AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Jacob T. Hood for the degree of Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies in Speech Communication, Speech Communication, and Business Administration presented on May 31, 2018.

Title: A Look into Spillover: The Effect of Supervisor Leadership on Subordinate Family Life.

Abstract approved:

_____

Colin R. Hesse

According to Wang and Repetti (2013), American adults are working more hours per week than in decades past. Additionally, more people in each family must work to support their families (Patten, 2015). This has led to an increase in stress levels due to the strain that is placed on balancing work and family. Research that has been conducted on spillover has shown that work life can impact family relationships. If people enjoy their jobs, positive spillover is more likely to occur. However, if people are not satisfied with their jobs, negative spillover becomes more likely. This thesis examines spillover from the workplace to family life by applying Galvin, Dickson, and Marrow's (2006) systems perspective. More specifically, this study explores the role of the supervisor in creating positive or negative spillover in their subordinates' family lives. Three elements of supervisor leadership were examined. The current study tested whether supervisor motivation, incivility, and dominance/affiliation were correlated with family closeness, satisfaction, affection, and dominance/affiliation. The results of this study indicate that supervisor motivation and affiliation may cause positive spillover, while supervisor incivility may cause negative spillover. Since correlational testing was used, causality cannot be determined; nevertheless, it can be suggested. This study proposes the societal implications of ethical and competent leadership by supervisors at work.

A Look into Spillover: The Effect of Supervisor Leadership on Subordinate Family
Life

by
Jacob T. Hood

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 31, 2018
Commencement June 2018

<u>Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies</u> thesis of <u>Jacob T. Hood</u> presented on <u>May 31, 2018</u>

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.

_____

Jacob T. Hood, Author

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my thesis committee:

Dr. Colin Hesse, thank you very much for being the chair of my committee. I am lucky to have had your wisdom, patience, and guidance throughout this process. I enjoyed talking with you about the world of sports and fantasy football mishaps (which were numerous for me), and I genuinely appreciate the positivity you have displayed during the past two years.

Mark Porrovecchio, in my first term of graduate school, I took your Pragmatism class. You quickly whipped me into shape and showed me what it is to be a graduate student. I am better off because of that. Thank you for pushing me, challenging me, and introducing me to Thai food during my time here.

Chad Murphy, I was honored when you chose to be my advisor for Business. Reading your research and talking to you really helped guide me toward the topic of my thesis. You made me much more comfortable about working with the College of Business with your encouragement and interest in my learning. Thank you!

To my cohort:

I have thoroughly enjoyed sharing an office with all of you. That includes those who graduated in 2017 and those who will graduate in 2019. Each of you really made this experience better, and I'm glad to have been able to get to know you. Walker and Rochelle, it's been fun doing this for the last two years.

To my friends:

Packy, Gilly, Kris, Gino: you'll never read a lick of this, but darn it you deserve a mention and a thank you along with your families. Thank you, also, to my fraternity. I am lucky to have been a part of such a great group of people.

To my family:

Thank you for everything is an understatement. To my parents, Renelle and Harold: the support and opportunities you have given me have not gone unappreciated—even if I don't say much. I wouldn't be here without you. Thank you

so much for your patience, care, and acceptance. Ben, you're alright, and I'm proud to be your brother. You've done a lot of pretty cool things—keep it up. I wouldn't be here without you either. To my Nonne and Auntie, I appreciate your love, support, and overestimation of my abilities and characteristics—thank you for believing in me. To the rest of my family and family-friends—thank you.

To my beautiful girlfriend:

Paige, you said that both of us have come a long way. You're right. Your perseverance, intelligence, grace, and economical nature inspire me. Your fun-loving personality makes hard times better. You push me to be better and keep me driven. Nothing is more calming than hearing your voice and seeing that pretty face. I'm pretty lucky to be a part of your life. Thanks for the joy and support you give me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter One: Introduction

On average, stress-levels for adults are significantly higher than they were decades ago. This can be attributed to the need for family members to work more and earn more money. In the 1970s, the majority of two-parent households consisted of one working spouse and one stay-at-home parent (Patten, 2015). Today, however, 46 percent of two-parent households contain two, full-time working spouses (Patten, 2015). Additionally, individuals are working more hours per week than they were decades ago, which equates to higher stress-levels (Wang & Repetti, 2013). Thus, not only are more people working in each family, they are both away from home longer each week.

Many families must work longer hours because it is difficult to move forward—financially—in today's economy. According to a Pew study, the majority of middle-class Americans reported that they are not making any financial progress ("Inside the Middle Class: Bad Times Hit the Good Life," 2008). Statistics support that notion; they are not making progress ("Inside," 2008). Decades ago, middle-class Americans were able to make financial progress and live more comfortably ("Inside," 2008). Now, they are not easily able to do so because the cost of living has dramatically increased with things like housing and the university system ("Inside," 2008). This means that Americans are spending, as well as borrowing more money ("Inside," 2008). Since the average American spends more and is in debt, more work-hours are required to make ends meet ("Inside," 2008).

Consequently, parents today are reporting that there is not enough time to fulfill their many obligations, such as work, maintaining a family, and having a social life (Patten, 2015). Roughly 40 percent of mothers who work full-time report that they do not spend enough time with their children, while 55 percent of parents who work full-time "say they do not spend enough time

away from their children" (Patten, 2015). Parents are either spending too much or too little time with their kids, and it is likely that whichever end of the spectrum they are on, it is not by choice. This, in part, explains the American ideal about having smaller families today. Polls have indicated that throughout the last century, couples have wanted less children as time has progressed (Gao, 2015). For instance, in 1936, people reported that the ideal number of children to have was 3.6 (Gao, 2015). However, in 2013, the ideal number of children was 2.6 (Gao, 2015). Among the many reasons for wanting less children, people stated that they did not have the time or money to invest in as many children (Gao, 2015). They also said that having children would not allow them to advance in their careers (Gao, 2015). Regardless, having less children has not necessarily made things easier for families. Work and family life are becoming increasingly difficult for adults to balance, putting strain on what individuals can do with their time. This makes both work and family more stressful environments for people today.

Job-induced stress can be a problem for individuals who are not satisfied with their jobs. As it happens, more than half of employees throughout the nation are unhappy with their jobs (Backman, 2017). Finding an enjoyable job is becoming more rare as time progresses. Individuals today typically do not expect to like their jobs. There are a multitude of reasons for which people can be unsatisfied with their occupations. According to Maurie Backman (2017), writing for CNN, these reasons include dead-end jobs, negative company culture, unfair financial compensation or benefits, and unpleasant coworkers or supervisors. These workplace issues are fairly prevalent, explaining why it is common for people today to be dissatisfied with their work. The structural issues people face at work can affect their careers, as well as diminish their general sense of well-being (Backman, 2017).

Problems or triumphs at work typically do not vanish as soon as one leaves the workplace; this is referred to as spillover. Spillover is categorized as either positive or negative. It deals with the way "stress, emotions, or behaviors at work" can translate to the family context (Doumas, Margolin, & John, 2008, p. 56). Families stand to benefit from positive spillover and suffer from negative spillover. For instance, a study conducted by Heller and Watson (2005) found that higher levels of job satisfaction were linked to higher levels of marital satisfaction. On days in which family members experience negative social interactions at work, however, they are much less likely to interact with their families (Story & Repetti, 2006). Furthermore, interaction that does occur between family members is more likely to be negative (Story & Repetti, 2006). Another study found that fathers who had stressful, high-demanding jobs (and described negative spillover effects as a result of their jobs) had less knowledge of their children's activities (Bumpus, Crouter, & McHale, 2006). In other words, the fathers were less involved in their children's lives and had less of a say in what they did. Spillover can play a major role in work-life balance and stress management. More must be done to eradicate negative spillover and promote positive spillover.

One major figure that contributes to employee-spillover effects is the supervisor. Although there are many workplace factors that contribute to spillover, supervisors are especially important to examine because they can dictate the types of interactions that take place on their shifts. Supervisors can make being at work enjoyable regardless of other structural issues (i.e. being underpaid or having a dead-end job). However, as Backman (2017) asserted, one of the primary reasons employees are unsatisfied with their jobs is because of their supervisor. According to Martha White (2014), writing for *Time*, at least one in five people have their careers damaged by bad managers. A damaged career can be problematic for a number of

reasons—reasons that are more long-term in nature. However, a few bad days at work can just as easily spillover into the family setting and become the norm of interaction.

Supervisors who execute good leadership can increase the likelihood that positive spillover occurs for their subordinates. The way supervisors communicate with their subordinates has the potential to make organizations, and therefore employees, either successful or unproductive (Tepper, 2007). This is important for spillover because job satisfaction is linked to life satisfaction. Work is becoming increasingly more definitive of self-image; people often times define themselves based on their careers and how competent they are at doing their jobs. If supervisors can make their subordinates feel competent and valued on the job, they will feel good about the work they do and will be more likely to feel fulfilled in life. This is known as the Pygmalion effect and is described in an article by Livingston (2003).

Study Objective

It is important to examine the effects that the workplace can have on an individual's family life. Furthermore, it is essential to analyze the importance of the supervisor's role in creating professional environments that affect their subordinates, or employees. This research will examine three, broad elements of supervision. The first element is supervisor motivation and its effect on employees in both the work and family context. Although this study will not measure workplace outcomes, it is important to consider how job identity (and other feelings about one's job) can influence family functioning. Few, if any, studies have focused specifically on supervisor motivation as it translates to the family life of employees. In past research, supervisor motivation has been proven to be momentous to organizations and their employees (see Kotter, 2001; Goleman, 2004; Myers, Seibold, & Park, 2011; Nohria, Groysberg, & Lee, 2008). The current study is aimed at finding a positive correlation between supervisor motivation and

subordinate family closeness, satisfaction, and affection. The second element of focus is supervisor incivility and the way it affects employees and their families' closeness, satisfaction, and affection. Although there is a significant amount of research on the wide-ranging effects of workplace incivility, it is important to contrast it to motivation. While research has demonstrated the harm of incivility, the contrast will advance the need for incivility to cease. Furthermore, Leff's (1987) concept of rhetorical decorum/propriety will be used to discuss the importance of supervisor civility, or civic performance (see Hariman, 2010). Decorum is concerned with "the adaptive power of persuasive discourse;" it provides a standard for judging the quality messages (Leff, 1987, p. 48). Decorum should be applied to real-world situations to enhance them (Leff, 1987). Civic performance and decorum in the workplace will be discussed in greater detail in the second chapter.

Additionally, two theories will be used to examine spillover from work to family. The use of systems theory will frame the context of the current study, help predict and explain the findings of this research, and offer insight as to the way systems theory can benefit other fields of study. It is important to note that a system contains a multitude of interdependent factors that come together to create a unit (Galvin, Dickson, & Marrow, 2006). In other words, individuals' attitudes and behaviors are influenced by multiple people in multiple contexts. The family can be observed as one subsystem, while the workplace can be viewed as another subsystem. In the current study, the two subsystems will be treated as components that come together to form an overarching system of interaction between work and family life.

Systems theory has been called a "grand theory" by scholars in the field of communication because it allows researchers to examine the "enormous complexities" of individuals who form groups (Galvin et al., 2006, p. 311). Therefore, communication scholars have been able to easily

apply the theory to the way families operate. Communication and behavioral interaction in a family can be framed as acts that serve the system as a whole (Polkinghorne, 1983). The same can be said for the role of each member in a given system (Galvin et al., 2006). While there has been a plethora of research on family communication and systems theory, little research exists in terms of handling the workplace as a systematic dynamic that shapes the familial system.

To supplement systems theory, relational framing theory (RFT) will also be used to explore the roles of dominance and affiliation in the spillover literature. Relational framing theory deals with the way the relationship between people (i.e. the amount of dominance or affiliation that is present in the relationship) guides the way they communicate with each other (Solomon & McLaren, 2008). More specifically, it provides a scientific way of measuring how individuals process messages that are communicated to them in conversations (Solomon & McLaren, 2008). Relational framing theory explains the way people make inferences about words spoken in a conversation—words that indicate the goals of the person with whom they are speaking (Solomon & McLaren, 2008). These inferences are designed to make the conversation less ambiguous based on the relationship between the respective individuals (Solomon & McLaren, 2008).

Scholarly Rationale

This study can benefit research in three ways. First, it can add new insight to spillover literature with the addition and extension of motivation and incivility. For instance, the positive effects of motivation have been exclusively examined in organizations. Employees need to be motivated because it provides them with the mental energy they need to solve problems, achieve, and overcome obstacles at work (Kotter, 2001; Goleman, 2004). While studies have proven the importance of motivation in the workplace, few have examined whether workplace motivation

can affect employees outside of the workplace. Thus, this study will attempt to extend spillover literature by including supervisor motivation as it affects their employees in a family setting. This can make spillover more comprehensive as an area of inquiry, and thus, make it better understood.

In terms of examining incivility, the current study can add to spillover literature. Research has already begun to study the negative effects of workplace incivility on families (see Ferguson, 2012; Lim & Lee 2011). However, this is a relatively new application of incivility; therefore, it is necessary to further analyze workplace incivility in the context of familial implications (Schilpzand, Pater, & Erez, 2014). By including incivility in this research and contrasting it to motivation, spillover can be more simply understood. Positive spillover will be represented by supervisor motivation, while negative spillover will be represented by supervisor incivility. This will potentially open the door for future research to apply other verbal and nonverbal communicative tactics (i.e. encouraging, smiling, or eye-rolling) to spillover literature. Many minute components of communication can cause spillover, and they can be tested in future studies. This leads to the second reason for conducting this study—connecting the fields of interpersonal and organizational communication.

There is a growing need to combine interpersonal communication and organizational communication. Researchers have mostly handled them as two separate fields. However, Myers (2010) argues that interpersonal communication can be used to explain and understand organizational communication. For instance, assimilation into the organizational culture can be more challenging for employees than learning the technical components of a new job (Myers, 2005). For this reason, it is not enough for supervisors to train new workers to develop job competency (Myers, 2010). New employees must also form relationships with others to

"improve performance, enhance the quality of work life, and become foundational in the organizing process" (Myers, 2010, p. 149). Workplace relationships can impact the light in which employees view their work (Myers, 2010; Myers, Seibold, & Park, 2011). If their relationships are positive, it is likely they will view their work as such. Consequently, it is important to study the way employees form interpersonal connections that cause them to become assimilated into their workplace cultures (Myers, 2010). Examining the workplace in this way is necessary for studying spillover. Understanding spillover requires understanding workplace relationships, self-esteem, and self-efficacy as they pertain to organizational identities.

This study will combine both fields (interpersonal and organizational) of communication by examining the interpersonal processes that supervisors use to create spillover in their employees' family lives. Motivation, incivility, and dominance/affiliation are specific, interpersonal tactics that supervisors employ that affect perceived employee-levels of workplace assimilation. For this study, spillover can only be understood after employees' perceptions of their workplace environment are examined. However, exploring subordinates' perceptions of their workplace environment requires examining the way their supervisors interpersonally facilitate that process. By using the aforementioned interpersonal elements to gain insight into the way organizational structures are formed, this research is furthering Myers's (2010) suggestion to bridge the two fields of communication.

Finally, this research will combine RFT and systems theory to examine spillover. These theories have not been used together to explain spillover. Connecting these theories will advance spillover literature in two ways. First, it will provide a framework for studying it. There is currently no theoretical framework for spillover. Past research has not used theories to better understand and explain spillover. It has simply used daily occurrences to determine what types

of interactions cause spillover (see Doumas, Margolin, & John, 2008; Heller & Watson, 2005; Story & Repetti, 2006; Bumpus, Crouter, & McHale, 2006). Using RFT will allow scholars to examine the way subordinates process messages they receive from their supervisors. Researchers can then code messages as either positive or negative spillover based on whether the message is categorized as one of dominance or affiliation. Second, and more simply, it will officially place spillover in the context of a system. In large part, spillover can be viewed as one of many factors that influences the family as a system. Moreover, spillover is the product of two, interconnected subsystems.

Practical Rationale

This research is also important to consider for its real-world applications. The current study is useful for employees, as awareness of this issue can help them and their families. Employees who have an adequate understanding of spillover, particularly negative spillover, have a better chance of preventing negative spillover from occurring in their families. They can potentially change their outlook on the way they view their family members when they get home from work. Treating the home as a safe haven from their work can make them more appreciative of their families. This research can provide employees with a positive perspective about home and family life. It can improve their attitudes if their jobs and supervisors cause them significant stress. With a heightened awareness of negative spillover, employees may want to ensure that they are protecting their families from negative interactions at work.

Although this study only collects data from employees, it carries implications for the families of employees as well. Their awareness of spillover can constitute an enhanced understanding of what their family member is experiencing. Thus, families can do things to help their family members reduce stress that is caused by work. They can attempt to make the home a

safe haven once again, as Baruch, Biener, and Barnett (1987) described it. Additionally parents

can talk to their children about spillover. This can ensure that the children are informed about

spillover effects so that they are less likely to take negative spillover personally. Parents can also

talk to their children to find out how they are handling it. If parents are aware that their children

may be struggling with spillover, they can address those issues to diminish any negative effects.

In an ideal situation, the parents of children can work to make sure children do not experience

negative spillover.

Perhaps most importantly, supervisors can gain an awareness of their behavior and

interactional tendencies at work. As Livingston (2003) stated, supervisors can shape their

subordinates' perceptions of themselves for years to come just by the way they convey

expectations. Supervisors have the power and the ability to mold their young subordinates into

productive, confident people both in and out of the context of work. Motivation and affiliation

are important tools that supervisors can use to accomplish this. This study can show supervisors

that their interactive tendencies as workplace leaders matter more than they know. If supervisors

are encouraging, and communicate competently and ethically toward their subordinates, they can

make a difference in their organizations. Moreover, they can enhance the lives of subordinates

and their families by creating a positive atmosphere at work. The current study can necessitate

awareness on the part of supervisors everywhere—awareness that their actions can partially

dictate family life, and thus, society.

Preview of Thesis

The thesis will begin by establishing a context for the study in chapter two. In this

chapter, the literature review will present systems theory and spillover research. Following that,

chapter two will be broken down into three sections of supervisor leadership. The first section

will be motivation, followed by incivility, followed by dominance/affiliation. Rhetorical decorum and civic performance will be discussed under incivility, while RFT will be used in the dominance/affiliation section. In the third chapter, the methodology of the current study will be provided. This will examine the participants, procedure, and measures used in the current study. Chapter four will present the descriptive statistics and findings of the study. Finally, the thesis will conclude in chapter five by summarizing the main findings, examining the theoretical and practical implications of the findings, discussing the limitations of the study, and offering suggestions for future research.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

This literature review will consist of three, major sections. The review will begin with an overview of systems theory, as this is the primary theory that will be used to frame the findings of the current study. In this section, the major assumptions of the theory will be discussed. Additionally, the historical roots of systems theory will be explored, along with its specific applications that demonstrate the way the theory has been used in past research. Second, research on spillover from the workplace to family life will be introduced. This section will be divided into two parts—negative and positive spillover. It should be noted that negative spillover has been researched far more than positive spillover (Wang & Repetti, 2013). Nevertheless, positive spillover is of equal importance to scholarship, and it is of practical concern to enhance both the workplace and the family.

The final section of the literature review will examine three elements of supervisor communication. For this section, the elements of importance are motivation, incivility, and dominance/affiliation. The review will discuss the outcomes of each of these three communicative components as they affect employees at work. Rhetorical decorum and civic

performance will be discussed to establish a need for supervisor civility in the workplace. Additionally, relational framing theory (RFT) will be examined as a framework that can be used to understand dominance and affiliation in supervisor-subordinate relationships.

Systems Theory

Systems theory is important because it distinguishes the study of individuals from the study of individuals within a particular group. A system can be defined as interrelated parts that work together to form a whole (Galvin, Dickson, & Marrow, 2006). Thus, when individuals form relationships with each other, they create something that is larger and more complicated than everybody who is in the group, or system (Galvin et al., 2006). Studying a holistic system, then, is vastly different from studying the individuals that comprise a particular group. Therefore, there is a different set of assumptions that is made about social systems.

Assumptions. Systems theory presents seven major assumptions about the dynamics that exist in every system (Galvin et al., 2006). The first assumption is that interdependence exists among all of the members in a given group. If one component of the system changes, the system is impacted and changes in some way. The primary focus of each system is on each of the members that make up the system (Galvin et al., 2006). Therefore, the state of the system is dependent upon each individual in the system in terms of overall family functioning (Rogers, 2008).

Second, according to Galvin et al. (2006), systems contain the element of wholeness. The entire group is characterized by all of the interactions that occur within it. Each intricate interaction within a family can be conceptualized as an ingredient that gives the family their holistic identity. For instance, siblings may tease each other, while parents may argue with one another. Galvin et al. (2006) uses the analogy of a cake to explain wholeness. A cake has many

ingredients that go into it in order for the cake to take the form of a cake. Likewise, families have patterns of communication with each other that, when combined, give themselves characteristics that distinguish them from other families. In every system, each interaction that takes place is possible only because the parts of the system are interacting together. If a part of the system were to be removed or replaced by another part, the end product (wholeness) would be a different one, making a different system (Whitchurch & Constantine, 1993).

The third assumption of every system is that there are patterns, or regularities that are observable and predictable (Galvin et al., 2006). These patterns give a system, such as the family, order. Although systems undoubtedly face and experience change (Hoffman, 1990; Yerby, 1995), these patterns generally manage the behavior of every member in the system—that is—until change occurs, at which point, new regularities are established. Change is important for scholars who use systems theory as a lens to do their research. Relationships within a system change frequently due to developmental changes of members, as well as events that take place that can either positively or negatively affect the way a family operates and copes with one another (Yerby, 1995).

The fourth assumption of systems is that there is interactive complexity among their members (Galvin et al., 2006). This is the idea that one component of the system cannot explain the state of the system. One component's state is based on the state or action of other components. A single member of a system, or a single event or interaction cannot be observed in isolation. Other members, events, and interactions that are in the system help to explain why things take place in any given system. Duncan and Rock (1993) stated that it is useless to place blame on a member of a system for an event that happens; all members contribute to creating the event. Galvin et al. (2006) used the example of a married couple that engages in the demand-

withdraw pattern. It can be said that one spouse withdraws because the other demands.

Likewise, it can be said that the spouse that demands does so because the other withdraws. This

demonstrates that it is pointless to place blame on one member. Rather, more can be gained by

examining the current patterns of interactions within a system to determine underlying issues

(Galvin et al., 2006).

Fifth, there is a degree of openness in every system to accommodate change (Galvin et al.,

2006). Boundaries are important to consider when studying a system. There are boundaries that

exist both within the system, as well as those that exist that separate the system from its

surrounding environment and larger social system (i.e. the ecosystem, politics, religion,

education, institutions, etc.). While boundaries are present, openness must exist within a system

for topics relevant to the entire system. Openness allows for systems to grow in times of change

and struggle.

The sixth assumption of systems theory is that a series of complex relationships exists

within each system (Galvin et al., 2006). For instance, alliances and coalitions can be formed

between/among certain members of the system. When two people in a system experience

tension with one another, it is common for a third member to become involved in their dyad—

making a triad—to relieve the tension between them. Generational dynamics also serve as a

traditional example of the complexity that is present in families. Generally speaking, members

of the same generation are closer than they would be with a member from another generation.

Older generations typically have more power within the system as well. However, today, it is

becoming more common for younger generations to have more power within their systems

because of events like immigration and technological advancement. In these cases, older

generations within systems are more reliant on younger generations to learn or adapt to these

changes.

Finally, the seventh assumption of every system is the presence of equifinality (Galvin et al., 2006). Each system has an ultimate goal toward which they are working. While different systems often times have the same goal, the means they use to obtain that goal may be different (Littlejohn, 2002). Furthermore, in terms of reaching goals, the starting position of systems when they begin working toward goals can vary (Galvin et al., 2006). For example, some systems may be closer to reaching a goal than others when they start working toward a particular end. Thus, their road to obtaining the end is less rigorous and long.

Origins and applications. The most common application of systems theory is to the family (Galvin et al., 2006). In fact, systems theory was so influential when it was introduced, that a majority of modern family communication scholars have adopted a systems-based perspective in their approach (Whitchurch & Dickson, 1999). In one of its earliest applications, the theory was used for family therapy (Bateson, Jackson, Haley, & Weakland, 1956; Rogers, 2001). For instance, rather than examining family members separately, therapists would focus on "the holistic nature of interaction patterns" within the family (Galvin et al., 2006, p. 310). This was a popular framework for professionals (i.e. family therapists and doctors) to practically help families outside of an academic context (Rogers, 2001). Systems theory allowed for the examination of the way group processes emerged and occurred in families (Galvin et al., 2006). Moreover, it established that individual members of groups are united—for better or worse—by the way they communicate with one another (Mabry, 1999).

Systems theory has been used to study many elements of family communication. In an article by Olson (2000), the Circumplex Model was used to explore the family as a system. Designed to give the theory a more practical purpose, the Circumplex Model focuses on three

components that occur in systems--cohesion, flexibility, and communication. Cohesion, the most important of the three, refers to the level of emotional bonding that occurs within a system. In terms of cohesion, systems generally fall into one of four categories—disengaged, separated, connected, or enmeshed. Separated and connected types of cohesion are more moderate, or balanced in nature, while disengaged and enmeshed types are more extreme, or unbalanced. Olson (2000) claimed that systems that are cohesively balanced are more functional than systems that are cohesively unbalanced. Moderate amounts of cohesion allow individuals in the system to form attachments with each other. Moderation simultaneously allows them to have the independence to fulfill their personal interests. The level of cohesion that is present in a system can be a good indicator of the way a system operates due to the relationships that exist within the system.

Systems theory has been used to gain insight into relational dynamics within a system. In a study conducted by Ferguson and Dickson (1995), children's attitudes toward their single-parents' dating tendencies were explored. Children displayed a positive attitude when their parent was transparent about dating, while they felt more excluded if they were unaware of the situation. Moreover, children wanted a chance to express the way they felt about their parent dating; they wanted a say in the system, so to speak. Another study examined the way attachment styles of spouses affected their family system (Mikulincer, Florian, Cowan, & Cowan, 2002). For instance, the article stated that parents who are securely attached to each other make it much more likely that their children will form secure attachments towards them, their siblings, and their peers. The same is true for insecure attachments between spouses. Another study examined the presence of children in parent conversations (Belsky & Volling, 1987). It was found that spouses were less satisfied with their interactions when their children

were present. These studies demonstrate that individuals in systems are dependent on other

individuals in their system in terms of well-being and functioning.

Other studies have used systems theory to examine negative occurrences in families such

as child abuse, domestic violence, mental illness, and unhealthy marriages (Galvin et al., 2006).

For example, in a study conducted by Marks, Glaser, Glass, and Horne (2001), the researchers

wanted to determine the psychological effects of witnessing marital discord on children. The

findings indicated that children who witnessed marital discord were more likely to develop

behavioral issues, as well as demonstrate more socially inept behavior than children who did not

witness marital discord. Children who witness and experience domestic violence at home are

much more likely to be abused themselves, as well as develop emotional and behavioral

problems (Holt, Buckley, & Whelan, 2008). However, if children have a strong connection with

a caring adult (i.e. their mothers), then the trauma of witnessing and experiencing abuse can be

diminished (Holt et al., 2008). These studies demonstrate the way negative occurrences in the

family system affect individuals within the system.

To conclude, systems theory is concerned with a broad viewpoint of communication. It

seeks to understand individual behaviors and communicative patterns based on the way the entire

system operates. Systems theory argues that behaviors cannot be understood with an isolated

point of view. Rather, other parts of the system must be taken into account to explain or

understand interactions and actions of those within a given system. Systems theory makes seven

major assumptions about systems. In every system, there is interdependence, wholeness,

observable patterns/regularities, interactive complexities, openness, complex relationships, and

equifinality. Although there are varying degrees of these seven components in each system, they

are, nevertheless, present. This is seen in the studies that have been conducted using a

systematic lens to view family behavior and outcomes.

The point of systems theory is that there are more drivers at play than meet the eye. Examining behavior involves observing the many drivers in the system. Thus, systems theory can be used as a way to frame and better understand the concept of spillover, which is discussed in detail in the following section. When looking at spillover—a phenomenon that conjoins the two subsystems of work and family—through a systems theory lens, the system acquires an added complexity. The family exists as one subsystem, and the workplace exists as another. While they both affect each other, the current study is only concerned with the way work affects family. In examining spillover, systems theory can be used to analyze each of those realms as two subsystems that work together to form an overarching, more complex system. In this system, one subsystem can be affected by the interactions and events that occur in the other subsystem; this is spillover. Spillover is a link between the two systems. Behavior that occurs at home can, in part, be understood by applying a systems perspective to occurrences at work.

Spillover

This section will review research that has been done on spillover. Specifically, it will examine spillover that occurs from work to family, not family to work. Though, it is important to note that research has been conducted on spillover from family to the workplace. It is also important to note that the existing literature on spillover is provided in the context of work and family; spillover is not present in other areas of academic research. Spillover is concerned with the way jobs can affect workers' "cognitions, mood, and physiology, and carry over into the home by shaping the way workers interact with their family members" (Wang & Repetti, 2013, p. 410). In this section, the causes of spillover will be identified, as well as family outcomes that result from workplace phenomena. The spillover section will be broken up into two sections—

positive spillover and negative spillover. A substantial amount of negative spillover can be attributed to incivility at the workplace, which will be discussed in detail later in chapter two.

Negative spillover. There are many characteristics of work that can negatively affect the families of employees. One factor that is loosely connected to the way couples view their marriage is the number of hours that they spend at work each week (Wang & Repetti, 2013). Couples who work many hours in a week are more likely to report being less involved with their families (Grzywacz, Almeida, & McDonald, 2002). However, there is something that matters even more than the number of hours worked per week. According to Barnett (2006) and Presser (2005), families with one family member working evening or night shifts can be significantly disruptive to family time and functioning. However, if working family members voluntarily choose to work night shifts, then negative family effects are much less likely to occur (Staines & Pleck, 1983). Therefore, if family members are powerless in crafting their work schedules, negative spillover is much more likely to occur.

Another factor that can cause negative spillover is work-related mental depletion, or job exhaustion (Kinnunen, Feldt, Geurts, & Pulkkinen, 2006; Doumas, Margolin, & John, 2008). When workers feel depleted by their jobs, it becomes more likely that they will be less involved with their families (Wang & Repetti, 2013). Consequently, a number of issues can rise that result from a lack of involvement. One of the main issues is that the workers are simply less aware of their family members' activities (Wang & Repetti, 2013). In a study conducted by Bumpus, Crouter, and McHale (1999), both parents were less aware of their children's experiences and whereabouts when the father had a high-demanding job. In another study, it was found that fathers were less familiar with their adolescent children when they reported significant amounts of negative spillover from work to family (Bumpus, Crouter, & McHale,

2006). A lack of parental knowledge has been linked to higher rates of child-delinquency (Wang & Repetti, 2013).   Thus, when parents are unable to spend time with their families due to work exhaustion, the likelihood of having familial issues increases.

Significant levels of job stress can also cause negative spillover, as it is correlated with social withdrawal and negative engagement (Wang & Repetti, 2013). More specifically, significant job stressors affect families differently based on gender, well-being of the worker and family members, and the disposition of family members (Repetti & Saxbe, 2009). In other words, the factors mentioned above can dictate how well a family deals with a family member who experiences work-related stress. For instance, looking at gender, husbands reported that the interactions they had at work were often times predictive of the interactions they would later have at home that day (Repetti & Saxbe, 2009). However, wives reported that their interactions at work were not predictive of the interactions they would later have that day (Repetti & Saxbe, 2009). Wang and Repetti (2013) provide another example of the way familial factors predict the way families handle stress. Families with children in grade school were more likely to experience negative effects after their parents' workdays. Additionally, fathers who scored low on the trait, neuroticism, were more likely to withdraw from their families, while fathers who scored high on neuroticism were more likely to negatively interact with their families (Wang & Repetti, 2013). Thus, well-being can be a determining factor of how well families deal with negative spillover and job stressors (Wang & Repetti, 2013).

Negative spillover can also be a product of bad interactions with supervisors. In a study conducted by Hoobler and Brass (2006), it was found that employees who were treated with hostility by their supervisors were much more likely to communicate with hostility toward their families after work. The displaced anger exhibited by employees can, in part, be explained by

the differences in power; supervisors undoubtedly have more power than their employees. In a

relationship in which power is equal (i.e. coworkers), negative reciprocity is a common

occurrence (Tepper & Almeda, 2012). Negative reciprocity is the idea that if one individual is

unkind or rude to another individual, the other individual will reciprocate that behavior (Tepper

& Almeda, 2012). However, when subordinates are psychologically harmed by their supervisor,

they are unlikely to reciprocate that behavior (Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2006). This is explained

by Emerson's (1962) power-dependence theory, which states that power and dependence are

inversely related. If one individual is reliant on another individual for valued resources, negative

reciprocity is much less likely to occur due to the fear of losing access to those resources (Molm,

1988; Aquino et al., 2006). Consequently, when employees feel that they are unable to bring

balance to negative interactions with their supervisors, it becomes more likely that they will

displace their anger and frustration to somewhere in which the power dynamic allows it. With

many employees, their families are one of these outlets. This occurrence is also discussed later

in the literature review as a way of understanding incivility.

Positive spillover. Although positive spillover is researched far less than negative

spillover, research shows that positive experiences at work can have beneficial effects on family

life (Wang & Repetti, 2013). With positive spillover, elements of one role transfer to another

role (Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair, & Shafiro, 2005). One factor of positive spillover is

employee perception of job satisfaction. In a study conducted by Heller and Watson (2005), it

was found that "job satisfaction in the afternoon was associated with higher levels of marital

satisfaction in the evening" (p. 413). In other words, when employees felt good about their work

on a particular day, they were more likely to feel good about their marriages when they returned

home from work. If people enjoy their work, they are more likely to be fulfilled in other areas of

life. The take-away of positive spillover seems to be job satisfaction, which is supported by

Kinnunen and colleagues (2006). Kinnunen and colleagues (2006) found that individuals who

had greater well-being at work were more likely to have pleasant interactions with their families

after their workdays than those who had lower levels of well-being at work.

Self-efficacy and work-family facilitation have also been proven to cause positive spillover

in families (Wang & Repetti, 2013; van Steenbergen, Ellemers, & Mooijaart, 2007). These

factors contribute to general job satisfaction. van Steenbergen and colleagues (2007) found that

workers who took on multiple roles in their organizations were more likely to experience

positive spillover in their families. They mentioned a few reasons for this. First, having multiple

roles can enhance self-efficacy and well-being. Second, if one role is getting stressful, another

role can serve as a buffer for the stressful role. Finally, if one role is going well, this can transfer

over into performance in other roles. Thus, having multiple roles at work seems to enhance job

satisfaction, which then benefits the family. This is reflective of the enhancement hypothesis,

which states that "the more roles one occupies, the more resources one has, leading to increased

opportunities for energy to be recharged through enhanced self-esteem" (Hammer et al., 2005, p.

141).

Positive spillover has also been negatively linked to depression (Hammer et al., 2005). In

Hammer and colleagues' (2005) study, they found that positive spillover has a strong correlation

to decreased depression. Their study was inspired by the studies mentioned below. In a study

conducted by Grzywacz (2000), it was found that employed individuals who reported positive

spillover from work to family were more likely to have better mental health and well-being than

employed individuals who reported less positive spillover. Another study found a similar effect

for adult daughters who cared for their elderly parents (Stephens, Franks, & Atienza, 1997). If

they reported positive spillover from work to caregiving, then they were more likely to have good mental health. These studies suggest that people who experience positive spillover in their lives are much more likely to have better mental health than individuals who do not experience positive spillover.

If people feel rewarded by the work that they do, positive spillover is more likely to occur. In a study conducted by Barnett, Marshall, and Sayer (1992), it was found that job-reward factors can enhance mother-child relationships for mothers who are employed. The impetus for this research was that employed mothers were more likely to have turbulent relationships with their children if the mothers experienced psychological distress. Past research demonstrated, however, that if mothers had rewarding jobs, they were less likely to experience psychological distress (Barnett et al., 1992). The main finding of Barnett and colleagues (1992) was that challenging work made parenting less stressful for mothers, and thus, enhanced their relationships with their children. When they were able to overcome difficult tasks at work, it made their jobs more rewarding, causing positive spillover in their families.

To conclude, spillover is concerned with the way feelings from work can transfer over to family life or vice versa. Again, the current study is only concerned with the way work affects family, not the way family affects work. There are two types of spillover—negative and positive. There are many things that can cause negative spillover from work to family, including job burnout, general job dissatisfaction, a lack of autonomy in scheduling, working extensive hours, and negative interactions with coworkers and supervisors. These workplace effects can have negative effects on families. Effects can include increased destructive conflict, social withdrawal, child delinquency, and a lack of awareness about other family members. Positive spillover, however, is beneficial and indicates that things are going well at work and home. The

main component that causes positive spillover is job satisfaction. When people enjoy their work and find it fulfilling, it increases the likelihood of positive spillover occurring. Moreover, when people are challenged at work and have multiple roles, positive spillover is more likely to happen because they feel valued. Consequently, their feeling of value and worth transfers over to family interactions. People who report positive spillover in their lives generally have greater well-being than those who do not report it. While there are many factors that contribute to the type of spillover that occurs from the workplace to the family, one of the most important factors is the supervisor, and their ability or inability to lead subordinates. Supervisors have the power to make work either rewarding or unpleasant.

Supervisor Leadership

This section of the literature review will examine three components of supervisor leadership. The first one is motivation. Specifically, the section will discuss primitive motivation, why motivation is important for workers, and useful strategies that supervisors can implement into their leadership styles to motivate their subordinates. The second component of supervisor leadership that will be discussed is incivility. To begin this section, the origins/nature of incivility as an area of study will be discussed. Next, the negative effects of incivility will be addressed, as it impacts both employees and organizations (Walsh et al., 2012; Schilpzand et al., 2014). After incivility effects are discussed, the review will shift to examining supervisor incivility. Finally, this section will end with a discussion of rhetorical decorum and civic performance in the workplace; this will practically necessitate supervisor civility. These concepts will also be used to examine the ideal role of the supervisor. The third and final component that will be examined in this section is dominance/affiliation. Relational framing theory (RFT) will be used to guide this discussion. At the end of each of these three subsections,

a synthesis leading into the hypotheses of the current study will be presented.

  Motivation. Motivation is important to employees, and therefore, organizational success (Nohria, Groysberg, & Lee, 2008). It is defined as "the forces either internal or external to a person that arouse enthusiasm and persistence to pursue a certain course of action" (Daft, 2015, p. 226). One of the most challenging tasks that supervisors face is getting employees to do their best work (Nohria et al., 2008). Workers must be motivated to do their work because motivation provides them with the mental energy they need to solve problems, achieve, and overcome obstacles they face at work (Kotter, 2001; Goleman, 2004). Good leaders are those who motivate those around them (Kotter, 2001; Goleman, 2004). Without intrinsic motivation, employees are not likely to do their best work. Before examining motivation in the workplace, however, it is important to understand it at its most fundamental level (Nohria et al., 2008).

  According to Nohria et al. (2008), humans have four basic drives that underlie motivation. Each of these drives is equal in terms of importance, and they are independent of each other (Nohria et al., 2008). The first is the drive to acquire. Individuals want to acquire "scarce goods that bolster their sense of well-being" (Nohria et al., 2008, p. 134). Such goods include water, food, shelter, clothes, and money. When these objects are acquired, people are satisfied; when they are not, people are disgruntled. The second drive is the drive to bond. This involves forming meaningful relationships with others, as well as being a part of a group or organization. When the drive to bond is met, people experience positive, healthy emotions. When it is not met, people experience negative, detrimental emotions.

  The third basic drive that underlies motivation, according to Nohria et al. (2008), is the drive to comprehend. People have a need to make sense of the world around them. Thus, when people are unable to make sense of occurrences, they become frustrated and work hard to find

the answers. Furthermore, people want to make contributions to groups. When they are unable to do this, they often times leave the group and seek another group that will give them a better opportunity to contribute. The fourth and final drive that underlies human motivation is the drive to defend (Nohria et al., 2008). This drive entails defending belongings, family and friends, ideas, and beliefs. It can also take the appearance of doing things to foster justice. When individuals successfully defend, they get a sense of security and self-assurance. When the drive to defend is not met, however, people experience negative emotions such as anxiety and resentment.

Supervisors must know how to fulfill the four drives of their subordinates if they are to effectively motivate them at work (Nohria et al., 2008). Furthermore, fulfilling all four drives—as opposed to one or two—is proven to significantly improve an organization in terms of profit (Nohria et al., 2008). Companies that stand at the fiftieth percentile (relative to other companies' profits) moved to the eighty-eighth percentile when management focused on fulfilling all four needs of their employees (Nohria et al., 2008). However, when companies at the fiftieth percentile only focused on improving one drive of their employees, they only rose to the fifty-sixth percentile (Nohria et al., 2008). Thus, supervisors who have a firm grasp on fulfilling all four drives help their employees, as well as their organizations.

Motivational tactics for supervisors. Based on Nohria et al.'s (2008) discussion of the four basic drives of humans, there are strategies that supervisors can employ to motivate their subordinates at the workplace. In terms of providing motivation for subordinates, one of the most important things a supervisor can do is recognize and reward good work (Myers, Seibold, & Park, 2011; Kotter, 2001). Receiving recognition provides employees with a feeling of acceptance in an organization (Myers et al., 2011). When workers in organizations feel

accepted, they are fulfilling the drive to form bonds with others. For instance, in a study

conducted by Myers and Oetzel (2003), participants revealed that receiving positive feedback

from a supervisor was rewarding because they knew that their contributions were valued.

Getting positive feedback from a respected supervisor can have lasting, positive effects on job

satisfaction, motivation at work, and job performance (Myers et al., 2011). Nohria et al. (2008)

would also argue that receiving recognition serves as a means for fulfilling the drive to acquire.

Getting recognized for good work is one component of a quality reward system, whereby good

work is differentiated from average work (Nohria et al., 2008). Therefore, receiving recognition

for good work is an efficient form of leadership. It seems to fulfill two drives at once, and it

does not consume time and resources from the organization.

Another way supervisors can motivate their subordinates is by simply forming positive

relationships with them. Creating a positive organizational culture is a valuable way for

supervisors to fulfill each of their subordinate's need to bond with others (Nohria et al., 2008).

Bono and Yoon (2012) stated that supervisors who form positive relationships with their

subordinates make it much more likely that their subordinates will form positive relationships

with each other. Thus, a culture of positive working relationships is created. This allows

employees in the organization to "feel empowered, have intrinsic motivation, have increased

well-being, and have increased innovation and creativity" (Bono & Yoon, 2012, p. 44). With a

positive network at the workplace, subordinates enjoy their work more, and they perform their

tasks with a higher level of skill and dedication.

Another thing that supervisors can do to motivate their subordinates is ensure that everyone

is working with a purpose (Nohria et al., 2008). Employees must feel that what they are doing

for the company is important. Therefore, supervisors must design jobs in a way that allows their

subordinates to make organizational contributions (Nohria et al., 2008). When supervisors

design jobs/tasks for their subordinates, they should do so in a way that aligns all employees with

the organization's vision. According to Kotter (2001), alignment involves getting everyone in

the organization working toward the same end. For alignment to happen, supervisors must

clearly communicate the organization's vision, as well as each employee's role in reaching the

vision (Kotter, 2001). This way, everything employees do is contributing to the betterment of

the organization. When employees know what they should be working toward and why they are

doing their tasks, it fulfills the drive to comprehend their place in the organization (Nohria et al.,

2008). To fulfill this drive for subordinates, supervisors should design "jobs that are meaningful,

interesting, and challenging" (Nohria et al., 2008, p. 137).

Other important motivational tactics that supervisors can use involves being transparent

with employees and emphasizing fairness for all workers (Nohria et al., 2008). This would also

include empowering employees in organizations; they should not feel powerless relative to

higher-ups in the company (Kotter, 2001). A sense of collective empowerment can benefit

organizations and employees in a couple of ways (Hassan, Mahsud, Yukl, & Prussia, 2013).

First, it can motivate them to face inevitable change that occurs at work without fearing harsh

reprimands from superiors (Kotter, 2001; Hassan et al., 2013). Second, when subordinates are

made aware of the *whys* behind the method of operation, they are more likely to be committed to

making the organization better (Hassan et al., 2013). When supervisors are transparent, fair, and

empowering, they fulfill their subordinates' drive to defend (Nohria et al., 2008). Furthermore, it

creates an organizational culture of trust (Nohria et al., 2008).

Motivation is momentous in organizations and is something that all competent supervisors

have the ability to do (Goleman, 2004; Kotter, 2001). Supervisors must demonstrate to their

subordinates that they are motivated by more than external rewards; they must be motivated by

the satisfaction of achievement (Goleman, 2004). Motivation starts with supervisors. If they are

able to exude energy and passion with the way they lead, it becomes contagious and causes

everyone to become more passionate and committed (Goleman, 2004). Organizations that are

lacking in passion and commitment are less successful than those with passion and commitment

(Goleman, 2004). It is important to examine such a culture to demonstrate why the absence of

motivation is detrimental to organizations and their employees. To do this, the literature review

will discuss incivility in the workplace after the first set of hypotheses is presented.

    Synthesis and motivation hypotheses. The workplace and family can be viewed as two

subsystems that influence each other and thus, are part of a larger system. In terms of this study

and previous research on positive spillover, occurrences at home can partially be attributed to

occurrences at the workplace (Wang & Repetti, 2013). Similarly, the state of things at home can

partially be attributed to the state of things at work (Wang & Repetti, 2013). Incidents at home

should not be viewed in isolation (see Galvin et al., 2006); the workplace should be one of the

elements that is accounted for in terms of explaining and understanding family communication.

For this reason, spillover provides a suitable link between the two subsystems. In particular,

positive spillover can connect job satisfaction to families that function well with each other.

Based on the literature presented for positive spillover, it evidently has a positive effect on

individual well-being (Heller & Watson, 2005; Kinnunen et al., 2006). Spillover literature states

that job satisfaction is important for positive spillover to occur in families. People who feel

fulfilled and rewarded by the work that they do are much more likely to experience positive

spillover (Livingston, 2003). Supervisors who effectively motivate their subordinates make their

jobs rewarding (Myers et al., 2011; Nohria et al., 2008). They give them the drive to succeed in

their work and help the organization. This is fulfilling for subordinates. However, research has

not specifically examined motivation as it pertains to spillover between the two subsystems.

Therefore, the current study makes the following hypotheses about motivation and positive

spillover:

H1(a): Perceived supervisor motivation is positively correlated to subordinate family

closeness.

H1(b): Perceived supervisor motivation is positively correlated to subordinate family

satisfaction.

H1(c): Perceived supervisor motivation is positively correlated to subordinate family

warmth/affection.

Incivility. Workplace incivility is a fairly new area of research in the realm of workplace

behaviors; it was first introduced to scholarship in the late 1990s (Schilpzand, De Pater, & Erez,

2014). Incivility is defined as "low-intensity deviant workplace behavior with an ambiguous

intent to harm" (Schilpzand et al., 2014, p. S57). Thus, incivility is often times very subtle.

People who are behaving with incivility are not always aware that they are doing so. When

uncivil behaviors occur, they are very likely to be reciprocated, causing a spiral of incivility to

take place, which can form a culture of incivility (Anderson & Pearson, 1999). This makes

incivility a fairly common occurrence in the workplace. Porath and Pearson (2013) estimated

that 98 percent of employees experience incivility at work, while 50 percent of employees

experience incivility on a weekly basis. Abject remarks, ignoring or interrupting others, and

speaking in a condescending manner are all examples of incivility (Porath & Pearson, 2009).

The fact that these acts are labeled as "low-intensity" also explains the reason for which they

occur with such frequency. However, these low-intensity, negative interactions have been

shown to have costly effects on organizations and employee well-being (Schilpzand et al., 2014).

General effects of incivility. The effects of experiencing incivility are negative and wide-ranging. One of the most common effects of experiencing incivility is quitting one's job (Walsh et al., 2012). The literature refers to this as turnover intentions. Research has shown that incivility prompts individuals to seek employment elsewhere (Schilpzand et al., 2014). As such, incivility harms individual workers, as well as organizations in which incivility is a commonality. It is estimated that the annual cost of incivility per employee is $14,000 due to work delays and distractions that it causes (Schilpzand et al., 2014). Furthermore, if organizations have high turnover rates, they are forced to spend money on hiring and training a multitude of new employees. Organizations that have a culture of civility are able to use tens of thousands of dollars to improve the quality of their companies, rather than spend it on new workers who are likely to quit shortly after being hired and trained.

Experiencing incivility has also been linked to other individual, job-related factors. For instance, those who experience incivility typically have a low level of job satisfaction (Walsh et al., 2012; Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001), which may partially explain turnover intentions. Studies have also shown that incivility can decrease employees' levels of job-involvement and organizational commitment (Cortina et al., 2001; Lim & Teo, 2009). When workers feel that they are being treated unfairly at work, they are less likely to be dedicated workers. Tepper and Almeda (2012) further asserted that if workers are in an uncivil environment, they are likely to engage in organizational sabotage to get back at their company. However, assuming that workers are still dedicated despite experiencing incivility, the quality of the work they do can still be hindered. In a study conducted by Porath and Erez (2007), job-performance was also shown to be negatively affected by incivility. The study also found that

workers who experienced incivility were less helpful in terms of assisting other employees with their work. Thus, the literature shows that the presence of incivility in an organization makes it less functional, as workers are not unified in bettering the company. Rather, individual workers are more interested in protecting and defending themselves due to the tense, interpersonal environment.

Experiencing incivility at work can affect individuals outside of the workplace as well. For instance, in general, those who experience incivility at work have increased emotional labor in their lives, and thus, are more likely to be emotionally exhausted (Adams & Webster, 2013; Kern & Grandey, 2009). They spend a great deal of time trying to avoid or fix uncivil behavior, which is mentally taxing. Moreover, people who experience incivility at work have been found to have more negative affect (Schilpzand et al., 2014). This can include depression, lower levels of energy, diminished well-being, and emotions like anger, fear, and sadness (Schilpzand et al., 2014). Experienced workplace incivility has also been linked to lowered marital satisfaction, as well as conflict in the family (Ferguson, 2012; Lim & Lee, 2011). Work is an important part of life, and it is becoming more important as time passes. Therefore, what happens at work is more likely than ever to determine one's quality of life.

Supervisor incivility. While incivility from any source is detrimental, the most negative source is perhaps the supervisor. In a study conducted by Hershcovis and Barling (2010), it was found that supervisor incivility (as opposed to coworker and customer incivility) was related to stronger effects of diminished job satisfaction, commitment, health, and turnover intent. However, more research must be done on the different sources of incivility, as differences are not fully clear (Schilpzand et al., 2014). Nevertheless, the study from Hershcovis and Barling (2010) suggests that supervisor incivility can be the most detrimental. One reason for this is that

the supervisor is the face of the organization for subordinates (Tepper & Almeda, 2012).

Consequently, if subordinates do not like their supervisor, it is incredibly likely that they will

have negative feelings toward the organization for which they work. One reason supervisor

incivility can be more detrimental than, say, coworker incivility, is because of the structural

power of the supervisor. As Anderson and Pearson (1999) found, incivility is likely to be

reciprocated. When another coworker psychologically injures a coworker, he or she will be

prompted to return a psychological injury to the other (Tepper & Almeda, 2012). However,

when power is present in a given relationship, the likelihood of negative reciprocity decreases for

the subordinate. When individuals are psychologically damaged by someone who has more

power than them, such as a supervisor, they are unlikely to reciprocate the behavior (Tepper &

Almeda, 2012). This is reflective of Emerson's (1962) power-dependence theory, which

provides an example of power's inverse relationship with dependence.

In power-dependence theory's application to the relationship between supervisors and

subordinates, subordinates have less occupational power relative to their supervisors (Tepper &

Almeda, 2012). As such, their dependency upon supervisors in terms of acquiring rewards and

resources is rather important (Tepper & Almeda, 2012). Therefore, when a supervisor

psychologically damages subordinates, they are much less likely to negatively reciprocate the

behavior to their superior due to power discrepancies (Tepper & Almeda, 2012). Since

employees are unlikely to confront their supervisors about this abuse of power, they may channel

their frustrations to other areas of the organization, such as coworkers or work itself. This also,

as spillover literature shows, can cause subordinates to channel their energy to areas of life other

than the workplace (see Hoobler & Brass, 2006).

Civic performance and rhetorical decorum/propriety. The opposite of incivility, then, is

civility. Civility ensures healthy institutions, wherein conflict is dealt with constructively

(Hariman, 2010). Civility is more than showcasing good manners and being polite (Walsh,

Magley, Reeves, Davies-Schrils, Marmet, & Gallus, 2012). Being civil in the workplace entails

being aware of others and demonstrating respect and concern for the well-being of other people

at work (Peck, 2002; Sypher, 2004). Civility is what should be present in the workplace, and it

starts with the supervisor. In a study conducted by Beattie and Griffin (2014), it was found that

supervisor support significantly reduced the stress levels of their subordinates who experienced

incivility from other coworkers. This demonstrates that even if there is incivility between

coworkers, the supervisor's structural power—used for good—is able to diminish the effects of

incivility. Hariman (2010) also supports this, as he stated that civility could restore broken

institutions and countries; proper and skillful conversation is what sustains civility in

relationships. If it can restore countries, it seems fair to assume that it can enhance and restore

modern-day organizations. In order to better understand this, the rhetorical concept of

decorum/propriety will be discussed as a way of establishing the ideal role of the supervisor.

Rhetoric is meant to be used for real-world situations (Leff, 1987). As such, it can be

referred to as "a universal activity that finds its habitation only in the particular" (Leff, 1987, p.

48). This means that rhetoric is best applied to real-world situations. It must be used on a

situational and practical basis if it is to truly help people. Furthermore, the fact that rhetoric is

universal implies that it can be used by anyone in any context. It blends seamlessly into each

particular situation; rhetoric is concerned with the given topic of discussion (Leff, 1987). The

goal, then, of rhetoric is persuasion (Leff, 1987). However, persuasion (style) must be balanced

with proof (content) (Leff, 1987). They must be used together to lead the auditors of a message

to a desirable conclusion. For instance, it is unethical to persuade in a manner that tampers with

the facts of the situation. Ethical rhetoric should persuade audiences in any context based on the available proof at hand. Likewise, persuasion is also necessary for proof (Leff, 1987). When proof exists, one must convince others of its existence. This is the essence and functionality of decorum/propriety (Leff, 1987). First, it is a "principle of action that accounts for the adaptive power of persuasive discourse" (Leff, 1987, p. 48). This means that persuasion is dynamic and has the ability to alter perspectives. Second, decorum can be used for judging the value and quality of a given message, situation, or context (Leff, 1987). People can decide whether they want to accept a message based on decorum. Finally, decorum can be used to change things within a structure, thereby changing the structure as a whole (Leff, 1987). In an organization, for instance, a supervisor can begin to shift an uncivil organizational culture to a more civil one by exercising and emphasizing civility among employees.

Decorum is concerned with the "process of mediation and balance connected with qualitative judgment" (Leff, 1987, p. 48). Balance, in this instance, can refer to two different ideas. The first refers to the mediation of content and style in a message. Leff (1987) argues that decorum should account for both "cognitive and stylistic concerns" (p. 47). This is to say that the content of the message and the way it is presented are both important in order for auditors to properly make sense of the situation. Moreover, these two factors, when executed well, are undistinguished from each other (Leff, 1987). In other words, the auditors of messages should simultaneously place their focus on the content and on the persuasiveness of the content being presented to them. If style and content are blended together competently, auditors will simply judge the message holistically and base their judgment on the unity of the content and style of the presentation or argument.

The second idea of balance refers to the mediation of the internal self and the external

environment (Leff, 1987). The type of mediation that occurs in this instance involves acting

consistently with people and goals that are proper for the situation or context (Leff, 1987). For

example, an individual may need to reconcile what she or he wants to accomplish versus what

needs to be accomplished for the greater good of the situation or context. This is especially

important for individuals who are in charge of groups of people. Leaders should be driven by

civic virtues, not private interest (Hariman, 2010). They should act in a manner that benefits the

people they lead, not in a manner that will set them ahead at the expense of those they lead. If

actions are for the people, the betterment of the institution, and a reflection of civic virtues, then

the actions can be considered ethical (Hariman, 2010). In organizational terms, supervisors

should make decisions that will move the company forward, not decisions that will advance their

personal agendas. This leads to a discussion of balancing and reconciling one's private life (or

personal interests) and public image.

An important feature of Cicero's Republic is the competing tension of private life—a

liberal ideal—and public life/image, or reputation (Hariman, 2010). People want to take care of

their private life. However, it is also important for them to do things that will benefit the

republic, or group of people who they are leading. As such, leaders must find an effective way

to "translate the language of individualism into a language of civic mutuality" (Hariman, 2010,

p. 134). They must take their own thoughts and motives (content) and make them appealing to

others (style) to enhance the republic. According to Hariman (2010), Cicero did just that with

his letter to Atticus; he addressed his private concerns about public circumstances. In the letter,

Cicero began with a personal conversation about private life and friendship and shifted toward a

conversation about politics in Rome (Hariman, 2010). Cicero demonstrated the importance of

building his personal reputation in order to enhance the republic. Hariman (2010) asserted that

building a good reputation and public image is essential for this, but there is also irony in building reputation. For Cicero to concern himself with the welfare of the public, he had to consider his reputation as a leader (Hariman, 2010). Cicero himself recognized this and was ashamed that he was so concerned with his image (Hariman, 2010). Regardless, effective leaders must build their credibility and reputations among the public if they are to succeed (Hariman, 2010). "Reputation is the medium in which one's principles and desires exist at all and the very means of personal integrity" (Hariman, 2010, p. 139). Thus, reputation is a driver of public discourse and accomplishment. It is something that modern-day supervisors should concern themselves with in terms of leading their subordinates. To be an effective leader of workers, supervisors must have the respect of their subordinates so they will allow themselves to be led by their supervisor.

  Synthesis and incivility hypotheses. As discussed in the prior synthesis section under motivation, the family subsystem is dependent on the workplace subsystem because of spillover effects (see Galvin et al., 2006; Wang & Repetti, 2013). Occurrences at home should not be viewed in isolation (Galvin et al., 2006); workplace occurrences should be factored into understanding behavior at home. When work is not going well, it can affect life at home; this is negative spillover. Negative spillover from work to family, as the literature review has demonstrated, can happen for a number of reasons. Generally, it happens due to a general dissatisfaction with work. Dissatisfaction can happen when workers feel powerless, unfulfilled, or exhausted from their work (Hassan et al., 2013; Kinnunen et al., 2006; Doumas et al., 2008). Employees can also experience negative spillover if they experience negative interactions or incivility with their coworkers or supervisor (Hoobler & Bass, 2006; Tepper & Almeda, 2012). Consequently, negative spillover disrupts family functioning by increasing family conflict and

social withdrawal from family members, decreasing general awareness of family members, and increasing child delinquency (Bumpus, Crouter, & McHale, 1999; 2006; Wang & Repetti, 2013). The literature seems to suggest that supervisors can have the biggest impact on subordinates when it comes to civility or a lack thereof (Tepper & Almeda, 2012; Hershcovis & Barling, 2010; Schilpzand et al., 2014). Given the structural power of the supervisor, supervisor incivility can cause subordinates a significant amount of work-related stress, increasing the likelihood that negative spillover will occur from one subsystem to the other. While studies have shown that incivility can cause negative spillover, Schilpzand et al. (2014) argue that more research must be done on incivility as it affects families. Therefore, the current study makes the following hypotheses about negative spillover in subsystems and workplace incivility:

H2(a): Perceived incivility in supervisor communication is inversely correlated to subordinate communication of family warmth/affection.

H2(b): Perceived incivility in supervisor communication is inversely correlated to subordinate family satisfaction.

H2(c): Perceived incivility in supervisor communication is inversely correlated to subordinate family closeness.

There has also been a small amount of research done on gender and incivility, though it is conflicting (Schilpzand et al., 2014). Lim and Lee (2011) found that males experience more incivility than females, while Cortina et al. (2001) found that females experience more incivility than males. Other research has shown that males typically experience more incivility than women, but females view incivility as more inappropriate than males view it (Schilpzand et al., 2014). While there is little, conflicting research on this matter, the current study presents the following research question about gender and incivility:

RQ1: Will female or male subordinates be more likely to experience supervisor incivility?

Relational framing theory: Dominance/affiliation. Relational framing theory (RFT) can be used to examine the effects of power dynamics in the supervisor-subordinate dyad. RFT explains the way people process and interpret the communication of others to confirm their presumptions about their relationships with other people (Dillard, Solomon, & Samp, 1996). When people process messages, they either interpret them as a message of dominance-submissiveness and/or affiliation-disaffiliation (Solomon & McLaren, 2008). With regard to RFT, dominance-submissiveness and affiliation-disaffiliation serve as frames that assist people in interpreting messages, making presumptions about their relationships, and reducing the ambiguity of the messages that they receive (Dillard & Solomon, 2005).

According to Solomon and McLaren (2008), RFT has two, major assumptions. The first assumption deals with the "nature of relational judgments," or the conclusions that people draw based on the presumptions they have made about their relationships (Solomon & McLaren, 2008, p. 104). People make judgments of dominance-submissiveness and affiliation-disaffiliation, which make up the foundation of relational messages (Solomon & McLaren, 2008). Dominance-submissiveness is the "degree to which one person controls, influences, or has status over the other, while affiliation-disaffiliation captures the appreciation, esteem, or solidarity one person has for another" (Solomon & McLaren, 2008, p. 105). In the instance of a supervisor-subordinate dyad, the supervisor may rely on his or her status over the subordinate by telling the subordinate to complete a task within a certain amount of time. This would be an example of dominance-submissiveness in that particular dyad, whereby the supervisor is dominant, and the subordinate is submissive. Using the same dyad, the supervisor might congratulate and reward the subordinate for a job well-done. In this instance, there is a certain degree of affiliation that is

taking place between the two people. However, it is important to note that these two frames—dominance-submissiveness and affiliation-disaffiliation—typically compete with one another in relational dyads (Dillard et al., 1996). In a given relationship, one would most likely find either one frame or the other, but not both. This leads into the second assumption of RFT.

The second assumption of RFT, according to Solomon and McLaren (2008), is "the process of relational judgments" (p. 107). The process deals with the way individuals in a given interaction make sense of messages by using "cognitive structures, interaction cues, and relational judgments" (Solomon & McLaren, 2008, p. 107). The way these messages get processed can depend on the nature of the relationship, social cues, and culture (Solomon & McLaren, 2008). For instance, take the social cue of a loud voice; a loud voice can be processed differently depending on whether one frames it as a dominant cue or a cue of affiliation (Solomon & McLaren, 2008). A loud voice might be processed dominantly by a subordinate if a supervisor is speaking loudly about tasks that need to be completed. Contrarily, using the same people from the first example, the message may be processed as one of affiliation if a supervisor is welcoming the subordinate into his or her office after successfully completing a task.

The social situation might also determine whether a person perceives dominance or affiliation with another person. For instance, a dyad that interacts at a meeting may process messages as those of dominance. However, if the same dyad were to interact at a company party, messages may be more likely to be processed as those of affiliation. As previously stated, the majority of the time, only one frame is processed in an interaction (Dillard et al., 1996). Dillard and colleagues (1996) stated that it is possible for both frames to be activated, but it requires significantly more mental energy and is uncomfortable for people to process. When both frames are activated in the mind, it can negatively affect the ability to process a message

and cause the individual anxiety about the relationship (Dillard et al., 1996). As such, the

majority of people tend to activate one frame in an interaction, as opposed to spending excessive

mental energy reconciling the two frames (Dillard et al., 1996).

   Applications. Studies have used RFT to examine different types of relationships between

people. In a study conducted by Solomon, Dillard, and Anderson (2002), it was found that the

two frames of RFT—dominance-submission and affiliation-disaffiliation—are functions of

social interactions, and therefore, the types of relationships present between dyads. For instance,

Solomon et al. (2002) found that the dominance-submission frame was indicative of a

relationship that was compliance-based, while the affiliation-disaffiliation frame was indicative

of an affinity-based relationship. Another finding in their study supported the general intensifier

hypothesis. The hypothesis states that involvement is "correlated with dominance and affiliation,

but the magnitude of that association varies as a function of frame salience" (Solomon et al.,

2002, p. 145). In other words, in dominant frames, involvement is much more prevalent with

dominance than affiliation. In frames of affiliation, however, involvement is more prevalent

with affiliation than dominance. This demonstrates that regardless of the type of relationship,

people are involved in their relationships. Solomon et al.'s (2002) study also suggests that the

type of scenario—compliance or affinity—makes one of the two frames relevant in any given

interaction (Henningsen, Henningsen, Cruz, & Morrill, 2003). However, the different relational

frames motivate people to be involved for different reasons. The third finding of their study

suggests that people use relational frames, as well as attachment styles to guide their perceptions

of the messages that other individuals send them. If individuals feel uncertainty in their

perceptions about the other, they experience more anxiety about the relationship. Moreover,

individuals with unhealthy attachment styles are less likely to accurately perceive social cues that

they receive from others.

The study by Henningsen et al. (2003) built upon the foundation set by Solomon et al. (2002). Henningsen et al. (2003) were able to replicate some of the findings mentioned in the preceding paragraph. However, the main goal of Henningsen et al. (2003) was to determine whether RFT could be used to predict normative and informational influence statements in group discussions. According to the authors, normative statements are those that promote group harmony; informational statements are those that promote high-quality connections among group members. It was found that normative influence was present in groups with task-oriented goals. Moreover, the results stated, "RFT implied that dominance was the salient frame for understanding group interaction causing normative influence to occur" (Henningsen et al., 2003, p. 194). In other words, people in task-oriented groups used a dominant framework to interpret messages of normative influence.

Synthesis and RFT hypotheses. As discussed in the prior synthesis sections, the subsystems of work and family are linked through spillover. Employees who experience negative spillover because of supervisor incivility are more likely to show displaced aggression toward family members once they have returned home from work (Hoobler & Brass, 2006). Furthermore, if a supervisor is constantly relying on dominance to control subordinates, subordinates may tire from the constant expectation to comply, which could lead to the displacement that was discussed in Hoobler and Brass (2006). The salience of the dominant frame may wear on them. If employees feel powerless at work, they may seek to feel more dominant at home, creating negative spillover (Hoobler & Brass, 2006). Therefore, the current study presents the following hypotheses:

H3: Subordinates who experience supervisor incivility will behave more dominantly

toward their families.

H4(a): Perceived supervisor dominance is inversely correlated with subordinate family

closeness.

H4(b): Perceived supervisor dominance is inversely correlated with subordinate family

satisfaction.

Contrarily, a supervisor that expresses more affiliation toward subordinates can cause their

workers to become more satisfied with their jobs due to the formation of positive working

relationships and the creation of bonds, which are essential components of motivation (Bono &

Yoon, 2012; Nohria et al., 2008). Thus, with more job satisfaction, positive spillover would be

more likely to take place (Heller & Watson, 2005; Kinnunen et al., 2006). With this in mind, the

current study presents the following hypotheses:

H5: Subordinates who are motivated by their supervisors experience more affiliation with

their families.

H6(a): Perceived supervisor affiliation is positively correlated with subordinate family

closeness.

H6(b): Perceived supervisor affiliation is positively correlated with subordinate family

communication of warmth/affection.

Chapter Three: Methods

Participants

The current study initially consisted of 446 participants who took a survey. Of those 446,

146 were removed from the survey by at least one of the exclusion criteria. Of the remaining

300 participants, 21 were removed from the datafile because they failed to answer the checks in

the survey correctly. Their failure to answer the checks correctly indicated that they did not read

and answer the questions to the best of their abilities. Their answers would have contaminated the study, so they were removed. By the end of this process, the final sample size was 279 participants with an average age of 35 (*SD* = 9.35) who were all employed and had families. In terms of race/ethnicity, participants fell into the following categories: 9% Hispanic, 14% African-American, 70% Caucasian, 10% Asian-American, 1% Native-American, and 1% other. The sum of the percentages is greater than 100% because participants were asked to check as many boxes as apply. In terms of annual family salary, participants and their families fell into the following categories: 4% made less than $20,000, 27% made between $20,000 and $45,000, 25% made between $46,000 and $65,000, 17% made between $66,000 and $85,000, and 27% made more than $85,000. Fifty-nine percent of participants reported that they had a male supervisor, and 41% of participants reported that they had a female supervisor. Of the 279 participants, 142 women took the survey, and 137 men took the survey.

Procedure

The survey was constructed by using Qualtrics and administered through Mechanical Turk. Mechanical Turk is a website that distributes surveys to workers who voluntarily choose to take surveys online. The workers were given $1.00 for completing the survey for the current study. The survey began with seven questions that addressed exclusion criteria for the survey. To take the survey, participants had to be employed, have a supervisor, work at least 20 hours per week, work at their company's physical place of employment, have a family, and live in the same residence as their family. Participants also had to be the age of majority in their state (in most cases, this is 18 years of age or older). If they answered "No" to any of these seven questions, they were unable to take the survey. After answering "Yes" to each of these questions, participants answered questions about their family relationships, their primary supervisor, and

demographic factors. Once they completed the survey, the participants were done with the study. They were given a code to enter into the Mechanical Turk website to get their $1.00 payment.

Measures

There were nine measures, or variables, in the current study, each of which either dealt with supervisor or family communication. All questions pertaining to the measures were asked on a 1-5 Likert-type scale. Table 1 shows the internal reliability estimates, means, and standard deviations of each of the measures. It also shows the correlations between each of the variables.

Supervisor motivation. Supervisor motivation was measured by using of the Motivation Questionnaire Index, which was used in Wong, Gardiner, Lang, and Coulon (2008). Some of the questions from their version of the survey were omitted to shorten the survey. Participants were presented with 15 statements about their supervisors that were designed to get their perspectives on their supervisor's ability to motivate them at work. Participants answered each question using a 1 to 5 Likert-type scale with (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree.* The statements all dealt with positive elements of motivation, not negative ones. For instance, none of the statements were phrased as, "My supervisor does not tell me that I am valuable to the organization." Each of the statements was framed positively. The reliability estimate for the motivation statements was sufficient, at .96.

Supervisor incivility. The variable, supervisor incivility, was measured by using the Workplace Incivility Index as seen in Cortina, Magley, Williams, and Langhout (2001). The six statements in this section were designed to assess how often participants felt that their supervisor was rude/uncivil to them at work. The reliability estimate for the incivility statements was sufficient, at .94.

Supervisor and family dominance/affiliation. This subheading contains four variables (supervisor dominance, family dominance, supervisor affiliation, and family affiliation) that will be discussed together. Each of these variables was measured by using the Dominance/ Affiliation Index as seen in Theiss and Knobloch (2013). The wording in the survey was altered to fit either the supervisor or the family. In one section, participants were asked to respond to the statements by thinking about the way their primary supervisor communicates to them; in the other section, participants were asked to respond to the statements by thinking about the way they communicate to their family members. There were six statements in the index. Four of them measured affiliation; two of them measured dominance. The reliability estimates for each of the four variables were sufficient and are as follows: supervisor dominance--.78, family dominance--.78, supervisor affiliation--.86, and family affiliation--.77.

Family closeness. Family closeness was measured by using the Communication of Closeness Index, which can be found in Smilkstein (1978). In this section, participants were asked to pick one family member to refer to when responding to the statements. They were presented with 10 statements, each of which were designed to get the participant's perspective on his or her closeness with the family member that was chosen. The reliability estimate for family closeness was sufficient, at .94.

Family satisfaction. Family satisfaction was measured by using the Family Satisfaction Index as seen in Smilkstein (1978). In this section, participants were asked to pick one family member to refer to when responding to the statements. The participants were given five statements that were designed to indicate their level of relational satisfaction with the family member that was selected. The reliability estimate for family satisfaction was sufficient, at .89.

Family affection. Family affection was measured by using the Affectionate

Communication Index, which can be found in Floyd and Morman (1998). In this section,

participants were asked to pick one family member to refer to when responding to the statements.

The participants were given 10 statements that were designed to get the participant's perspective

on the level of affectionate communication present in their relationships with the family member

that was selected. The reliability estimate for family affection was sufficient, at .92.

Chapter Four: Results

Descriptive Statistics

Prior to running the hypothesis tests, the participants' demographic factors were examined

to test whether they accounted for some of the results. Regarding participant sex, there was no

significant group differences with any study variable. Furthermore, there was no significant

difference on any of the supervisor variables based on the sex of the supervisor. The next factor

that was tested was family relationship type. In the study, 224 participants wrote about their

spouse and 57 wrote about someone else (i.e. children, parents, etc.). The participants who wrote

about their spouses scored differently than participants who wrote about someone else.

Regarding family closeness, participants who wrote about their spouse ($M = 4.48$, SD $= .66$), (t

$(279) = 1.84$, $p = .03$) scored significantly higher than participants who wrote about someone

else ($M = 4.30$, SD $= .64$). Regarding family satisfaction, participants who wrote about their

spouse ($M = 4.39$, SD $= .68$), ($t (279) = 3.40$, $p < .001$) scored significantly higher than

participants who wrote about someone else ($M = 4.05$, SD $= .73$). For family affection,

participants who wrote about their spouse ($M = 4.42$, SD $= .64$), ($t (279) = 2.30$, $p = .01$) scored

significantly higher than participants who wrote about someone else ($M = 4.20$, SD $= .72$). For

family dominance, however, participants who wrote about their spouse ($M = 2.88$, SD $= 1.07$), (t

$(279) = -1.88$, $p = .03$) scored significantly lower than participants who wrote about someone

else (M = 3.18, SD = .99).

Hypotheses

This section addresses the 12 hypotheses and one research question in the current study, which dealt with the nine variables that were discussed in the "Measures" section of the "Methods" chapter. For all the hypotheses, a regression was run controlling for family relationship type. RQ1, however, was run using an independent-samples t-test. After the initial test of each regression model, if the control variable was nonsignificant, it was removed, and the test was re-run as a zero-order correlation.

H1(a). This hypothesis predicted that the perceived supervisor motivation of the subordinate would be positively correlated with subordinate family closeness. The family relationship type was nonsignificant in the regression. The zero-order correlation test showed that supervisor motivation and subordinate family closeness were positively and significantly related (r (279) = .35, $p < .01$). H1(a) was supported.

H1(b). H1(b) predicted that the perceived supervisor motivation of the subordinate would be positively correlated with subordinate family satisfaction. The family satisfaction model was significant, (F (2, 276) = 22.83, $p < .001$) r^2 = .14. Family relationship type (β = -.17, t = -3.06, p = .002) was a negative predictor and supervisor motivation (β = .32, t = 5.75, $p < .001$) was a positive predictor in the model. H1(b) was supported.

H1(c). H1(c) predicted that the perceived supervisor motivation of the subordinate would be positively correlated with subordinate family affection. The family relationship type was nonsignificant in the regression. The zero-order correlation test showed that supervisor motivation and subordinate family affection were positively and significantly related (r (279) = .28, $p < .01$). H1(c) was supported.

H2(a). H2(a) predicted that the perceived supervisor incivility of the subordinate would be inversely correlated with subordinate family affection. The family relationship type was nonsignificant in the regression. The zero-order correlation test showed that supervisor incivility and subordinate family affection were negatively and significantly related (r (279) = -.38, p < .01). H2(a) was supported.

H2(b). H2(b) predicted that the perceived supervisor incivility of the subordinate would be inversely correlated with subordinate family satisfaction. The family satisfaction model was significant, (F (2, 277) = 17.13, p < .001) r^2 = .11. Family relationship type (β = -.17, t = -2.92, p = .004) was a negative predictor and supervisor incivility (β = -.27, t = -4.68, p < .001) was also a negative predictor in the model. H2(b) was supported.

H2(c). H2(c) predicted that the perceived supervisor incivility of the subordinate would be inversely correlated with subordinate family closeness. The family relationship type was nonsignificant in the regression. The zero-order correlation test showed that supervisor incivility and subordinate family closeness were negatively and significantly related (r (279) = -.35, p < .01). H2(c) was supported.

RQ1. RQ1 wanted to determine whether female or male subordinates would be more likely to experience supervisor incivility. An independent-samples t-test was ran to test this inquiry. This test was significant. Men (M = 2.04, SD = 1.14) scored significantly higher on supervisor incivility than women (M = 1.66, SD = 0.84), (t (277) = -.3.23, p < .001). Thus, men reported experiencing more supervisor incivility than women.

H3. H3 predicted that subordinates who experience supervisor incivility will behave more dominantly toward their families. The family relationship type was nonsignificant in the regression. The zero-order correlation test showed that supervisor incivility and subordinate

family dominance were positively and significantly related (r (279) = .41, $p < .01$). H3 was supported.

H4(a). H4(a) predicted that supervisor dominance would be inversely correlated with subordinate family closeness. The family relationship type was nonsignificant in the regression. The zero-order correlation test showed that supervisor dominance and subordinate family closeness were not significantly related (r (279) = -.05, $p < .01$). H4(a) was not supported.

H4(b). H4(b) predicted that supervisor dominance would be inversely correlated with subordinate family satisfaction. The family satisfaction model was significant, (F (2, 277) = 6.12, $p = .003$) r^2 = .04. Family relationship type (β = -.19, t = -3.22, $p = .001$) was a negative predictor and dominance was nonsignificant in the model (β = -.05, t = -0.86, $p = .39$). H4(b) was not supported.

H5. H5 predicted that subordinates who are motivated by their supervisors would experience more affiliation with their families. The family relationship type was nonsignificant in the regression. The zero-order correlation test showed that supervisor motivation and subordinate family affiliation were positively and significantly related (r (279) = .36, $p < .01$). H5 was supported.

H6(a). H6(a) predicted that perceived supervisor affiliation would be positively correlated with subordinate family closeness. The family relationship type was nonsignificant in the regression. The zero-order correlation test showed that supervisor affiliation and subordinate family closeness were positively and significantly related (r (279) = .36, $p < .01$). H6(a) was supported.

H6(b). H6(b) predicted that perceived supervisor affiliation would be positively correlated with subordinate family affection. The family relationship type was nonsignificant in

the regression. The zero-order correlation test showed that supervisor affiliation and subordinate family affection were positively and significantly related (r (279) = .28, $p < .01$). H6(b) was supported.

Chapter Five: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine positive and negative spillover from work to family life. Specifically, the study was interested in examining whether supervisor motivation, incivility, and dominance/affiliation could cause spillover in their subordinates' family lives. In terms of spillover, the family communication factors that were measured were closeness, satisfaction, affection, and dominance/affiliation. The current study tested whether the supervisor factors could be related to family factors. To do this, a survey was administered to the participants. The survey asked them questions about their family relationships and their relationships with their supervisors to determine whether correlations existed between family life and work. Systems theory, spillover, and relational framing theory were used to frame the findings. Rhetorical decorum/propriety was also used to establish a need for the ethical leadership of supervisors. Decorum and civic performance will be discussed in the "Practical Implications" section. First, this section will review the findings of the current study. Following this, the theoretical and practical implications will be discussed, followed by the limitations of the study and directions for future research.

Summary of Findings

Motivation. The purpose of the motivation questions in the survey was to determine whether perceived supervisor motivation was positively correlated with subordinate family closeness (H1a), subordinate family satisfaction (H1b), and subordinate family affection (H1c). In other words, if subordinates are motivated by their supervisors, then they will be more

satisfied, close, and affectionate with their families. Additionally, H5 predicted that subordinates who are motivated by their supervisors would experience more affiliation with their families. Each of these hypotheses was supported; they were formulated with respect to the literature on systems theory and spillover.

These findings support some existing research about systems theory and positive spillover. To begin, the assumptions of systems theory will be discussed as they relate to the findings of this study. Five of these assumptions will be discussed in this section, one in the "Incivility" section, and one in the "Theoretical and Practical Implications" section. Furthermore, additional elements of systems theory will be discussed in the sections following, as these elements are applicable across all of the variables in the current study.

Galvin et al. (2006) stated that there are seven elements present in every system; the first element is interdependence. Since the study found a significant correlation between supervisor motivation and the four family factors mentioned above, the following conclusion can be made: the two subsystems of work and family are dependent on each other in terms of the type of communication that takes place. If there is positive communication in one subsystem, then positive communication is more likely to spillover into the other subsystem.

Three other assumptions of systems are the presence of observable patterns/regularities, interactive complexity, and openness (Galvin et al., 2006). The findings of the current study also demonstrate this in terms of the family and the workplace. Regarding patterns/regularities, supervisor motivation seems to lend itself to patterns of family interaction that are closer, more affectionate, and more satisfying. However, systems also face changes that can break patterns/regularities (Galvin et al., 2006). For instance, if a family member were to get a different supervisor who was not an effective motivator like the previous supervisor, this could

potentially change the regularities of family communication. It might, for example, make family interactions less close or less affectionate. When change occurs in a system, openness becomes necessary to accommodate it (Galvin et al., 2006). There are boundaries within the family and within the workplace, as well as boundaries that interlink the two subsystems (Galvin et al., 2006). If a family member experiences a difficult change at work (such as the example above), this should be communicated to the family so that growth can occur during a time of struggle, minimizing negative spillover effects (Galvin et al., 2006). Patterns/regularities also lead into interactive complexity, which means that one component of the system cannot explain the entire state of the system (Galvin et al., 2006). It is important to note that supervisor motivation may partially explain family closeness, satisfaction, and affection. However, there are many other components to factor in that could also explain elements of family communication. Nevertheless, the results indicate that motivation could be one of those factors.

Another important assumption of systems theory is the presence of wholeness (Galvin et al., 2006). If a family member were to get a new job in which they were not motivated, the identity of the family would shift in some way because one of their family members would be exposed to different interactions, or less fulfilled at work. Supervisor motivation seems to contribute to family wholeness in a unique way. Motivation is contagious and fulfills the basic needs of human beings (Goleman, 2004; Nohria et al., 2008). The findings suggest that the contagious nature of motivation at work can contribute to the identity of families. Subordinates become motivated at work, and it becomes part of their identities when they leave work. This is evident in their efforts to maintain good relationships with their family members. Subordinates convey and transfer their work identities to their families, shaping their interactions with each

other as a system. This leads into motivation and positive spillover from the workplace to family life.

Since the four hypotheses above were supported, the occurrence of spillover in this study was evident. Positive spillover is concerned with workplace occurrences transferring over to family life (Wang & Repetti, 2013). Stated more simply, when work is going well, it can enhance the quality of interactions at home after work. Supervisors must be able to effectively motivate their subordinates in order to make them successful at what they do and therefore, more satisfied with their jobs (Nohria et al., 2008). Job satisfaction is essential for positive spillover to occur (Heller & Watson, 2005; Kinnunen et al., 2006). In the current study, participants who reported that they were motivated were, based on the research, satisfied with their jobs. The findings of this study showed that motivated subordinates were closer, more satisfied, more affectionate, and more affiliated with their families than subordinates who were not motivated by their supervisors. This supports the study that was conducted by Heller and Watson (2005), who found that "job satisfaction in the afternoon was associated with higher levels of marital satisfaction in the evening" (p. 413).

The findings of the current study also support the findings of van Steenbergen et al. (2007), who stated that self-efficacy at work contributes to positive spillover. An important component of supervisor motivation is recognizing and rewarding subordinates who do good work (Myers et al., 2011; Nohria et al., 2008). It fulfills two of the four basic drives—acquiring and bonding—because it makes employees feel truly valued and appreciated for their work (Myers et al., 2011; Nohria et al., 2008). This is important for self-efficacy at work because it builds the confidence and commitment of employees to their organizations by conveying positive expectations (Goleman, 2004; Livingston, 2003). The findings of the current study show that

motivation is necessary for high levels of self-efficacy at work. Furthermore, when supervisors make their subordinates feel good about the work they do, subordinates are fulfilled in an important part of their life. This fulfillment transfers over to the way they interact with their families. They report being closer to them, satisfied with them, affectionate with them, and they convey more behaviors of affiliation toward them.

Incivility. The purpose of the incivility questions in the survey was to determine whether perceived supervisor incivility was inversely correlated with subordinate family affection (H2a), subordinate family satisfaction (H2b), and subordinate family closeness (H2c). Additionally, RQ1 wanted to test whether female or male subordinates would be more likely to experience supervisor incivility, and H3 predicted that subordinates who experience supervisor incivility would behave more dominantly toward their families. All of these hypotheses were supported in the current study. Like the motivation hypotheses, they were formed with the framework of systems theory and spillover literature.

The incivility findings in the current study run parallel with research that has been done using systems theory as a framework. For instance, a study by Marks et al. (2001) used systems theory to examine the psychological effects of witnessing marital discord on children. Another study by Holt et al. (2008) found that children who witness and experience domestic violence at home are more likely to develop emotional and behavioral problems. The objective of these studies was to examine what was causing these problems in children. With a systems perspective, their psychological problems could not be viewed in isolation. Rather, there were occurrences in their systems that contributed to the development of psychological issues. In the current study, the findings are framed in the same way. The diminished affection, satisfaction, and closeness in the subordinates' families should not be viewed in isolation. Likewise,

dominant communication in families cannot be viewed in isolation. There are other factors that may contribute to this. The findings of the current study suggest that supervisor incivility may be a contributing factor to these more negative patterns of family communication. The type of communication that subordinates are getting from their supervisors seems to partially explain diminished family communication. This leads to a discussion of supervisor incivility and negative spillover.

Based on the findings mentioned above, it is reasonable to conclude that supervisor incivility may have caused negative spillover in participants' family lives. Like positive spillover, negative spillover is concerned with workplace occurrences transferring over to family life (Wang & Repetti, 2013). However, the occurrences for this type of spillover are detrimental for relationships, rather than beneficial. There are many factors that can cause negative spillover. However, this study was concerned with the way negative supervisor interactions, or supervisor incivility, cause negative spillover. Though causality was not determined through correlational testing, the findings suggest that causality is a possibility.

The current study somewhat supports the study that was conducted by Hoobler and Brass (2006). They found that employees who were treated with hostility by their supervisors were much more likely to be hostile toward their families, displaying negative spillover from work to family. The current study found that those who experienced supervisor incivility were more likely to be less close, less satisfied, more dominant, and communicate with less affection to their families than those who did not experience supervisor incivility. Thus, the current study's findings suggest negative spillover as a result of negative interactions with supervisors. However, the study by Hoobler and Brass (2006) dealt with supervisor and family hostility, which is more extreme than incivility. In the current study, the diminished closeness,

satisfaction, and affection do not necessarily indicate family hostility, and incivility does not necessarily indicate hostility. However, hostility may be present in incivility and family interactions, but it is unaccounted for in this study. Regardless, the results of this study demonstrate the presence of negative spillover when there is supervisor incivility, supporting the research of Hoobler and Brass (2006) and Schilpzand et al. (2014). When subordinates experience supervisor incivility, they are typically less satisfied with their jobs (Walsh et al., 2012; Cortina et al., 2001). As stated previously, job satisfaction is essential for positive spillover to occur (Heller & Watson, 2005; Kinnunen et al., 2006). For that reason, it can be inferred that job dissatisfaction is linked to negative spillover; incivility, then, is likely a major contributor to negative spillover. In terms of applying a systems perspective, negative spillover that occurs from supervisor incivility is reflective of the assumption that there are complex relationships in systems (Galvin et al., 2006). The tension that is created at work may be activating tension between family members. This tension can cause people in the system to either take sides or act as a mediator to diffuse the tension (Galvin et al., 2006).

To conclude the discussion on incivility, RQ1 will now be discussed. As stated in the literature review, research that has been conducted on gender and incivility has been inconclusive (Schilpzand et al., 2014). Some studies have found that males experience more incivility than females (see Lim & Lee, 2011), while others have found the opposite (see Cortina et al., 2001). The current study wanted to determine whether females or males experience more workplace incivility; the study found that males experience it more than females. It could be that there is a stereotype at play. Males might be expected to be less sensitive and are therefore communicated to more bluntly, or without consideration of feelings. It could also be that findings are random occurrences that are reflective of the particular sample of a given study.

Perhaps this is why studies have reached conflicting results on the matter. Gender and incivility can be dependent on many factors, including attitudes about gender, personality types, worker reputation, and workplace culture. These elements are likely going to differ from organization to organization.

Dominance/affiliation. The purpose of the dominance/affiliation questions in the survey was to determine if supervisor leadership influenced family dominance and affiliation. The questions were also designed to measure whether supervisor dominance and affiliation influenced family communication. Although some of the dominance/affiliation hypotheses were discussed above, they will be framed in this section by using systems theory, spillover, and relational framing theory (RFT).

To begin, H4(a) and H4(b) will be discussed. H4(a) predicted that perceived supervisor dominance would be inversely correlated with subordinate family closeness. H4(b) predicted that perceived supervisor dominance would be inversely correlated with family satisfaction. Neither of these hypotheses was supported, indicating no spillover effects between these factors. This can be explained by some of the literature on RFT. According to Solomon and McLaren (2008), in any interaction, people either approach it with a dominance-submissiveness frame or an affiliation-disaffiliation frame. A dominance frame simply implies status or control over another individual, as seen in the supervisor-subordinate dyad (Solomon & McLaren, 2008). In terms of the current study, a participant could have identified their boss as dominant without having negative feelings about it. In the dyad, it is generally accepted that a supervisor has status and control over subordinates. Thus, the findings of this study indicate that participants did not have an issue with the dyad, or at least, it had no effect on the way participants would interact

with their families. It was simply a frame that was chosen to apply to their supervisors; dominance is often times not a negative attribute.

The final hypotheses that will be discussed are H6(a) and H6(b). H6(a) predicted that perceived supervisor affiliation would be positively correlated with subordinate family closeness, while H6(b) predicted that perceived supervisor affiliation would be positively correlated with subordinate family communication of affection. Both of these hypotheses were supported. With the H6 hypotheses, it seems that subordinates who approach their supervisors with a framework of affiliation are more likely to experience positive spillover in their families. With affiliation, relationships are more concerned with feelings of mutual appreciation and esteem for the other party in the interaction (Solomon & McLaren, 2008). It could be that subordinates who perceive affiliation with their supervisors feel better about their work and professional relationships, causing them to have greater levels of job satisfaction. In this respect, a leadership tactic for supervisors can be to work toward affiliating more with their subordinates. An important part of workplace leadership is putting people first, or before the results (Blanchard & Johnson, 2015). When people feel good about themselves, their work will reflect that (Blanchard & Johnson, 2015). If subordinates feel that they have a positive working relationship with their supervisor, it can enhance the quality of work, potentially causing positive spillover.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

In terms of theoretical implications, this study was able to successfully combine systems theory and spillover research. This study built on previous applications of systems theory and RFT to examine spillover from work to family life. Previous research used systems theory to explain family behavior by accounting for all parts of the family system. Each individual in a system affects everyone else who is in the system. The results in this study indicate that systems

theory and spillover are intertwined with each other. Spillover was the link between the two subsystems of work and family; the way the two subsystems influence each other is spillover. Additionally, RFT provided new insight about spillover occurrence. The findings show that the frames that people apply to others when they interact with them can induce spillover from one subsystem to the other. Therefore, this study has done something new with the two theories by linking them to spillover. Systems theory, RFT, and spillover have all been used to examine family dynamics. However, until this study, they had not been used together to examine family communication as it is affected by the workplace. By combining these three areas of research, the current study offers a preliminary theoretical framework for studying spillover effects in the future.

Another implication of this research is the new insight it provides for examining spillover. More specifically, workplace motivation seems to play an essential role in increasing the likelihood of positive spillover. Research has shown that job satisfaction is linked to positive spillover. Motivation at work can cause job satisfaction and therefore positive spillover; the same may be true for affiliation and spillover. By applying these communicative elements to examine two subsystems, this study has contributed toward better understanding the way spillover can occur from a scholarly standpoint. Based on the findings, it is evident that workplace motivation is not only important for organizations, but for the families of the people who work for these organizations. From a research standpoint, the implications of motivation at work are far-reaching; it does not stop at work.

In addition to the theoretical implications of this study, there are practical implications. As mentioned in the practical rationale, this study is important for all supervisors to consider. The results of this research show that the way supervisors lead and communicate to their

subordinates at work can have an impact on their subordinates' relationships with other people. If supervisors are uncivil to their subordinates, then their subordinates' families could suffer the consequences. However, if supervisors are effective and ethical leaders, and they genuinely care about the well-being of their subordinates, they can potentially improve the lives of many families. They can accomplish this by motivating their subordinates, thereby increasing their job satisfaction and making positive spillover more likely to occur. By indirectly making a positive impact on the building block of society, supervisors can enhance the quality of society. This leads to mentioning Galvin et al.'s (2006) final component of every system—equifinality, which is the ultimate goal toward which a system is working.

It seems that the two subsystems of work and family do not quite form a system in the truest sense of the word. The other six components of the system have been reconciled relative to the current study. However, equifinality cannot be reconciled because it is not a norm for supervisors to enhance work to make a positive impact on the family. The equifinality for which this study is arguing is for supervisors to make work and family a true system. This would be accomplished by supervisors taking on the responsibility of enhancing their organizations, as well as the lives of their subordinates. It is important to show civility to subordinates. This leads to a discussion of the implications of rhetorical decorum/propriety relative to the findings of the current study.

Practically speaking, the current study itself is, in a way, an act of decorum. In order to change the whole structure (or system) changes must be made within the structure (or subsystems) (Leff, 1987). This study is calling for supervisors to make changes within the workplace to adjust and improve the subsystems of work and family, which should form a system. However, as previously stated, they do not quite form a system since equifinality is

missing from the equation. The presence of equifinality would make the two subsystems a true system. People want to be able to balance work and family life. However, that does not necessarily constitute equifinality. Equifinality would be accomplished if supervisors made it a priority to enhance peoples' lives at home by enhancing them at work. The end goal of equifinality, in this instance, would be the presence of balance between the two subsystems on a societal level. This balance can be achieved by an increase in supervisor motivation and affiliation and a decrease in supervisor incivility. Supervisors would not change the content of their workplace language per se, but they would change the style in which it is conveyed. Leff (1987) stated, "Decorum orders the elements of discourse and rounds them out into a coherent product relative to the occasion" (p. 48). There is a need for civility in the workplace. Decorum, as a means that allows people to judge situations/contexts, allows supervisors to understand the need for civility and act accordingly (Leff, 1987). Hariman (2010) would argue that civility could restore damage caused by workplace incivility, which in turn, can translate to the restoration of family damage in the form of negative spillover.

Civility offers value to the workplace. The republican style presents a way of broadening perspectives and understanding people by exercising civic virtues (Hariman, 2010). Supervisors should show their subordinates that they have a genuine concern for their subordinates as people by the way they address them. For instance, they can consult their subordinates to improve work and simultaneously make them feel valued. This can accomplish two things. First, it can motivate subordinates, as Nohria et al. (2008) and Myers et al. (2011) stated that feeling valued by one's organization is important for motivation. Second, by establishing themselves as someone who cares about their subordinates, supervisors can build their reputations among their subordinates, which Hariman (2010) asserts is important. With a good reputation, supervisors

can more easily make accomplishments at work because they will have the respect of their employees.

A final practical implication of this study is that it can help employees manage negative spillover in their family relationships. If work is not going well, employees can at least be aware that they might be at risk of succumbing to negative spillover effects. They can then take the necessary steps to minimize these effects, as well as discuss them with their families so there is more awareness about the issue. This way, employees would be less likely to experience negative spillover, and families will be better prepared and equipped to deal with it should it occur. Moreover, families may be able to help their family member who is struggling at work. The results demonstrate that negative spillover can be an issue for families. This study raises awareness about negative spillover so that families can cope with it and not take it as personally.

Limitations and Future Research

This study contains limitations, which can be addressed in future studies. First, the study was only concerned with correlations, which means that causality cannot be determined. Based on the results, it remains uncertain about what type of spillover is occurring—work-to-family or family-to-work. In this research, the type of spillover that was dealt with was work-to-family. As a result, the discussion was framed in a way that suggested work-to-family spillover, but it should be noted that the spillover effects could possibly be reversed. Nevertheless, it can be stated that motivation and incivility were common links in the first two sets of hypotheses. Family closeness, affection, and satisfaction were all correlated to motivation and incivility. While causality cannot be determined, it can still be suggested. Future research can design studies on this matter that are geared toward determining which subsystem is more influential in causing spillover.

Another limitation of the study was that a large majority of the participants chose to answer the family communication questions about their spouse. While this was helpful for examining spillover in romantic relationships, it was not as helpful for examining spillover effects for children or other family relationship types. People may be more or less prone to spillover with different family members. For instance, if spillover was not present in a romantic relationship, it could have been present in another type of family relationship; this study was unable to account for that. A second problem with this is that the type of relationship might dictate closeness, satisfaction, and affectionate communication. People have different levels of those factors with different family members. Future research can examine whether certain types of family relationships are more or less prone to spillover effects. Participants can be placed into separate categories. One group can answer questions about their spouse, while the other group can answer questions about their children. Other groups can be made as well to accommodate for other family members who may live in the same residence as the participants.

Conclusion

This study demonstrated the prominence of spillover effects between the two subsystems of work and family. Work is undoubtedly consuming individuals' time more than in the past. People are getting busier, and there is a tremendous pressure to balance work and family life. While nothing may be able to be done about people being busy, there is something that can potentially enhance peoples' lives—the supervisor. This study suggests that supervisors can enhance their subordinates' family lives by enhancing their fulfillment at work. Although life can be stressful and busy, it can be better if people show genuine concern and civility for each other at work. This is especially true for people in power, like the supervisor. Supervisors can make their subordinates' lives better or worse. People in power should not underestimate the

power of their communication and leadership styles. Something that seems insignificant to them

may in fact make a substantial impact on the lives of the people who follow them (see

Livingston, 2003). It is important for supervisors to be realistic, positive, and ethical.

References

Adams, G. A., & Webster, J. R. (2013). Emotional regulation as a mediator between interpersonal mistreatment and distress. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 22,* 697-710.

Anderson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 24,* 452-471.

Aquino, K., Tripp, T. M., & Bies, R. J. (2006). Getting even or moving on? Power, procedural justice, and types of offense as predictors of revenge, forgiveness, reconciliation, and avoidance in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 653-668.

Backman, M. (2017). Top 4 reasons why people hate their jobs—and what to do about them. *CNN Money.*

Barnett, R. C. (2006). The relationship of the number and distribution of work hours to health and quality-of-life (QOL) outcomes. In A. Vangelisti (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Family Communication* (pp. 409-423). New York, NY: Routledge.

Barnett, R. C., Marshall, N. L., & Sayer, A. (1992). Positive-spillover effects from job to home: A closer look. *Women & Health*, *19*, 13-41.

Baruch, G. K., Biener, L., & Barnett, R. C. (1987). Women and gender in research on work and family stress. *American Psychologist*, *42*, 130-136.

Bateson, G., Jackson, D. D., Haley, J., & Weakland, J. (1956). Toward a theory of schizophrenia. *Behavioral Science, 1,* 251-263.

Beattie, L., & Griffin, B. (2014). Day-level fluctuations in stress and engagement in response to workplace incivility: A diary study. *Work and Stress, 28,* 124-142.

Belsky, J., & Volling, B. (1987). Mothering, fathering, and marital interaction in the family triad.

In D. O. Braithwaite & L. A. Baxter (Eds.), *Engaging Theories in Family Communication: Multiple Perspectives* (pp. 309-324). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Blanchard, K., & Johnson, S. (2015). *The New One Minute Manager*. Manjul Publishing.

Bono, J. E., & Yoon, D. J. (2012). Positive supervisory relationships. *Personal Relationships: The Effect on Employee Attitudes, Behavior, and Well-Being* (pp. 43-66). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bumpus, M. F., Crouter, A. C., & McHale, S. M. (1999). Work demands of dual-earner couples: Implications for parents' knowledge about children's daily lives in middle childhood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *61,* 465-475.

--- (2006). Linkages between negative work-to-family spillover and mothers' and fathers' knowledge of their young adolescents' daily lives. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *26*, 36-59.

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6*, 64-80.

Daft, R. L. (2015). *The Leadership Experience*. Cengage Learning.

Dillard, J. P., & Solomon, D. H. (2005). Measuring the relevance of relational frames: A relational framing theory perspective. In V. Manusov (Ed.), *The Sourcebook of Nonverbal Measures: Going Beyond Words* (pp. 325-334). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dillard, J. P., Solomon, D. H., & Samp, J. A. (1996). Framing social reality: The relevance of relational judgments. *Communication Research, 23,* 703-723.

Doumas, D. M., Margolin, G., & John, R. S. (2008). Spillover patterns in single-earner couples: Work, self-care, and the marital relationship. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*,

29, 55-73.

Duncan, B., & Rock, J. (1993). Saving relationships: The power of the unpredictable. *Psychology Today, 26,* 46-95.

Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, *27,* 31-41.

Ferguson, M. (2012). You cannot leave it at the office: Spillover and crossover of coworker incivility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33,* 571-588.

Ferguson, S. M., & Dickson, F. C. (1995). Children's expectations of their single parents' dating behaviors: A preliminary investigation of emergent themes relevant to single parent dating. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 23,* 308-324.

Floyd, K., & Morman, M. T. (1998). The measurement of affectionate communication. *Communication Quarterly*, *46*, 144-162.

Galvin, K. M., Dickson, F. C., & Marrow, S. R. (2006). Systems theory: Patterns and (w)holes in family communication. *Engaging Theories in Family Communication: Multiple Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gao, G. (2015). Americans' ideal family size is smaller than it used to be. *Pew Research Center.*

Goleman, D. (2004). What makes a leader. *Harvard Business Review, 82,* 82-91.

Griffin, B. (2010). Multilevel relationships between organizational-level incivility, justice and intention to stay. *Work & Stress*, *24*, 309-323.

Grzywacz, J. G. (2000). Work–family spillover and health during mid-life: Is managing conflict everything? *American Journal of Health Promotion, 14,* 236 –243.

Grzywacz, J. G., Almeida, D. M., & McDonald, D. A. (2002). Work-family spillover and daily reports of work and family stress in the adult labor force. *Family Relations, 51,* 28-36.

Hammer, L. B., Cullen, J. C., Neal, M. B., Sinclair, R. R., & Shafiro, M. V. (2005). The

longitudinal effects of work-family conflict and positive spillover on depressive

symptoms among dual-earner couples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,*

10, 138-154.

Hariman, R. (2010). In oratory as in life: Civic performance in Cicero's republican style.

Political Style: The Artistry of Power (pp. 95-140). University of Chicago Press.

Hassan, S., Mahsud, R., Yukl, G., & Prussia, G. E. (2013). Ethical and empowering leadership

and leader effectiveness. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 28,* 133-146.

Heller, D., & Watson, D. (2005). The dynamic spillover of satisfaction between work and

marriage: The role of time and mood. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 1273-79.

Henningsen, M. L. M., Henningsen, D. D., Cruz, M. G., & Morrill, J. (2003). Social influence in

groups: A comparative application of relational framing theory and the elaboration

likelihood model of persuasion. *Communication Monographs*, *70*, 175-197.

Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010). Towards a multi-foci approach to workplace aggression:

A meta-analytic review of outcomes from different perpetrators. *Journal of*

Organizational Behavior, 31, 24-44.

Hoffman, L. (1990). Constructing realities: An art of lenses. *Family Process, 29,* 1-12.

Holt, S., Buckley, H., & Whelan, S. (2008). The impact of exposure to domestic violence on

children and young people: A review of the literature. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *32*, 797-810.

Hoobler, J. M., & Brass, D. J. (2006). Abusive supervision and family undermining as displaced

aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 1125-1133.

Inside the middle class: Bad times hit the good life. (2008). *Pew Research Center.*

Kern, J. H., & Grandey, A. A. (2009). Customer incivility as a social stressor: The role of race

and racial identity for service employees. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,*

14, 46-57.

Kinnunen, U., Feldt, T., Geurts, S., & Pulkkinen, L. (2006). Types of work-family interface: Well-being correlates of negative and positive spillover between work and family. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 47,* 149-162.

Kotter, J. (2001). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review, 79,* 25-33.

Leff, M. (1987). The habitation of rhetoric. In M. J. Porrovecchio, & C. M. Condit (Eds.), *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader* (pp. 52-64). The Guilford Press.

Lim, S., & Lee, A. (2011). Work and nonwork outcomes of workplace incivility: Does family support help? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16,* 95-111.

Lim, V. K., & Teo, T. S. (2009). Mind your e-manners: Impact of cyber incivility on employees' work attitude and behavior. *Information & Management, 46,* 419-425.

Littlejohn, S. W. (2002). *Theories of Communication* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/ Thomson Learning.

Livingston, J. S. (2003). Pygmalion in management. *Harvard Business Review*, *81*, 97-106.

Marks, C. R., Glaser, B. A., Glass, J. B., & Horne, A. M. (2001). Effects of witnessing severe marital discord on children's social competence and behavioral problems. *The Family Journal*, *9*, 94-101.

Mikulincer, M., Florian, V., Cowan, P. A., & Cowan, C. P. (2002). Attachment security in couple relationships: A systemic model and its implications for family dynamics. *Family Process*, *41*, 405-434.

Molm, L. D. (1988). The structure and use of power: A comparison of reward and punishment power. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *51,* 108-122.

Myers, K. (2005). A burning desire: Assimilation into a fire department. *Management*

Communication Quarterly, *18*, 344-384.

--- (2010). Workplace relationships and membership negotiation. *New Directions in Interpersonal Communication Research*, 135-156.

Myers, K., & Oetzel, J. (2003). Exploring the dimensions of organizational assimilation: Creating and validating measure. *Communication Quarterly, 51,* 438-457.

Myers, K. K., Seibold, D. R., & Park, H. S. (2011). Interpersonal communication in the workplace. *The Sage Handbook of Interpersonal Communication* (pp. 527-562). Sage, California.

Nohria, N., Groysberg, B., & Lee, L.E. (2008). Employee motivation: A powerful new model. *Harvard Business Review, 86,* 133-139.

Olson, D. H. (2000). Circumplex model of marital and family systems. *Journal of Family Therapy*, *22*, 144-167.

Patten, E. (2015). How American parents balance work and family life when both work. *Pew Research Center*.

Peck, D. L. (2002). Civility: A contemporary context for a meaningful historical concept. *Sociological Inquiry, 72,* 358–375.

Polkinghorne, D. (1983). *Methodology for the Human Sciences: Systems of Inquiry*. In D. O. Braithwaite & L. A. Baxter (Eds.), *Engaging Theories in Family Communication: Multiple Perspectives* (pp. 309-324)*.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Porath, C. L., & Erez, A. (2007). Does rudeness matter? The effects of rude behavior on task performance and helpfulness. *Academy of Management Journal, 50,* 1181-1197.

Porath, C. L., & Pearson, C. (2009). How toxic colleagues corrode performance. *Harvard Business Review, 87,* 24-24.

--- (2013). The price of incivility. *Harvard Business Review, 91,* 115-121.

Presser, H. B. (2005). Embracing complexity: Work schedules and family life in a 24/7
economy. In A. Vangelisti *The Routledge Handbook of Family Communication* (pp. 409-
423). New York, NY: Routledge.

Repetti, R., & Saxbe, D. (2009). The effects of job stress on the family: One size does not fit all.
In A. Vangelisti *The Routledge Handbook of Family Communication* (pp. 409-423). New
York, NY: Routledge.

Rogers, L. E. (2001). Relational communication in the context of family. *Journal of Family
Communication, 1,* 25-35.

--- (2008). Relational communication theory. *Engaging Theories in Interpersonal
Communication: Multiple Perspectives*, 335-347.

Schilpzand, P., De Pater, I., & Erez, A. (2014). Workplace incivility: A review of the literature
and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37,* S57-S88.

Smilkstein, G. (1978). The Family APGAR: A proposal for family function test and its use by
physicians. *The Journal of Family Practice*.

Solomon, D. H., Dillard, J. P., & Anderson, J. W. (2002). Episode type, attachment orientation,
and frame salience: Evidence for a theory of relational framing. *Human Communication
Research*, *28*, 136-152.

Solomon, D. H., & McLaren, R. M. (2008). Relational framing theory. *Engaging Theories in
Interpersonal Communication*, 103-115.

Staines, G. L., & Pleck, J. H. (1983). *Impact of Work Schedules on the Family*. In A. Vangelisti
The Routledge Handbook of Family Communication (pp. 409-423). New York, NY:
Routledge.

Stephens, M. A. P., Franks, M. M., & Atienza, A. A. (1997). In The longitudinal effects of work-family conflict and positive spillover on depressive symptoms among dual-earner couples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*, 138-154.

Sypher, B. D. (2009). Reclaiming civil discourse in the workplace. *Southern Communication Journal, 69,* 257-269.

Tepper, B. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, *33*, 261-289.

Tepper, B., & Almeda, M. (2012). Negative exchanges with supervisors. *Personal Relationships: The Effect on Employee Attitudes, Behavior, and Well-Being* (pp. 67-93). New York, NY: Routledge.

Theiss, J. A., & Knobloch, L. K. (2013). A relational turbulence model of military service members' relational communication during reintegration. *Journal of Communication*, *63*, 1109-1129.

van Steenbergen, E. F., Ellemers, N., & Mooijaart, A. (2007). How work and family can facilitate each other: Distinct types of work-family facilitation and outcomes for women and men. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*, 279-300.

Walsh, B. M., Magley, V. J., Reeves, D. W., Davies-Schrils, K. A., Marmet, M. D., & Gallus, J. A. (2012). Assessing workgroup norms for civility: The development of the Civility Norms Questionnaire-Brief. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *27*, 407-420.

Wang, S., & Repetti, R. L. (2013). How jobs impact family relationships. *The Routledge Handbook of Family Communication*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Whitchurch, G., & Constantine, L. (1993). Systems theory. In D. O. Braithwaite & L. A. Baxter (Eds.), *Engaging Theories in Family Communication: Multiple Perspectives* (pp. 309-324).

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Whitchurch, G., & Dickson, F. C. (1999). Systems theory. In D. O. Braithwaite & L. A. Baxter

(Eds.), *Engaging Theories in Family Communication: Multiple Perspectives* (pp. 309-324).

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

White, M. (2014). The 5 absolute worst kinds of bosses. *Time Magazine.*

Wong, M., Gardiner, E., Lang, W., & Coulon, L. (2008). Generational differences in personality

and motivation: do they exist and what are the implications for the workplace?. *Journal*

of Managerial Psychology, *23*, 878-890.

Yerby, J. (1995). Family systems theory reconsidered: Integrating social construction theory and

dialectical processes. *Communication Theory, 5,* 339-365.

TABLE 1

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

Variable	*M*	*SD*	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Sup. Motivation	3.82	0.82	.96								
2. Sup. Incivility	1.85	1.02	.94	-.22**							
3. Sup. Dominance	3.07	1.04	.78	-.25**	.45**						
4. Sup. Affiliation	3.84	0.82	.86	.83**	-.21**	-.21**					
5. Fam. Closeness	4.44	0.66	.94	.35**	-.35**	-.05	.36**				
6. Fam. Satisfaction	4.32	0.70	.89	.34**	-.29**	-.08	.36**	.83**			
7. Fam. Affection	4.38	0.66	.92	.28**	-.38**	-.04	.28**	.85**	.72**		
8. Fam. Dominance	2.94	1.06	.78	.05	.41**	.35**	.04	-.13*	-.05	-.15*	
9. Fam. Affiliation	4.27	0.67	.77	.36**	-.26**	.04	.35**	.75**	.69**	.65**	-.09

Note. All variables were measured on a 1-5 scale wherein higher scores indicate greater levels of the variable.

APPENDIX A

Survey Questions

The following section contains the survey questions of this study. Before the study, participants were asked 7 questions for the eligibility screening.

1. Are you the age of majority in your state?

2. Are you employed?

3. Do you work an average of 20 hours per week?

4. Do you work at your physical place of employment?

5. Do you have a supervisor?

6. Do you have a family of your own (i.e. married and/or children of your own)?

7. Do you live in the same residence as your family?

Workplace Incivility Index—Cortina, Magley, Williams, and Langhout (2001)

Directions: During the past 3 years of your employment, assess how often your primary supervisor has done the following things to you according to the scale: 1 (Never or almost never) to 5 (Always or almost always).

1) Put you down or was condescending to you
   Never:__1….5__: Always

2) Paid little attention to your statement or showed little interest in your opinion
   Never:__1….5__: Always

3) Made demeaning or derogatory remarks about you
   Never:__1….5__: Always

4) Addressed you in unprofessional terms, whether publicly or privately
   Never:__1….5__: Always

5) Ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie
   Never:__1….5__: Always

6) Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal matters?
   Never:__1….5__: Always

Affectionate Communication Index—Floyd and Morman (1998)

Directions: In this section, indicate which family member (the family member's relationship to you) you are referring to when answering these questions. Pick 1 family member. To what extent would you say that you do each of the following things as a way to express affection to this person? Indicate your response by choosing the appropriate number on the line preceding each item, according to the scale: 1 (Never or almost never) to 5 (Always or almost always).

1) Indicate your family member's relationship to you.

2) I help this person with his/her problems
   Never:__1….5__: Always

3) I acknowledge this person's birthday
   Never:__1….5__: Always

4) I hug this person
   Never:__1….5__: Always

5) I praise this person's accomplishments
   Never:__1….5__: Always

6) I put my arm around this person
   Never:__1….5__: Always

7) I share private information with this person
   Never:__1….5__: Always

8) I say "I care about you" to this person
   Never:__1….5__: Always

9) I tell this person how important our relationship is
   Never:__1….5__: Always

10) I tell this person "I love you" or "I care about you"
    Never:__1….5__: Always

11) I compliment this person
    Never:__1….5__: Always

Communication of Closeness Index—Smilkstein (1978)

Directions: In this section, indicate which family member (the family member's relationship to you) you are referring to when answering these questions. Pick 1 family member. To what extent would you say you agree or disagree with each of the following statements based on the scale: 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree)?

1) Indicate your family member's relationship to you

2) Our relationship is close
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

3) When we are apart, I miss this person
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

4) We disclose important, personal things to each other
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

5) We have a strong connection
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

6) We want to spend time together
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

7) This person is a priority in my life
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

8) We do a lot of things together
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

9) When I have free time, I choose to spend it with this person
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

10) My relationship with this person is important in my life
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

11) I consider this person when making important decisions
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

Family Satisfaction Index—Smilkstein (1978)

Directions: In this section, indicate which family member (the family member's relationship to you) you are referring to when answering these questions. Pick 1 family member. To what extent would you say you agree or disagree with each of the following statements based on the scale: 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree)?

1) Indicate your family member's relationship to you

2) I can turn to this person for help
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

3) I am satisfied with the overall level of communication from this person

Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

4) I am satisfied with the level of support I receive from this person
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

5) I am satisfied with the level of affection I receive from this person
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

6) I am satisfied with the way this person spends time with me
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

Dominance/Affiliation Index—Theiss and Knobloch (2013)

Directions: Read the following statements about the way your primary supervisor communicates to you at work. Then, indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statement based on the scale: 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree).

1) My boss displays professional attraction to me as a worker of the organization
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

2) My boss displays a professional liking for me as a worker of the organization
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

3) My boss attempts to control conversations he or she has with me
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

4) My boss shows positive regard for me as a worker of the organization
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

5) My boss attempts to dominate conversations he or she has with me
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

6) My boss communicates professional affection toward me as a worker of the
   organization (i.e. tells me that I am valuable to the organization)
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

Dominance/Affiliation Index—Theiss and Knobloch (2013)

Directions: Read the following statements about the way you communicate with your family in general. Then, indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statement based on the scale: 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree).

1) I display a platonic attraction toward my family
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

2) I display a liking for my family

Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

3) I tend to control conversations I have with my family
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

4) I show positive regard toward my family
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

5) I tend to dominate conversations I have with my family
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

6) I convey/communicate affection toward my family (i.e. tell them their positive
   worth, pat them on the back, hug them, etc.)
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

Motivation Questionnaire Index—used in Wong, Gardiner, Lang, and Coulon (2008)

Read the following statements about your primary supervisor's ability to motivate.
Then, indicate whether you agree or disagree with each statement based on the scale:
1 (Strongly disagree) to 3 (Not sure) to 5 (Strongly agree).

1) My supervisor makes me feel like my job is important
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

2) My supervisor explains to me the results that are expected of me
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

3) My supervisor leads by example
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

4) My supervisor tells me what he or she thinks of my performance
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

5) My relationship with my supervisor allows me to be open when discussing
   work problems and concerns
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

6) In the last 7 days, my supervisor has given me recognition or praise for doing
   good work
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

7) My supervisor keeps me informed about what is going on
   Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

8) My supervisor seems to care about me as a person

Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

9) I have a good working relationship with my supervisor
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

10) My supervisor consults me and my opinions seem to count
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

11) In the last year, my supervisor has given me opportunities to learn and develop
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

12) My supervisor gives me the freedom to choose my own method of working
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

13) My supervisor gives me opportunities to innovate and work on my initiative
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

14) My supervisor makes sure that I have all the materials and equipment I need to do my best
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

15) My supervisor gives me enough work to keep me busy but not too much to over-burden me
Strongly disagree:__1….5__: Strongly agree

Demographic Questions:

1) How old are you?

2) What is your gender?

3) What is your race/ethnicity?

4) What is your annual family salary?

5) What is the gender of your supervisor?

6) What is your highest level of education completed?

7) What is your occupation?