**SPCRD GLOBAL
PUBLISHING**
Sustainable Solutions

RAMSS Review of Applied Management
and Social Sciences

Journal homepage: <http://ramss.spcrd.org>

ISSN (Print): 2708-2024

ISSN (Online): 2708-3640

The Mediating Analysis of Complex Pathway between Discrete Negative Emotions, Proactive Behavior and Constructive Decision Making

^a Azhar khan, ^b Shahid Jan Kaka Khail, ^c Fayaz Ali Shah

^a PhD Scholar, Department of Management Sciences Islamic College Peshawar, Pakistan

Email: azhar5896081@gmail.com

^b Associate Professor, Chairman Department of Management Sciences Islamic College Peshawar, Pakistan

Email: shahidjan@icp.edu.pk

^c Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences Islamic College Peshawar, Pakistan

Email: fayaz@icp.edu.pk

ARTICLE DETAILS	ABSTRACT
History: Accepted 30 October 2021 Available Online December 2021	<i>The aim of the study was to develop and test an empirical model which describe when and how discrete negative emotions can spark proactivity and can be molded to produce positive decision making. Nexus to the problem statement, drawing the theory of emotions, and theory of planned behavior (TPB), a quantitative research study was designed based on onion model while data was collected from the 357 faculty members of eleven public sector universities of KP, Pakistan. The data was analyzed via SPSS 27 and SEM-PLS 3.3.3 in two stages of measurement modeling and structuring modeling techniques. The results of the present study provided a new insight that how two discrete negative emotions i.e. anger and fear can be molded to produce constructive decision making. The novelty of this study is the use of molding discrete negative emotions into positive outcomes by using the mechanism of sequential mediation. The study is relatively new as none of the study related to molding discrete negative emotion in positive outcomes is available in the context of Pakistan. The outcomes of the study can be applied in education sector, health sector any public and private sectors where the issue of negative emotions are at their peak. More work is required in this area to study emotion regulation knowledge and pro-social motivation to strengthen the phenomena of molding negative emotion into positive outcomes.</i>
Keywords: <i>Experienced Anger, Experienced Fear, Self-Efficacy, Protective Efforts, Proactive Behavior, Constructive Decision Making, SEM-PLS, TPB</i>	
JEL Classification: D70, D81	
DOI: 10.47067/ramss.v4i4.184	

© 2021 The authors. Published by SPCRD Global Publishing. This is an open-access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0

Corresponding author's email address: azhar5896081@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Research on negative emotions and decision making has flourished in present decades, with a special attention of self-efficacy, emotion regulation knowledge, proactive behavior and the well-

being Gross, (2015). Indeed, many scholars and practitioners now presumed that emotions are the central driver of most expressive decisions in life (Ekman, 2007). Many individuals believe, as Griffin (2006) does, that decision making should be without of emotion. Though the practice of negative discrete emotions is usually associated with negative behaviors and consequences. Our emotions make us what we are; they are the driving force for many behaviors, with so many descriptive labels in our languages. Emotions of human are observed on (3) levels. On a biological level, emotions are observed as states of motivation involving changes in heart rate, breathing rate and other physiological changes. On a psychological level, it is related to different feeling states such as anger, fear, love and pain and the ways in which they influence person's perception, thinking and behavior. According to Coleman (1979), social level emotions are considered as a **universal language** centered on human expressions.

Events at work have always a real emotional impact on the participants. Emotions in the workplace play a vital role in how an entire organization communicates within and also to the outside world. The consequences of emotional states in the workplace, both behavioral and attitudinal, have considerable significance for individuals, groups, and society. Emotions at the workplace are categorized into two type's i.e. positive emotions and negative emotions. Positive emotions at workplace support faculty attain favorable outcomes as well as constructive decision making, comprises of achievement; job commitment and loyalty, whereas negative emotions produce unfavorable situations such as increasing counter-productivity or uncivil behavior, interpersonal conflicts, limiting employees' efforts towards organizational improvement, and limits creativity & initiative (Lebel, 2017, Ashkanasy & Dorris, 2017; Maitlis & Ozcelik, 2004; Morrison & Miliken, (2000); Spector & Fox, 2002 & Anderson & Pearson, 1999).

Thinking of change is itself is a symbol of proactive behavior; **employees experiencing negative emotions are ultimately driving themselves towards change**, which itself is an anticipatory action aimed towards oneself or the situation (Crant, (2000); Grant & Ashford, 2008). Whenever faculty are pro-active, they perform positively instead of reacting. They take actions for the betterment of themselves and trying to change the situation with good faith (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Individually, proactivity is unrestricted and flexible but futuristic (Parker et al., 2010).

2. Development of Hypotheses Based on Review of Literature

2.1 Negative Emotions and Proactivity

Negative emotions such as anger and fear both are unfriendly and triggering emotions (Smith & Ellsworth, 1985). These negative emotions at workplace provides probable energized-to motivation state. Due to the high activation and unpleasant environment, these negative emotions such as anger and fear activate physiological and psychological properties for people to take action (Cosmides & Tooby, 2000). The potential to be energized and motivate, an individual can take the profile of self-efficacy following negative emotions such as anger (Lerner & Tiedens, 2006). In both anger and fear, energized-to-motivation provides an energy to an individual to take the shape of protective efforts, for instance increased attention on a threat and keenness for the state of self-protectiveness (Izard & Ackerman, (2000). When faculty at workplace are proactive, they will act in anticipatory rather than respond. According to Grant & Ashford, (2008) Acts are performed with the aim to enhance themselves according to the conditions. When faculty are proactive, they expect to be positive and have an impact (Grant & Ashford, 2008).

2.2 Connection of Experienced anger, Self-efficacy; Experienced fear and Protective efforts

Self-efficacy is a strong belief about an individual on his/her capacity to control discrete emotions. In negative emotion like anger and fear are the pattern of high provocation sentiments that organize the individuals to take action (Lerner & Keltner, 2001). At work place, employees experiencing fear generally seek protection and defensive strategy by retreating and moving back from work (Ashford *et al.*, 1989; Rafferty & Griffin, 2006) or remaining silent (Milliken, Morrison, & Hewlin, 2003; Vogel *et al.* 2015; Ashkanasy 2017 & Lebel 2018).

2.3 Connection of experienced anger and proactive behavior with the mediation of Self-efficacy

Negative emotions at work place are highly considered as high-activation and un-pleasant sentiments, both anger and fear activates emotional and functional resources for an individual to perform actively (Cosmides & Tooby, (2000). This motivational state of energized-to drive can take the shape of self-efficacy backed by anger. Lerner & Tiedens, (2006) suggested that undergoing anger and fear can strengthen proactivity to modify the negative situation, but could not described how and when this would be occurred. The situation where employees at workplace accepting when to be sufficient can-do and reason-to proactive inspiration backed by negative emotions such as anger and fear support to identify when and how these emotions' behavioral consequences take proactive shape. In line with prior studies on relationship between proactive behavior and self-efficacy which is an individual psychological state they found a significant and positive outcome (Parker *et al.*, 2006). According to Bandura (1977), that employees themselves are also influenced of their internal abilities to effectively achieve their goals. At workplace, employees evaluate whether proactivity is feasible or not, including evaluation of self-efficacy for instance **can I do it?** If self-efficacy is low, there will negative relationship between experienced anger and fear with proactive behaviors. (Namhee K *et al.*, 2020 & Rossenkhan *et al.*, 2020; Parker *et al.*, 2010; Ashkansay, 2016; George *et al.* ,2020; & Rossenkhan *et al.*, 2020).

2.4 Connection between protective effort, proactive behavior and constructive decision making during fear

The ambiguous likelihood of fear hazard can trigger protective efforts, including expressing to protect the self, growing care and courtesy concerning a threat, and some time seeking a backdoor to evade or run away from the negative state (Frijda, 1986; Izard & Ackerman, (2000)). Once a person practice fear, they naturally incline to face the situation of uncertainty by seeing for suggestions from supervisor and mostly from co-workers and their managers (Rachman, 1990), they asking guidance how to deal and respond with the situation (Gino, Brooks, & Schweitzer, 2012; Schachter, 1959; Taylor, 2006). In the situation when uncertain threat is arising at workplace, the proactive behavior can be inspired by these discrete emotions. the proactive potential of fear lies in directing the efforts of workers into constructive action such as constructive decision making in order to shield themselves and/or others from adverse circumstances. Based on the above literature, nine hypotheses are developed in order to test empirically.

2.4.1 Theory support

Theory of Emotions

Theory of evolution motivates humans to respond rapidly and positively in order to improve the chances of accomplishment (Darwin, (2000)).

2.4.2 Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)

In psychology, the theory of planned behavior (abbreviated TPB) is a theory that links beliefs and behaviors. The concept was proposed by Icek Ajzen to improve the predictive power of the theory of reasoned action by including perceived behavioral control.

3. Methodology

This portion deal with the methodology of the article. This research was planned under the Saunders *et al.* onion model (2007). The Onion model offers a comprehensive step-by-step process in the form of layers for carrying out a research study. According to the onion model, the philosophy is positivist, the approach is deductive, the methodological choice is mono method quantitative, the strategy was survey questionnaire, cross-sectional primary data was collected while due to the nature and need of model, SEM-PLS is employed for data analysis.

3.1 Population and sampling:

Population frame is composed of all faculty members of 11 public sector Universities located at different districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Only those universities are included in the study those have attained the statutory age of 10 years or above. Below mentioned Universities are included in the research.

3.2 Sampling

In this research, a researcher used probability random sampling method for obtaining primary data from the faculty of public sector universities located at different districts of KP, Pakistan.

Determination of Sample Size using Solvin's Formula	
Population in Public Sector Universities (Faculty)	Total
$n = N / 1 + N * (e)^2$ $n = 3157 / 1 + 3157 * (.05)^2$	$n = 357$

Scales and item used:

Sno	Variable	Source	Items
1	Experienced Anger	Arnold H. (1992)	7
2	Experience Fear	Kelloway (1997)	5
3	Self-Efficacy	Caprara <i>et al.</i> (2008)	3
4	Protective Effort	Clark and Watson (1995)	5
5	Proactive Behavior	Ali Murat ALPARSLAN (2016)	6

6	Constructive Making	Decision	Evans, J. & Barchard, K.A. (2005)	7
---	---------------------	----------	-----------------------------------	---

4. Analysis

The analysis of the current study is composed of statistical results. The two statistical software SPSS and SMART-PLS were used for data analysis. The initial process on collected data was performed by using SPSS including handling of missing data, outlier's detection, normality tests and multicollinearity.

4.1 Assessment of measurement model

The structural equation modeling (SEM-PLS) is composed of two models; the measurement model and structural model. In measurement model theory, four important measurement test are applying on data in order to confirm the reliability and validity of the scales. The first step is to check the criteria of internal consistency, the Cronbach's Alpha and rho_A and composite reliability CR were tested (Hair et al., 2019).

4.2 Cronbach's Alpha, Average Variance Extraction (AVE), and Composite Reliability

In prior research studies, Cronbach's alpha was mostly used to measure internal consistency of primary data. A highly loaded construct with Cronbach's Alpha value was considered all the items have similar range and series (Cronbach, 1971). Though, there were deficiencies when using Cronbach's Alpha. It assumes that all the indicators/ items have equal scores loaded to the construct (Linn & Joreskog, 1974). In SEM-PLS, it is unsuitable to consider all indicators will have the same loading on construct. McNeish (2017), argued that one should stay away from only Cronbach's Alpha technique for finding internal consistency and can look into omega reliability. Omega reliability is also known as "composite reliability". Due to the deficiencies in Cronbach Alpha, omega/ composite

reliability is more appropriate to apply for the measurement of internal constancy (Gefen, Straub, & Boudreau, (2000)).

4.3 Item Loadings

Item loading are the degree of consistency of the items related with each construct which act as a sign that an observed variable is related with the latent construct which is measureable (Hair *et al.*, 2019).

There is a threshold for item loading that the value should be greater than 0.708. The score of each item can be different but in case the value is below and its effect on AVE, then the item can be removed from the construct, until unless the overall value of AVE should above 0.5 (Ramayah *et al.*, 2018).

4.4 Indicator Reliability / Items Loading

The second phase of measurement model is to confirm the confirmatory factor analysis. Prior studies have set the range for outer loading as greater than 0.4 (Hulland, 1999), greater than 0.5 (Byrne, 2016), greater than 0.6 (Byrne, 2016), loading value equal to and greater than 0.7 (Hair *et al.*, 2010) and loading value equal to and greater than 0.708, indicating a construct/ latent variable is able to explain at least fifty percent (50%) of indicators variance (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2017). The items of a construct which does not achieve the threshold value were remove one by one starting with the item that carries the lowest loading.

4.5 Convergent Validity

In third phase of measurement model, the convergent validity is used to calculate the outer loadings of each construct and to find out the average variance extract (AVE) (Hair *et al.*, 2019). According to Ramayah *et al.* (2018), convergent validity is the magnitude to which a measure associate significantly the alternative mean of the same variable.

According to Hair *et al.* (2016), the rule of thumb for AVE stands at 0.05 and above, and rule of thumb for outer loading is stands at 0.708 or above. Below are the sub-sections of item loadings and average variance extract (AVE) of the measurement model of the study.

Constructive decision making ($CR = 0.899$ and $AVE = 0.645$), experience anger ($CR = 0.894$ and $AVE = 0.679$), experience fear ($CR = 0.898$ and $AVE = 0.688$), proactive behavior ($CR = 0.901$ and $AVE = 0.698$), protective effort ($CR = 0.876$ and $AVE = 0.639$), and self-efficacy ($CR = 0.853$ and $AVE = 0.660$). Consequently, all the criterions for the internal consistency of Cronbach's Alpha, Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extract (AVE) have been achieved and the measurement model of the present study accomplished the construct validity.

The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of constructive decision making, experience anger (, experience fear, proactive behavior, protective effort and self-efficacy have reliably achieved consistency as the values are (0.857, 0.843, 0.848, 0.856, 0.811 and 0.744). Additionally, all the values of omega/ composite reliability (CR) were found above the threshold value of 0.70 as suggested by (Hair *et al.*, 2019). The value of CR and AVE are presented in Table 1.

4.6 Hetrotrait-Monotrait Ration of Correlation (HTMT)

In fourth phase of measurement model, the discriminant validity is measure with the test of

HTMT. Prior researches have criticized the criterion of cross-loading and Fornell-Larcker used for detecting discriminant validity in the model (Hair et al., 2019; Henseler et al., 2015; Ramayah et al. (2018). In this connection, Henseler (2015) have proposed a new concept for measuring discriminant validity is HTMT ratio of the correlations which is the ratio of within-trait and between-trait correlations.

Table 1. Results of Measurement model

Variable	Cronbach's α	CR	AVE	Hetrotrait-Monotrait			
				2	3	4	5
1. Constructive Decision	0.857	0.899	0.645				
2. Experience Anger	0.843	0.894	0.679	0.613			
3. Experience Fear	0.848	0.898	0.688	0.578	0.706		
4. Proactive Behavior	0.856	0.900	0.698	0.590	0.522	0.651	
5. Protective Effort	0.811	0.876	0.639	0.534	0.418	0.551	0.581
6. Self-Efficacy	0.744	0.853	0.660	0.577	0.650	0.577	0.494

Abbreviations: AVE average variance extracted: CR, composite reliability. "The upper bound of the 95% percentile bootstrap confidence interval (one-sided) is below 0.90 for all HTMT results".

Figure 1. Measurement Model

4.7 Structural Model:

According to Hair Jr et al. (2016) and Hair et al. (2017) once the assessment of measurement model generated satisfactory results, that the constructs measures are according to the standard set

by researchers, statisticians and experts, the next step is to evaluate the same model variables & their association and the model projected capabilities. There are standard steps involved in the process in order to assess the structural model (Hair Jr et al., 2016; Hair et al., 2019).

Structural Model

4.8 Direct hypotheses testing

The result study comprises four (04) direct hypotheses. As per the recommendations of Hair et al. (2016) and Ramayah et al. (2018), the result of relationships was obtained by performing SEM-PLS (5000) bootstrapping technique. The result of the direct relationship hypotheses is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Direct Hypotheses

		(β)	p	LL 2.5%	UL 97.5%	f^2	R^2	Remarks
H1	Experienced Anger >> Proactive Behavior	0.169	0.001	0.065	0.272	0.008	0.517	Accepted
H2	Experience Fear >> Proactive Behavior	0.163	0.013	0.038	0.294	0.022		Accepted
H3	Experience Anger >> Self-efficacy	0.387	0.000	0.269	0.500	0.185		Accepted
H4	Experience Fear >> Protective Effort	0.296	0.000	0.194	0.413	0.095		Accepted

4.9 Indirect Hypotheses testing (Mediation Analysis)

Mediation occurs when third party (variable) interferes between independent variable and dependent variable (Sobel, 1990). This research study is comprising of direct and indirect mediation effects between constructs. In first step the mediation effect of self-efficacy between experienced anger and proactive behavior was evaluated. In second step the mediation effect of protective effort between experienced fear and proactive behavior was evaluated. Similarly, direct effect of

experienced anger and proactive behavior and direct effect of experienced fear with proactive behavior were also examined. Accordingly, two serial mediations between experienced negative emotions and constructive decision making. The first serial mediation between experienced anger and constructive decision making was the mediating role of self-efficacy and proactive behavior. While the other serial mediation between experienced fear and constructive decision making was the mediating role of protective effort proactive behavior.

Table 3. Indirect Hypotheses
Specific indirect Effect

		Path Coefficient	P Values	Confidence Interval		Remarks
				LL 2.50%	UL 97.50%	
H5	Experience Anger >> Self-efficacy >> Proactive Behavior	0.066	0.021	0.052	0.199	Accepted
H6	Experience Anger >> Self-efficacy >> Proactive Behavior >> Constructive Decision	0.07	0.000	0.016	0.116	Accepted
H7	Experience Fear >> Proactive Behavior >> Constructive Decision	0.125	0.001	0.007	0.063	Accepted
H8	Experience Fear >> Protective Effort >> Proactive Behavior	0.06	0.019	0.016	0.128	Accepted
H9	Experience Fear >> Protective Effort >> Proactive Behavior >> Constructive Decision	0.031	0.030	0.01	0.123	Accepted

The result indicated that self-efficacy mediate the relationship between experienced anger and proactive behavior ($0.066, p < 0.05$), are significant and positive. Accordingly, the non-zero value between (LL = 0.052) and (UL = 0.199) indicated that there is a mediating effect (Preacher and Hayes, 2004; Hair et al., 2019), hence H5 is accepted.

The result of second mediating hypothesis analysis is about the sequential mediation. In this analysis path, there are two mediators intervene the relationship between independent variable and dependent variable. In this connection, self-efficacy and proactive behavior act as mediators between IV and DV. The result shows that ($\beta = 0.070, p < 0.05$), are significant and positive mediate the effect of IV on DV. Accordingly, the non-zero value between (LL = 0.016) and (UL = 0.116) showed that there is a sequential mediation effect (Preacher and Hayes, 2004), hence H6 is accepted.

In third mediating analysis, the result showed that protective behavior ($\beta = 0.125, p < 0.05$) are significant and positive between experienced fear and constructive decision making. Accordingly, the non-zero value between (LL = 0.007) and (UL = 0.063) indicated that there is a significant mediating effect (Preacher and Hayes, 2004; Hair et al., 2019), hence H7 is accepted.

The result of fourth hypothesis analysis showed that protective effort ($\beta = 0.06, p < 0.05$) is intervening the impact of experienced fear on proactive behavior. The result shows a significant

effect of mediator. Accordingly, the non-zero value between (LL = 0.016) and (UL = 0.128) showed that there is a mediating effect (Preacher and Hayes, 2004), hence H8 is accepted.

Finally, the fifth hypothesis analysis is about the sequential mediation. In this analysis, two mediators intervene the relationship between independent variable and dependent variable. In this connection, protective effort and proactive behavior act as mediators between IV and DV. The result shows that ($\beta=0.031$, $p<0.05$) have significant effect of IV on DV. Accordingly, the non-zero between (LL = 0.01) and (UL = 0.123) showed that there is sequential mediation effect (Preacher and Hayes, 2004), hence H9 is accepted.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The primary aim of this research is a greater understanding, development and testing of empirical model. Moreover, to explore and examining the mechanisms of mediating variables at workplace that (when and how) negative emotions i.e. anger and fear molded to produce positive outcomes such as proactive behavior and constructive decision making. Findings are given based on the results of hypotheses.

5.1 Findings

Research question 1

Q1: Does experienced anger have association with proactive behavior?

In order to answer the first question, a direct relationship "*H1: Experienced anger has significant impact on proactive behavior*" was formulated and tested.

The tested result of the (H1) indicated a positive and statistically significant relationship between anger with proactive behavior. Prior studies have produced mixed and inconsistent results as (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2007 suggested positive relationship, (Fritz Yankelevich, zarubin, & Barger, 2010; Fay & Sonnentag, 2012) suggested negative relationship, while (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2007; Fritz & Sonnentag, 2009; Bindl *et al.*, 2012) suggested no relationship.

Research question 2

Q2: Does experienced fear have association with proactive behavior.

In order to answer the second question, a direct relationship "*H2: There is a significant relationship between experienced fear with proactive behavior*" was formulated and tested.

The tested result of the (H2) indicated a positive and statistically significant relationship between fear with proactive behavior. Prior studies have produced mixed and inconsistent results about the impact of negative emotion such as fear (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2007 proposed positive relationship, (Fritz Yankelevich, zarubin, & Barger, 2010; Fay & Sonnentag, 2012) suggested negative relationship, while (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2007; Fritz & Sonnentag, 2009; Bindl *et al.*, 2012) suggested no relationship.

Research question 3

Q3: Does experienced anger have association with self-efficacy?

In order to answer the third question, a direct relationship "*H3: Experienced anger has significant impact on self-efficacy*" was formulated and tested.

To answer this research question, another direct relationship between experienced anger and self-efficacy was formed and tested. As earlier discussed, anger is a discrete negative emotion often generate destructive effects at work place and limiting employee's efforts towards organizational

development. In this connection, the relationship of anger with proactive behavior was tested and found positive and significant result. Similarly, the result of this hypothesis reveals that there is a significant and statistically positive relationship between anger and self-efficacy.

Research question 4

Q4: Does experienced fear have association with protective effort?

In order to answer the third question, a direct relationship "*H4: Experienced fear has significant impact on protective effort.*" was formulated and tested.

The statistical result disclosed that fear has a significant and positive relationship with protective effort. The result of the study is in line with the prior results of Ashford *et al.* (1989); Milliken, Morrison, & Hewlin, (2003); & Rafferty & Griffin, (2006) that employee's experiencing fear usually seek protection by moving back from the work place.

Research question 5

Q5: Does self-efficacy mediate the relationship between experience anger and proactive behavior?

In order to answer the fifth research, an in-direct relationship "*H5: Self-efficacy mediates the relationship between experience anger and proactive behaviors.*" was hypothesized and tested.

The result indicates self-efficacy mediate the relationship between anger and proactive behavior. Result shows that, sense of efficacy helps an individual believe that they can stimulus and change difficult and challenging situation.

The present result of the study is in line with the prior study of Lerner & Tiedens (2006) that improved self-efficacy normally specifies stimulus to be proactive in the situation of negativity at workplace. Similarly, Parker *et al.* (2006) argued that during the situation of anger, it can stimulate a desire to take revenge or punish the alleged source of anger.

Research question 6

Q6: Does self-efficacy and proactive behavior sequential mediate the impact of experienced anger on constructive decision making?

In order to answer the sixth research question, the sequential mediation hypothesis "*H6: Self-efficacy and proactive behavior sequential mediate the impact of experienced anger on construction decision making*" was hypothesized and tested.

The result indicates that self-efficacy and proactive behavior both mediate the impact of anger and constructive decision making. This shows that, sense of efficacy helps an individual believe that they can stimulus and change difficult and challenging situation.

Research question 7

Q7: Do proactive behaviors mediate the relationship between experienced fear and constructive decision making?

In order to answer the 7th research question, a mediating in-direct relationship "*H7: Proactive behavior mediate relationship between experienced fear and construction decision making*" was hypothesized and tested.

The result indicates that proactive behavior mediate the relationship between fear and constructive decision making. Result shows that, sense of proactivity helps an employee's believe that they can control negative emotions and will do not allow those negative emotions to control

them.

Research question 8

Q8: Does protective effort mediate the relationship between experienced fear and proactive behavior?

The aim of this research question was to answer does protective effort mediate the relationship between fear and proactive behavior. In this connection, the in-direct hypothesis “H8: *Protective Effort mediates the relationship between Experienced Fear and Proactive Behavior*” was formulated and tested. The result of this hypothesis discloses that protective effort mediate the relationship of fear and proactivity. The result reflected that during the situation of fearful situation, protecting himself is a common way of defense, and that is the sign of energizing a person to be proactive. The result of the present study is in line with the prior research study of Frijda (1986) that fear may lead to protective effort when there is no instant to escape. The tentative probability of hazard can activate protective effort, like preparing to protect himself (Izard & Ackerman, (2000)).

Research question 9

Q9: Does protective effort and proactive behavior sequential mediate the impact of experienced fear on constructive decision making?

In response to answer the research question, the sequential mediating effect of protective effort and proactive behavior influence the relationship between experience fear and constructive decision making was generated and tested. The indirect relationship “H9: *Protective effort and proactive behavior sequential mediate the impact of experienced fear on constructive decision making*” is found significant.

The result of the present study is consistent with the prior study of Parrott (2001) that, fear may lead to effort and careful planning; without protection fear can lead to flee or withdrawal. Moreover, negative emotion energizes employees with self-efficacy and that self-efficacy leads the employees to take proactive decision making. Result shows that faculty at work place need can-do-motivation approach to activate protective effort and if needed they take action. Similarly, during the situation of fear, faculty protective effort carries out proactivity, instead of avoidance of situation at work place.

5.2 Implication of the study

The implications of research are referring to the impact of current research might have on society, policy making and or future research in related field of interest of the study. The aim of the current research is the development and testing of empirical model. Furthermore, to explore and examining the mechanisms of mediation, that (when and how) negative emotions i.e. anger and fear molded to proactivity which leads to constructive outcomes.

Based on the findings, the existing research study provides several contributions, which contains a theoretical, conceptual, empirical, contextual and managerial implications.

References

- Averill, J.R. (1982). *Anger and aggression: An essay on emotion*. New York: Springer.
- Chin, W.W., Henseler J. and Wang, H. (2010). (Eds), *Handbook of Partial Least Squares: Concepts, Methods and Applications* (Springer Handbooks of Computational Statistics Series), Springer, Heidelberg, Dordrecht, London, New York, NY, Vol. II, pp. 171-193.
- Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 869-884.
- Detert, J. R., & Edmondson, A. C. (2011). Implicit voice theories: Taken-for-granted rules of self-censorship at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 461-488.
- Detert, J. R., Burris, E. R., Harrison, D. A., & Martin, S. R. (2013). Voice flows to and around leaders: Understanding when units are helped or hurt by employee voice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58: 624-668.
- Drolet, A.L. and Morrison, D.G. (2001), "Do we really need multiple-item measures in service research?", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 196-204.
- Ekman, P. (1992). An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition & Emotion*, 6: 169-200.
- Grant, A. M. (2008). Does intrinsic motivation fuel the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 48-58.
- Grant, A. M. (2013). Rocking the boat but keeping it steady: The role of emotion regulation in employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56: 1703-1723.
- Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. 2008. The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28: 3-34.
- Grant, A. M., & Berry, J. W. (2011). The necessity of others is the mother of invention: Intrinsic and prosocial motivations, perspective taking, and creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 73-96.
- Grant, A. M., & Rothbard, N. P. (2013). When in doubt, seize the day? Security values, prosocial values, and proactivity under ambiguity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98: 810-819.
- Grant, A.M. & Ashford, S.J. (2008). The Dynamics of Proactivity at Work", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 3-34.
- Griffin, M.A., Neal, A. & Parker, S.K. (2007). A New Model of Work Role Performance: Positive Behavior in Uncertain and Interdependent Contexts, *Academy of Management Journal*, 50 (2), 327-347.
- Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology*, 2: 271-299.
- Gross, J. J. (2008). Emotion regulation. In M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (3rd ed.): 497-513. New York:
- Gross, J.J. (2015). Emotion Regulation: Current Status and Future Prospects. *Psychological Inquiry*.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., and Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*, 2nd Ed., Sage: Thousand Oaks.
- Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M. and Sarstedt, M. (2017a), *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M., Sarstedt, M. and Thiele, K.O. (2017b), "Mirror, Mirror on the wall: a comparative evaluation of composite-based structural equation modeling methods", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 45 No. 5, pp. 616-632.
- Hair, J.F., Ringle, C.M. and Sarstedt, M. (2011), "PLS-SEM: indeed, a silver bullet", *Journal of*

- Marketing Theory and Practice, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 139-151.
- Hair, J.F., Ringle, C.M. and Sarstedt, M. (2013), "Partial least squares structural equation modeling: rigorous applications, better results and higher acceptance", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 46 Nos 1/2, pp. 1-12.
- Hair, J.F., Sarstedt, M. and Ringle, C.M. (2019), "Rethinking some of the rethinking of partial least squares", *European Journal of Marketing*, Forthcoming.
- Hair, J.F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L. and Kuppelwieser, V.G. (2014), "Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): an emerging tool in business research", *European Business Review*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 106-121.
- Hair, J.F., Sarstedt, M., Matthews, L. and Ringle, C.M. (2016), "Identifying and treating unobserved heterogeneity with FIMIX-PLS: part I – method", *European Business Review*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 63-76.
- Hair, J.F., Sarstedt, M., Pieper, T.M. and Ringle, C.M. (2012a). "The use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in strategic management research: a review of past practices and recommendations for future applications", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 45 Nos 5/6, pp. 320-340.
- Hair, J.F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C.M. and Gudergan, S.P. (2018). *Advanced Issues in Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Hair, J.F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C.M., et al. (2012b), "An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 414-433.
- Henseler, J. and Fassott, G. (2010). "Testing moderating effects in PLS path models: an illustration of available procedures", in Esposito Vinzi, V., Chin, WW, Henseler, J., et al. (Eds), *Handbook of Partial Least Squares: Concepts, Methods and Applications* (Springer Handbooks of Computational Statistics Series), Springer, Heidelberg, Dordrecht, London, New York, NY, Vol. II, pp. 713-735.
- Henseler, J. and Sarstedt, M. (2013). "Goodness-of-fit indices for partial least squares path modeling", *Computational Statistics*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 565-580.
- Henseler, J., Hubona, G.S. and Ray, P.A. (2016a). "Using PLS path modeling in new technology research: Updated guidelines", *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, Vol. 116 No. 1, pp. 1-19.
- Henseler, J., Hubona, G.S. and Ray, P.A. (2017). "Partial least squares path modeling: updated guidelines", in Latan, H. and Noonan, R. (Eds), *Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling: Basic Concepts, Methodological Issues and Applications*, Springer, Heidelberg, pp. 19-39.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C.M. and Sarstedt, M. (2015). "A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 115-135.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C.M. and Sarstedt, M. (2016b). "Testing measurement invariance of composites using partial least squares", *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 405-431.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C.M. and Sinkovics, R.R. (2009). "The use of partial least squares path modeling in international marketing", in Sinkovics, R.R. and Ghauri, P.N. (Eds) *Advances in International Marketing*, Emerald, Bingley, pp. 277-320.
- Hooper, D., Coughlan, J. & Mullen, M.R. (2008). *Structural Equation Modelling: Guidelines for Determining Model Fit*, *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 6 (1), 53-60.
- Izard, C. E., & Ackerman, B. P. (2000). Motivational, organizational, and regulatory functions of discrete emotions. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (2nd

- ed.): 253–265. New York: Guilford Press.
- Khan, G.F., Sarstedt, M., Shiao, W.-L., Hair, J.F., Ringle, C.M. and Fritzes, M. (2019). “Methodological research on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): an analysis based on social network approaches”, Internet Research, Forthcoming.
- Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2001). Fear, anger, and risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(1): 146-159. Page 39 of 46 *Academy of Management Review*
- Lerner, J. S., & Tiedens, L. Z. (2006). Portrait of the angry decision maker: How appraisal tendencies shape anger’s influence on cognition. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 19(2): 115-137.
- Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W., & Hewlin, P. F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don’t communicate upward and why. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6): 1453-1476.
- Morrison, E. W. (2006). Doing the job well: An investigation of pro-social rule breaking. *Journal of Management*, 32(1): 5-28.
- Morrison, E. W. (2011). Employee voice behavior: Integration and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1): 373-412.
- Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4): 706-725.
- Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extra role efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4): 403-419.
- Parker, S. K. (1998). Enhancing role breadth self-efficacy: The roles of job enrichment and other organizational interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6): 835-852.
- Parker, S. K., & Collins, C. G. (2010). Taking stock: Integrating and differentiating multiple proactive behaviors. *Journal of Management* 36(3): 633-662.
- Parker, S. K., Bindl, U. K., & Strauss, K. (2010). Making things happen: A model of proactive motivation. *Journal of Management*, 36(4): 827-856.
- Parker, S. K., Williams, H. M., & Turner, N. (2006). Modeling the antecedents of proactive behavior at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3): 636-652.
- Ramayah, T., Cheah, J.-H., Chuah, F., Ting, H. and Memon, M.A. (2016), *Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Using SmartPLS 3.0: An Updated and Practical Guide to Statistical Analysis*, Pearson, Singapore.
- Ramsey, J.B. (1969), “Tests for specification errors in classical linear least-squares regression analysis”, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 350-371.