatment, which may induce unfavorable psychological consequences. Thus subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervision increase the subordinate psychological discomforts such as depression, anxiety, and emotional exhaustion (Tepper, 2000; Wu & Hu, 2009).

To discover the boundary conditions for theory development, recent works have discussed that abusive supervision should be regarded as less impactful to high power distance orientation individuals (Lian, Ferris, & Brown, 2012; Lin, Wang, & Chen, 2012; Tepper, 2007). As subordinates high in power distance tend to have a strong respect for authority figures and to depend greatly upon their supervisors (Bochner & Hesketh, 1994), they are disposed to be more responsive to their supervisors'

commands and behavior. At the extreme of power distance, subordinates may feel that they are highly obligated to show respect, loyalty, and dutifulness to their supervisors and their authorities, such that they would justify these supervisors' abusive supervision. Furthermore, high power distance subordinates are less likely to rely on the norm of reciprocity when they interact with supervisors because they tend to accept the idea that people of higher authority enjoy more flexibility when interacting with an individual of lower authority. Under such conditions, they may cognitively rationalize abusive supervision and feel less stressed.

However, low power distance subordinates do not believe supervisors should have a different set of behavioral norms, owing to their higher organizational rank and authority. They believe that their status are equal to their supervisors in organization (Farh et al., 2007). The existence of power misuse such as abusive supervision highlights power imbalance in supervisor-subordinate relationship, leads low power distance subordinates feel more psychological discomforts when interacting with the supervisor (Lin et al., 2012). Consequently, they may not rationalize supervisors' abusive supervision, and the feeling of emotional exhaustion cannot be alleviated.

In conclusion, subordinates high in power distance are likely to have a strong sense of obligation, to confirm supervisors' behaviors, and to show respect, loyalty, and dutifulness to their supervisors. Consequently, subordinates in high, rather than low power distance relationships will be more likely to rationalize or discard abusive supervision, and therefore, they experience less emotional exhaustion than

their counterparts, who are low in power distance. Accordingly, I hypothesize:

H3: Subordinates' power distance moderate the relationship between abusive supervision and emotional exhaustion such that the positive relationship will be stronger for low power distance subordinates.

五、研究方法

Participants

I conducted survey to collect data from supervisor-subordinate dyads in two time-period. To ensure confidentiality, no personal information that could be used to identify any respondent was collected and each respondent was asked to mail the completed questionnaire directly to the researcher in an envelope with prepaid postage. In addition to the paper-and-pencil format of the survey, a web-based survey web site also was available for the participants who prefer Web-based survey. The SurveyMonkey.com website was used to construct and administer the online survey. A matching number was used to match the returned questionnaire. Approximately 400 sets of questionnaires were distributed. After excluding returned surveys that had missing data, the final sample size of matched dyads for analysis was 285.

Measures

Abusive supervision. Subordinate participants responded to Tepper's (2000) 15-item abusive supervision scale at Time 1 ($\alpha = .94$). All items were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (I cannot remember him/her ever using this behavior with me) to 5 (He/she uses this behavior very often with me).

Cognitive trust. Supervisor participants responded to 6-item scale which has adapted and abbreviated from Gabarro (1978) and used by Robinson (1996) and Sue-Chan et al. (2012) at Time 1 ($\alpha = .83$). All items were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Power distance. Both supervisor ($\alpha = .71$) and subordinate ($\alpha = .59$) participants responded to a six-item scale of power distance developed by Dorfman and Howell (1988) at Time 1. All items were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Emotional exhaustion. Subordinate participants' emotional exhaustion were measured by a five-item emotional exhaustion subscale of the Maslach burnout inventory-general survey at Time 2 (Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach, & Jackson, 1996). All items were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) ($\alpha = .83$).

Control variables. On the basis of previous studies on employees' reactions to interpersonal interaction (Burke & Richardsen, 2001; Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Robbins, 2001; Tsai, 2001), the following demographic variables were controlled while examining the hypotheses: respondent tenure, respondent gender, respondent educational background, respondent organization rank, supervisor gender, the length of the working relationship and the gender combination between the respondent and the supervisor. Since participant's positive affectivity (PA) and negativity affectivity (NA) are potentially confounding variables that may be related to employees' interpersonal perceptions and psychological well-being in the workplace, these variables also were

controlled (Brotherridge & Grandey, 2002; Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002b). A short version of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) adopted by Tepper (2000) was used. Four items measures PA (inspired, excited, strong, and active), and the other four items were for NA (distressed, upset, afraid, and jittery).

Analysis

A serious confirmatory factor analyses first was conducted to examine the construct validity of the major study variables. Hierarchical regression that suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986) was used to analyze the hypotheses. To prevent the problem of collinearity, independent variables and the moderators were centered (Aiken & West, 1991).

六、結果與討論

Before testing for hypotheses, I first examined the construct validity of the variables using the approach suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). I used confirmatory factor analysis to examine a four-factor model (Abusive supervision, Cognitive trust, Power distance, and Emotional exhaustion). The results suggested the model fit was marginally acceptable ($\chi^2(489) = 956.092, p < .01, CFI = .89, RMSEA = .06$) (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). All items had significant factor loadings ($p < .01$) on the corresponding factors and none of the confidence interval of the latent correlations included a value of 1 or -1. Based on Anderson and Gerbing's (1988) approach, both convergent and discriminant validities were supported.

I used hierarchical regression analyses to test the hypotheses. Supervisors' cognitive trust in subordinates relates

negatively to subordinates' abusive supervision perception ($\beta = -.25, p < .01$), supporting Hypotheses 1. However, Hypothesis 2 was not supported because the interaction effect of supervisors' cognitive trust and power distance was not significant ($\beta = -.06, p > .05$). Although subordinates' abusive supervision perception and their emotional exhaustion were related positively (Time 1: $\beta = .40, p < .001$ / Time 2: $\beta = .25, p < .001$), I found that subordinates' power distance did not moderate the relationship between such that the positive relationship ($\beta = .08, p > .05$). Hypothesis 3 was also not supported.

I applied the additional analyses and found that there was the fully mediation effect of subordinates' abusive supervision perception on the relationship between supervisors' cognitive trust in subordinates and subordinates' emotional exhaustion (Trust effect at step 1: $\beta = -.20, p < .01$, Trust effect at step 2: $\beta = -.10, p < .10$, AS effect at step 2: $\beta = .40, p < .001$). In addition, supervisors' cognitive trust in subordinates was also mediated the negative relationship between supervisors' affective trust and subordinates' abusive supervision perception (Affective trust effect at step 1: $\beta = -.21, p < .01$, Affective trust effect at step 2: $\beta = -.10, p < .10$, Cognitive trust effect at step 2: $\beta = -.19, p < .05$).

In summary, although the moderation effects of supervisors' and subordinates' power distance were not significant. I found that supervisors' cognitive trust plays an important role in resulting abusive supervision. The possible limitation of the current study is that the internal consistency reliability of the scale of power distance is relatively weak ($< .70$).

七、研究成果效益

I will join 2015 AOM Annual Meeting to present the research findings.

八、參考文獻

- Aiken, Leona S., & West, Stephen G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Aryee, Samuel, Chen, Zhen Xiong, Sun, Li-Yun, & Debrah, Yaw A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 191-201.
- Ashforth, Blake E. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations, 47*(7), 755-778.
- Ashforth, Blake E., & Lee, Raymond T. (1990). Defensive behavior in organizations: A preliminary model. *Human Relations, 43*(7), 621-648. doi: 10.1177/001872679004300702
- Bochner, Stephen, & Hesketh, Beryl. (1994). Power distance, individualism/collectivism, and job-related attitudes in a culturally diverse work group. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 25*(2), 233-257.
- Brotherridge, C. M., & Grandey, Alicia A. (2002). Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of "people work". *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 60*(1), 17-39.
- Brower, Holly H., Lester, Scott W., Korsgaard, M. Audrey, & Dineen, Brian R. (2009). A Closer look at trust between managers and subordinates: Understanding the effects of both trusting and being trusted on subordinate outcomes. *Journal of Management, 35*(2), 327-347. doi: 10.1177/0149206307312511
- Burke, Ronald J., & Richardsen, Astrid M. (2001). Psychological burnout in organizations: Research and intervention. In R. T. Golembiewski (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 327-363). New York, NY, US: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Cheng, Bor-Shiuan, Chou, L. -F., Wu, Tsung-Yu, Huang, M. -P., & Farh, Jing-Lih. (2004). Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 7*, 89-117.
- Cheng, Bor-Shiuan, Farh, Jing-Lih, Chang, H. F., & Hsu, W. L. (2002). Guanxi, zhongcheng, competence, and managerial Behavior in the Chinese context. *Chinese Journal of Psychology, 44*(2), 151-166 (In Chinese).
- Clugston, Michael, Howell, Jon P., & Dorfman, Peter W. (2000). Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment? *Journal of Management, 26*(1), 5-30.
- Colquitt, Jason A., Scott, Brent A., & LePine, Jeffery A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(4), 909-927. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.909
- Cordes, Cynthia L., & Dougherty, Thomas W. (1993). A review and an integration of research on job burnout. *Academy of Management Review, 18*(4), 621-656.
- Dirks, Kurt T., & Ferrin, Donald L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 611-628. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.611
- Dorfman, P. W., & Howell, J. P. (1988). Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns: Hofstede revisited. *Advances in International Comparative Management, 3*, 127-150.
- Duffy, Michelle K., Ganster, Daniel, & Pagon, Milan. (2002a). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 331-351.
- Duffy, Michelle K., Ganster, Daniel, & Pagon, Milan. (2002b). Social undermining in the workplace.

- Academy of Management Journal*, 45(2), 331-351.
- Farh, Jing-Lih, & Cheng, Bor-Shiuan. (2000). A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations. In J. T. Li, A. S. Tsui & E. Weldon (Eds.), *Management and organizations in the Chinese context* (pp. 94-127). London: Macmillan.
- Farh, Jing-Lih, Hackett, R. D., & Liang, J. (2007). Individual-level cultural values as moderators of perceived organizational support-employee outcome relationships in China: Computing the effects of power distance and traditionality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 715-729.
- Gurtman, Michael B. (1992). Trust, distrust, and interpersonal problems: A circumplex analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(6), 989-1002. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.62.6.989
- Hofstede, Geert. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, Geert. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- House, Robert J. (1988). Power and personality in complex organizations. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 10, pp. 305-357). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Kirkman, B., Lowe, K., & Gibson, C. (2006). A quarter century of culture's consequences: a review of empirical research incorporating Hofstede's cultural values framework. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37, 285-320.
- Lewis, J. David, & Weigert, Andrew. (1985). Trust as a social reality. *Social Forces*, 63(4), 967-985.
- Lian, Huiwen, Ferris, D. Lance, & Brown, Douglas J. (2012). Does power distance exacerbate or mitigate the effects of abusive supervision? It depends on the outcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(1), 107-123. doi: 10.1037/a0024610
- Lin, Weipeng, Wang, Lei, & Chen, Shuting. (2012). Abusive Supervision and Employee Well-Being: The Moderating Effect of Power Distance Orientation. *Applied Psychology*, n/a-n/a. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2012.00520.x
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
- Mayer, Roger C., Davis, James H., & Schoorman, F. David. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-734.
- McAllister, Daniel J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 24-59.
- Mitchell, Marie S., & Ambrose, Maureen L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1159-1168. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1159
- Robbins, Stephen P. (2001). *Organizational behavior* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Robinson, S. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 574-599.
- Rotter, Julian B. (1980). Interpersonal trust, trustworthiness, and gullibility. *American Psychologist*, 35(1), 1-7. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.35.1.1
- Schaufeli, Wilmar B., Leiter, M. P., Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1996). Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey. In C. Maslach, S. E. Jackson & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *The Maslach Burnout Inventory-Test manual*. (pp. 22-26).
- Sue-Chan, Christina, Au, Al K. C., & Hackett, Rick D. (2012). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between leader/member behavior and leader-member-exchange quality. *Journal of*

- World Business*, 47(3), 459-468. doi:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2011.05.012>
- Tepper, Bennett J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 178-190.
- Tepper, Bennett J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33, 261-289. doi: 10.1177/0149206307300812
- Tepper, Bennett J., Duffy, Michelle K., Henle, Christine A., & Lambert, Lisa Schurer. (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 101-123.
- Tepper, Bennett J., Duffy, Michelle K., Hoobler, Jenny, & Ensley, Michael D. (2004). Moderators of the relationships between coworkers' organizational citizenship behavior and fellow employees' attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 455-465.
- Tepper, Bennett J., Duffy, Michelle K., & Shaw, Jason D. (2001). Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinates' resistance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 974-983.
- Tierney, Pamela, & Tepper, Bennett J. (2007). Introduction to The Leadership Quarterly special issue: Destructive leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 171-173.
- Tsai, Wei-Chi. (2001). Determinants and consequences of employee displayed positive emotions. *Journal of Management*, 27(4), 497-512.
- Watson, David, Clark, Lee A., & Tellegen, Auke. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063-1070.
- Wu, T. -Y., & Hu, C. (2009). Abusive supervision and employee emotional exhaustion. *Group and Organization Management*, 43, 143-169.
- Zellars, Kelly L., Tepper, Bennett J., & Duffy, Michelle K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 1068-1076.

科技部補助計畫衍生研發成果推廣資料表

日期:2015/03/31

科技部補助計畫	計畫名稱: 上司對部屬之認知信任、權力距離與不當督導之關係
	計畫主持人: 胡昌亞
	計畫編號: 102-2410-H-004-154-SSS 學門領域: 組織行為與理論
無研發成果推廣資料	

102 年度專題研究計畫研究成果彙整表

計畫主持人：胡昌亞		計畫編號：102-2410-H-004-154-SSS					
計畫名稱：上司對部屬之認知信任、權力距離與不當督導之關係							
成果項目		量化			單位	備註（質化說明：如數個計畫共同成果、成果列為該期刊之封面故事...等）	
		實際已達成數（被接受或已發表）	預期總達成數（含實際已達成數）	本計畫實際貢獻百分比			
國內	論文著作	期刊論文	0	0	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	0	0	100%		
		專書	0	0	100%		
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力 （本國籍）	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
		博士生	1	1	100%		
博士後研究員		0	0	100%			
專任助理		0	0	100%			
國外	論文著作	期刊論文	0	0	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	0	0	100%		
		專書	0	0	100%		章/本
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力 （外國籍）	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	100%		
博士後研究員		0	0	100%			
專任助理		0	0	100%			

<p>其他成果 (無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等，請以文字敘述填列。)</p>	<p>無</p>
--	----------

	成果項目	量化	名稱或內容性質簡述
科 教 處 計 畫 加 填 項 目	測驗工具(含質性與量性)	0	
	課程/模組	0	
	電腦及網路系統或工具	0	
	教材	0	
	舉辦之活動/競賽	0	
	研討會/工作坊	0	
	電子報、網站	0	
	計畫成果推廣之參與(閱聽)人數	0	

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估

達成目標

未達成目標（請說明，以 100 字為限）

實驗失敗

因故實驗中斷

其他原因

說明：

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形：

論文： 已發表 未發表之文稿 撰寫中 無

專利： 已獲得 申請中 無

技轉： 已技轉 洽談中 無

其他：（以 100 字為限）

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）（以 500 字為限）

本研究以兩階段之對偶資料，顯示認知信任對主管之不當督導行為具有關鍵性的影響，且長期而言會影響員工的情緒耗竭程度，整體而言，本研究初步達成預期目標，但權力距離之調節效果，則尚有待後續研究釐清。本人也將持續投入修正權力距離的定義與測量方式，以期能提升此構念的效度與信度。