**A Tale of Two Narratives: The Role of Event Disruption in Employee Affective and Behavioral Reactions to Authoritarian Leadership**

Supplemental Material

**Supplemental Material A: A Scenario Experiment**

To demonstrate the cross-cultural generalizability of our theoretical model, we further conducted a scenario experiment with a Western sample. Below, we report the procedures and findings of this experiment.

**Participants and Procedure**

We posted experimental materials on the *Prolific* platform and invited full-time employees to participate. A total of 236 full-time employees from the United States and the United Kingdom provided complete responses and were each paid $1.12 US. After removing participants who failed to correctly answer two attention check questions, our final sample comprised 227 participants (71.37% female; *Mage* = 38.93 years, *SDage* = 13.70). Participants were randomly assigned to conditions in a 2 (authoritarian leadership: high, low) × 2 (event disruption: high, low) between-person design.

**Manipulations**

We used a vignette to manipulate authoritarian leadership and event disruption, asking participants to imagine the situation as vividly as possible. We used the same scenarios as Wang et al. (2018) to manipulate authoritarian leadership, which described a variety of authoritarian behaviors (e.g., being strict with subordinates, telling others what to do, punishing subordinates who make mistakes or violate principals). Our manipulation of event disruption was based on the conceptualization of event disruption (Morgeson, 2005) and the disruptive-event example cited by Li and Tangirala (2022). All the manipulations are included in Appendix S1.

**Measures**

Anxiety (Cronbach’s α = .96) and awe (Cronbach’s α = .81) were measured using the same scales as in Study 1. Due to the scenario-based design, we modified the scales used in Study 1 to assess participants’ intentions to engage in behaviors reflecting leader-directed avoidance (Cronbach’s α = .95), counterproductivity (Cronbach’s α = .88), leader-directed affiliation (Cronbach’s α = .76), and job performance (Cronbach’s α = .91).

**Pretests of the Manipulations**

Similar to Study 3a in the manuscript, we conducted manipulation checks of authoritarian leadership and event disruption with an independent sample on *Prolific* to prevent the manipulation checks from exerting independent influence. We recruited 197 participants (73.10% female, *M*age = 42.13 years, *SD*age = 11.45), whom we randomly assigned to an authoritarian leadership condition (high vs. low) and event disruption condition (high vs. low). We used the same scales as before to measure authoritarian leadership (Cronbach’s α = .97) and event disruption (Cronbach’s α = .95). With authoritarian leadership as the outcome, ratings were higher in the high authoritarian leadership condition (*M* = 4.53, *SD* = .48) compared to the low authoritarian leadership condition (*M* = 1.94, *SD* = 1.08), *F*(1,195) = 478.53, *p* <.001, *η*2 = .71. With event disruption as the outcome, ratings were higher in the high event disruption condition (*M* = 4.14, *SD* = .67) compared to the low event disruption condition (*M* = 2.20, *SD* = .89), *F*(1,195) = 296.66, *p* <.001, *η*2 = .60. Moreover, there were no cross-over effects nor interactive effects across the two manipulations.[[1]](#footnote-1) These results support the veracity of the manipulations.

**Results**

Table S1 presents the descriptive statistics, reliabilities, and correlations of the focal variables. The means and standard deviations of the focal variables, by conditions, are in Table S2. We conducted the same analyses as in Study 3b to test our model.

Before testing the hypotheses, we conducted a CFA to assess the discriminant validity of the measured variables (i.e., anxiety, awe, leader-directed avoidance and affiliation, counterproductive behavior, and job performance). We created three parcels for counterproductive work behavior using the same item parceling strategy as in Study 2. The six-factor model had a better fit to the data, *c*2(137) = 275.52, *p* < .001, CFI = .96, TLI= .95, RMSEA = .07, than any alternative 5-factor models, Δχ2(Δ*df* = 5) = 112.93 to 798.87, *p*s < .001.

In support of Hypothesis 1, authoritarian leadership and event disruption interacted to predict anxiety, *F*(1,223) = 8.25, *p =* .004, *η*2 = .04 (see Figure S1). When event disruption was high, there was a significant difference in anxiety when authoritarian leadership was low (*M* = 2.98, *SD* = 1.24) versus high (*M* = 4.01, *SD* = .94), *F*(1, 223) = 26.45, *p <* .001, *η*2 = .11. When event disruption was low, there was also a significant difference in anxiety when authoritarian leadership was low (*M* = 2.41, *SD* = 1.11) versus high (*M* = 4.24, *SD* = .90), *F*(1, 223) = 86.26, *p <* .001, *η*2 = .28. Although authoritarian leadership had a positive effect on anxiety regardless of whether event disruption was high or low, we examined the relative magnitude of this effect across the high and low conditions. The test of simple slopes (Aiken & West, 1991) indicated that authoritarian leadership had a stronger effect on anxiety in the low disruption condition (simple slope = 1.83, *p* < .001) compared to the high disruption condition (simple slope = 1.03, *p* < .001), and the difference of these slopes was significant (difference= -.81, *p* = .004). This difference is in line with Hypothesis 1.

In testing Hypothesis 3, authoritarian leadership and event disruption interacted to predict awe, *F*(1,223) = 4.03, *p =* .046, *η*2 = .02 (see Figure S1). In probing this interaction with a simple effect analysis, when event disruption was high, participants in the high (*M* = 3.62, *SD* = .75) versus low (*M* = 3.07, *SD* = .89) authoritarian leadership condition reported greater awe, *F*(1, 223) = 12.19, *p* =.001, *η*2 = .05. However, when event disruption was low, awe did not vary significantly across the high (*M* = 3.37, *SD* = .83) and low (*M* = 3.27, *SD* = .89) authoritarian leadership conditions, *F*(1,223) = .46, *p* = .499, *η*2 = .00. Thus, Hypothesis 3 received support.

Path analytic results indicated that anxiety was positively related to leader-directed avoidance (*γ* = .41, *p* *<*.001) and counterproductive (*γ* = .15, *p* *=*.001) intentions. Also, awe was positively related to leader-directed affiliation (*γ* = .14, *p* = .006) and job performance (*γ* = .15, *p* *<*.001) intentions. Moderated mediation results (see Table S3) indicated that authoritarian leadership had a positive indirect effect on leader-directed avoidance via anxiety at both high (estimate= .421, 95% CI [.2432, .6285]) and low (estimate= .751, 95% CI [.5145, 1.0144) levels of event disruption, with a significant difference between them (estimate= -.330, 95% CI [-.5880, -.1097]). The indirect effect of authoritarian leadership on counterproductive behavior via anxiety was also significant at both high (estimate= .155, 95% CI [.0599, .2728) and low (estimate= .276, 95% CI [.1158, .4519) levels of event disruption, and this difference was significant (estimate= -.121, 95% CI [-.2462, -.0294]). Thus, Hypothesis 2 received support.

The indirect effect of authoritarian leadership on leader-directed affiliation via awe was significant when event disruption was high (estimate= .076, 95% CI [.0159, .1579]) but not when it was low (estimate= .014, 95% CI [-.0282, .0653]), and this difference was significant (estimate= .062, 95% CI [.0001, .1540]). The indirect effect of authoritarian leadership on job performance via awe was significant at both high (estimate= .082, 95% CI [.0264, .1544]) and low (estimate= .015, 95% CI [-.0301, .0680]) levels of event disruption, and the difference between these indirect effects was significant (estimate=.067, 95% CI [.0022, .1532]). Therefore, Hypothesis 4 received support.

**Discussion**

This scenario experiment replicates the general pattern of findings from our main studies, indicating that authoritarian leadership has stronger effects on anxiety and stronger indirect effects on leader-directed avoidance and counterproductive intentions (via anxiety) when event disruption is lower. In contrast, only when event disruption is high does authoritarian leadership elicit awe and (via awe) increased leader-directed affiliation and job performance intentions. These results provide further causal evidence for the notion that authoritarian leadership evokes diverging emotional states and behavioral intentions for employees in stable versus disruptive contexts, and also demonstrate the cross-cultural generalizability of our theoretical model.

Table S1

*Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations, and Reliabilities*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Mean | *SD* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1. AL manipulation | .51 | .50 | -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Event disruption manipulation | .49 | .50 | -.04 | -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Anxiety | 3.43 | 1.28 | .56\*\* | .04 | (.96) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Awe | 3.33 | .86 | .19\*\* | .01 | .03 | (.81) |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Leader-directed avoidance | 3.46 | 1.20 | .56\*\* | -.04 | .64\*\* | .02 | (.95) |  |  |  |
| 6. Counterproductive work behavior | 2.29 | .81 | .26\*\* | .04 | .35\*\* | -.18\*\* | .44\*\* | (.88) |  |  |
| 7. Leader-directed affiliation | 3.82 | .69 | .04 | -.07 | -.11 | .25\*\* | -.20\*\* | -.35\*\* | (.76) |  |
| 8. Job performance | 4.11 | .59 | -.04 | -.05 | -.14\* | .29\*\* | -.24\*\* | -.45\*\* | .51\*\* | (.91) |

*Note*. *N* = 227.AL manipulation = Authoritarian leadership manipulation. Values in the brackets are Cronbach’s alpha coefficients. For the authoritarian leadership manipulation, low authoritarian leadership condition = 0, high authoritarian leadership condition = 1. For the event disruption manipulation, low event disruption condition = 0, high event disruption condition = 1.

\* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01 (two-tailed).

Table S2

*Means and Standard Deviations by Condition for Focal Variables*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition | Anxiety |  | Awe |  | Leader-directed avoidance |  | Counterproductivework behavior |  | Leader-directed affiliation |  | Job performance |
| *M* | *SD* |  | *M* | *SD* |  | *M* | *SD* |  | *M* | *SD* |  | *M* | *SD* |  | *M* | *SD* |
| High AL, High ED (*N*=55) | 4.01 | .94 |  | 3.62 | .75 |  | 3.96 | .96 |  | 2.56 | .83 |  | 3.85 | .63 |  | 4.09 | .53 |
| High AL, Low ED (*N*=61) | 4.24 | .90 |  | 3.37 | .83 |  | 4.25 | .95 |  | 2.45 | .91 |  | 3.84 | .71 |  | 4.09 | .60 |
| Low AL, High ED (*N*=57) | 2.98 | 1.24 |  | 3.07 | .89 |  | 2.88 | 1.01 |  | 2.09 | .67 |  | 3.69 | .77 |  | 4.08 | .66 |
| Low AL, Low ED (*N*=54) | 2.41 | 1.11 |  | 3.27 | .89 |  | 2.69 | 1.07 |  | 2.06 | .70 |  | 3.90 | .62 |  | 4.19 | .56 |

*Note.* *N =* 227*.* AL= Authoritarian leadership, ED = Event Disruption.

Table S3

*Results for Hypothesized Indirect Effects*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Leader-directed avoidance |  | Counterproductive work behavior |  | Leader-directed affiliation |  | Job performance |
|  | Estimate | 95% CI |  | Estimate | 95% CI |  | Estimate | 95% CI |  | Estimate | 95% CI |
|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Low event disruption (–1*SD*) | .751 | [.5145, 1.0144] |  | .276 | [.1158, .4519] |  | .014 | [-.0282, .0653] |  | .015 | [-.0301, 0680] |

 |
| High event disruption (+1*SD*) | .421 | [.2432, .6285] |  | .155 | [.0599, .2728] |  | .076 | [.0159, .1579] |  | .082 | [.0264, .1544] |
| Difference | -.330 | [-.5880, -.1097] |  | -.121 | [-.2462, -.0294] |  | .062 | [.0001, .1540] |  | .067 | [.0022, .1532] |

*Note.* *N* = 227. Monte Carlo method in R software was adopted to construct the CIs for the conditional indirect effects with 20,000 replications. Unstandardized path coefficients with 95% CIs are reported.

Figure S1

*Interaction of Authoritarian Leadership and Event Disruption on Anxiety and Awe*

Appendix S1

*Manipulations of Authoritarian Leadership and Event Disruption in the Scenario Experiment*

Dear participants, when you read the passage that follows, please try to put yourself in the shoes of the person being described. The questions after the passage ask you to respond with how you would react if you were in the situation yourself.

Imagine that you are working in the production team of a chemical company that produces more than 300 varieties of products. You work in a team and all members are supervised by Mr./Ms. Smith.

**High authoritarian leadership condition**

Mr./Ms. Smith clearly tells subordinates in your unit what to do and is very strict with you. He/she closely monitors everyone’s work progress and expects performance beyond expectations. When subordinates fail to meet a target or make mistakes that violate the manager’s principles, Mr./Ms. Smith scolds and disciplines them.

**Low authoritarian leadership condition**

Mr./Ms. Smith does not clearly specify what to do but lets subordinates in your unit do assigned tasks in their own way. He/she does not keep an eye on subordinates’ work progress or whether they can get the job done. Even when they make mistakes or fail to meet Mr./Ms. Smith’s expectations, Mr./Ms. Smith seldom scolds or disciplines them.

**High event disruption condition**

The company is undergoing a business process reengineering and introducing four new product administration platforms to replace existing ones that have been in use for years. You needed to work with new hardware and software and operate completely unfamiliar processes to manage your production lines. This change is discontinuous as you have to substantively modify your existing practices, structures, and workflow. Because the company struggles to hold its position in the coating segments, your team needed to achieve production goals and qualification criteria set top–down by the management.

**Low event disruption condition**

The company has used product administration platforms to manage productions for many years, and everyone in your team is familiar with these platforms used in the production processes. At daily work, each member of your team worked with the hardware and software in the product administration platforms to manage the production lines. You are familiar with the production procedures, and very few special events or situations occur in your everyday work.

**Supplemental Material B: Path Analysis Results Without Control Variables**

Following best practices, we conducted a robustness check of the hypothesized relationships without control variables in Studies 1 and 2. After removing all control variables, we followed the same analytic procedure as outlined in the manuscript to test the hypothesized model. As Table S4 shows, the pattern and significance of results remain the same when control variables are removed from analyses in Studies 1 and 2.

Table S4

*Studies 1 and 2: Path Analytic Results for the Hypothesized Model Without Control Variables*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Predictor | Anxiety |  | Awe |  | Leader-directed avoidance |  | Counterproductive work behavior |  | Leader-directed Affiliation |  | Job performance |
| *γ* | SE |  | *γ* | SE |  | *γ* | SE |  | *γ* | SE |  | *γ* | SE |  | *γ* | SE |
| *Study* 1 (Level 1: *N* = 1049, Level 2: *N* = 224) |
| Authoritarian leadership (AL)  | .39\*\* | .07 |  | .13\* | .06 |  | .37\*\* | .06 |  | .29\*\* | .07 |  | .01 | .02 |  | .02 | .01 |
| Event disruption | .05 | .05 |  | .14 | .09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AL × Event disruption | -.23\* | .10 |  | .21\* | .09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anxiety |  |  |  |  |  |  | .31\*\* | .03 |  | .33\*\* | .05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Awe  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .00 | .02 |  | .02\* | .01 |
| *Study* 2 (*N* = 343) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leader-directed avoidance (T1) |  |  |  |  |  |  | .28\*\* | .05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Counterproductive work behavior (T1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .34\*\* | .05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leader-directed affiliation (T1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .50\*\* | .09 |  |  |  |
| Job performance (T1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .53\*\* | .08 |
| Authoritarian leadership (AL)  | .55\*\* | .07 |  | .20\* | .08 |  | -.13\*\* | .04 |  | -.27\*\* | .05 |  | -.03 | .03 |  | -.04 | .02 |
| Event disruption | .05 | .09 |  | .20\*\* | .07 |  | .05 | .06 |  | .10 | .07 |  | -.03 | .03 |  | -.01 | .03 |
| AL × Event disruption | -.22\*\* | .07 |  | .14\* | .06 |  | -.08 | .05 |  | -.05 | .06 |  | .01 | .02 |  | -.00 | .03 |
| Anxiety |  |  |  |  |  |  | .28\*\* | .04 |  | .34\*\* | .04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Awe  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .07\*\* | .02 |  | .07\* | .03 |

*Note.* Estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients.

\* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01 (two-tailed).

**Supplemental Material C: Supplementary Analyses for Crossover Relationships**

Based on research on emotions, leader-directed avoidance/counterproductive work behavior and leader-directed affiliation/job performance were specified as unique action tendencies of anxiety and awe, respectively. We did not expect that leader-directed avoidance and counterproductive work behavior would be predicted by feelings of awe and leader-directed affiliation and job performance would be predicted by anxiety feelings. The non-hypothesized crossover relationships were tested, and the pattern and significance of results relevant to our hypothesized relationships remained the same across four studies, after including these crossover relationships. With one exception in Study 1, the relationship between awe and job performance was marginally significant (*γ* = .02, *p* = .080) after including the crossover relationship. As indicated by Table S5, some cross-ties exist; awe was negatively related to both counterproductive work behavior (*γ* = -.13, *p* = .003, Study 1; *γ* = -.21, *p* < .001, Supplemental study) and leader-directed avoidance (*γ* = -.13, *p* = .002, Study 1); whereas, anxiety exhibited a non-significant correlation with both leader-directed affiliation and job performance across all studies.

Our supplementary analyses offer preliminary evidence of the adverse impact of awe on leader-directed avoidance and counterproductive work behavior. Although awe has been found as a self-transcend emotion that evokes prosocial behavior (e.g., Piff et al., 2015; Stellar et al., 2017; Yam et al., 2023), our supplementary results, to some degree, enrich awe literature by suggesting that awe can also inhibit antisocial behaviors such as interpersonal avoidance behaviors and counterproductive behaviors.

Table S5

*Path-Analytic Results for Crossover Relationships Between Emotions and Work Behaviors*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Leader-directed avoidance |  | Counterproductive work behavior |  | Leader-directed affiliation |  | Job performance |
|  | *γ* | SE |  | *γ* | SE |  | *γ* | SE |  | *γ* | SE |
| *Study 1* (Level 1: *N* = 1049 weekly observations, Level 2: *N* = 224 participants) |
| Anxiety | .35\*\* | .04 |  | .36\*\* | .04 |  | .00 | .01 |  | .01 | .01 |
| Awe | -.13\*\* | .03 |  | -.13\*\* | .03 |  | .01 | .02 |  | .02 | .01 |
| *Study 2* (*N* = 343) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anxiety | .19\*\* | .06 |  | .24\*\* | .06 |  | -.01 | .02 |  | -.04 | .02 |
| Awe | -.02 | .06 |  | -.12 | .07 |  | .07\*\* | .03 |  | .10\*\* | .03 |
| *Study 3b* (*N* = 189) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anxiety | .22\*\* | .07 |  | .07 | .09 |  | -.07 | .05 |  | 5.70 | 4.27 |
| Awe | -.05 | .08 |  | .10 | .09 |  | -.03 | .05 |  | -10.69\* | 4.42 |
| *Supplemental study* (*N* = 227) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anxiety | .44\*\* | .06 |  | .18\*\* | .05 |  | -.08 | .04 |  | -.06 | .04 |
| Awe | -.07 | .07 |  | -.21\*\* | .06 |  | .19\*\* | .05 |  | .21\*\* | .04 |

*Note.* Estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients. We used time spent on the task as the indicator of participants’ job performance, and more time spent on the task indicated lower job performance.

\* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01 (two-tailed).

**Supplemental Material D: Supplementary Analyses for Indirect Effects of Alternative Mechanisms (Study 2)**

Four alternative mechanisms have been identified as control mediators to verify that leader-focused anxiety operates uniquely from other negative states (i.e., high-arousal felt uncertainty and low-arousal fatigue), and that leader-focused awe operates uniquely from other positive states (i.e., high-arousal happiness and low-arousal relief).

The path analytic results (see Table S6) demonstrate the unique role of anxiety and awe as affective mechanisms of authoritarian leadership. With respect to the alternative negative states, neither state was predicted by the interaction of authoritarian leadership and event disruption (for felt uncertainty: *γ* = -.06, *p* = .617; for fatigue: *γ* = -.09, *p* = .350). Felt uncertainty was, likewise, unrelated to both leader-directed avoidance (*γ* = .11, *p* = .162) and counterproductive work behavior (*γ* = .09, *p* = .152), whereas fatigue related only to counterproductive work behavior (*γ* = .21, *p* < .001) but unrelated to leader-directed avoidance (*γ* = .10, *p* = .147). With respect to the positive states, higher event disruption weakened the negative relation of authoritarian leadership with relief (*γ* = .15, *p* = .027) but it did not interact with authoritarian leadership to predict happiness (*γ* = .09, *p* = .300), and neither happiness nor relief predicted leader-directed affiliation (for happiness: *γ* = .03, *p* = .291; for relief: *γ* = -.04, *p* = .318) and job performance (for happiness: *γ* = -.00, *p* = .971; for relief: *γ* = -.01, *p* = 817). Moreover, the non-significant moderated mediation effects (see Table S7) further confirm that other positive or negative states cannot mediate the relationship between authoritarian leadership and work behaviors. Therefore, we verify that the proposed mechanisms (awe and anxiety) uniquely explain how authoritarian leadership interacts with event disruption to predict work behaviors.

Table S6

*Study 2: Path-Analytic Results for the Hypothesized Model*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Predictor | Anxiety(T2) | Awe(T2) | Felt uncertainty(T2) | Fatigue(T2) | Happiness(T2) | Relief(T2) | Leader-directed avoidance (T3) | CWB (T3) | Leader-directed affiliation (T3) | Job performance (T3) |
| *γ* | SE | *γ* | SE | *γ* | SE | *γ* | SE | *γ* | SE | *γ* | SE | *γ* | SE | *γ* | SE | *γ* | SE | *γ* | SE |
| Control Variables |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | .01 | .01 | -.00 | .01 | -.01 | .01 | -.01 | .01 | -.01 | .01 | -.01 | .01 | -.00 | .01 | .01 | .01 | -.01 | .00 | -.00 | .00 |
| Gender | -.05 | .13 | -.03 | .08 | -.11 | .10 | -.13 | .11 | -.13 | .08 | -.09 | .10 | .09 | .09 | .12 | .08 | .01 | .06 | -.00 | .05 |
| Education | .01 | .06 | -.01 | .05 | .00 | .05 | .02 | .05 | .07 | .04 | .03 | .05 | -.01 | .05 | -.05 | .06 | -.04 | .03 | -.02 | .02 |
| Organization tenure | .01 | .01 | .01 | .01 | .01 | .01 | .02\* | .01 | -.00 | .01 | -.00 | .01 | -.00 | .01 | -.00 | .01 | -.00 | .01 | -.01 | .01 |
| Leader benevolence | -.40\*\* | .07 | .12 | .07 | -.24\*\* | .05 | -.30\*\* | .07 | .54\*\* | .07 | .49\*\* | .08 | -.22\*\* | .06 | -.13 | .07 | .04 | .03 | .01 | .03 |
| Power distance orientation | .26\*\* | .08 | .07 | .08 | .19\*\* | .07 | .14\* | .06 | -.04 | .07 | -.07 | .07 | .07 | .07 | .07 | .08 | -.00 | .02 | -.03 | .02 |
| AL × Leader benevolence | -.26\*\* | .07 | .02 | .09 | .01 | .08 | -.02 | .09 | -.19\*\* | .06 | -.16\* | .08 | .01 | .05 | -.03 | .05 | -.03 | .03 | -.03 | .03 |
| AL × Power distance orientation | .16\* | .08 | -.12 | .08 | .16\*\* | .05 | .20 | .10 | .03 | .08 | .02 | .07 | .02 | .05 | .01 | .05 | .02 | .02 | .01 | .02 |
| Felt uncertainty |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .11 | .08 | .09 | .06 |  |  |  |  |
| Fatigue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .10 | .07 | .21\*\* | .06 |  |  |  |  |
| Happiness |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .03 | .03 | -.00 | .03 |
| Relief |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -.04 | .04 | -.01 | .03 |
| Leader-directed avoidance (T1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .24\*\* | .05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CWB (T1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .32\*\* | .06 |  |  |  |  |
| Leader-directed affiliation (T1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .50\*\* | .08 |  |  |
| Job performance (T1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .53\*\* | .08 |
| Predictors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Authoritarian leadership (AL) | .45\*\* | .07 | .17\* | .07 | .20\*\* | .07 | .28\*\* | .08 | -.04 | .09 | -.09 | .07 | -.18\*\* | .05 | -.35\*\* | .05 | -.00 | .03 | -.02 | .02 |
| Event disruption | .09 | .08 | .19\* | .07 | .11 | .07 | .15\* | .06 | -.02 | .07 | .04 | .08 | .07 | .05 | .08 | .06 | -.03 | .03 | .01 | .03 |
| AL × Event disruption | -.16\* | .07 | .15\* | .08 | -.06 | .11 | -.09 | .10 | .09 | .09 | .15\* | .07 | -.03 | .04 | -.02 | .06 | -.01 | .03 | -.01 | .03 |
| Anxiety |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .18\*\* | .05 | .20\*\* | .06 |  |  |  |  |
| Awe  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .07\*\* | .03 | .07\* | .03 |
| *R*2 | .28\*\* | .04 | .17\*\* | .05 | .23\*\* | .07 | .26\*\* | .06 | .26\*\* | .04 | .24\*\* | .05 | .35\*\* | .06 | .32\*\* | .05 | .37\*\* | .11 | .42\*\* | .10 |

*Note.* *N* = 343. AL = Authoritarian leadership. CWB = Counterproductive work behavior. Estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients.

\* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01 (two-tailed).

Table S7

*Study 2: Results for Indirect Effects via Alternative Mechanisms*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Conditional Indirect Effects | Estimate | 95% Confidence Interval |
| Authoritarian leadership →Felt uncertainty →Leader-directed avoidance |
| Low event disruption (–1*SD*) | .025 | [-.0094, .0932] |
| High event disruption (+1*SD*) | .016 | [-.0084, .0456] |
| Difference | -.009 | [-.0736, .0237] |
| Authoritarian leadership →Felt uncertainty → Counterproductive work behavior |
| Low event disruption (–1*SD*) | .022 | [-.0103, .0712] |
| High event disruption (+1*SD*) | .014 | [-.0072, .0369] |
| Difference | -.007 | [-.0569, .0234] |
| Authoritarian leadership →Fatigue →Leader-directed avoidance |
| Low event disruption (–1*SD*) | .036 | [-.0123, .1007] |
| High event disruption (+1*SD*) | .022 | [-.0100, .0531] |
| Difference | -.014 | [-.0724, .0168] |
| Authoritarian leadership →Fatigue → Counterproductive work behavior |
| Low event disruption (–1*SD*) | .075 | [.0179, .0150] |
| High event disruption (+1*SD*) | .045 | [.0099, .0888] |
| Difference | -.030 | [-.1053, .0312] |
| Authoritarian leadership →Happiness →Leader-directed affiliation  |
| Low event disruption (–1*SD*) | -.004 | [-.0200, .0082] |
| High event disruption (+1*SD*) | .001 | [-.0076, .0107] |
| Difference | .005 | [-.0073, .0226] |
| Authoritarian leadership →Happiness →Job performance |
| Low event disruption (–1*SD*) | .000 | [-.0130, .0106] |
| High event disruption (+1*SD*) | .000 | [-.0057, .0074] |
| Difference | .000 | [-.0110, .0155] |
| Authoritarian leadership →Relief →Leader-directed affiliation |
| Low event disruption (–1*SD*) | .007 | [-.0080, .0252] |
| High event disruption (+1*SD*) | .000 | [-.0063, .0094] |
| Difference | -.008 | [-.0234, .0097] |
| Authoritarian leadership →Relief →Job performance |
| Low event disruption (–1*SD*) | .001 | [-.0109, .0145] |
| High event disruption (+1*SD*) | .000 | [-.0026, .0063] |
| Difference | -.001 | [-.0125, .0139] |

*Note.* *N* = 343. Monte Carlo method in R software was adopted to construct the CIs for the conditional indirect effects with 20,000 replications. Unstandardized path coefficients with 95% CIs are reported.

**Supplemental Material E[[2]](#footnote-2): Scales Used in the Research**

**Authoritarian leadership (Cheng et al., 2014)**

1. My leader appears to be intimidating in front of his/her subordinates.
2. My leader brings me a lot of pressure when we work together.
3. My leader is very strict with his/her subordinates.
4. My leader scolds me when I fail expected target.
5. My leader disciplines me for violation of his/her principles.

**Event disruption (Morgeson et al., 2015)**

1. This event requires me to change the way I do my work.
2. This event disrupts my ability to get my work done.
3. This event causes me to stop my work and think about how to respond.
4. This event alters my normal way of completing my job.

**Awe (Stellar et al., 2018)**

1. Awe.
2. Amazement.
3. Wonder.

**Anxiety (Mawritz et al., 2014)**

1. Distressed.
2. Nervous.
3. Jittery.

**Job performance (Eisenberger et al., 2001)**

1. This employee meets formal performance requirements of the job.
2. This employee fulfills responsibilities specified in job description.
3. This employee performs tasks that are expected of him or her.
4. This employee adequately completes assigned duties.

**Counterproductive work behavior (Dalal et al., 2009)**

1. I spend time on tasks unrelated to work.
2. I gossip about people at [organization name].
3. I do not work to the best of my ability.
4. I say or do something that was unpleasant.
5. I do not fully comply with a supervisor’s instructions.
6. I behave in an unfriendly manner.
7. I speak poorly about [organization name] to others.
8. I talk badly about people behind their backs.

**Leader-directed affiliation (Liu et al., 2010)**

1. This employee always follows my instruction.
2. This employee precisely executes my decisions even when nobody watches out.
3. This employee tries to avoid creating trouble for me.

**Leader-directed avoidance (Hu & Shi, 2015)**

1. I try to stay away from interactions with my leader at work.
2. I never initiate interactions with my leader.
3. I often intentionally avoid opportunities to interact with my leader.

**Leader benevolence (Cheng et al., 2003)**

1. My leader devotes all his/her energy to taking care of me.
2. Beyond work relations, my leader expresses concern about my daily life.
3. My leader will help me when I’m in an emergency.
4. My leader takes very thoughtful care of subordinates who have spent a long time with him/her.
5. My leader takes good care of my family members as well.

**Power distance orientation (Farh et al., 2007)**

1. Managers should make most decisions without consulting subordinates.
2. It is frequently necessary for a manager to use authority and power when dealing with subordinates.
3. Managers should seldom ask for the opinions of employees.
4. Managers should avoid off-the-job social contacts with employees.
5. Employees should not disagree with management decisions.
6. Managers should not delegate important tasks to employees.

**Felt uncertainty (Kim et al., 2021)**

1. I’ve felt unclear regarding what is expected of me at work.
2. There has been a great deal of ambiguity at work.
3. I get mixed messages from different people concerning what I am supposed to do at work.

**Fatigue (Gross et al., 2011)**

1. I feel spent.
2. I feel exhausted.
3. I feel in need for recovery.
4. I feel rested (R).
5. I feel recuperated (R).

**Relief (Harmon-Jones et al., 2019)**

1. Relieved.
2. Soothing.
3. Comforting.

**Happiness (Burgess et al., 2022)**

1. Happy.
2. Joyful.
3. Glad.

**Leader trustworthiness (Jones & Shah, 2016)**

1. The leader has the ability to instruct us to complete high-quality work.
2. The leader concerns for my welfare.
3. The leader is fair and honest.
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1. Specifically, there was no main effect of authoritarian leadership condition on event disruption ratings, *F*(1, 195) = .23, *p =* .64, nor of event disruption condition on authoritarian leadership ratings, *F*(1, 195) = .27, *p =* .61. The authoritarian leadership by event disruption interaction did not affect authoritarian leadership ratings (*F*(1, 193) = .08, *p =* .77) nor event disruption ratings (*F*(1, 193) = .83, *p =* .37). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The original items of scales developed by previous research are present here, which we adapted to our experimental context. For example, we asked participants to rate to what extent they agreed with “I tried to stay away from interactions with the leader (an adjusted example item of leader-directed avoidance)” when they were doing the task. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)