

## AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Sarah Spiegelman for the degree of Masters of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies in Speech Communication, Speech Communication and Sociology presented on May 24, 2017

Title: Affection in the Workplace: Perceptions, Personality and Affection

Abstract approved:

---

Colin R. Hesse

Humans have a desire for a connection among others, and they also have a desire for both giving and receiving affection, regardless of class, age, gender, cultural or religious backgrounds. There is a plethora of research on the health benefits for both giving and receiving affection in romantic and family relationships. However, there is a lack of research about the benefits of receiving affection in the workplace. The general discourse surrounding workplace affection is negative because it is viewed as inappropriate in a workplace setting. However, affection is innate and humans are adept at giving and receiving affection. In fact, there are consequences on a person's mental and physical health when this desire is not met. Therefore, the objective of this study was to understand if affection in the workplace could be beneficial on an employee's perception of stress, depression, and job satisfaction. Also, to learn if the personality characteristics self-esteem, introversion and trait affection impact perceptions of affection in the workplace. The study found that personality characteristics do play a role in perceptions of received coworker affection. The study also found that affection does have an impact on stress, depression and job satisfaction.

©Copyright by Sarah Spiegelman  
May 24, 2017  
All Rights Reserved

Affection in the Workplace: Personality, Perceptions and Affection

by  
Sarah Spiegelman

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of

Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies

Presented May 24, 2017  
Commencement June 2017

Masters of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies thesis of Sarah Spiegelman presented on May 24, 2017

APPROVED:

---

Major Professor, representing Speech Communication

---

Director of the Interdisciplinary Studies Program

---

Dean of the Graduate School

I understand that my thesis will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my thesis to any reader upon request.

---

Sarah Spiegelman, Author

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses sincere appreciation to her family, dog, cohort, advisor and committee. She would also like to thank her tutor, Chris Nelson.

Mom and Dad, thanks for dealing with me and being supportive. Dr. Goodnow and Dr. Ortiz, thank you for guiding me. Dr. Davis, thank you for offering your support and working with me to solidify my direction. Dr. Hesse, thank you for never losing patience, and being an amazing advisor. I would not have been able to complete my thesis without your help and guidance. Chris, thanks for meeting with me weekly to teach me the ins and outs of grammar. To my cohort, you are the most supportive group I have ever known and I cherish the moments we had together. Mel and Sam, you've been a rock for me to lean on. STEPHANIE(FEFANIE) cake, walks, thesis parties, coffee dates, drama, facials - you are so selfless and awesome. Thanks for being my best friend and a huge help. Sophie, thanks for teaching me that at the end of the day, there are still lizards to chase.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter 1.INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Theoretical Rationale	
1.2 Practical Implications	
Chapter 2.LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
2.1 Workplace Relationships	
2.2 Affection	
2.3 Synthesis	
Chapter 3.METHODS.....	28
3.1 Participants	
3.2 Procedures	
3.3 Measures	
Chapter 4. RESULTS.....	31
4.1 Descriptive Statistics	
Chapter 5. DISCUSSION.....	33
5.1 Theoretical Implications	
5.2 Practical Implications	
5.3 Strengths, Limitations, and Future Research	
5.4 Conclusion	
References.....	46

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Descriptive Statistic, Alphas, and Intercorrelations.....	53
2. Survey.....	54

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2016) Americans spend an average of 7.6 hours a day at work; thus, spending more time at their job than at home. Some people live in single parent households, alone, or in divorced homes, which can impact a person's ability to feel a sense of belongingness to others. One way to feel a sense of connection to others is through communicating and receiving affection (Floyd, 2006).

Due to the fact Americans spend a portion of their day at their place of employment, it is important to acknowledge the workplace environment as an “arena for the development of close personal relationships” (Sloan, Newhouse & Thompson, 2013, p. 344). The development of these relationships provides ample opportunities for “emotional bonds with others” (Sloan et al., 2013, p. 345). These emotional bonds can readily develop because the workplace offers the ability for unique shared experiences with other employees (Sloan et al., 2013). One could argue these shared experiences are a product of communication, by which employees are able to cultivate mutual understanding of the workplace through interaction and discussion with each other (Myers, 2009). Therefore, communication in general impacts an employee's perception of their workplace experience. However, this study does not look at, nor define romantic workplace relationships.

Having strong bonds with other employees is important because the workplace is a stressful environment, and research shows that the development of workplace relationships acts as a buffer against workplace stressors (Halbesleben, 2006). The workplace environment is considered stressful because a job can be very demanding. Often the demand of the job can cause work related tensions and frustrations (Lambert, Minor, Wells & Hogan, 2016). For example, the



work environment has the potential for long hours, fluctuating workloads, technological difficulties, and diversity of co-worker interactions (Danna & Griffin, 1999). Over time these stressors take a toll on one's physical and mental health, leading to turnover and feelings of burnout (Lambert et al., 2016; Ju, lan, Li, 2015). To combat feelings of burnout, employees tend to seek out relationships with other coworkers (Sloan et al., 2013). Employees who can cultivate relationships with others tend to feel supported (Ju, lan, Li, 2015), and these relationships are "directly associated with higher levels of happiness and lower levels of depressive symptoms" (Sloan et al., 2013, p. 345). Furthermore, the workplace is a stressful environment but the cultivation of co-worker relationships can act as buffers against workplace stressors.

One way to develop strong relationships with other co-workers is through communicating affection. Communicating affection is a way to express "positive, often intimate regard for another" (Floyd & Morman, 1998, p.145). In other words, the behavior of expressing affectionate communication is a way to express our "closeness, care and fondness" to others (Floyd & Morman, 1998, p. 145). In the workplace, an example of communicating affection is physical touch (eg., handshakes and pats on the back). Physical touch can help aid in the development of strong co-worker relationships (Fuller, 2011, p. 234).

The current study looks at affectionate communication in co-worker interactions and how affectionate communication plays a role in an employee's perception of the workplace through measuring job satisfaction, depression and stress. This study was also designed to acknowledge diversity of coworker personalities. Therefore, this study looks at the personality characteristics of self-esteem, high trait affection and introversion. Within the study, there will be an acknowledgement of previous research, an explanation of hypotheses, a methods, a results and a discussion section.

## **Theoretical Rationale**

Through the theoretical foundation of Need to Belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995) and Affection Exchange Theory (Floyd, 2006) we know that affectionate communication benefits both workplace relationships and the individual health of employees.

**The Need to Belong.** Baumeister and Leary (1995) propose that humans have an innate ability and need to form and maintain interpersonal relationships with others, and this need is defined as regular social contact with others. This need is “nearly” universal among all humans and it permeates different cultures (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). In other words, humans have an intrinsic desire for having interpersonal relationships with others. The need to belong argues that this desire is exemplified through the behavior to seek out interpersonal relationships, and it is motivated by an inclination to have a sense of belongingness to others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). One type of desire is for people to have their achievements recognized or valued by others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). These achievements could be different depending on the situational context; for example, in the workplace, employees are likely to seek out or want affirmation from their co-workers or their supervisors for a job well done.

There are consequences if one is unable to satisfy their feeling of belongingness to others. furthermore, many people suffer from a sense of disconnection to others because they are not fulfilling this need in their personal lives. People who lack belongingness suffer from negative emotions and feelings of “anxiety, depression, grief, jealousy, and loneliness” (Baumeister & Leary, 1995, p. 508). As a society, we spend most our time at work or at home, and not all home environments fulfill our need to belong. Many people live in divorced homes, single parent homes, or alone without a spouse. Therefore, the workplace as an organizational institution, is a necessary arena for the cultivation of relationships. In other words, workplace relationships can

fulfill a need for having interpersonal relationships with others. This study will help us understand if there is a relationship between coworker affectionate communication, workplace satisfaction, and an employee's mental health. It will also examine how diversity of personality characteristics impact perceptions of received co-worker affection. As discussed, humans have a longing for a sense of connection to others and this desire permeates culture, and arguably personality characteristics. Affectionate communication is an innate ability that can cultivate a sense of connection to others. Also, affection communication in and of itself is a desire that has associations with our mental and physical health (Floyd, 2006). Therefore, the reception of affectionate communication in the workplace is something that needs to be explored.

**Affection Exchange Theory.** Affection Exchange Theory (Floyd, 2006) is a Neo-Darwinist theory that argues affectionate communication is an innate desire because it aids in the development of emotional pair bonds with others. We have innate desires to communicate and receive affection because it aids in the development and stability of our relationships, aiding in our reproductive success. Affection Exchange Theory proposes (1) "That the need and capacity for affection are inborn" (p.161). (2) "Affectionate communication is adaptive with respect to human viability and fertility" (p. 164). (3) "Humans vary in their optimal tolerance for affection and affectionate behaviors" (p.171). Furthermore, arguing that affectionate communication is inborn and affectionate communication is an adaptive behavior necessary for our survival. Also, that the sharing of affectionate communication can be considered the fulfillment of a need. Additionally, there are consequences if this need is not met. Affection deprivation is a postulate of affectionate exchange theory. As discussed, affection is considered a fundamental human need and a lack of affectionate interaction is considered affection deprivation. Affection deprivation is considered a lack of physical contact or affectionate interaction (i.e hugging, hand-holding,

kissing, etc.) (Floyd, 2014). There is evidence that suggests a lack of affectionate communication is associated with “loneliness, depression, stress, alexithymia, preoccupied and fearful avoidant attachment styles, and numbers of personality disorders, mood and anxiety disorder, and secondary immune disorders” (Floyd, 2014, p. 383). It’s understood that a lack of affectionate communication negatively impacts one’s emotional and physical health. So, let’s now explore the practical benefits of affectionate interaction in the workplace.

### **Practical Implications**

Through theory, it is evident that we are born with intrinsic desires which need to be met. Looking at the practical implications of affectionate communication it can be understood that affectionate communication is critical to our wellbeing.

**Health benefits.** Physical contact is one form of affectionate behavior that can be very beneficial for one’s mental and physical health. For example, increasing the amount of physical contact for someone who is dealing with compromised health can help aid in the recovery process (Floyd, 2006). Affectionate communication, or the nonverbal expression of touch, is also beneficial for positively impacting “management of stress hormones, resting blood pressure, resting heart rate, blood lipids, and recovery from elevated distress” (Floyd, 2014, p. 384). For instance, Fields (2002) conducted a study where a population of disorderly adolescence received massages twice a week for 30 minutes. She concluded that the massages led to feelings of lowered anxiety levels, depression and aggression. Within the workplace, the expression of affectionate communication is beneficial for one’s health because it acts as a buffer against workplace stressors. For instance, the sharing of affectionate communication in co-worker relationships is correlated to an increase in happiness, and a decrease in feelings of depression and burnout (Floyd, 2006; Ju, lan, Li, 2015).

**Relational benefits.** Humans are social beings who seek relationships with others because relationships can serve as a “predictor of life satisfaction” (Floyd, 2006, p. 187). One way to solidify these relationships is through the sharing of affectionate communication. Affectionate communication leads to a host of relational benefits. In a study conducted by Mansoon (2003), it was found that affectionate communication in grandparent-grandchild dyads lead to feelings of trust, relational commitment and control mutuality. In another study, Floyd, Sargent & Di Corcia (2004) concluded that affectionate communication in father-son dyads aided in feelings of closeness and involvement. Consequentially, affectionate relationships are “stronger, closer, more satisfying, and more engaging than those that are not” (Floyd, 2006, p.186). In other words, affectionate communication is important for impacting the quality of our relationships with others. Connecting back to the workplace, affectionate communication can be associated with aiding in the formation meaningful co-worker relationships (Fuller, 2011).

## **Conclusion**

Communicating affection is innate and natural because humans are wired to receive and give affection. The desires for affection dates back to our existence as humans, argued to be an adaption for aiding in our survival and reproductive success. Moreover, communicating affection in the workplace is a natural, healthy behavior. However, many people are suffering from a lack of affectionate interaction. Thus, the institutions where we spend a large portion of our day at should be structured to meet our needs. Unfortunately, affection in the workplace is frowned upon in some business settings. Consequently, research on this topic is largely underrepresented. Moreover, this research works to understand how one’s perception of received coworker impacts an individual’s physical, and mental health.

## **Chapter 2: Literature Review**

Workplace relationships are vital to the success of an organization because they influence the experience of an employee. This literature focuses on the formation and impact of workplace relationships. This literature also focuses on the effect workplace relationships have on an employee's mental health, and workplace experience. Next, the literature defines affectionate communication, and the benefits of communicating affection are explored. This review will focus on the benefits of communicating affection for one's physical, mental, and relational health. This study intends to fill the gap between co-worker relations and affection in the workplace.

### **Workplace Relationships**

This section talks about workplace relationships that develop through the process of assimilation, and how these relationships impact and are impacted by individual personality characteristics. It also talks about employee's perception of workplace support.

**Organizational assimilation.** Organizational assimilation is a process. The exact process or phases of organizational integration are subject to disagreement among scholars. However, Karen Myers is accredited with looking at assimilation as a communicative process. The organizational assimilation process "consist of both the explicit and implicit attempts by organizations to influence their employees that is to teach them the values, norms and required behaviors which allow them to participate as members of an organization" (Jablin, 1994, p. 34). Even so, researchers are unable to come to an agreement on how best to conceptualize new membership into an organization; therefore, assimilation and socialization research is "subject to controversy" (Gailliard, Myers & Seibold, 2010, p. 79). Understanding the process of organizational assimilation is important for workplace outcomes because organizational

assimilation is how new employees become acquainted with, and learn about the workplace (Myers, 2009).

Myers (2009) theorizes that assimilation into a workplace environment stems from conversations had between newer and more established employees, and how these relationships are influenced by, and influence, the workplace environment. The research Myers conducts is to understand how members of an organization interact and negotiate aspects of their identity, within an already existing social structure and workplace culture (Myers, 2009). Her research acknowledges that employees are individuals with their own perspectives and values. However, through the process of communication, workplace expectations can become understood and negotiated (Myers 2009; Myers & Scott, 2010). These interactions are conceptualized through the concept new membership negotiation.

New membership negotiation was a term coined by Myers and Scott (2010) as a measure to understand how individuals can be autonomous, and negotiate their organizational membership by engaging in communication with other employees. These conversations are a time for “socialization agents”- more established employees - and newer employees to be “able to enjoy reciprocal influence over one another” (Scott & Meyers, 2010, p. 80). In other words, through conversations with more established employees, newer employees can learn about the roles, values, goals, and expectations of the workplace environment (Myers, 2009). This is significant because it accounts for the autonomy of an individual. Where a person’s individual communication behaviors are an extenuation of their personal, workplace and social identities. Thus, through conversation employees can accommodate, learn, and negotiate their identities within the workplace environment (Gailiard et al., 2010, p. 555). Moreover, new membership

negotiation is a concept that acknowledges employees bring their individuality into a workplace conversation.

The acknowledgment of one's autonomy within conversation is important because as individuals, we bring our past experiences, expectations, beliefs, and thoughts into the situation (Thomas, 1966). As an example, let's imagine that Pam is a new hire and she has been interacting with Stephanie, who is a long-time employee. Pam has been asking Stephanie questions about the workplace environment and what she should expect. Through this conversation, and in conjunction with Pam's internal dialogue, Pam can come to an understanding with Stephanie, about workplace expectations. Furthermore, Pam and Stephanie are able to come to an understanding about the definition of the situation or workplace goals, and values (Thomas, 1966). To summarize, new membership negotiation (Myers, 2009; Scott & Meyers, 2010; Gailliard et al., 2010) is a process where new members become organizational members through negotiating and communicating with other more established employees (Scott & Myers, 2010) as a way to create a shared definition of the workplace (Thomas, 1966). These interactions are significant because they begin to shape a new employee's understanding of the workplace organization (Myers, 2009).

Individual personality characteristics also play a role in the workplace because they impact an individual's behavior. Behavior in the workplace is a huge contributor to workplace productivity and workplace outcomes. For instance, included in the research conducted by O'Neil, Lewis & Carswell (2011), it was found that personality characteristics are factors in employee's workplace perceptions and workplace outcomes. Additionally, O'Neil, Lewis & Carswell (2011) concluded that employee's personality characteristics were a factor in whether employees abided by workplace regulations. In another study Bolton, Becker & Barber (2010),



focused on the personality characteristic “extraversion”. The study concluded that participants who scored “lower extraversion predicted more theft, while higher openness to experience predicted more production deviance” (p. 540). Another example of a personality characteristic impacting an individual’s behavior is shown through the personality trait “conscientiousness”. Conscientiousness is related to positive job task results. Overall, individuals who have a stronger idea of their purpose, responsibilities and motivations perform better than those who do not. When considered through one’s personal lens (personality) employees form a sentiment about the workplace, as either positive or negative in nature (Barrick & Mount, 1991, p.18). Consequentially, this sentiment plays a role in impacting workplace behaviors and perception of the workplace environment.

Employee personality characteristics also play a role in co-worker exchanges and communication behaviors. For example, agreeing with his colleagues, Spector (2012) states that “individuals who are high in agreeableness and conscientiousness will engage in less negative and more positive directed behavior towards others, and they will tend to have fewer negative and more positive coworker exchanges” (p.165). Moreover, individual personality characteristics relate to a person’s ability to communicate, and express themselves in the workplace. Thus, personality characteristics are a component of coworker interactions, and new membership negotiations (Scott & Myers, 2010). This study works to understand how the personality characteristics introversion, high trait affection and self-esteem, impact perception of co-worker relationships. More specifically, how self-esteem, high trait affection and introversion play a role in the reception of co-worker affection.

**Development of workplace relationships.** Workplace relationships are very significant to the workplace environment because through new membership negotiation (Scott & Myers,

2010) or conversations had with other employee's, expectations and values about the organization become understood and negotiated on an interpersonal level (Myers, 2009). This level of interaction is likely to cultivate a relationship that is capable of offering workplace support (Sloan et al., 2013). Workplace interactions can be categorized into either work-related or non-work related interactions. Consistent, positive workplace interactions are likely to develop into workplace relationships (Myers, 2009; Chadsey & Beyer, 2001). Work-related interactions are more regimented to job expectations. For instance, work-related interactions consist of "following directions, requesting assistance, sharing work information, and responding to criticism" (Chadsey & Beyer, 2001, p.129). Whereas, non-work related interactions are defined by communication topics outside of workplace discussions. For example, "teasing or joking, sharing information about sports, or asking questions about a co-worker's family" (Chadsey & Beyer, 2011, p.129). Non-work related interactions occur as self-disclosure and comfortably increase. Workplace relationships are maintained based on work and non-work related interactions (Chadsey & Byers, 2001).

The development of supportive workplace relationships plays a large role in the experience of an employee. Jobs can be very demanding, taking a toll on an employee's mental and physical health. However, research shows that the development of workplace relationships acts as a buffer against workplace stressors (Halbesleben, 2006). Moreover, to combat feelings of burnout, employees tend to seek out relationships with other coworkers (Sloan et al., 2013). According to Sloan, Ranae, Newhouse & Thompson (2013), Feeling supported in the workplace is important because an employee's perception of social support affects an employee's job experience and perceptions of the workplace environment. For example, workplace relationships

offer feelings of social support, and guidance when dealing with negative workplace emotions; allowing an employee to discuss their emotions instead of harbor them (Sloan et al., 2013).

Workplace relationships also help an employee feel a sense of connection to other employees, enhancing perceived organizational support (Brunetto, Xerri, Shriberg, Farr-Wharton, Shacklock, Newman & Diegner, 2010). Perceived organizational support is considered the positive evaluation employees have of their organization. For instance, employees who feel like they are valuable assets to the company are more likely to identify with their work through engagement. Engagement is a positive state of mind while working (Brunetto et al., 2013). More specifically engagement refers to “job energy levels, plus positive beliefs and feelings about the organization, work conditions and value of the work” (Brunetto et al., 2013, p. 2788). Workplace relationships play a role in an employee’s workplace experience because they can offer social support, impacting an employees’ workplace experience. This next section will first discuss the supervisor subordinate relationship, and second, discuss the co-worker relationship.

**Supervisor subordinate relationships.** One workplace relationship that can set the standard for what workplace relationships should look like is the supervisor subordinate relationship. In the literature supervisor subordinate relationships are understood to be relationships based off power-imbalances, where the communication styles shared between supervisors and their subordinates set the tone for the rest of the workplace environment (Bono & Yoon, 2012). Supervisors have control over resources like financial rewards, job opportunities, and promotions (Bono & Yoon, 2012). Moreover, the ability of the supervisor to decide the trajectory of an employee’s achievement influences the social dynamic of the workplace environment (Myers, 2009; Bono & Yoon, 2012). For example, supervisors who communicate openly and fairly with their subordinates create a more open and fair workplace

environment (Bono & Yoon, 2012). Consequentially, when open communication is part of the workplace culture, employees tend to feel empowered and motivated (Barbee & Cunningham, 2009).

The supervisor subordinate relationship also impacts workplace commitment and morale (Brunetto, Wharton & Shacklock, 2010). For instance, supervisor subordinate relationships have a direct impact on “feelings of empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and well-being, as well as increased innovation and creativity” (Bono & Yoon, 2012, p. 44). With all of this in mind, it can be understood that the supervisor subordinate relationship is very impactful to the workplace environment, because this relationship influences other employee’s perceptions, feelings, and communication patterns (Bono & Yoon, 2012; Myers, 2009). The supervisor subordinate relationship can also be understood as a hierarchical relationship that effects the workplace environment and other employee’s feelings about, and commitment to, the workplace (Brunetto et al., 2010; Bono & Yoon, 2012). Therefore, this relationship can be understood as an influential factor, for the development of other co-worker relationships (Bono & Yoon, 2012). Overall, the supervisor subordinate relationship influences co-worker relationships because it is a relationship that model’s the behaviors for other co-worker relationships to follow.

**Co-worker Interactions.** Co-worker relationships are peer relationships that make-up the social system of an institutional organization. Co-worker relationships are influential on an employee’s workplace experience because coworkers spend long hours together sharing similar workplace “experiences, pressures, concerns, vocabulary, and culture” (Chadsey & Beyer, 2001, p. 128). Additionally, coworkers are working in close proxemics to one another, where there is ample opportunity for communication, and interaction with other employees. Co-worker relationship benefit from positive interactions. Positive interactions can be understood by the

acknowledgement of one another's presence, respecting one another's differences, listening, staying positive, appreciating others, offering to help, staying on top of individual task, admitting mistakes, and keeping things in perspective by partaking in interest outside of work (Getting Along with Co-Workers Better, 1991). If frequent, constant interactions are shared among co-workers, then co-worker friendships can develop.

Just like all co-worker interactions, co-worker friendships are voluntary and they are defined and made special by the participants involved (Sias, Gallagher, Kopaneva, Pedersen, 2012). In the workplace employees just need to perceive that there is opportunity for the development of these co-worker friendships (Morrison, 2004). For example, in a study conducted by Morrison (2004) it was found that employees who perceived having the opportunity to develop friendships at their place of employment, were more satisfied with their job, and more committed to the institutional organization. According to Barbee & Cunningham (2009) co-worker friendships develop in three phrases, from coworker or acquaintance to friend, friend to close friend and close friend to almost-best friend. They are relationships that "involve mutual commitment, trust, and shared values or interests between people at work, in ways that go beyond mere acquaintanceship but that exclude romance" (Berman, West, Richter, 2002, p. 217).

The first stage begins through communicating about broad topics with one another, also because of "proximity, sharing common ground, and engaging in extra-organizational socializing" (Barbee & Cunningham, 2009, p. 1699). The second stage or the friend-to-close-friend transition consist of more intimate communication topics, and disclosing more personal detail to one another. Lastly is the close-friend-to-almost-best-friend transitions, this relationship is associated with "life events, work-related problems, and the passage of time" (Barbee & Cunningham, 2009, p. 1699). Regardless of the stage of the coworker relationship, their just

needs to be a friendship component. Moreover, they can be a “mere acquaintanceship” where self-disclosure, trust, and mutual commitment are involved (Berman et al., 2002, p. 217; Morrison, 2004). Additionally, a workplace relationship can offer feelings of social support regardless of the phase of the relationship because it is dependent on how the relationship is defined by the individuals involved (Sias et al., 2012). Furthermore, a coworker relationship just needs to be perceived as positive to be beneficial.

Workplace relationships that are perceived as positive play an important role in an employee’s workplace experience because they are impactful on employee’s perception of received social support, impacting an employee’s perception about the workplace and themselves (Chiaburur & Harrison, 2008). First, co-worker relationships are an avenue for “emotional bonds” with others (Sloan et al., 2013), and these bonds are consistent with our need for interpersonal relationships with others. Furthermore, meeting this need can have a positive impact on one’s mental health (Baumeister and Leary, 1995). Second, co-worker relationships act as a buffer against workplace stressors because they are an avenue for advice and alleviating the strain of large workloads (Chiaburur & Harrison, 2008). For instance, co-worker relationships aid in feelings of burnout by providing social support (Halbesleben, 2006). Social support, according to Halbesleben (2006) is a process where co-workers assist one another with tasks, information and empathy. Noted by Sloan Newhouse & Thompson (2013) social support is positively associated with “increased job satisfaction, enhanced well-being, and help with the management of difficult work-related emotions (p. 343). Furthermore, co-worker relationships are important in the workplace because they play a role in employees’ mental health through offering support, and being an avenue for emotional bonds. Moreover, the reception of workplace support is associated with well-being, job satisfaction, and organizational

commitment (Barbee & Cunningham, 2009, p. 1699). Overall, co-worker relationships just need to be defined by the individuals involved, and positive workplace relationships are capable of alleviating workplace stress, and physical strain by offering a sense of social support.

Relationships are largely defined during new membership negotiation and the communication between existing and newer employees. Additionally, affection communication is largely associated with the development and cultivation of these workplace relationships.

### **Affection**

Affection is defined as an “internal psychological state of positive, often intimate regard for another... and affectionate behaviors are expressed as an...intentional and overt enactment or expression of feelings of closeness, care and fondness for another” (Floyd, Morman, 1998, p.145). Affectionate behaviors are a way to express affectionate feelings because through affection, we can “convey feelings of love, fondness, and appreciation to others” (Hesse & Floyd, 2008, p. 783). According to Burgoon and Hale (1984), affection is considered a fundamental human need. Meaning, people have innate desires for receiving and giving affection to others. There is a positive reward for both giving and receiving affection because it gives us a sense of connection to others. Maslow (1970) argues that this sense of connection is most influenced by human’s desires and innate motivations to be loved.

Affectionate communication is expressed in three ways. The three dimensions of affectionate communication are; verbal, social supportiveness and nonverbal. Giving examples for all three types; verbal is the expression of “I love you” or “you’re a good friend”; social supportiveness is helping with problems or giving compliments; and nonverbal can be hugging, kissing, sitting close, a pat on the back, a handshake, or a kiss on the cheek (Floyd, 2006; Floyd

& Morman, 1998). Both giving and receiving affectionate behaviors are related to enhancing relational closeness, physical and psychological health (Floyd, 2006).

In the workplace, affectionate behaviors can be expressed between co-workers through a pat on the back for a job well done, a handshake, a hug, a verbal expression of “you’re a good coworker” or through aiding in tasks related activities (Fuller, 2011 & Floyd, 2006).

Furthermore, affectionate behaviors should be expressed in the workplace because in our society, we are spending more time at our place of work than at home (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2016). As humans, we have innate desires for social relationships with others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Where the expression of affectionate communication is one way to solidify these emotional bonds with others, to satisfy a desire for a sense of connection among others (Maslow, 1970). Unfortunately, a large portion of the current literature frames affection in the workplace as a negative by associating affection with sexual harassment. However, some scholars are working to analyze the positive impacts of affection in the workplace. For instance, Fuller, Simmering, Marler, Cox & Bennet (2010) found that physical touch in the workplace can be related to “interpersonal communication effectiveness, developing better co-worker relationships, or persuading and gaining compliance from co-worker” (p. 234). Meaning, affection in the workplace can be a positive addition, but there is minimal research on the positive impact of affectionate communication in the workplace. This next section of the literature will focus on affectionate communication and its benefits.

**Affection exchange theory.** Affection Exchange Theory (Floyd, 2006) was used as the theoretical foundation for understanding perceptions of affection in the workplace because the theory argues that affection is intrinsic in all humans, regardless of class, age, weight, height, and cultural backgrounds. However, people have different propensities for its need. Affection



Exchange Theory is a Neo-Darwinist evolutionary perspective that argues affection is adaptive, and those who are more apt at giving and receiving affection are more advantaged than non-affectionate communicators. Specifically, affectionate communicators are more likely to survive and have reproductive success because they are more satisfied with themselves. For instance, people who communicate affection more regularly are “happier, more socially active, less stressed, less depressed, and more satisfied in their romantic relationships” (Floyd, 2006, p. 93). Consequentially, these feelings impact one’s openness to communicate and receive affectionate communication. Thus, affectionate communicators are more likely to create pair bonds because they are more likely to communicate affection and benefit from the cultivation of pair bonds (Floyd, 2006).

Affection Exchange Theory is important because it proposes affection is innate, assisting in our survival as humans—specifically in its function of creating pair bonds also known as relationships. The theory proposes that affection is a tool for cultivating and stabilizing emotional pair bonds with others, which feeds our desires for a sense of connection amongst (Floyd, 2006; Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Implicit in this argument is that affection is necessary for cultivating a sense of belongingness to others. Because affection is innate, there are visible psychological and physical consequences if this need is not met. The importance of affection also impacts the quality of our lives in various ways. In the words of the theorist Floyd (2006), Affection Exchange Theory argues (1) “That the need and capacity for affection are inborn” (p.161), (2) “Affectionate communication is adaptive with respect to human viability and fertility and affectionate behavior” (p.164) and (3) “Humans vary in their optimal tolerance for affection and affectionate behaviors” (p.171). Discussing postulate (1) the need for capacity and affection are inborn because humans have an innate desire for what Baumeister & Leary (1995), have

coined, a sense of belongingness to others and affection is how we solidify these bonds.

Although environmental factors can play a role in one's ability to communicate and perceive affection, this desire permeates culture, gender, class and other external factors. Additionally, affection is argued to be a fundamental need, like food, water and shelter (Floyd, 2014).

Consequently, if this need is not met, then people can suffer from affection deprivation (Floyd, 2014). Affection deprivation is a longing for more tactile affection than one receives and this longing can have an adverse impact on one's psychological and physical health. Individuals dealing with affection deprivation can suffer from negative emotions and feelings depression, loneliness, body dysmorphia and stress (Floyd, 2014).

Moving on to the second postulate: "Affectionate communication is adaptive with respect to human viability and fertility" (p. 164). This assumption asserts that affectionate communication is an adaptive behavior benefiting both the sender and the receiver because it relates to one's "superordinate motivation for survival and procreation" (Floyd, 2006, p. 164). Our motivations for survival and procreation are met because the sharing of affectionate behavior is associated with strong pair bonds. Strong pair bonds can be either intimate or platonic in nature, and they are important because they aid in survival through the sharing of resources or reproductive opportunity. According to Baumeister & Leary (1995), humans have a need for interpersonal relationships with others and affection is an adaptation that assist in the cultivation of these pair bonds and these pair bonds can assist in one's survival and reproductive success.

Lastly, postulate (3) "Humans vary in their optimal tolerance for affection and affectionate behaviors" (p. 171). This postulate claims that humans have innate desires for affection, but people have different propensities for its need. Differences in affectionate needs,

stem back to a lack of affectionate communication during developmental stages, in which a lack of affectionate communication would impact a person's ability to decode or encode affectionate messages (Floyd, 2006, p. 172). Moreover, external factors like family relationships and attachment styles have an impact on a person's capacity for affection, but the need for affection is still innate, only people differ in their propensities for receiving and expressing it. Given, affection communication is argued to be advantageous for survival making it an innate desire.

Overall, affection exchange theory argues that affection is an adaptation for assisting in the cultivation of pair bonds which extends one's chances for survival. More specifically, that humans have both a "fundamental need and a fundamental ability to love and receive love from others" (Floyd, 2006, p. 161). Additionally, affection also feeds a sense of belongingness among others (Baumeister & Leary, 1985). Likewise, our innate desires for communicating and receiving affection have an impact on our mental and physical health. For example, Floyd (2006) took data sets from both his 2003, and 2005 studies where he found associations between received affection and one's mental health. The datasets showed that received affection is directly correlated to self-esteem, social activity, happiness, comfort with closeness, mental health, and relationship satisfaction, and inversely associated with depression, stress, and fear of intimacy" (p. 99). This next section will discuss physical health benefits of affection, and second, the mental health benefits of affection, and third, the relational health benefits for both communicating and receiving affection.

**Physical health benefits.** Communicating and receiving affection is largely associated with physical health benefits, understood in the measurement of one's cardiovascular and endocrine system (Perry, 2012) and on one's nervous system (Floyd, 2006). Affectionate communication "elicits stress-ameliorating effects both when it is expressed and when it is

received” (Floyd & Riforgiate, 2008, p.363). For instance, physical contact, more specifically, touch - “has the unique property of being reciprocal; one cannot touch another person without being touched back” (Gentsch et al., 2015, p.239). This physical contact is associated with management of stress hormones, happiness, satisfaction and cardiovascular health (Floyd, 2006; Floyd, 2014).

Touching behaviors can be understood as - hugging, sitting close, a pat on the back, a handshake, or a kiss on the cheek- through touch, we are able to communicate our feelings and emotions to others (Floyd & Morman, 1998; Gallace & Spence, 2010). A study conducted by Light, Grewen, Amico (2005) found that premenopausal women who reported frequent hugs with their partners, had low baseline blood pressure and higher levels of oxytocin. In another study by, Grewen, Anderson, Girdler & Light (2003) it was found that cohabitating couples who shared a 10-minute period of affectionate social, and affectionate physical contact before experiencing a speaking event, had roughly half of the blood pressure and heart rate measurements than the control group of participants who had not received physical or affectionate expression before the event. Moreover, the frequency of physical contact is associated with impacting one’s physical health by directly influencing one’s cardiovascular and endocrine health.

Affectionate communication also offers physical health when expressed and received in an institutional environment. For example, communicating affection to preschoolers during class has been correlated to a plethora of health benefits for individual students, aiding in improved behavior for children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), less touch aversion for students with autism and decreased glucose levels (LeFebvre & Agent, 2009).

Just like adults spend a large portion of their day at their place of work, children spend a large portion of their day in a classroom environment. Unfortunately, many of these students are suffering from a lack of connection with others and these students are more at risk for having a poor school performance (Andrejewski, 2008). According to Stamatis (2011), physical contact should be part of the teaching curriculum because touch plays a huge role in “communicating to children a sense of worth to themselves and building trusting relationships, at least in the lower grades” (p. 1435). For example, in a study conducted by Steward & Lupfer (1987) it was found that students who were touched by their teacher on the arm, scored higher on an exam.

**Psychological benefits.** Affectionate communication is associated with positively or negatively impacting one’s mental health (Floyd, 2006). For instance, highly affectionate individuals or those who are more apt at giving and receiving affection, are less prone to depression (Floyd, Hess, Miczo, Halone, Mikkelson & Tusing, 2007). High affectionate communicators are “happier, have higher self-esteem, are less depressed, have less stress, and have greater overall mental health than do low affection communicators” (Floyd, 2002, p.144). High affectionate communicators are those who communicate affection more regularly compared to low affection communicators (Floyd, 2002). In other words, trait affection is a personality characteristic related to a person’s affectionate communication threshold, which is associated with impacting one’s mental health, positively.

Some people suffer from a lack of affection, and they are more prone to psychopathologies (Floyd, 2014). Affectionate deprivation is considered a longing for more tactile affection than one receives (Floyd, 2014). The longing for more tactile affection is associated with negatively impacting one’s mental health. For example, Field (2002)

acknowledged that American children, when compared to French Children, “talked with, and touched their parents less and were more aggressive toward their parents” (p. 740).

Affection deprivation also impacts perceptions of “body image dissatisfaction and psychopathologies such as depression and eating disorders” (Floyd, 2014, p. 386). Affection deprivation is also associated with social pain or hurt feelings when feeling excluded from social interactions. The distress from feeling excluded manifest itself in physical pain, and sleeping disturbances (Floyd, 2016).

The affection received in early adulthood can also have lasting effects on one’s psychological health into adulthood, shaping one’s personality. For example, looking at the relationship between affectionate communication and self-esteem, a longitudinal study conducted by Roberts & Bengston (1996) found that young adults who self-reported affective ties to their parents had more stable self-esteem during 17 and 20 year follow-ups. On the contrary Form, Dear, Rodgers, Christensen (2002) found that poor affectionate relationship with either a mother or father is correlated to an increased risk for both anxiety and depression in one’s adult life.

Affectionate communication can also have therapeutic properties. For instance, massages were given to a group of hospitalized disorderly adolescents compared to a control group that just watched a relaxing video. The adolescence that received the 30-minute back massage, daily for a 5-day period were “less depressed and anxious, had lower saliva cortisol levels after the massage, and their nighttime sleep increased over the period” (p.741). This massage therapy is also capable in aiding in feeling of depression, enhancing attentiveness, and immune function (Fields, 2010).

**Relational benefits.** Affection communication is a tool for stabilizing or cultivating our relationships with others, which benefits the health of the relationships. Moreover, the expression of affection in relationships helps assist in developing the boundaries of the relationship, to be either casual or intimate in nature (Floyd, 2006). For instance, we often remember the first kiss, or the first hug as a defining moment in the relationship (Owen, 1987; Floyd, 1994). We can also express affection in relationships to “increase positive regard for the communicator and significantly enhance the quality of the relationship” (Floyd & Voloudakis, 1999, p. 360). For example, in sibling, spouse and sibling-in-law relationships the sharing of affectionate communication was positively correlated to both relational satisfaction and closeness (Floyd, Morr, 2009). Also, a study conducted by Morman & Floyd (2009), declared that among 139 father-son dyads the sharing of affectionate communication was largely associated to fathers feeling closer and more satisfied with their father-son relationships (p.395).

Affectionate communication is also important for the health of the individuals involved, and the relationship over time (Floyd, 2006). For instance, the sharing of affection is considered a relational maintenance tool, because the expression of affection to another person is often reciprocal, usually eliciting an affectionate response from a partner (Floyd, Hess & Halone, 2007). This response offers benefits to both individuals involved because, “touch has the unique property of being reciprocal; one cannot touch another person without being touched back” (Gentsch et., al 2015, p.239) and physical contact is related to a plethora of health benefits. For example, physical contact is correlated to feelings of “individual and relational benefits, including increased happiness, and self-esteem, decreased fear of intimacy and susceptibility to depression, and higher relational satisfaction” (Floyd et al., 2007, p. 285). Furthermore, relationships that are affectionate in nature are “closer, more satisfying, and more engaging than

those that are not” (Floyd, 2006 p. 186). For instance, in romantic relationships kissing is correlated to relationship satisfaction and commitment (Welsh, Haugen, Widman, Darling, Grello, 2005, p.32). This study looks at coworker relationships, and if they benefit from received affectionate communication.

### **Synthesis**

Overall, it is apparent that through the process of assimilation and new membership negotiation, employees are having constant interactions with one another. They are working in close proxemics and communicating with one another on regular basis throughout the work day. These constant interactions are likely to cultivate co-worker relationships. As the literature discussed, coworker relationships are most notable for impacting an employee’s job experience through providing feelings of social support, which plays a huge role in an employee’s workplace experience. However, there is a lack of literature that focuses on affection as being a positive addition to co-worker interactions. There is also a lack of literature that discusses how personality characteristics impact reception of affection in the workplace. Moreover, affection in the workplace should be studied more, because it is a communicative behavior for expressing our “feelings of closeness, care and fondness for another” (Floyd & Morman, 1998). Within the workplace, the feeling of support is vital to the success of employees and the three dimensions of affection – nonverbal, verbal and social supportiveness are communicative behaviors for expressing our appreciation, care, fondness, love, feelings of closeness and our positive regard for another person (Floyd & Morman, 1998; Hesse & Floyd, 2008). Thus, affectionate behaviors can be argued to be synonymous with support; potentially impacting workplace perceptions and outcomes.



Individual personality characteristics do play a role in employee workplace behaviors, so it is important to understand how they impact perception of workplace interactions. Furthermore, this study hypothesizes that introversion, self-esteem, and high trait experience impact perceptions of affection in the workplace. The study also hypothesizes that reception of affection is related to feelings of job satisfaction, stress, and depression. Lastly, the study asks if affection influences perceptions of job tasks, oneself and other coworkers.

## **Hypotheses**

**H1.** Reception of affection is inversely related to depression in the workplace

**H2.** Reception of affection is inversely related to stress in the workplace

Hypothesis 1 and 2 are related to one another. Affectionate communication is associated with one's mental and physical health, and specifically one's perception of stress and depression (Floyd, 2006). For instance, both receiving and giving affection offer "stress-ameliorating effects" (Floyd & Riforgiate, 2008, p. 363). In addition, people who are more apt at giving and receiving affection are less prone to depression (Floyd et al., 2007). Whereas, people who suffer from a lack of affection, are more prone to psychopathologies like depression (Floyd, 2014).

Affectionate communication is directly related to one's endocrine and cardiovascular system (Perry, 2012). These systems make us human, they are responsible for hormonal regulation, and survival. According to Affection Exchange Theory, affectionate communication is an adaptation, and we have innate capabilities for receiving and giving affection, we potentially have these adaptations because they associate with other systems in our body, that enhance their effectiveness and in turn, our chances of survival.

**H3.** Reception of affection is directly related to job satisfaction in the workplace

There is literature that shows coworker relationship relate to feeling of social support (Sloan et al., 2013; Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; Halbesleben, 2006) and perceived organizational support (Brunetto et al., 2010). However, there is no research that focuses on the behaviors of how support is expressed in the workplace, and the feeling of support is related to job satisfaction. Therefore, this study works to examine the direct link between the reception of affectionate behaviors impact one's job satisfaction.

**H4.** Trait experience of affection is directly related to receptions of affection in the workplace

People who more adapt at giving and receiving affection are considered to have high trait affection. Within the workplace, it is believed that there will be an association between this personality characteristic and affection.

**H5.** There is an inverse relationship between introversion and reception of affection in the workplace

**H6.** There is a direct relationship between self-esteem and reception of affection in the workplace.

Hypothesis 5 and 6 are both personality characteristics that have a relationship with communication behaviors. Usually introverts are less likely to participate in group activities because they prefer solemn actives over the company of others. It would be interesting to understand if introverted people perceive receiving affection in the workplace because they would be more inclined to work on job tasks alone without the company of their coworkers (Cain, 2013). Self-esteem is how we view ourselves, and it is important to understand if how we view ourselves plays a role in how we perceive affection from others.

**RQ1.** Receiving affection in the workplace influences perceptions.

There is a lack of literature that researches whether affection in the workplace has an influence on our perceptions of the workplace environment.

## **Chapter 3: Methods**

### **Participants**

A total of 261 individuals participated in the study, with 131 males and 125 females. Only one person declined to answer. The sample ranged in age from 66% being 30-65, 33% being 18-30, and 1% being over 65. The participations were made of individuals who were 75% white, 8% other, 7% Hispanic, 7% Asian, 2% American Indian or Alaska Native and 4% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. Participants had to be the age of majority in their state, they had to work at their physical place of employment and they had to work for at least 30 hours a week. This study was inclusive, the only requirements were that participants were of age, and working at their physical place of employment for at least 30 hours a week, or part time. In other words, the participants could be of any gender, sex, nationality, or religious background. The diversity of participants was important because workplace environments can be diverse with people of different backgrounds, beliefs and genders. Also, it was important that the participants work at their physical place of employment for 30 hours or more because relationships are likely to develop at the physical job site.

### **Procedures**

The Qualtrics survey was administered through Mechanical Turk, a website that distributes surveys to a non-random sample of workers, offering businesses and developers access to a “sociable workforce” (Mechanical Turk). The justification for using a survey or

quantitative approach is based on understandings about the Iowa school of thought. The Iowa school of thought is a quantitative approach for analyzing the relationships between self and social structures (Carter & Fuller, 2016, p. 5). The Iowa school of thought was more appropriate for this survey rather the Chicago school of thought, because the Chicago school of thought is a qualitative approach that focuses on how the self emerges through a mindful act of negotiation symbols, and finding meaning within situations (Carter & Fuller, 2016). Furthermore, the Chicago school of thought is how human behavior understood by understanding conceptual terms and concepts (Carter & Fuller, 2016). This approach was not appropriate for this study because the focus is not on interpreting concepts and situation meanings, the studies focus is to understand if people perceive a behavior in the workplace. Qualified participants had access to the survey and they were awarded 1.00 dollar for their participation. The survey asked participants to think about and reflect on times they had received affection in the workplace, their job satisfaction, their own attitudes towards affection, personality characteristics, and feelings of depression and self-esteem within the last month.

## **Measures**

Seven scales were used to measure depression, stress, job satisfaction, introversion, self-esteem, affectionate behaviors, and one's propensity for receiving and giving affection. All the scales were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale of agree to disagree, or often to not often. In table 1, the means, standard deviations, internal reliability estimates and intercorrelations are shown.

**Affectionate communication index.** Received affection in the workplace was measured using Floyd's (1998) Affection Communication Index. The affection communication index was a measure that had participants reflect on received co-worker affection in workplace. Items

included, “My coworkers say how important our relationship is” and “my coworkers put his or her arm around me”. The measure asked 14 questions. Within this measure two questions were added 1) “my coworkers and I high-five one another” and 2) “my coworkers give me a pat on the back for a job well done”.

**TSG-A.** Trait affection was measured using the TSG-A Scale (Floyd, 2002). This scale was used to measure participant’s thoughts and experiences about expressing affection to others, in the workplace. Items included, “I consider myself to be a very affectionate person” and “when I feel affection for someone I usually express it.” In total, the measure asked 10 questions.

**Stress.** Stress was measured using the Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen, Kamarck; Mermelstein, 1983). This measure asked participants to think about their feelings and thoughts during the last month. For instance, “in the last month, how often have you dealt successfully with irritating life hassles?” and “in the last month, how often have you felt the things were going your way?” This measure was made up of 12 questions.

**Depression.** Depression was measured using Becks Depression Inventory scale. This scale asked participants to reflect on their general feelings about themselves. Items included, “I feel I have nothing to look forward to” “I feel sad most of the time”. This scale was made up of 20 questions.

**RSES.** Self-esteem was measured using the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965). This scale asked participants to reflect on their general feelings about themselves. Items included “On the whole, I am satisfied with myself” and “I feel that I have a number of good qualities”. This scale was made up of 10 questions.

**Introversion.** Introversion was studied using the Introversion Scale created by Richmond, & McCroskey (1998). The scale asked participants to reflect on their general feeling about

themselves. Items included, “are you inclined to keep in the background on social occasions?” and “are you inclined to limit your acquaintances to a select few”? This measure was made up of 15 questions.

***Job Satisfaction Scale.*** The Job Satisfaction Scale (Scott Macdonald & Peter MacIntyre, 1997) was used to measure participant’s feelings about job satisfaction, regarding their current place of employment. Items included, “I feel close to the people at work?” and “I feel good about my job”. This measure was made up of 10 questions.

***Workplace Influence.*** Workplace influence was measured by asking participants to reflect on their feelings about workplace perceptions. They were asked if “receiving affection in the workplace influence perceptions of 1) yourself 2) job tasks and 3) your co-workers”. Then we combined these measures into an influence variable.

## Results

### Descriptive Statistics

I ran a series of correlation tests. I also ran a t-test looking at gender differences among respondent answers. There was a difference between gender and received verbal affection, affection given and self-esteem. For received verbal affection, women ( $M = 3.12$ ) scored higher than men ( $M = 2.90$ ), ( $t(258) = -1.98, p = .05$ ). For given affection there was also significant differences between genders, where women scored higher for giving affection in the workplace than men, women ( $M = 3.63$ ) and men ( $M = 3.22$ ), ( $t(258) = -3.32, p = .001$ ). Lastly, there was a difference regarding the variable self-esteem with men ( $M = 3.93$ ) and women (4.14), ( $t(258) = -2.04, p = .04$ ) women were found to have higher self-esteem than men.

### Hypothesis and Research Question

**H1.** Hypothesis 1 predicted that reception of affection was inversely related to depression in the workplace. The correlation tests found that verbal affection and depression had a negative relationship  $r(260) = -.17, p < .01$  and that nonverbal affection and depression were non-significant  $r(260) = .05, p > .05$ .

**H2.** Hypothesis 2 predicted that reception of affection was inversely related to stress in the workplace. Affection was broken down into verbal and non-verbal affection. We ran a correlation test, and it was found that reception of both verbal  $r(260) = -.29, p < .01$  and nonverbal affection  $r(260) = -.19, p < .01$  had a negative relationship to stress.

**H3.** Hypothesis 2 predicted that reception of affection was directly related to job satisfaction in the workplace. Affection was broken down into verbal and non-verbal affection. We ran a correlation test, and it was found that both verbal affection  $r(260) = .57, p < .01$  and non-verbal affection  $r(260) = .45, p < .01$  had a positive relationship to job satisfaction.

**H4.** Hypothesis 4 predicted that trait affection was directly related to reception of affection in the workplace. Affection was broken down into verbal and non-verbal affection. We ran a correlation test, and it was found that verbal affection  $r(260) = .50, p < .01$  and non-verbal affection  $r(260) = .45, p < .01$  had a positive relationship to trait affection.

**H5.** Hypothesis 5 predicted an inverse relationship between introversion and reception of affection in the workplace. Affection was broken down into verbal and non-verbal affection. We ran a correlation test, and it was found that verbal affection  $r(260) = -.51, p < .01$  and non-verbal affection  $r(260) = -.51, p < .01$  have a negative relationship to introversion.

**H6.** Hypothesis 6 predicted that there was a positive relationship between self-esteem and reception of affection in the workplace. Affection was broken down into verbal and non-verbal

affection. We ran a correlation test, and it was found that verbal  $r(260) = .27, p < .01$  and non-verbal affection  $r(260) = .14, p < .01$  both have a positive relationship to self-esteem.

**RQ1.** Our research question looked to see if reception of affection in the workplace influences workplace perceptions. Affection was broken down into verbal and non-verbal affection. We ran a correlation test, and it was found that both verbal affection  $r(260) = .36, p < .01$  and non-verbal affection  $r(260) = .46, p < .01$ , influence workplace perceptions.

#### **Chapter 4: Discussion**

I conducted this study to understand the positive outcomes affection has for employees in the workplace. In modern society, affection in the workplace is a taboo topic because many people associate it with sexual harassment. For example, the media portrays affection within the workplace as a negative by associating it with workplace relationships (Powell & Fowley, 1998). Consequently, affection in the workplace is not a topic that is viewed in a positive manner or encouraged in a workplace setting. However, affection in the workplace should be explored because humans have an innate desire to give and receive affection (Floyd, 2006). Humans also have a desire for a sense of connection amongst others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Unfortunately, these needs are often not met at home because many Americans are living in single parent households or in divorced homes. I conducted this research to measure if there were positive benefits for received affection in the workplace, since Americans spend a large portion of their day at work. I ran a series of correlation tests to see if there was a relationship between affection; both nonverbal and verbal affection to the personality variables self-esteem, introversion, and trait affection.

I chose these personality characteristics because they are dissimilar from one another. The importance of this is that within a workplace, employees have a range of personality



characteristics. The tests observed if the personality characteristics (self-esteem, introversion, and trait affection) impacted perceptions of received affection, and if there was a relationship to received affection on stress, job satisfaction, and depression. The following section will first give a summary of the results, then it will discuss implications and finally, it will end with a conclusion of the study.

## **Summary**

**Personality characteristics.** Within the survey, I found that there was relationship between affection and the three personality characteristics: trait affection, introversion, and self-esteem. Starting with trait affection, employees with this personality trait perceived receiving more affection from their coworkers. Hence, there was a positive relationship between reception of coworker affection and the personality characteristic, high trait affection.

According to Floyd (2006), individuals with trait affection are adept at giving and receiving affection. They are also confident in their abilities to express and receive affection from others. As hypothesized, employees with this personality characteristic perceived receiving both verbal and nonverbal affection from their co-workers. The prediction is, that individuals who have high trait affection are already comfortable and adept at giving and receiving affection and this comfort permeates different social contexts. For instance, according to Affection Exchange Theory (Floyd, 2006) affection is an adaptation. Thus, individuals who are wired for giving and receiving affection (high trait affection) are likely to perceive relationships with their co-workers. They are also likely to perceive affection within these relationships because they are comfortable receiving it (Floyd, 2006). Furthermore, the results reinforce Affection Exchange Theory (Floyd, 2006) because the results indicated that co-workers with high trait affection, are confident and comfortable with receiving affection in the workplace. Moreover, supporting the

premise that affection is an innate adaptation and those who are adept with this characteristic, are likely to perceive affection regardless of the social context because they are confident and comfortable with both giving and receiving it.

I found self-esteem was also a significant personality characteristic impacting employee's perceptions. There was a positive relationship between affection and self-esteem. Moreover, individuals with high self-esteem perceived receiving more verbal and nonverbal affection than individuals with low self-esteem. Individuals with high self-esteem reported receiving more affection from their coworkers because they have confidence in themselves and their abilities to decode the affectionate behaviors (Floyd, 2006). Individuals with high self-esteem often value themselves, and this value influences their social behaviors and beliefs about the quality of their interpersonal relationships (Stinson, Logel, Zanna & Holmes, 2008). Consequentially, employees with high self-esteem are open to perceiving affectionate communication from their co-workers because they have a positive outlook about themselves, allowing them to view the affection communication as genuine. Furthermore, these individuals perceive affection as a natural communicative tool for the cultivation or health of their co-worker relationships (Floyd, 2006). Essentially, employees with high self-esteem have a positive outlook about themselves and their relationships. This outlook allows employees with high self-esteem to be open to the benefits of receiving affectionate communication. For instance, believing that affection is a way to indicate relational closeness, support, fondness and care (Floyd, 2006). Therefore, employees with high self-esteem perceived receiving affection from their co-workers.

My study also found that the more introverted someone is, the less likely they are to report receiving both nonverbal and verbal affection from their coworkers. Furthermore, there is a negative relationship between affection and introversion. Introverted employees tend to shy

away from the company of others, preferring solidarity, and solemn job tasks over group or social work events (Cain, 2013). These results could indicate that introverted individuals may choose not to acknowledge received affection for a fear of needing to reciprocate the affectionate behaviors. According to Floyd (2006), receiving affection usually elicits feeling of guilt about needing to reciprocate the affectionate feelings. Furthermore, Floyd (2006) declares humans are ingrained with a social contract that suggest favors, resources, and acts of kindness should be reciprocated to individuals who first communicated the affectionate gesture. Additionally, introverted employees might make a conscious effort not to perceive much affection from their coworkers. They might decide to ignore the affectionate gesture due to a lack of interest, or confidence in their ability to communicate and reciprocate these emotions in the workplace (Floyd, 2006, p.128).

**Outcomes.** This summary will begin discussing the relationship between affection and the four different outcomes, depression, job satisfaction, stress and influence. For nonverbal affection, I found there was no significant relationship to depression reported among the respondents. However, I found there was a negative relationship between reception of verbal affection and depression. Receiving nonverbal affection in the workplace can be uncomfortable because there are negative connotations associated with it. For instance, the person receiving the affection may not perceive the display of affection as appropriate. In the media, affection is portrayed as romantic workplace relationships and how these relationships are often the topic of other employees gossip (Powell & Foley, 1998). Moreover, employees may worry about receiving affection from their co-workers for a fear that other employees might perceive they are having a romantic workplace relationship. Receiving nonverbal affection can also cause “relational boundary ambiguity for receivers” (Floyd, 2006, p.131). Relational boundary

ambiguity can cause cognitive distress for fear of misinterpretation, or for unrequited feelings (Floyd, 2006). Furthermore, co-workers might feel emotional distress or uncertainty receiving nonverbal affection from their co-workers.

On the contrary, we found a negative relationship between reception of verbal affection and depression. Verbal affection can be expressed by saying things such as, “you’re awesome, keep it up” or “you’re a good friend”. These expressions provide social support like, helping with problems or giving compliments (Floyd & Morman, 1998). These statements can make an employee feel important and valued by their co-workers. Co-workers who feel they are valuable assets to the company are more likely to positively identify with their work through engagement, which is a positive state of mind while working (Brunetto et al., 2013). This is important because Americans spend a large portion of their day at work, and for them to feel positive about their work is beneficial for their mental health. The reception of verbal support from co-workers also works as a relational maintenance tool (Floyd, 2006). Employees who perceive verbal affection from their co-workers might feel a sense of connection to their co-workers, which is satisfying a need for interpersonal relationships or emotional bonds with others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995) and this satisfaction is “directly associated with higher levels of happiness and lower levels of depressive symptoms” (Sloan et al., 2013, p. 345).

My study also found that the reception of both verbal and nonverbal affection is related to stress. More specifically, there is a negative relationship between affection and stress. Furthermore, the more affection someone perceives in the workplace the less stress they report having. The workplace can be a very stressful place for employees and workplace stressors come from fluctuating workload, the potential for long hours and technological difficulties (Danna & Griffin, 1999). However, research shows that the development of workplace relationships acts as

a buffer against workplace stressors because workplace relationships are avenues for emotional bonds (Halbesleben, 2006), where affection is often used as a tool for reinforcing or cultivating these relations. Thus, both nonverbal and verbal affection are communication behaviors that assist in workplace stressors because both verbal and nonverbal expressions can be perceived as affirmations that reinforce the importance or perception of a coworker relationships.

According to Halbesleben (2006) nonverbal affection is the ability to offer support through physically helping another coworker with their tasks and workload. This support can be perceived as helpful, because it is directly associated with alleviating workloads by helping someone with their job task. Whereas, verbal affection can be expressed by saying things such as, “I am here for you” or “you’re a good coworker”. These expressions provide social support through reinforcing care, and genuine like for someone. The reception of these behaviors could have a positive impact on an individual’s stress levels (Floyd & Morman, 1998) because both verbal and nonverbal affection are directly associated with one’s cardiovascular and endocrine system (Perry, 2012). Furthermore, receiving both verbal and nonverbal affection can be perceived as a stress relief because it is associated with alleviating stress hormones, happiness, satisfaction and cardiovascular health (Floyd, 2006; Floyd, 2014).

As discussed there was no significant relationship found between reception of nonverbal affection and depression. Nonverbal affection, when in the form of helping another coworker with their tasks is a physical form of help that is easy to decode. Whereas, a hug, or a pat on the back and can be a little more difficult to decode. Furthermore, the physical gesture of helping with workloads alleviates stress because it alleviates the workload, and it is a behavior that is easy to decode as form of support, or care. However, a pat on the back, or a hug can cause mal feelings surrounding relational ambiguity, guilt, or unrequited feelings. Moreover, reception of

nonverbal affection has no relationship to depression in the workplace while the nonverbal behaviors associated with workplace physical support, do.

Job satisfaction was another variable that this study looked at. The results showed that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and both verbal and nonverbal affection. This is because employees who perceive affection from their coworkers probably have healthy relationships with their coworkers (Floyd & Voloudakis, 1999). Coworker relationships play a role in an employee's workplace experience because they are impactful on employee's perception of received social support, impacting an employee's perception about the workplace and themselves (Chiaburur & Harrison, 2008). Therefore, if an employee is perceiving affection in their coworker relationships, then they probably perceive that they have strong bonds with their coworkers which can synonymous with job satisfaction.

The study also looked to see if verbal and nonverbal affection had an influence on job tasks, oneself and our co-workers or workplace perceptions. Discussing nonverbal affection, touch is a very powerful communicative tool. For example, a "brief touch to the shoulder or upper arm increases people's behavior and willingness to comply with requests" (Haans, Bruijn, Ijsselsteijn 2014, p. 302). Within the workplace, touch can be used to persuade and gain compliance from coworkers simply through a pat on the back (Fuller et al, 2011). The results of the survey indicated that nonverbal affection was influential on coworker's perceptions of themselves, job tasks and coworkers. This is because physical contact offers a sensation that reinforces a sense of connection amongst others (Baumeister & Leary, 1998). Employees have a strong desire to have a sense of connection with their coworkers, and the sensation of physical

contact can communicate connection. Therefore, nonverbal affection is influential on workplace perceptions because coworkers could want to sustain, create or have a sense of connection to other employees.

The reception of verbal affection also speaks to coworker's desires to have a sense of connection among others. Likewise, when they hear from a coworker, "I care", "good work" or "I will see you tomorrow," it changes how they perceive the workplace, themselves and the job tasks. Overall, both nonverbal and verbal affection have a relationship to workplace influence because they offer coworkers a sense of connection, and individuals are motivated to feel a part of something.

### **Theoretical Implications**

The theoretical foundation of this study was rooted in Affection Exchange Theory (Floyd, 2006) and the need to belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). As summarized, Affection Exchange Theory is a Neo-Darwinist, evolutionary perspective, that argues affection is adaptive and it is a desire that all humans have and are adept at giving and receiving. In so, that affectionate communication is natural and it is a part of coworker interactions because it fulfills a need. Moreover, coworker relationships benefit from affectionate communication because it is beneficial for an employee's mental and physical health to communicate affection. People can suffer from affection deprivation which is a longing for more tactile affection than one receives. Due to this, the workplace is an organizational institution where people spend a large portion of their day working in close proxemics to others, where the sharing of affectionate communication is necessary for one's health, and is a natural tool for communicating care and fondness for those arounds us because we are motivated by a sense of connection to others. Moreover, affection exchange offers an understanding about the innateness of affectionate communication in the

workplace. Furthermore, although not a postulate, there should be a postulate in Affection Exchange Theory that discusses that affection can be beneficial in different social context. For instance, this study found that in the workplace environment received affection was beneficial for employees.

The second theory used was the need to belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). This theory proposes that humans have an innate ability and need to form and maintain interpersonal relationships with others, and this need is defined as regular social contact with others. Moreover, humans have an intrinsic desire for having interpersonal relationships with others. Where the behaviors to solidify these bonds, are motivated by an inclination to have sense of belongingness (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). The workplace is a great arena for the development of these interpersonal bonds through the cultivation of workplace friendships (Sloan, Newhouse & Thompson, 2013, p. 344) because coworker friendships are beneficial for an employee's mental health and workplace perceptions. According to SHRM the Society for Human Resources Management, "Individuals with six or more workplace friends report feeling deeply connected to their companies. Nearly two-thirds of 716 full-time workers in the U.S. surveyed who had six to 25 workplace friends said they love their company." Logically, coworker friendships should be part of the workplace culture especially because they assist in our desires for a sense of connection amongst others.

### **Practical Implications**

This study can have real world application because affection is a natural tool for cultivating workplace relationships. Coworker relationships are important in the workplace because they offer social support, they are avenues stress relief, and these relationships can be stabilized or developed through affectionate communication. For example, employees who feel



like they have positive coworker relationships are more satisfied with their jobs than employees who don't, so they are more likely to have high production levels, and engage with their job tasks (Brunetto,2013). Furthermore, individuals who are perceiving affection in the workplace might be more productive in the workplace which could also extend to life outside of the office because they are feeling energized and supported by others.

Human Resources should hold seminars that discuss affection as an appropriate workplace behavior. These seminars could impact corporate culture, compliance, and the moral of onboarding new members because affection is a way to communicate connection, and employees who feel a sense of belongingness to their company are more likely to engage, comply, and perceive their workplace as enjoyable. Furthermore, Human Resources should open up dialogue about verbal affection in the workplace, and how it is associated with positive workplace outcomes.

### **Strengths, Limitation, and Future Research**

The strengths of the survey can be seen in the reliability scores, and the number of participants. The survey had strong reliable scores for each scale, and the survey questions were clear without any ambiguity. The survey also had a large dataset and the participants seemed to be thorough while filling out the survey. The survey had input from participants who were working at least 30 hours a week at their physical place of employment, which gives strong insight into the mindset of an employee who is working a large portion of their day at their job. The survey also had strong participation from both men and women. Overall, the results showcased interesting information about the reception of affection and influence of affection in the workplace.

Although there were strengths, there were also some limitations. One limitation of the study was that the large majority of participants were Caucasian. This is a limitation because it can be argued that most of the participants were socialized by a western society, and view affection according to these standards. Furthermore, there was a lack of diverse participants with different cultural backgrounds. The survey also failed to report about the employee's perceptions of their workplace environment. There was no consideration for how long they had been working at their physical place of employment or the type of job they had. The survey could have considered the exact number of hours spent at home, and the type of living situation participants were residing in.

For future research, it would be interesting to ask participants if affection influenced their perceptions of the workplace environment as either positive or negative, and if participants view affection in the workplace as important. Consequentially, it would be interesting to ask what participants consider as inappropriate or appropriate affectionate communication. Also, if affection was something that they liked to receive or something that they felt was an ambiguous term. With that, the research could explore giving affection in the workplace and asking participants how it made them feel to express affection behaviors to their coworkers.

Future research could also conduct this study with employees of diverse workplace environment. For instance, employees working at an educational institution vs. a company like Google. It would be interesting to see if a workplace environment impacts perceptions of received affection, and using companies with different workplace models might offer insight into how a workplace environment influences receptions of affection. It would also be interesting to look at introversion in more detail to see if introverted employees perceive receiving affection from co-workers they feel close to. This might answer if the perception of the relationship

influences reception of affection. Furthermore, it could bring attention to the importance of a relationship being a factor in influencing the perception of received affection. Lastly, future research could consider reception of affection when received from co-workers of a different gender, race, or cultural background. Are these factors significant? Or, is about how the relationship is perceived? Overall, future research in this field could really explore how affection is impactful in the workplace environment, and within employee relationships.

### **Conclusion**

Affection in the workplace is something that should continue to be researched and explored in the workplace environment. This study gave insight into how both nonverbal and verbal affection can have an impact on depression, stress, and job satisfaction. Also, how personality characteristics impact reception of received affection. The survey offers practical insight into the strengths of these forms of affection, as well as the limitations. From this survey, it can be understood that reception of both nonverbal and verbal affection is worth exploring because it has outcomes, that most companies would view as beneficial to a workplace environment. Hopefully, a dialogue about the benefits of affection in the workplace can be explored.

## References

- Abraham H. (Abraham Harold) Maslow. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2d ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Andrzejewski, C. E., & Davis, H. A. (2008). Human contact in the classroom: Exploring how teachers talk about and negotiate touching students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(3), 779–794.  
doi:10.1016/j.tate.2007.02.013
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497.
- Barbee, & Cunningham, A. (2009). Workplace Relationships (pp. 1698–1701).
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1–26.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497.
- Berman, E. M., West, J. P., & Richter, M. N. (2002). Workplace relations: friendship patterns and consequences (according to managers). (Statistical Data Included). *Public Administration*
- Bolton, L. R., Becker, L. K., & Barber, L. K. (2010). Big Five trait predictors of differential counterproductive work behavior dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(5), 537–541. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2010.03.047 *Review*, 62(2), 217.
- Bono & Yoon (2012). *Personal relationships: the effect on employee attitudes, behavior, and well-being*. New York: Routledge Academic.

- Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. (1984). The fundamental topoi of relational communication. *Communication Monographs*, 51(3), 193–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758409390195>
- Brunetto, Y., Xerri, M., Shriberg, A., Farr - Wharton, R., Shacklock, K., Newman, S., & Dienger, J. (2013). The impact of workplace relationships on engagement, well-being, commitment and turnover for nurses in Australia and the USA. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69(12), 2786.
- Brunetto, Y., Farr-Wharton, R., & Shacklock, K. (2010). The impact of supervisor–subordinate relationships on morale: implications for public and private sector nurses' commitment.
- Cain, S. (2013). *Quiet: the power of introverts in a world that can't stop talking* (1st pbk. ed.). New York: Broadway Paperbacks.
- Chadsey, J., & Beyer, S. (2001). Social relationships in the workplace. *Mental Retardation & Developmental Disabilities Research Reviews*, 7(2), 128–133.
- Chiaburu D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 93, 1082-1103.
- Field, T. (2002). Violence and Touch Deprivation in Adolescents. *Adolescence*, 37(148), 735.
- Field, T. (2010). Touch for socioemotional and physical well-being: A review. *Developmental Review*, 30(4), 367–383.
- Floyd, K. (1997). Communicating affection in dyadic relationships: An assessment of behavior and expectancies. *Communication Quarterly*, 45(1), 68–80. [https://doi.org/Floyd, K. \(2016\)](https://doi.org/Floyd, K. (2016)).
- Floyd, K. (2002). Human affection exchange: V. Attributes of the highly affectionate. *Communication Quarterly*, 50(2), 135–152. doi:10.1080/01463370209385653
- Floyd, K. (2006). *Communicating affection: interpersonal behavior and social context*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Floyd, K. (2014). Relational and Health Correlates of Affection Deprivation. *Western Journal of Communication*, 78(4), 383–403. doi:10.1080/10570314.2014.927071
- Floyd, K., Boren, J., Hannawa, A., Hesse, C., Mcewan, B., & Veksler, A. (2009). Kissing in Marital and Cohabiting Relationships: Effects on Blood Lipids, Stress, and Relationship Satisfaction. *Western Journal of Communication*, 73(2), 113–133.
- Floyd, K., & Morman, M. (2001). Human affection exchange: III. discriminative parental solicitude in men's affectionate communication with their biological and nonbiological sons. *Communication Quarterly*, 49(3), 310–327. doi:10.1080/01463370109385631
- Floyd, K., & Morman, M. (1997). Affectionate communication in nonromantic relationships: Influences of communicator, relational, and contextual factors. *Western Journal of Communication*, 61(3), 279–298. doi: 10.1080/10570319709374578
- Floyd, K., & Morman, M. (1998). The measurement of affectionate communication. *Communication Quarterly*, 46(2), 144–162. doi: 10.1080/01463379809370092
- Floyd, K., & Morr, M. C. (2003). Human affection exchange: VII. Affectionate communication in the sibling/spouse/sibling-in-law triad. *Communication Quarterly*, 51(3), 247–261. doi:10.1080/01463370309370155
- Floyd, K., Hess, J. A., Miczo, L. A., Halone, K. K., Mikkelsen, A. C., & Tusing, K. J. (2005). Human Affection Exchange: VIII. Further Evidence of the Benefits of Expressed Affection. *Communication Quarterly*, 53(3), 285–303. doi :10.1080/01463370500101071
- Floyd, K., Sargent, J. E., & Corcia, M. D. (2004). Human Affection Exchange: VI. Further Tests of Reproductive Probability as a Predictor of Men's Affection With Their Adult Sons. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 144(2), 191–206.

- Floyd, K., & Voloudakis, M. (1999). Affectionate Behavior in Adult Platonic Friendships Interpreting and Evaluating Expectancy Violations. *Human Communication Research*, 25(3), 341–369.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1999.tb00449.x>
- Floyd, K., & Riforgiate, S. (2008). Affectionate Communication Received from Spouses Predicts Stress Hormone Levels in Healthy Adults. *Communication Monographs*, 75(4), 351–368.  
 doi:10.1080/03637750802512371
- Fuller, B., Simmering, M. J., Marler, L. E., Cox, S. S., Bennett, R. J., & Cheramie, R. A. (2011). Exploring touch as a positive workplace behavior. *Human Relations*, 64(2), 231–256.
- Gailliard, B. M., Myers, K., & Seibold, D. (2010). Organizational Assimilation: A Multidimensional Reconceptualization and Measure. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(4), 552–578.  
 doi:10.1177/0893318910374933
- Gallace, A., & Spence, C. (2010). The science of interpersonal touch: an overview. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 34(2), 246–259.
- Getting Along with Co-Workers Better. (1991). *Nursing*, 21(1), 113–114.
- Grewen, K. M., Anderson, B. J., Girdler, S. S., & Light, K. C. (2003). Warm Partner Contact Is Related to Lower Cardiovascular Reactivity. *Behavioral Medicine*, 29(3), 123–130.
- Haans, A., Bruijn, R. de, & IJsselsteijn, W. A. (2014). A Virtual Midas Touch? Touch, Compliance, and Confederate Bias in Mediated Communication. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 38(3), 301–311. doi:10.1007/s10919-014-0184-2
- Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2006). Sources of social support and burnout: A meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 1134. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1134
- Human Resource Management Journal*, 20(2), 206–225. doi:10.1111/j.1748-8583.2009.00117.x

- Jablin, F. (1994). Communication Competence: An Organizational Assimilation Perspective. *Utrecht Studies in Language and Communication*, 4, 30–41
- Jorm, A. F., Dear, K. B. G., Rodgers, B., & Christensen, H. (2003). Interaction between mother's and father's affection as a risk factor for anxiety and depression symptoms: Evidence for increased risk in adults who rate their father as having been more affectionate than their mother. *Social Psychiatry & Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 38(4), 173.
- Ju, C., Lan, J., Li, Y., Feng, W., & You, X. (2015). The mediating role of workplace social support on the relationship between trait emotional intelligence and teacher burnout. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 51, 58–67. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2015.06.001
- Lambert, E. G., Minor, K. I., Wells, J. B., & Hogan, N. L. (2016). Social support's relationship to correctional staff job stress, job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *The Social Science Journal*, 53(1), 22–32. doi:10.1016/j.soscij.2015.10.001
- Light, K. C., Grewen, K. M., & Amico, J. A. (2005). More frequent partner hugs and higher oxytocin levels are linked to lower blood pressure and heart rate in premenopausal women. *Biological Psychology*, 69(1), 5–21. doi: 0.1016/j.biopsycho.2004.11.002
- LeFebvre, J. E., & Agent, F. L. (2009). Importance of Touch. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.212.4438&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Mansson, D. (2013). Affectionate Communication and Relational Characteristics in the Grandparent–Grandchild Relationship. *Communication Reports*, 26(2), 47–60. doi:10.1080/08934215.2013.798670
- Morrison, E. W. (2002). Newcomers' Relationships: The Role of Social Network Ties during Socialization. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 45(6), 1149–1160. doi:10.2307/3069430



- Morrison, R. (2004). Informal relationships in the workplace: associations with job satisfaction, organisational commitment and turnover intentions. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 33(3), 114.
- Myers, K. K. (2005). A Burning Desire: Assimilation into a Fire Department. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 18(3), 344–384. doi:10.1177/0893318904270742
- Myers, Karen. (2009). *New Directions in Interpersonal Communication Research*. Workplace Relationships and Membership Negotiation (135-156). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- McPhee, R.D., & Zaugh, P. (2002). The communication
- O'Neill, T. A., Lewis, R. J., & Carswell, J. J. (2011). Employee personality, justice perceptions, and the prediction of workplace deviance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(5), 595–600. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.05.025
- Powell, Gary N., and Sharon Foley. "Something to talk about: romantic relationships in organizational settings." *Journal of Management* May- June 1998:421+. *Business Insights: Global*. Web. 28 Apr. 2017
- Perry M. Pauley, Kory Floyd & Colin Hesse (2015) The Stress-Buffering Effects of a Brief Dyadic Interaction Before an Acute Stressor, *Health Communication*, 30:7, 646-659, DOI: 10.1080/10410236.2014.888385
- Roberts, R. E. L., & Bengtson, V. L. (1996). Affective Ties to Parents in Early Adulthood and Self-Esteem Across 20 Years. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59(1), 96–106. doi:10.2307/2787121
- Scott, C., & Myers, K. (2010). Toward an Integrative Theoretical Perspective on Organizational Membership Negotiations: Socialization, Assimilation, and the Duality of Structure. *Communication Theory*, 20(1), 79–105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2009.01355.x>

- Sias, P. M., Gallagher, E. B., Kopaneva, I., & Pedersen, H. (2012). Maintaining Workplace Friendships. *Communication Research*, 39(2), 239–268.  
doi:10.1177/0093650210396869
- Sloan, M. M., Newhouse, R. J. E., & Thompson, A. B. (2013). Counting on Coworkers Race, Social Support, and Emotional Experiences on the Job. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 76(4), 343–372.
- Stamatis, P. J. (2011). Nonverbal communication in classroom interactions: A pedagogical perspective of touch. *Comunicación No Verbal En Las Interacciones de Aula: Una Perspectiva Pedagógica Sobre El Contacto Físico.*, 9(3), 1427–1442.  
doi:10.1177/0190272513504937
- Steward, A.L., & Luper, M. (1987) Touching as healing: The effect of touch on students' perceptions and performance. *Journal of applied social psychology*, 17, 800-809.
- Survey: Workplace Friends Important Retention Factor. (2014, December 16). Retrieved May 1, 2017, from <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/employee-relations/pages/workplace-friendships.aspx>
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2016). Retrieved July 26, 2016, from <http://www.bls.gov/>
- William Isaac Thomas. (1966). *W.I. Thomas on social organization and social personality; selected papers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wiley: Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Research and Practice, 6th Edition - Paul E. Spector. (2012). Retrieved May 3, 2017, from <http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-EHEP001994.html>
- Welsh, D. P., Haugen, P. T., Widman, L., Darling, N., & Grello, C. M. (2005). Kissing is good: A developmental investigation of sexuality in adolescent romantic couples. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, 2(4), 32–41. doi:10.1525/srsp.2005.2.4.32

*Descriptive Statistics, Alphas, and Intercorrelations for Predictor and Outcome Variables*

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	$\alpha$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Received Verbal	3.01	0.88	.86								
2. Received Nonverbal	2.74	0.86	.83	.78**							
3. Depression	1.68	0.82	.96	-.17**	-.05						
4. Stress	2.48	0.74	.88	-.29**	-.19**	.72**					
5. Job satisfaction	3.67	0.86	.91	.57**	.45**	-.48**	-.54**				
6. Trait affection	3.42	1.00	.94	.50**	.46**	-.33**	-.32**	.38**			
7. Introversion	2.93	0.69	.84	-.51**	-.51**	.41**	.51**	-.48**	-.53**		
8. Self-Esteem	4.03	0.85	.91	.27**	.14*	-.83**	-.73**	.58**	.36**	-.45**	
9. Influence	2.76	1.02	.84	.36**	.46**	.16*	.12	.17**	.29**	-.20**	-.14*

*Notes.* All variables were measured on a 1-7 scale wherein higher scores indicate greater levels of the variable. There was no alpha for relational closeness since it was a single-item measure. \* $p < .05$ .

The following 9 pages are the survey questions. Before the study, employees will be asked five questions for the eligibility screening.

1. Are you the age of majority in your state?
2. Do you work an average of 30 hours a week?
3. Do you work at your physical place of employment?
4. Have you read and understood the conditions of this research?
5. Do you consent to taking part in this research?

**Demographic Questions:**

6. 1)How old are you?
7. 2)What is your gender?
8. 3)What is your race/ethnicity?

## 9. Affectionate Communication Index (Floyd & Morman, 1998)

Directions: please think about your co-workers. To what extent would you say that your co-workers do each of the following things as a way to express affection to you? Indicate your response by choosing the appropriate number on the line preceding each item, according to the scale; 1 (Never or almost never) and 5(always or almost always).

1)My coworkers help me with my problems  
Never: \_\_1....5\_\_:Always

2)My coworkers acknowledge my birthday  
Never: \_\_1....5\_\_:Always

3)My coworkers hug me  
Never: \_\_1....5\_\_:Always

4)My coworkers praise my accomplishments  
Never: \_\_1....5\_\_:Always

5)My coworkers put his/her arm around me  
Never: \_\_1....5\_\_:Always

6)My coworkers share private information with me  
Never: \_\_1....5\_\_:Always

7)My coworkers say "I care about you"  
Never: \_\_1....5\_\_:Always

8)My coworkers give me a massage or backrub  
Never: \_\_1....5\_\_:Always

9)My coworkers sit close to me  
Never: \_\_1....5\_\_:Always

10)My coworkers say I am his/her best friend  
Never: \_\_1....5\_\_:Always

11) My coworkers and I say how important our relationship is  
Never: \_\_1....5\_\_:Always

12) My coworkers and I high five one another

13) My coworkers give me a pat on the back for a job well done

## ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

Directions: Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement, According to the scale.

1(agree) and 5( Disagree)

1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

2. At times I think I am no good at all.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

6. I certainly feel useless at times.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Self Report Measures for Love and Compassion Research: Self-Esteem

7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

### **Trait Affection Scale ( Floyd, 2002)**

Directions: think about your thoughts on expressing affection to others. Please indicate your response by choosing the appropriate number, according to the scale. 1 (agree) and 5(Disagree).

Trait affection given

I consider myself to be a very affectionate person.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

I am always telling my loved ones how much I care about them.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

When I feel affection for someone, I usually express it.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

I have a hard time telling people that I love them or care about them.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

I'm not very good at expressing affection.

Agree : \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

.I'm not a very affectionate person.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

I love giving people hugs or putting my arms around them.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

I don't tend to express affection to other people very much.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

Anyone who knows me well would say that I'm pretty affectionate.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

Expressing affection to other people makes me uncomfortable.

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

### **Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen, Kamarck; Mermelstein (1983))**

Directions: The questions in this scale ask you about your feelings and thoughts during the last month. In each case, you will be asked to indicate the appropriate number, for how often you felt or thought a certain way, according to the scale. 1(not often) and 5(often)

In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and “stressed”?

Not often: \_\_1....5\_\_:Often

In the last month, how often have you dealt successfully with irritating life hassles?

Not often: \_\_1....5\_\_:Often

In the last month, how often have you felt that you were effectively coping with important changes that were occurring in your life?

Not often: \_\_1....5\_\_:Often

In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?

Not often: \_\_1....5\_\_:Often

In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way?

Not often: \_\_1....5\_\_:Often

In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?

Not often: \_\_1....5\_\_:Often

In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations in your life?

Not often: \_\_1....5\_\_:Often

In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things?

Not often: \_\_1....5\_\_:Often

In the last month, how often have you been angered because of things that happened that were outside of your control?

Not often: \_\_1....5\_\_:Often

In the last month, how often have you found yourself thinking about things that you have to accomplish?

Not often: \_\_1....5\_\_:Often

### **Introversion Survey Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1998).**



Directions: Below are statements that people sometimes make about themselves. Please indicate whether or not you believe each statement applies to you according to the scale:

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Are you inclined to keep in the background on social occasions?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Do you like to mix socially with people?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Do you sometimes feel happy, sometimes depressed, without any apparent reason?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Are you inclined to limit your acquaintances to a select few?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Do you like to have many social engagements?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Do you have frequent ups and downs in mood, either with or without apparent cause?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Would you rate yourself as a happy-go-lucky individual?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Can you usually let yourself go and have a good time at a party?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Are you inclined to be moody?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Would you be very unhappy if you were prevented from making numerous social contacts?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Do you usually take the initiative in making new friends?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Does your mind often wander while you are trying to concentrate?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Do you like to play pranks upon others?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Are you sometimes bubbling over with energy and sometimes very sluggish?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Do you often "have the time of your life" at social affairs?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Are you sometimes bubbling over with energy and sometimes very sluggish?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Are you frequently "lost in thought" even when you should be taking part in a conversation?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree

Do you derive more satisfaction from social activities than from anything else?

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_ :Disagree:

### **Job Satisfaction Scale Scott Macdonald & Peter MacIntyre (1997)**

Directions: Think about your currently place of employment. Please indicate whether or not you believe each statement applies to you by marking whether you: Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

1)I receive recognition for a job well done

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

2) I feel close to the people at work

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

3)I feel good about working at this company

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

4) I feel secure about my Job

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

5) I believe management I is concerned about me

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

6) On the whole, I believe work is good for my physical health

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

7) My wages are good

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

8) Alf my talents and skills are used at work

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

9) I get along with my supervisors

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

10) I feel good about my job

Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

### Beck's Depression Inventory

Directions: Please indicate whether or not you believe each statement applies to you by marking whether you: Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

- 1) I feel sad.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 2) I am sad all of the time that I can't snap out of it.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 3) I am so sad and unhappy that I can't stand it.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 4) I feel I have nothing to look forward to.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 5) I feel the future is hopeless and that things cannot improve.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 6) I feel I have failed more than the average person.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 7) I feel I am complete failure as a person.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 8) I feel guilty most of the time.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 9) I am disgusted with myself  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 10) I feel I am being punished  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 11) I am critical of myself for my weaknesses or mistakes.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 12) I have thoughts of killing myself, but I would not carry them out.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 13) I have lost all of my interest in other people.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 14) I can't make decisions at all anymore  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 15) I believe that I look ugly.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 16) I have to push myself very hard to do anything.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 17) I can't do any work at all.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 18) I don't sleep as well as I used to.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 19) I am too tired to do anything.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 20) I have no appetite at all anymore.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

Directions, in the lines provided please indicate your feelings for each statement by filling in the appropriate response. Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree

- 1) Does receiving affection in the workplace influence your perceptions of yourself.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 2) Does receiving affection in the workplace influence perceptions of job tasks.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree
- 3) Does receiving affection in the workplace influence perceptions of your co-workers.  
Agree: \_\_1....5\_\_:Disagree