

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Sarah Kay Nielsen entitled "A Multi-Source Model of Perceived Organizational Support and Performance." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Psychology.

Eric Sundstrom

Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Schuyler Huck

John Lounsbury

Rich Saudargas

Accepted for the Council:

Linda Painter

Interim Dean of Graduate Studies

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

A MULTI-SOURCE MODEL OF PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT
AND PERFORMANCE

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Sarah Kay Nielsen

December 2006

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my daughter, Evans Alexandra Nielsen. You are my constant source of light, inspiration, and pride. May you never waver before life's challenges nor question your strength and, most importantly, may you always know how you are loved.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank all those who helped me complete my Doctor of Philosophy degree in Psychology. I thank Drs. Sundstrom and Lounsbury for their patience, guidance, encouragement, and assistance throughout my tenure at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville and all through this research project. I thank Drs. Saudargas and Huck for their assistance and serving on my committee. I am particularly thankful to my husband, Dr. Tjai Nielsen, for the constant love, support, and encouragement. Lastly, I would also like to thank my parents, Sandy and Garrett Soulen, and the rest of my family and friends for their support, without which this project would not have been possible.

Abstract

The two-fold purpose of this field study was to examine: 1) the collective contributions of supervisor support (PSS), coworker support (PCS), and direct report support (DRS) to an employee's global sense of organizational support (POS), and 2) the additive value of counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) to a performance outcome model of POS that also includes in-role and extra-role performance. To this end, the researcher predicted a 360-model of POS such that PSS, PCS, and DRS would better predict POS than any individual support variable alone. Additionally, the researcher hypothesized that POS would predict in-role performance, extra-role performance, and CWB over time. The author gathered self-report questionnaires ($n = 154$) from the employees and supervisors of a community college, a non-profit counseling group, and a correctional facility at two points in time with at least a one-month time lapse between administrations. Results indicate that PSS, PCS, and DRS are positively related to POS, but PSS remained the only significant predictor of POS. In addition, POS predicted all performance outcomes at Time 1, but neglected to predict Time 2 performance. These results further existing knowledge concerning both the antecedents and consequences of POS. Present findings indicate that PSS is the most important variable concerning an employee's POS to the extent that it stifles the effects of all other individual support variables. Previous research has found consistently strong evidence of the relationship between POS, performance, and withdrawal behaviors, but has not addressed the potential relationship between POS and *active* deviant behaviors such as CWB. Present findings add to this literature and suggest that not only is POS a strong predictor of positive work behavior, but it is also a strong predictor of employees' active negative work behaviors.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Organizational Support Theory.....	1
POS Antecedents.....	5
Fairness.....	5
Organizational Rewards and Job Conditions.....	9
Recognition, Pay, and Promotions.....	9
Supervisor Support.....	12
Coworker Support.....	16
POS Consequences.....	19
Job Performance Typologies.....	19
Organizational Support Theory and Job Performance.....	21
POS and In-role Performance.....	23
POS and Extra-role Performance.....	25
POS and Counterproductive Work Behaviors.....	28
Hypotheses.....	32
360-degree Support.....	32
Performance.....	33
II. METHOD.....	35
Design.....	35
Participants.....	35

	Procedures.....	36
	Measures.....	37
	Support Measures.....	37
	Performance Measures.....	38
	Variables.....	39
III.	RESULTS.....	41
	Hypothesis 1a, 1b, and 1c.....	41
	Hypothesis 2.....	41
	Hypothesis 3a, 3b, and 3c.....	42
IV.	DISCUSSION.....	45
	360-Support Model.....	48
	Performance Outcomes.....	52
	Research Implications.....	55
	Practical Implications.....	56
	Limitations.....	58
	Common Method Variance.....	58
	Statistical Power.....	58
	Population.....	59
	Conclusion.....	59
	LIST OF REFERENCES.....	61

APPENDICES.....	74
Appendix A – Participant Survey.....	75
Appendix B – Supervisor Survey.....	82
Appendix C – Tables.....	86
VITA.....	92

I. Introduction

Organizational Support Theory

Employee dedication and commitment to the organization is highly valued by employers. Indeed, employee commitment has been given a great deal of attention in research (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Emotionally committed employees tend to exhibit behaviors that benefit organizations such as enhanced performance, reduced withdrawal behaviors such as absenteeism and tardiness, and more prosocial behaviors such as helping and cooperating (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Mowday et al., 1982). Much like the organization's concern about the employees' dedication, the employee is equally concerned about the organization's commitment to them. Benefits such as pay, promotion, respect and approval are highly valued by the employee and are expected in return for acceptable performance and behavior.

Social exchange theory provides an explanation for the relationship between employer and employee. Gouldner (1960) proposed a *reciprocity norm* that obliges the receiver of favorable treatment to return the favor. The benefits exchanged could involve such resources as money, services, and information or such socioemotional resources as approval, respect, and liking (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Batson, 1993; Blau, 1964; Foa & Foa, 1974). By extending this approach to organizations, employee – employer relationships may be viewed as the trade of employee effort and loyalty for socioemotional benefits and tangible resources (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986; Etzioni, 1961; Kotter, 1973; Levinson, 1965). The norm of reciprocity obligates employees receiving increased benefits from their organization to compensate their employer with higher work performance (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rousseau &

McLean Parks, 1993). Meeting obligations helps employees maintain the positive self-image of those who repay debts, avoid the social stigma associated with the reciprocity norm's violation, and obtain favorable treatment from the organization (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhoades, 2001). Hence, employees that receive beneficial treatment are motivated to compensate the organization in ways that are valued by the organization.

Blau (1964) was among the first to differentiate social exchange from economic exchange. Blau suggested that social exchange, unlike economic exchange, refers to relationships that involve *unspecified* future obligations. In addition, social exchange does not occur on a calculated basis. Economic exchange is based on transactions, but the key to social exchange relationships is the individuals' trust in the other parties to fairly discharge their obligations in the long run (Holmes, 1981). According to researchers (Blau, 1964; Rousseau & Parks, 1993) "macromotives" such as trust, loyalty, and commitment are essential to maintaining social exchange relationships. Holmes (1981) describes macromotives as sets of attributions that characterize people's feelings and beliefs about their exchange partners. An example might be "My supervisor is trustworthy."

Organizational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Shore & Shore, 1995) presumes that to determine the organization's willingness to participate in this exchange by rewarding increased work effort and meeting socioemotional needs, employees develop perceptions concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (perceived organizational support; POS). Correspondingly, employees exhibited a consistent pattern of agreement with several

statements concerning the extent to which the organization appreciated their contributions and would treat them favorably or unfavorably in various circumstances (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

According to organizational support theory, employees' tendency to assign the organization humanlike characteristics encourages the development of POS (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Research has shown that policies and actions taken by agents of the organization are actually viewed as indications of the organization's intent rather than attributed to the inclinations of particular individuals (Levinson, 1965). Due to this personification of the organization, employees view the favorable or unfavorable treatment that they receive from the organization as an indication that the organization favors or disfavors them.

Social exchange research suggests that resources received from others are more highly valued if they are based on discretionary choice rather than circumstances beyond the donor's control (Blau, 1964; Eisenberger, Cotterell & Marvel, 1987; Gouldner, 1960). The discretionary nature of beneficial treatment can be taken as evidence that the donor genuinely cares about and respects the recipient. Applied to the employment setting, rewards such as pay, promotions, or job enrichment contribute more to POS if the employee believes that they result from discretionary organizational actions as opposed to external constraints (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997; Shore & Shore, 1995). As organizational agents, any beneficial treatment received from supervisors should contribute to POS. Research has found that the intensity of this relationship, however, depends on the extent to which employees identify the supervisor with the

organization, rather than viewing the supervisor's behavior as idiosyncratic (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002).

In addition, organizational support theory addresses the psychological processes and motives fundamental to consequences of POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Based on the reciprocity norm, not only should organizations feel obligated to repay the employees' effort with beneficial treatment in various kind, but POS should create a felt obligation for employees as well. Employees should care about the organization's welfare and help the organization reach its objectives through heightening performance and reducing turnover, withdrawal behaviors, and counterproductive behaviors. Additionally, the fulfillment of socioemotional needs inherent with POS should lead employees to feel a greater sense of organizational membership and role status, resulting in greater job satisfaction and positive mood. Furthermore, through a healthy social exchange relationship, employees will have strengthened performance-reward expectancies believing that the organization recognizes and rewards increased performance.

POS has been found to be related to, yet distinct from, affective organizational commitment (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990; Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996; Rhoades, Eisenberger, Armeli, 2001; Shore & Tetrick, 1991), effort-reward expectancies (Eisenberger et al., 1990), continuance commitment (Shore & Tetrick, 1991), LMX (Settoon, et al., 1996; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997), perceived organizational politics (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, & Toth, 1997), procedural justice (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Rhoades et al., 2001), job satisfaction (Eisenberger et al., 1997), and supervisor support (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988; Shore & Tetrick, 1991).

POS Antecedents

Stemming from organizational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986), three general forms of perceived favorable treatment received from the organization should increase POS: fairness, organizational rewards and job conditions, and supervisor support. In addition to supervisors, coworkers and perhaps customers and direct reports may be viewed as agents of the organization. While the amount of research on the relationship between support from coworkers and direct reports in relation to POS is negligible, the link between these additional avenues of support and POS seems intuitively plausible. A 360-degree support model contributing to perceptions of organizational support is proposed and discussed.

Fairness

Procedural justice was initially thought to concern individuals' perceptions about the fairness of formal procedures governing decisions. The theory focused on process control and opportunities for voice (i.e., employee input in the decision process) as structural elements contributing to fairness perceptions (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Leventhal (1980) identified six justice rules he proposed were used by individuals in judging the fairness of procedures: accuracy, representativeness, bias suppression, consistency, ethicality, and correctability.

Researchers, however, came to realize that structural elements were not the only important factors of fairness perceptions. Another important factor of fairness perceptions was discovered – interpersonal treatment. Bies and Moag (1986) suggested individuals' fairness judgments are also based on the quality of interpersonal treatment received during the execution of a procedure, and labeled the concept “interactional justice.” They

also proposed that interactional justice perceptions would affect attitudes and behaviors toward the agent of the treatment, unlike procedural justice perceptions, which affect attributions of the employing organization.

Since Bies and Moag's (1986) proposal of interactional justice, researchers include interactional justice in a widened concept of procedural justice, suggesting interactional elements impact procedural justice perceptions just as structural elements do. Cropanzano and Greenberg (1997) distinguished between structural and social aspects of procedural justice. Structural elements consist of formal rules and policies concerning decisions that affect employees. These elements include adequate notice before decisions are implemented, communication of accurate information, and voice. The social aspects of procedural justice, what Bies and Moag (1986) called interactional justice, involve the quality of interpersonal treatment in resource allocation. These elements include treating employees with respect and dignity, and providing employees with information concerning how outcomes are determined.

Shore and Shore (1995) suggest that repeated instances of procedural justice should contribute to POS by indicating a concern for employees' welfare. Organizational support theory supports this view suggesting that favorable treatment by the organization contributes to employee perceptions of organizational motives and that employees interpret positive discretionary activities by the organization as evidence that the organization cares for the employee's well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Justice perceptions could be an aspect of an employee's evaluation of discretionary actions taken by the organization that suggests a degree of organizational support (Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998).

Researchers have confirmed the relationship between procedural justice and POS with empirical support. Fasolo (1995) found that both distributive and procedural justice dimensions of performance appraisals explained unique variance in POS when controlling for the other type of justice (either procedural or distributive). Moorman, Blakely, and Niehoff (1998) found that POS mediated procedural justice's relationship with extra-role behaviors carried out on the organization's behalf.

Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, and Taylor (2000) also found a strong relationship between procedural justice and POS. Their study focused on the employees of a large public university in the northeastern United States. The researchers included measures of interactional justice, procedural justice, leader-member exchange (LMX), and POS. Their results indicate that interactional justice perceptions affect supervisor-related outcomes such as supervisor-directed organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) via the mediating variable of LMX, while procedural justice perceptions affect organization-related outcomes such as organization-directed OCB via POS.

Wayne, Shore, Bommer, and Tetrick (2002) found similar results during their study involving employees and their direct supervisors from metal fabricating plants. Researchers collected data concerning a variety of constructs including procedural justice, distributive justice, POS, LMX, employee commitment, and OCB. Results indicate that organizational justice (both procedural and distributive) is an antecedent to POS, but not with LMX. Top management actions in the form of inclusion and recognition were also antecedent to POS, but not LMX. In relation to consequences, POS predicted employee commitment and OCB.

Empirical evidence of a positive relationship between perceptions of fairness in organizational decisions exists and provides additional support for the POS model.

Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002), in a recent meta-analysis including 22 studies focusing specifically on procedural justice and POS, found strong support for this notion ($r = .54$, $p < .001$).

Related to procedural justice is the concept of perceived organizational politics, referring to attempts to influence others in ways that promote self-interest, often at the expense of rewards for individual merit or the betterment of the organization (Cropanzano et al., 1997; Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, Birjulin, 1999). Usually measured with the Perceptions of Politics Scale (Kacmar & Ferris, 1991), organizational politics is typically assumed to encompass three main types of self-oriented political behaviors: obtaining valued outcomes by acting in a self-serving manner, going along with ill-advised management decisions to secure valued outcomes, and obtaining pay increases and promotions through favoritism rather than merit.

Widespread organizational politics should strongly conflict with perceptions of fair procedures and outcomes (Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999), thus lowering POS. In a study involving 128 employees from three different organizations, Randall et al. collected survey data on several variables, including employees' perceptions of organizational politics and organizational support. Consistent with their hypotheses, the researchers found a strongly negative relationship between perceived organizational politics and organizational support ($r = -.77$, $p < .01$). Also, in their recent meta-analysis, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) found a very strong negative relationship between perceptions of organizational politics and POS ($r = -.82$, $p < .001$). The

empirical evidence thus far supports the notion that widespread self-interest influencing in organizations negatively effects employees' perceptions of organizational support.

Organizational Rewards and Job Conditions

Signaling theory proposes that early job assignments, promotions, and other organizational experiences based on human resources decisions serve as signals about an employee's potential (Sheridan, Slocum, Buda, & Thompson, 1990). Employees will possibly view these human resources decisions as valued indicators of the organization's favorable valuation of their contributions and concern for their well-being as they perceive links between the decisions and valued rewards.

Shore and Shore (1995) propose that human resources practices showing recognition of employee contributions should be positively related to POS. In particular, they identified two key types of human resources practices that are related to POS. The first concerns discretionary practices that imply investment by the organization in the employee. An example of this type of practice might include time off for education, training, and so forth. The second type of practice concerns organizational recognition, including pay, promotions, awards, and so forth. An array of human resources practices have been studied in relation to POS, including recognition, pay, promotions, job security, autonomy, role stressors, and training (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Recognition, pay, and promotions According to organizational support theory, favorable opportunities for rewards contribute to POS because they serve to communicate a positive valuation of employees' contributions. Some empirical support for this proposition exists. In a study involving 330 employees of a large southeastern corporation (Shore & Tetrick, 1991), researchers collected measures of several different

variables, including job satisfaction, POS, and facets of job satisfaction, such as job security and pay. A strong and significant relationship was found between satisfaction with pay and POS ($r = .45, p < .05$), garnering support for the POS model.

In addition, Miceli and Mulvey (2000) were interested in how pay level satisfaction and pay system satisfaction might result in differing consequences. Researchers surveyed employees from a large organization in the communications industry on their satisfaction with pay level, pay system, and POS. Consistent with their hypotheses, they found that pay system satisfaction was strongly positively related to perceptions that the organization values employees' contributions and cares for their well-being ($r = .37, p < .001$). Satisfaction with pay or pay level was not found to be significantly related to POS.

On a related note, Eisenberger, Rhoades, and Cameron (1999) surveyed employees of a large chain of discounted electronics and appliances stores about their expectancies that high job performance would bring increased pay, their perceived autonomy, their POS, and mood while working. Results indicate that employees' expectations of reward for high performance was positively related to employees' perception of autonomy ($r = .24, p < .01$), which, in turn, was related to employees' belief that the organization valued their contributions and cared about their well-being ($r = .47, p < .01$). The employees viewed the opportunity to gain reward for higher performance as indicating increased freedom of action. This new autonomy is then attributed to the organization's commitment to their well-being and positive evaluation of their contributions.

Researchers have examined a variety of POS antecedents in addition to satisfaction with pay and pay systems. To investigate the relationship between the favorableness of job conditions and perceived organizational support, Eisenberger et al. (1997) surveyed 295 employees from a variety of organizations. Employees rated not only the favorableness of particular job conditions, but also the degree of discretion they perceived the organization had to deliver such job conditions. This distinction resulted in three categories of job conditions: high-discretion (conditions which the organization readily controls), medium-discretion, and low-discretion (conditions over which the organization has little to no control). The favorableness of high-discretion job conditions was found to be much more closely related to POS ($r = .61, p < .01$) than was the favorableness of low-discretion job conditions ($r = .24, p < .01$). In an effort to decide how much the organization values their contributions and well-being, employees distinguish job conditions whose favorableness the organization readily controls from job conditions whose favorableness is constrained by limits on the organization.

In a similar line of research, Rhoades et al. (2001) assessed 367 university alumni about organizational rewards, encompassing employee's perceptions concerning the favorableness of opportunities for not only pay, but also recognition and promotion. Using a 3-item adapted scale from Eisenberger et al. (1997), the researchers found a strong and significant positive relationship between POS and organizational rewards ($r = .47, p < .05$). Employees believe favorable opportunities for rewards convey a positive valuation of employees' contributions and therefore contribute to POS.

In an effort to further examine the relationship between discretionary job experiences and POS, Wayne et al. (1997) collected surveys concerning employee's

developmental experiences and POS from 252 employees of a large corporation in the United States. Researchers defined developmental experiences as informal and formal training provided for the employee by the organization. In addition, the researchers gathered information from company records regarding the number of promotions (defined as a change in pay grade) employees' received. A strong relationship was found between developmental experiences and POS ($r = .45, p < .01$). Promotions exhibited only a moderate relationship with POS ($r = .21, p < .01$). These results provide further support for the proposition that employees base some of their perception of organizational support on discretionary human resources decisions.

Supervisor Support

Not only do employees form global perceptions concerning their valuation by the organization but they also form similar perceptions concerning the degree to which supervisors value their contributions and care about their well-being (perceived supervisor support, or PSS; Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). Since supervisors act as agents of the organization, who have responsibility for directing and evaluating subordinates' performance, employees would view their supervisor's favorable or unfavorable treatment toward them as an indication of the organization's level of support (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Beneficial treatment received from a supervisor should contribute positively to POS to the extent that employees attribute the favorable treatment to the organization's policies, procedures, or general culture rather than to supervisors' idiosyncratic motivation (Levinson, 1965). Additionally, employees are aware that supervisors communicate their evaluations of subordinates to upper management, further contributing to employees' association of supervisor support with POS.

Hutchison (1997) sought to distinguish POS from related concepts of PSS and affective commitment. In a study involving 205 members of the faculty and staff of a large western state university, he collected survey data on several variables, including employees' POS, PSS, and affective commitment. Results indicate that not only are PSS and POS strongly related ($r = .66, p < .05$) but they are distinct concepts as well.

To investigate the interrelationships among work experiences, POS, and PSS, Rhoades et al. (2001) surveyed 367 alumni of a large eastern United States university. Researchers utilized a four-item adapted form of the Eisenberger et al. (1986) SPOS scale with a reported coefficient alpha of .90. Supporting their hypotheses, the results indicate that POS and PSS have a strong positive relationship ($r = .65, p < .001$). Additionally, the researchers found support for their proposition that POS mediates the relationship between PSS and affective commitment.

Though several studies have examined the relationship between PSS and POS, few studies have examined the direction of causality between these constructs. Stemming from organizational support theory, most researchers have interpreted their results such that PSS leads to POS (Hutchison, 1997; Rhoades et al., 2001). However, Yoon and Thye (2000) suggested that causality could also occur in the opposite direction. It is possible that employees' perception that the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being might lead them to believe that supervisors, as agents of the organization, are favorably inclined toward them.

Eisenberger et al. (2002b) specifically sought to investigate the relationship between PSS and POS, and the directionality between these two constructs. In a study involving 314 alumni of a Belgium university, researchers collected data from

participants at two different points in time. Results indicate not only a strong positive relationship between PSS and POS but that PSS does seem to lead to POS. The path between Time 1 PSS and Time 2 POS was significant ($r = .24, p < .001$), but the path from Time 1 POS to Time 2 PSS was not significant. These results further support the notion that employees view supervisors as agents of the organization that, through their un/favorable treatment of employees, indicate the organization's valuation of employee contributions and concern for their well-being.

The POS literature concerning support from supervisors has also included a similar concept to PSS – leader-member exchange. Social exchange theory provides the dominant theoretical basis for leader-member exchange (LMX; Sparrowe & Liden, 1997). Leader-member exchange theory suggests an interpersonal relationship develops between supervisors and subordinates against the background of a formal organization (Graen & Cashman, 1975). The relationship is based on social exchange and as such is dependent upon each party offering something of value to the other and each party must judge the exchange to be equitable and fair. Generally speaking, the quality of the LMX relationship increases with greater perceived value of exchanged commodities – whether tangible or intangible. Prior research has determined that the quality of the leader-member exchange is related to important supervisor and subordinate behaviors (Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997).

Empirical research has provided evidence of a strong link between LMX and POS (Hoffmann & Morgeson, 1999; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996; Wayne et al., 1997). Settoon, Bennett, and Liden surveyed 102 employees from a large hospital located in the southern United States in an effort to further study the

relationships between LMX, POS, and various performance behaviors. LMX was assessed using the Multidimensional Measure of Leader Member Exchange (Liden & Maslyn, 1993), which contained four subscales: loyalty, affect, contribution, and respect. Results support the proposition that leader-member exchange is positively related to employees' beliefs concerning the organization's valuation of their contributions and concern for their well-being ($r = .68, p < .01$).

In related research, Wayne et al. (1997) sought to investigate the relationship between LMX and POS, and the distinctiveness of these constructs. Researchers surveyed 252 employees of a very large United States corporation using the SPOS (Eisenberger et al., 1986) and a seven-item adapted LMX measure (Scandura & Graen, 1984). The researchers not only found a strong positive relationship between LMX and POS ($r = .50, p < .01$), but they also found evidence supporting the notion that although the two constructs are strongly related, each is quite distinct and valuable.

In summary, employees develop beliefs concerning the degree to which supervisors value their contributions and care for their well-being. To the extent that the employee interprets the favorable treatment received by supervisors as discretionary, employees will extrapolate the un/favorable valuation by their supervisors to the overall organization, thereby contributing to POS. Measures of supervisor support have included both the concepts of PSS and LMX, and both have received empirical support in the literature (Eisenberger et al., 2002b; Hoffmann & Morgeson, 1999; Hutchison, 1997; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Rhoades et al., 2001; Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996; Wayne et al., 1997).

Coworker Support

Employee – organization and supervisor – subordinate exchange relationships have been widely studied in recent years (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). In contrast, there have been few studies examining the exchange relationship among coworkers. Social exchange theory provides insight into how perceptions of coworker support might also contribute to perceptions of organizational support.

According to organizational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986), employees form global beliefs regarding the organization's valuation of their contributions and concern for their well-being. Employees' tendencies to personify and assign humanlike characteristics to the organization encourage the development of POS (Eisenberger, et al). Furthermore, Levinson (1965) suggested that policies and actions taken by agents of the organization are actually viewed as indications of the organization's intent rather than attributed to the inclinations of particular individuals. The concept of perceived supervisor support stems from the notion that, as agents of the organization, the favorable or unfavorable treatment subordinates receive from their supervisors is an indication of how the *organization* favors or disfavors them. If taken one step further, organizational support theory could incorporate other types of agents as "transmitters" of organizations' valuation of their employees, namely coworkers. To the extent that coworkers' favorable treatment is discretionary and possibly attributable to organizational culture, and so forth, receiving employees could view the coworkers' support as an additional indicator of the organizations' valuation of their contributions and concern for their well-being.

In addition to organizational support theory, the validation hypothesis may shed light on how social support in the workplace generates organizational support. Dornbusch

and Scott (1975) suggest that social support involves the transfer of positive sanctions or evaluations, which eventually validates or legitimizes the receiver. Positive sanctions and evaluations given as social support from supervisors to subordinates authorize the receiving subordinates (Yoon, Han, & Seo, 1996; Walker, Thomas, & Zelditch, 1986). Authorization involves transfer of support from a higher position to a lower one. Endorsement, however, involves a transfer of support from a lower position to a higher position (from subordinate to supervisor) or between similar positions (among coworkers).

The validation hypothesis suggests that the organization bases its decision to provide support to the focal employee on the degree of support the focal employee is receiving from supervisors and coworkers. The support an employee receives from a supervisor or coworkers serves as validation to the organization and enforces the organization's decision. Therefore, those employees receiving favorable treatment from supervisors and/or coworkers are likely to receive more support from the organization as well.

Some initial empirical research supports the idea that coworker support is related to and contributes to organizational support. In an effort to investigate this potential relationship, Yoon and Lim (1999) surveyed 2136 employees of three different universities in Korea. Organizational support was measured using a three-item adapted form of the SPOS (Eisenberger et al., 1986) with a reported coefficient alpha of .60. Coworker support was measured using a three-item scale adapted from House (1981) with a reported coefficient alpha of .68. Results indicate that coworker support and

organizational support are significantly and positively related ($r = .38, p < .05$), providing initial support for this model.

In a related line of research, Ladd and Henry (2000) sought to examine the potential relationships between two types of support perceptions (coworker and organizational) and two types of citizenship behaviors (organizational and individual). The researchers surveyed 214 employees from a small manufacturing plant and a large government organization. Organizational support was measured using the SPOS (Eisenberger et al., 1986) with a coefficient alpha of .92. Coworker support was measured using an adapted form of the SPOS (Eisenberger et al.) with a coefficient alpha of .92. The results confirmed the hypotheses – perceived coworker support (PCS) was strongly related to POS ($r = .43, p < .05$). In addition, the results indicate that PCS and POS differentially predict citizenship behaviors. Specifically, PCS accounted for significant variance in *individual*-targeted citizenship ($R^2 = .02, p < .05$) and POS accounted for significant variance in *organizational*-targeted citizenship ($R^2 = .05, p < .05$).

The concept of coworker support and its possible contribution to POS is supported by theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Yoon, Han, & Seo, 1996; Walker, Thomas, & Zelditch, 1986). The potential relationship between perceived coworker support and POS has also received some empirical support (Yoon & Lim, 1999) lending confirmation to this new model. Furthermore, it appears from the research that PCS and POS contribute to performance outcomes differentially (Ladd & Henry, 2000), which opens more avenues for future research.

In addition to coworkers and supervisors, it is possible to consider direct reports and internal customers as potential supportive agents of the organization. Stemming from organizational support theory, if the employee feels supported by an organizational agent and attributes the supportive behavior to the organizational culture, as opposed to individual idiosyncrasies, then the employee should feel increased POS. Taking this theory one step further, if the employee feels increased POS due to supportive direct reports or internal customers, then the employee should likewise feel an obligation to repay the favorable treatment in a way that is deemed favorable to the individual and the organization.

POS Consequences

Job Performance Typologies

Arguably the most prominent contemporary framework for job performance is that of Campbell (1990). He defined eight performance factors: job-specific task proficiency, non-job-specific task proficiency, written and oral communication, demonstrating effort, maintaining personal discipline, facilitating team and peer performance, supervision, and management and administration. Although Campbell did not specifically mention examples of behavioral episodes with varying levels of expected organizational, it is easy to imagine what they might be from the definitions he provided for the behavioral categories. For example, the sixth dimension is defined as how well someone supports, helps, and develops peers and helps the group function as an effective unit. Therefore, behaviors that represent generous help and support for coworkers in need would carry positive expected value and behaviors that represent indifference toward

coworkers in need, or hostile and hurtful acts toward coworkers would carry negative expected value.

Another equally prominent job performance framework concerns the distinction between what the researchers call task performance and contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Task performance refers to activities that usually appear on formal job descriptions. Motowidlo (2003) suggests task performance might take either of two forms. One form involves activities that directly transform raw materials into the goods and services that are the organization's products. These activities could include selling merchandise in a store, cashing checks in a bank, operating a production machine in a manufacturing plant, and so forth. The second form involves activities that service and maintain the technical core by replenishing its supply of raw materials, distributing its finished products, or providing planning, coordination, supervising, and so forth.

Contextual performance (Motowidlo, 2003) is part the performance domain that the researchers believed was relatively ignored in research. Contextual performance is equally valuable to the organization and includes behavior that contributes to organizational effectiveness through its effects on the psychological, social, and organizational context of work. Employees can contribute through contextual performance in several ways. One way is through affecting other individuals in the organization so that they become more likely to carry out organizationally valuable behaviors themselves (e.g. promoting positive affect in others, defusing hostilities and conflict, and so forth.). Another way to contribute is by increasing the individual's own readiness to perform organizationally valuable behaviors (e.g. adapting flexibility to work demands, taking on more responsibility, seeking out knowledge and training, and so

forth.). Still a third way to contribute via contextual performance is through actions that affect the organization's tangible resources (e.g. turning lights off to conserve energy, cleaning up after a meeting, and so forth).

Organizational Support Theory and Job Performance

Organizational support theory addresses the psychological processes and motives fundamental to consequences of POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Based on the reciprocity norm, not only should organizations feel obligated to repay the employees' effort with various kinds of beneficial treatment, but POS should create a felt obligation for employees as well. The norm of reciprocity obligates employees receiving increased benefits from their organization to compensate their employer with higher work performance (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1993). Employees should care about the organization's welfare and help the organization reach its objectives through heightening performance and reducing turnover, withdrawal behaviors, and counterproductive behaviors. Meeting obligations helps employees maintain the positive self-image of those who repay debts, avoid the social stigma associated with the reciprocity norm's violation, and obtain favorable treatment from the organization (Eisenberger et al., 2001). Additionally, the fulfillment of socioemotional needs inherent with POS should lead employees to feel a greater sense of organizational membership and role status, resulting in greater job satisfaction and positive mood. Furthermore, through a healthy social exchange relationship, employees will have strengthened performance-reward expectancies believing that the organization recognizes and rewards increased performance. Hence, employees that receive beneficial treatment are motivated to compensate the organization in ways that are valued by the organization.

POS has been linked with a multitude of consequences in past research: organizational commitment (Armeli, Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Lynch, 1998), job-related affect (Eisenberger et al., 2001), job involvement (Cropanzano et al., 1997; Eisenberger et al., 1999), strains (Cropanzano et al., 1997; George, Reed, Ballard, Colin, & Fielding, 1993), desire to remain (Nye & Witt, 1993; Witt, 1991; Witt & Nye, 1992), and withdrawal behaviors (Guzzo, Noonan, & Elron, 1994; Wayne et al., 1997).

Job performance can be grouped into two main factors according to Borman and Motowidlo (1993) – task performance and contextual performance. These two factors include the behaviors that are typically known as in-role performance and extra-role performance. Contextual performance has also been referred to as citizenship behaviors (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983), prosocial behaviors (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), and extra-role behaviors (George & Brief, 1992). While differences exist between these definitions (e.g. some require that a behavior *not* be formally rewarded by the organization, while others do not make this distinction), the definitions are largely overlapping. These factors have resulted in emerging literature regarding the distinctions between the task performance domain and the contextual/prosocial/citizenship performance domain. Recently, Sackett (2002) suggests adding the concept of counterproductive work behaviors to this framework of job performance, resulting in a broad three-factor conception of performance: task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive behaviors.

It is according to this broad three-factor framework of job performance that this discussion continues. While the empirical research supporting a relationship between counterproductive work behaviors and POS is limited, the relationship will be discussed

and supported by theory and some initial empirical evidence. Specifically, the relationships between perceived organizational support and the following job performance dimensions will be discussed: in-role job performance, extra-role job performance directed toward individuals and toward the organization, and counterproductive work behaviors.

POS and In-role Performance

According to the norm of reciprocity, employees are obligated to fulfill their role in the social exchange by repaying the organization in ways that the organization finds valuable for any beneficial treatment they may receive (Eisenberger et al., 1986). One way that employees can fulfill this need is by heightening job performance behaviors – specifically, task/in-role performance. According to Borman and Motowidlo (1993) task performance includes those behaviors that one would typically find on a job description and are defined by their tasks. These types of behaviors involve activities that directly transform raw materials into the good and services that are the organization’s products (i.e. cashing checks at a bank, operating a production machine at a manufacturing plant). In-role performance also involves activities that service and maintain the technical core by replenishing raw materials, distributing products, or providing planning, coordination, or supervision.

Stemming from organizational support theory, if employees perceive that the organization favorably supports and cares for their well-being, they are obligated to return this “favor.” If focusing specifically on in-role performance, one could expect employees that feel supported to exhibit increased or heightened in-role performance behaviors. Research on this link between POS and in-role performance has found

empirical support for the relationship (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Randall, et al., 1999; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

In one of the first studies to focus on the relationship between POS and performance dimensions, Eisenberger et al. (1990) surveyed 237 employees from a variety of occupations ranging from high school teachers to police officers. POS was measured using a short form of the SPOS (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Performance was measured in a variety of ways. Two of the samples measured performance using a behaviorally anchored rating scale. One of the samples used a seven-item Likert-type evaluation scale. Yet another of the samples, the police officers, used objective measures of performance ranging from the annual number of “discretionary citations” and arrest rates. The researchers accumulated all of the performance data together by meta-analysis. The results indicate a strong combined relationship between in-role performance dimensions and POS ($r = .33, p < .01$), thus supporting the POS – performance link.

In a more recent study, Randall et al. (1999) investigated the relationship of organizational politics and organizational support to various work attitudes and behaviors among a field sample of 128 participants from three different organizations. POS was measured using an adapted form of the SPOS (Eisenberger et al., 1986), while in-role performance was measured using a 20-item scale devised by Williams and Anderson (1991). Both the POS and performance measures resulted in coefficient alphas of .94 and .88, respectively. Results confirm the researchers’ hypotheses that perceptions of organizational support are related to in-role job performance ($r = .22, p < .05$).

POS and Extra-role Performance

Organ (1988) defined organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (p.4). However, in 1997 Organ redefined OCB as “contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance” (p.91), leaving out the requirement that OCBs are discretionary and not formally rewarded. Citizenship behaviors are typically broken into five distinct sets of behaviors: 1) altruism, 2) conscientiousness, 3) sportsmanship, 4) civic virtue, and 5) courtesy.

OCB can include such behaviors as:

- 1) employees going out of their way to help one another with work-related problems (altruism);
- 2) not taking breaks and maintaining acceptable attendance (conscientiousness);
- 3) focusing on the positive side rather than on what’s wrong (sportsmanship);
- 4) attending meetings that are not mandatory but are considered important (civic virtue);
- 5) taking steps to try to prevent problems with other workers (courtesy).

According to the norm of reciprocity, employees are obligated to fulfill their role in the social exchange by repaying the organization in ways that the organization finds valuable (Eisenberger et al., 1986). One way that employees can fulfill this need is by heightening job performance behaviors – specifically, OCB/extra-role/contextual performance. According to Borman and Motowidlo (1993) contextual performance

includes those behaviors that contribute to organizational effectiveness through its effects on the psychological, social, and organizational context of work.

If focusing specifically on extra-role performance, one could expect employees that feel supported to exhibit increased or heightened extra-role behaviors. Heightened OCBs and extra-role performance might include employees helping each other more often, complaining less, exhibiting more conscientiousness, and acting more courteous to each other. Research on the link between POS and extra-role performance has found empirical support for the relationship.

In one of the first studies to examine the relationship between POS and OCB, Shore and Wayne (1993) surveyed 276 employees and their supervisors from a large multinational firm located in the southeastern United States. The researchers assessed OCB using a 16-item scale developed by Smith, Organ, and Near (1983). Results indicate a strong relationship between POS and the altruism dimension of OCB ($r = .23, p < .05$). Thus, employees who feel that they are supported by their organization, over time, may reciprocate and reduce the imbalance in the relationship by engaging in citizenship behaviors.

Though the Shore and Wayne (1993) study provides supportive evidence to the relationship between POS and OCB, the researchers considered only a single dimension of OCB. Most research suggests that OCB is multidimensional (Organ, 1988). In an effort to further examine the multidimensional nature of OCB and its relation to POS, Randall et al. (1999) surveyed 128 employees from three organizations. POS was assessed using the 17-item SPOS (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Supervisors provided ratings of OCB using a measure developed by Williams and Anderson (1991), which measures

two dimensions of OCB: 1) OCB that benefits a specific individual (OCBI), and 2) OCB that benefits the organization as a whole (OCBO). Sample items from the OCBI scale include “helps others who have been absent” and “goes out of way to help new employees.” Sample items from the OCBO scale include “adheres to informal rules devised to maintain order” and “complains about insignificant things at work” (reverse scored). Consistent with the researchers’ hypotheses, results indicate that POS is significantly related to both citizenship behavior directed toward individuals ($r = .25$, $p < .05$) and the organization as a whole ($r = .26$, $p < .05$).

In a more recent study, Ladd and Henry (2000) not only distinguished between OCBI and OCBO, but also between perceived organizational support and perceived *coworker* support (PCS). Specifically, they hypothesized that POS would be positively related to citizenship behaviors that directly help the organization. Also, they proposed that PCS would be positively related to citizenship behaviors that directly help individuals. The researchers’ sample included 214 employees of a small manufacturing plant and a large, government organization. Williams and Anderson’s (1991) OCB scale was used to assess OCBI and OCBO. A nine-item version of the SPOS (Eisenberger et al., 1986) was used to assess POS. In addition, the researchers developed a measure of perceived coworker support by adapting the target of the SPOS from the organization to coworker, resulting in a coefficient alpha of .94. A sample item from this scale is, “My coworkers are supportive of my goals and values.” Results indicate employees’ perceptions of support from different agents results in differential performance outcomes. Specifically, POS was positively related to organization-targeted citizenship ($r = .19$, $p < .01$) and PCS was positively related to individual-targeted citizenship ($r = .21$, $p < .01$).

01). POS was not related to individual-targeted citizenship and PCS was not related to organization-targeted citizenship. Although these results are limited by a correlational design, the preliminary findings indicate that the relationship between POS and citizenship behaviors might depend upon the agent of support and the target of the behaviors.

POS and Counterproductive Work Behaviors

An interesting contrast to organizational citizenship behavior is organizationally dysfunctional behavior such as antisocial behavior (Robinson & O’Leary-Kelly, 1998), deviant behavior (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), and counterproductive behavior (Sackett, 2002). The contrast is between behaviors that are carried out to help and cooperate and behaviors that are carried out to hurt or hinder. Workplace deviance is a prevalent and expensive problem for organizations. The annual costs of workplace deviance have been estimated to be as high as \$4.2 billion for workplace violence (Bensimon, 1994), \$40 to \$120 billion for theft (Buss, 1993; Camara & Schneider, 1994), and \$6 to \$200 billion for a wide range of delinquent organizational behavior (Murphy, 1993).

Robinson and Bennett (1995) defined employee deviance as “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both” (p.556). Their research efforts yielded a two-dimensional model of workplace deviance that produced four categories of behaviors: 1) production deviance (e.g., leaving early, taking excessive breaks, wasting resources), 2) property deviance (e.g., sabotaging equipment, lying about hours worked, stealing from the company), 3) political deviance (e.g., showing favoritism, gossiping about coworkers, blaming coworkers), and 4) personal aggression (e.g., sexual harassment, verbal abuse,

stealing from or endangering coworkers). In addition, the researchers distinguished between deviant behavior targeted or directed at the organization (organizational deviance) or at members of the organization (interpersonal deviance).

The most general term used to describe organizationally dysfunctional behaviors is *counterproductive work behavior* (CWB). Sackett (2002) defines these behaviors as “any intentional behavior on the part of the organizational member viewed by the organization as contrary to its legitimate interests” (p.5). Based on Gruys (1999), Sackett identifies 11 categories of counterproductive behaviors: theft, destruction of property, misuse of information, misuse of time and resources, unsafe behavior, poor attendance, poor quality of work, alcohol use, drug use, inappropriate verbal actions, and inappropriate physical actions.

A common theme among various definitions of organizationally dysfunctional behaviors is the need for the behaviors to be *intentional*. Considering the intentional nature of role behaviors for both citizenship and dysfunctional behaviors, one must address the possibility that perhaps OCBs and dysfunctional behaviors are simply opposite ends of a single construct continuum. On the low end, employees exhibit behaviors deemed dysfunctional and inappropriate by the organization. On the high end, employees exhibit behaviors deemed helpful and cooperative by the organization. Some research provides initial support for the distinctiveness of the two constructs. Kelloway, Loughlin, Barling, and Nault (2002) investigated the construct validity of CWBs and OCBs and found that while they are negatively related ($r = -.20, p < .01$), they are also unique constructs.

According to the norm of reciprocity, employees are obligated to fulfill their role in the social exchange by repaying the organization in ways that the organization finds valuable (Eisenberger et al., 1986). In addition to heightening in-role and extra-role performance, employees can fulfill this need by reducing counterproductive/deviant behaviors. If focusing specifically on dysfunctional behaviors, one could expect employees that feel supported by their organization to exhibit fewer behaviors involving theft or destruction of property, misuse of time and/or resources, unsafe behaviors, poor attendance, alcohol and drug use, and inappropriate verbal and physical actions.

There is little research on the relationship between POS and CWBs. Most of the research to date has focused on *withdrawal behaviors*, which refers to employees' lessening of active participation in the organization. The relationship of POS to behavioral intentions to leave (i.e., turnover intention) has been assessed (Guzzo et al., 1994; Wayne et al., 1997), as well as withdrawal behaviors such as tardiness, absenteeism, and voluntary turnover. In a recent meta-analysis, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) found a strong negative relationship between POS and withdrawal behaviors ($r = -.30, p < .001$).

While previous research addresses the relationship between POS and withdrawal behaviors, the research does not address a relationship between POS and CWBs. Both withdrawal behaviors and CWBs are undesirable outcomes, yet they are the result of fundamentally different actions. Lessening one's positive behaviors in an organization is quite different from increasing one's negative behaviors, such as gossiping or sabotage. Some research lends support to the possible relationship between POS and CWBs. Miles, Borman, Spector, and Fox (2002) surveyed 203 participants employed at various types of

organizations regarding CWB, job-related affect, and organizational constraints. Job-related affect was assessed with a scale developed by Van Katwyk, Fox, Spector, and Kelloway (2000), and measured a wide range of emotions experienced in response to conditions of the job. A scale by Spector and Jex (1998) was used to measure work constraints. Respondents indicated the frequency with which their job performance was hindered by constraints such as availability or resources, coworkers, interruptions, rules and procedures, and inadequate training. CWB was assessed with a measure developed by the researchers, which was combined from several existing CWB measures and resulted in a coefficient alpha of .87. Results confirm the researchers' hypotheses. CWB was significantly related to both positive job-related affect ($r = -.22, p < .01$) and work constraints ($r = .32, p < .01$).

While this study did not specifically measure POS, the results indicate that CWB is related to employees' perceptions of organizational constraints and positive job-related affect. Research indicates that POS has a positive relationship with job-related affect and a negative relationship with strains (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Employees who feel supported by their organization tend to display positive job-related affect and fewer psychological and psychosomatic reactions to stressors. Based on these results, one could postulate that CWB should have a negative relationship with POS, such that if employees feel supported by their organization they should display increased positive affect, which employees will exhibit through decreased counterproductive behaviors.

Hypotheses

360-degree Support

One goal of this study was to investigate the potential role that a 360-degree view of supportive relationships might have with POS and performance. Empirical research to date has largely focused on the relationship specifically between PSS and POS, and has found consistently strong evidence of this relationship ($r = .51, p < .001$; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Very limited research is beginning to investigate the relationship between coworker support (PCS) and POS. The concept of perceived supervisor support stems from the notion that, as agents of the organization, the favorable or unfavorable treatment subordinates receive from their supervisors is an indication of how the *organization* favors or disfavors them. If taken one step further, coworkers could be considered additional agents of the organization, and as such, coworkers' support could be an additional indicator of the organizations' valuation of the employees' contributions and concern for their well-being. Some empirical research provides initial support for the relationship between PCS and POS (Ladd & Henry, 2000; Yoon & Lim, 1999).

One avenue of research that has yet to be examined is the potential relationship between employees and their direct reports/internal customers. In addition to coworkers and supervisors, it is possible to consider direct reports and internal customers as potential supportive agents of the organization. Stemming from organizational support theory, if the employee feels supported by an organizational agent and attributes the supportive behavior to the organizational culture, as opposed to individual idiosyncrasies, then the employee should feel increased POS. Taking this theory one step further, if the

employee feels increased POS due to supportive direct reports or internal customers, then the employee should likewise feel an obligation to repay the favorable treatment in a way that is deemed favorable to the individual and the organization.

Consistent with these relationships, a 360-degree model of support is proposed such that:

H1. Individual sources of support will correlate positively with perceived organizational

support:

- a. Perceived supervisor support will correlate positively with perceived organizational support.*
- b. Perceived coworker support will correlate positively with perceived organizational support.*
- c. Perceived direct report/internal customer support (DRS) will correlate positively with perceived organizational support.*

H2. The 360-degree model of support consisting of supervisor support, coworker support,

and direct report/internal customer support will more strongly predict organizational support than will any of these variables separately.

Performance

Through a process of social exchange employees' POS results in various performance outcomes. Employees with a heightened sense of POS exhibit increased in-role performance (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Randall et al., 1999), and extra-role performance directed toward both individuals and the organization as a whole (Ladd &

Henry, 2000; Randall et al., 1999; Shore & Wayne, 1993). In addition, a possible relationship between POS and counterproductive work behaviors has been proposed and supported with theory and some initial empirical research (Miles et al., 2002).

Consistent with these relationships, a relationship between POS and performance is hypothesized such that:

H3. Perceived organizational support will predict:

- a. In-role performance.*
- b. Extra-role performance.*
- c. Counterproductive work behaviors.*

II. Method

Design

This field study assessed the relationships among individually directed support, organizational support, and performance in a work environment. The measured variables were participants' supervisor support, coworker support, direct report support, in-role performance, extra-role performance, and counterproductive work behaviors. All support and performance dimensions were collected through the administration of self-report questionnaires distributed to both employees and their supervisors from three organizations. The in-role performance and extra-role performance measures were gathered twice from supervisors with a minimum of a one-month time lapse between administrations.

Participants

Survey respondents totaled 154 and were employees and supervisors from one of three organizations: a public community college (faculty and staff; $n=68$), a small non-profit counseling and consulting group (social workers, staff, and counselors; $n=19$), and a medium-security level correctional facility (security officers, staff, and administration; $n=67$). The typical respondent was female (51%), 44 years of age (range of 21-70 years of age), held a graduate (40%) or undergraduate degree (31%), worked full-time (86%) and had worked for her organization an average of 8 years. The number of surveys distributed to employees and supervisors totaled 335. However, only 154 of the employee surveys matched a supervisor survey, which resulted in a response rate of 50%.

Procedures

Upon organizational approval for project participation, participants were notified of impending data collection in one of two ways: 1) through a group email announcing the project, potential risks and benefits, confidentiality, and a link to the secure online survey, in addition to in-person department meetings with the researcher, or 2) an in-person meeting with the researcher during pre-shift meetings. The counseling group and the community college surveys were administered through a secure online format, which the employees and their supervisors could access on their individual computers. The correctional facility administered paper-and-pencil surveys, which were distributed during security officer pre-shift meetings.

Participants: Each participant was given a 63-item survey designed to assess self-reported organizational support, supervisor support, coworker support, direct report support, in-role performance, extra-role performance, and counterproductive work behaviors (see Appendix A). All participant surveys were distributed via a secure online format or during in-person meetings with the researcher.

Supervisors: Each participant's supervisor was given a 22-item survey designed to assess in-role performance and extra-role performance (see Appendix B). All supervisor surveys were distributed via a secure online format or during in-person meetings with the researcher. The supervisor of each participant received two administrations of the 22-item survey with a minimum of a one-month time lapse between the administrations. The supervisors at one of the organizations did not participate in the second administration of the surveys. Therefore, all Time 2 data is based on only two of the three participating organizations.

Debriefing: Following the completion and return of all surveys, all participants were again informed of the purpose of the research, possible outcomes, potential benefits of the research findings, and thanked for their time and assistance with this project. At the completion of the project, each participant who indicated interest received a written report based on research results.

Measures

Support Measures

The nine-item Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger et al., 1990) was used to assess participants' perceived organizational support ($\alpha = .95$). This survey used a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A sample item from this survey is "My organization really cares about my well-being."

To measure perceived supervisor support, Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli's (2001) four-item survey was administered to all participants ($\alpha = .92$). Responses to these items used a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strong disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A sample item from this survey is "My supervisor cares about my opinions."

To measure perceived coworker support, Ladd and Henry's (2000) nine-item survey was administered to all participants ($\alpha = .94$). Employees reported their level of agreement using a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A sample item from this survey is "My coworkers are supportive of my goals and values."

To measure perceived direct report support, a nine-item modified version of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger et al., 1990) was used. The target of each item was changed such that the referent was direct reports instead of the

organization ($\alpha = .96$). An example item from this survey is “My direct reports are supportive of my goals and values.”

Performance Measures

Employees and supervisors both used the same eight-item measure to assess in-role performance (Nielsen, 2002). Participants rated in-role performance using an eight-point scale (Performance: 1=does not meet standards, 2=is less than satisfactory, 3=is satisfactory in most respects, 4=is satisfactory in all respects, 5=is above average, 6=is superior in almost all respects, 7=is definitely superior in all respects, 8=is the single best performance). Items on this survey assess productivity, quality, openness to new learning, relationships with other associates, dependability and reliability, ability to function under stress, attendance and timeliness, and overall job performance. This measure was administered to both the supervisors (T1: $\alpha = .95$; T2: $\alpha = .97$) and the participants ($\alpha = .93$). When administered to the participant, the item stems were changed from third person to first person (i.e. “My dependability and reliability”, etc.).

Extra-role behaviors were measured using a 14-item scale developed by Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994). This survey includes three dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior: 1) helping (seven items), 2) civic virtue (three items), and 3) sportsmanship (four items). Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with a list of employee behaviors on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). This scale was administered to both the participants ($\alpha = .79$) and their supervisors (T1: $\alpha = .93$; T2: $\alpha = .95$). When administered to the participant, the item stems were changed from third person to first person (i.e. “I willingly give of my time”,

etc.). A sample item from this survey is “Willingly gives of his or her time to help other agents who have work-related problems.”

Counterproductive work behaviors were assessed with a ten-item survey (Kelloway et al., 2002). Participants were asked to indicate how often they engage in each of the listed behaviors on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). This measure was administered to participants and reported a coefficient alpha reliability estimate of .75. A sample item from this survey is “Exaggerated about your hours worked.”

Variables

Perceived organizational support was measured with the nine-item Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger et al., 1990). All responses were scored from 1 to 5, with a maximum aggregated score of 45 representing the highest level of organizational support and a minimum aggregated score of 9 representing the lowest level of organizational support.

Perceived supervisor support was measured using the four-item supervisor support scale developed by Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli (2001). All responses were scored from 1 to 5, with a maximum aggregated score of 20 representing the highest level of supervisor support and a minimum aggregated score of 4 representing the lowest level of supervisor support.

Perceived coworker support was measured using Ladd and Henry’s (2000) nine-item scale of perceived coworker support and all responses were scored from 1 to 5. A maximum aggregated score of 45 representing the highest level of coworker support and

a minimum aggregated score of 9 representing the lowest level of coworker support is possible.

Perceived direct report support was measured using a nine-item modified form of the SPOS (Eisenberger et al., 1990). The target of each item, however, was changed from “organization” to “direct reports.” All responses were scored from 1 to 5, with a maximum aggregated score of 45 representing the highest level of direct report support and a minimum aggregated score of 9 representing the lowest level of direct report support.

In-role performance was measured using an eight-item scale (Nielsen, 2002) with a response set from 1 to 8. This yielded a maximum aggregated score of 64 (representing the highest level of job performance) and a minimum aggregated score of 8.

Podsakoff and MacKenzie’s (1994) 14-item survey was used to measure extra-role behavior. Each response was scored from 1 to 5 with a maximum aggregated score of 70 representing the highest level of citizenship/extra-role behaviors and a minimum aggregated score of 14 representing the lowest level of citizenship/extra-role behaviors.

Kelloway et al.’s (2002) ten-item survey was used to measure counterproductive work behaviors. Each response was scored from 1 to 5 with a maximum aggregated score of 50 representing the highest level of counterproductive work behaviors and a minimum level of 10 representing the lowest level of counterproductive work behaviors.

III. Results

The means and standard deviations for all study variables, along with the correlations among all variables, are reported in Table 1 (all tables located in Appendix C). In addition, all scale reliability coefficients are reported on the diagonal and demonstrate high internal consistency with coefficient alphas above .75 (Nunnally, 1978).

Hypothesis 1a, 1b, and 1c

The first hypothesis was tested by examining the correlations among the individual support variables and POS. The hypothesis was supported for all three variables: PSS, PCS, and DRS all reported significant ($p \leq .01$) and positive relationships with POS ($r = .68$; $r = .49$; $r = .57$, respectively).

Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis, regarding the 360-degree model of support more strongly predicting POS than any individual support variable separately, was tested using hierarchical regression (Aiken & West, 1991). An examination of the correlation matrix (Table 1) provided insight into the potential influence of control variables. Organization reported a negative correlation with PSS, such that higher levels of PSS are evidenced more in the first and second organizations of the study. Education was positively correlated with PSS and DRS such that higher levels of education correspond to higher levels of perceived support. Job status (coded 0 for full-time and 1 for part-time) positively correlated with both POS and PSS such that employees with part-time status in their organizations reported slightly higher levels of POS and PSS. Tenure negatively correlated with both POS and PSS, such that employees with greater tenure within their

organizations reported lower levels of perceived support from their organization and supervisors. Therefore, the following served as control variables in the regression for Hypothesis 2: education, tenure, organization, and status. Education and organization were both dummy coded into dichotomous variables. Tenure was reported in months.

The first step regressed POS on employee education, tenure, organization, and status. Perceived supervisor support, PCS, and DRS were then added as the second, third, and fourth steps, respectively. The significance of the change in R^2 was examined to test whether PSS, PCS, and DRS predicted incremental variance in POS beyond the control variables and each other. The second hypothesis was not supported (See Table 2). Perceived supervisor support accounted for 28% of the variance in POS beyond the other variables ($p \leq .01$) and was by far the strongest predictor ($\beta = .45$; $p \leq .01$). However, PCS and DRS failed to account for any additional variance in POS beyond the other variables ($\Delta R^2 = .01$; $p \geq .05$, for both).

Hypothesis 3a, 3b, and 3c

The third hypothesis, regarding the ability of POS to predict in-role performance, OCB, and CWB, was also tested using hierarchical regression (Aiken & West, 1991). The correlation matrix was consulted to examine the potential influence of control variables. As shown in Table 1, gender (coded 0 for female and 1 for male) negatively correlated with in-role performance and OCB at both Time 1 and Time 2, such that women received lower performance and OCB ratings from their supervisors than did men. Tenure was also negatively correlated with both in-role performance and OCB at Time 1 and Time 2, such that employees with greater tenure at their organizations tended

to receive lower supervisor ratings for in-role performance and OCB. Therefore, gender and tenure served as control variables for all Hypothesis 3 regressions.

Separate regressions were run for each Hypothesis 3a, 3b, and 3c. The first step regressed tenure and gender on all of the performance measures. Perceived organizational support was entered as the second step for all regressions. Separate regressions were run for both Time 1 and Time 2 supervisor ratings. Time 2 measures of in-role performance and OCB were only collected from two of the three participating organizations, resulting in an n of 87 for both Time 2 regressions. Please see Table 3 for the complete Hypothesis 3 regression results.

Hypothesis 3a, regarding the ability of POS to predict in-role performance, was only partially supported. Perceived organizational support accounted for 6% of the in-role performance variation at Time 1 ($p \leq .01$). However, POS did not account for any additional variance in performance at Time 2 ($\Delta R^2 = .02$; $p \geq .05$). Results indicate that in-role performance is best predicted by POS ($\beta = .25$; $p \leq .01$) at Time 1 only.

Hypothesis 3b, regarding the ability of POS to predict OCB, was only partially supported. Perceived organizational support accounted for 7% additional variance beyond that of other variables ($p \leq .01$) at Time 1. However, POS failed to account for additional variance beyond that of other variables at Time 2 ($\Delta R^2 = .03$; $p \geq .05$). It appears that OCB at Time 1 is best predicted by POS ($\beta = .26$; $p \leq .01$) and tenure ($\beta = -.19$; $p \leq .05$), and at Time 2 by tenure ($\beta = -.37$; $p \leq .01$) and gender ($\beta = -.19$; $p \leq .01$).

Results supported Hypothesis 3c, which concerns the ability of POS to predict CWB. Perceived organizational support accounted for 8% additional variance in CWB

beyond that of other variables ($p \leq .01$) and was the strongest predictor ($\beta = -.28; p \leq .01$).

IV. Discussion

One goal of this study was to investigate the potential role that multiple sources of support might have with POS and a three-factor conception of performance. Empirical research to date has largely focused on the relationship between PSS and POS, and has found consistently strong evidence of this relationship ($r = .51, p < .001$; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Empirical research is beginning to investigate the relationship between PCS and POS and has provided some initial support for the relationship (Ladd & Henry, 2000; Yoon & Lim, 1999). The potential relationship between employees and their direct reports had not been addressed prior to this project.

All Hypothesis 1 relationships received very strong support. Consistent with previous research, the present findings suggest that PSS is very strongly related to POS such that the employee's sense of global support from the organization increases as the individual support from the supervisor increases. The present finding regarding the relationship between PCS and POS provides additional support to previous research (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) suggesting that individual support received from coworkers contributes to a global sense of support received from the organization. Although not previously investigated in empirical research, the strong relationship between DRS and POS in the present study indicates that support received from direct reports is an important consideration in an employee's overall sense of support in the workplace.

Based on strong previous findings regarding the relationships among PSS, PCS, and POS, this study tested a hypothesis that had not been examined in previous research - that the best predictive model of POS might be one that includes PSS, PCS, and DRS

(Hypothesis 2). However, present findings failed to support the notion of a 360-model of individual support predicting POS. Instead, PSS remained the strongest predictor of POS and continued to account for significant additional variance in POS beyond that of the control variables, PCS, and DRS. Supervisor support appears to be the strongest and most important factor when considering employees' global assessments of organizational support, regardless of the perceived support from coworkers and direct reports. This finding adds evidence to the literature that PSS is not only an important support predictor of POS, but rather it is *the* support predictor of POS.

A third goal of this study was to investigate the relationship between POS and a three-factor model of performance, which included task/in-role performance, contextual performance/OCB, and counter-productive work behaviors (CWB; Hypotheses 3a, 3b, and 3c, respectfully). Through a process of social exchange employees' POS results in various performance outcomes. Previous research suggests that employees with a heightened sense of POS tend to exhibit increased in-role performance (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Randall et al., 1999), and extra-role performance directed toward both individuals and the organization as a whole (Ladd & Henry, 2000; Randall et al., 1999; Shore & Wayne, 1993). While the literature has addressed the relationship between POS and withdrawal behaviors, the potential relationship between POS and *active* negative behaviors has yet to be studied. This study sought to examine not only the relationship between POS and performance, but also a possible relationship between POS and counterproductive work behaviors.

Present findings with regards to the relationship between POS and the three-factor model of performance are somewhat mixed. Time 1 results suggest that POS is a strong

predictor of both in-role performance (Hypothesis 3a) and OCB (Hypothesis 3b), which supports theory and previous empirical research suggesting that POS creates an obligation in the employee to reciprocate with behaviors that will benefit the supportive organization (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Ladd & Henry, 2000; Randall et al., 1999; Shore & Wayne, 1993).

However, POS did not significantly predict Time 2 in-role performance or OCB. Interestingly, tenure and gender exhibited significant relationships with OCB. Tenure was a significant negative predictor of OCB at Time 1 and became the strongest predictor of OCB at Time 2, along with gender, while POS failed to predict OCB. It appears that employees with greater length of tenure and males both tend to receive lower ratings of OCB from their supervisors. These findings seem to contradict previous research suggesting POS as a significant and robust predictor of both in-role performance and OCB (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Ladd & Henry, 2000; Randall et al., 1999; Shore & Wayne, 1993).

Hypothesis 3c, concerning the prediction of CWB from POS, was supported. POS exhibited a strong negative prediction of CWB, which bolsters theory suggesting that heightened POS should create a sense of obligation in the employee to reciprocate and not only exhibit increased positive work behaviors, but to also display fewer negative work behaviors such as CWB. Present results add to the previous literature in this area in that a relationship between POS and active negative behaviors had been merely assumed, not investigated. This finding also supports the notion that CWB should be considered an important piece of a more inclusive model and understanding of performance that not

only includes the typical constructs of in-role performance and contextual performance or OCB, but also CWB (Sackett, 2002).

360-Support Model

The concept of a 360-support model stems from the notion that particular employees can be seen as representatives of the organization and influence employees' individual assessments of POS. Employees tend to assign humanlike characteristics to the organization and view it as a living entity because of its ability to exert power, define roles, and enact policy and norms (Eisenberger, et al., 1986; Levinson, 1965).

Employees' perspectives of the organization's favorable or unfavorable treatment toward them are then encouraged through this humanlike attribution. To the extent that an employee is seen as an agent of the organization, support provided by that employee will be seen as an extension of the *organization's* favor or concern rather than simply due to the whims of the individual. More specifically, the favorable or unfavorable treatment employees receive from their supervisors, coworkers, and direct reports is an indication of how the *organization* favors or disfavors them.

This study sought to investigate the extent to which favorable treatment from supervisors, coworkers, and direct reports might be attributed to the organization and impact an employee's report of POS. The present findings both support and contradict previous literature on this topic. The relationship between PSS and POS has received a great deal of attention (see Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), suggesting that PSS has a strong and robust impact on employees' POS. To this end, Eisenberger, et al. (2002b) found that PSS was strongly related to POS and maintained predictive value of POS over time. These results, along with the present findings, suggest that supervisors are indeed

seen as representatives of the organization and supportive supervisory behaviors are in part attributed to the organization rather than to the sole proclivities of the supervisor.

While the present findings support the abundant literature on PSS and POS, they simultaneously contradict research suggesting the importance of coworker support as a predictor of POS. To the extent that coworkers are considered agents of the organization, employees should attribute coworkers' favor and support to the organization rather than to the inclinations of the coworkers, thereby impacting the employee's POS. Taken one step further, direct reports could potentially also be viewed as representatives of the organization and, thus, their support and favor attributed to the organization rather than the whims of the individual subordinates. Indeed, some empirical research provides initial support for a relationship between PCS and POS (Ladd & Henry, 2000; Yoon & Lim, 1999). The strong correlations found in this study between PCS, DRS, and POS also suggest that they impact one another. However, PCS and DRS both failed to predict POS when accounting for the control variables and PSS in the regression analyses.

Recent research provides a possible explanation for the lack of predictive power exhibited by DRS and PCS. This study hypothesized a 360-model of support such that supportive behaviors and favor from coworkers, direct reports, and supervisors all contribute to a more global sense of POS. This relationship depends upon the extent to which the employees identify the supervisor, coworker, or direct report with the organization. If employees do not view the supervisor, coworker, or direct report as an agent of the organization, then the support received by that person will more likely be attributed to the individual's inclinations rather than to the organization as a whole, thereby decreasing its effect on the employee's POS.

In fact, supervisor's perceived status in the organization has been shown to moderate the relationship between PSS and POS (Eisenberger, et al., 2002b). Employees judged supervisors' informal organizational status as a function of three criteria: 1) the organization's positive valuation of the supervisor and care about the supervisor's welfare, 2) the supervisor's influence over important organizational decisions, and 3) the authority and autonomy allotted supervisors to carry out their job responsibilities. PSS was positively related to POS for supervisors of both high and low organizational status. However, they found that the effect of PSS on POS was stronger when the supervisor was highly favored by the organization, suggesting that supervisors judged as having higher favor with the organization are seen as better agents of the organization's character, which strengthens the relationship between PSS and POS.

One could easily apply the findings regarding supervisor's status in the organization and POS to the role of coworkers and direct reports. Based on the three criteria used in the Eisenberger, et al. (2002b) study, one could postulate that coworkers' and direct reports' status in the organization would depend on: 1) the organization's positive valuation of the coworker/direct report and care for that person, 2) the extent of the coworkers'/direct reports' influence over important organizational decisions, and 3) the authority and autonomy allotted coworkers/direct reports to carry out their job responsibilities. According to this model, PCS and DRS could both still be positively related to POS, but their effect on POS would be much more pronounced when the coworkers and direct reports are judged by the employee as having higher informal organizational status.

The failure of PCS and DRS to significantly account for variance in POS beyond that already explained by the PSS in the present study could be a function of coworkers' and direct reports' perceived status in the organization. Lower-level security officers, staff, counselors, and college faculty largely comprised the sample for this study. The security officers and staff have little influence over important organizational decisions and little to no authority or autonomy to carry out their job responsibilities. The counselors and faculty in this sample by necessity of their job characteristics have more authority and autonomy to carry out their job responsibilities. Their direct influence over important organizational decisions, however, is limited. Therefore, the lack of prediction of POS by PCS and DRS in the present study might, in fact, be more a function of job characteristics and informal organizational status.

Research concerning the traits of *collectivism* and *individualism* may also shed light on the relationship between PCS, DRS, and POS. Collectivist individuals hold group membership as central to their identity and value personal traits that reflect the goals of collectivism, such as group harmony and sacrifice for the common good, and derive life satisfaction from the fulfillment of social roles and obligations (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002). Collectivists' esteem of group membership and identification with their ingroup has interesting implications when applied to the organizational context. The extent that a collectivistic employee identifies coworkers and direct reports as an ingroup would impact the employee's assessment of organizational concern and support. Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Rhoades, Jones, and Aselage (2002a) suggested that treatment of coworkers would serve as a stronger indicator of the organization's support to more collectivistic as opposed to more individualistic

employees. Their results were confirming, such that perceptions of fair coworker treatment more strongly contributed to POS for highly collectivistic employees.

For the present study, collectivism may play a role in the lack of predictive ability for PCS and DRS. If the participants are not highly collective by nature, then they would not tend to identify strongly with an ingroup consisting of coworkers and direct reports. If coworkers and direct reports are not considered part of the employee's ingroup, then any favorable treatment received by them would not have as great an impact on the employee's POS. It is possible that any support or favorable treatment received from coworkers and direct reports would still have a relationship with POS, but it is likely that the ability of PCS and DRS to strongly predict POS in addition to PSS would be very limited.

Performance Outcomes

In addition to the antecedents of POS, organizational support theory addresses the processes underlying consequences of POS. The reciprocity norm (Gouldner, 1960) obliges one to reciprocate and return favorable treatment. Based on the reciprocity norm, organizational support theory supposes that favorable treatment received by the organization obliges employees to repay the organization in ways that benefit the organization. Stemming from this logic, POS should result in positive outcomes for both employees and organizations in three ways: 1) employees experience a felt obligation to care for and assist the organization in goal attainment, 2) increased fulfillment of employees' socioemotional needs leads to greater employee identification with the organization, and 3) employees' performance-reward expectancies are increased.

Consistent with theory, employees with a heightened sense of POS tend to exhibit increased in-role performance (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Randall et al., 1999), and extra-role performance directed toward both individuals and the organization as a whole (Ladd & Henry, 2000; Randall et al., 1999; Shore & Wayne, 1993). Present findings with regard to in-role performance and OCB at Time 1 confirm previous research findings, with employees exhibiting increased in-role performance and OCB with higher reports of POS. However, Time 2 results indicate otherwise.

The present findings regarding performance outcomes at Time 2 failed to indicate POS as a significant predictor, which stands in direct opposition to theory and previous research findings. Two possible explanations surface from the sample of this particular study. The first logical explanation to pursue concerns the contextual environment during the Time 2 performance outcome administrations. Time 2 performance outcomes were collected from only two of the participating organizations and of these organizations the most represented was the community college, with faculty comprising the bulk of the Time 2 sample. The administration of the second performance ratings occurred during the end of the academic year, which is arguably one of the busiest times of year for academics. Based on this environment, the failure of POS to predict Time 2 performance ratings could be a product of: 1) an actual decline in participants' performance as perceived by supervisors, or 2) greater inaccuracies in supervisors' ratings of employee performance, both explained by the hectic and overwhelming time of year.

A second explanation for the lack of in-role performance prediction from POS is also particular to this study's Time 2 sample – power. If a true effect exists in the population, the power of a statistical test is the probability that the test will detect that

effect in the sample. Cohen (1988) demonstrated that power is contingent upon several factors: 1) the statistical test chosen (e.g. parametric vs. nonparametric), 2) significance level chosen (e.g. $\alpha = .01$ or $.05$), 3) the effect size in the population, and 4) the sample size. Cohen suggested .80 as the standard for the minimum power necessary to conduct any investigation. Considering the factors in this study pertinent to its predictive power of in-role performance at Time 2 from POS (e.g. multiple regression analysis, $\alpha = .05$, and a small effect size), the sample size for the Time 2 administration was not large enough to detect the small effect size of POS on in-role performance. Using Cohen's power tables for power .80 at $\alpha = .05$, and assuming no measurement error in the predictors, the sample size required to detect a small effect size would have to be larger than the participating sample in the present study. Given a larger sample size, it is very likely that POS would predict in-role performance at Time 2.

Time 2 POS-OCB results exhibited an additional peculiar finding. Not only was POS not a significant predictor of Time 2 OCB, but tenure demonstrated significant *negative* effects on supervisor-rated OCB. These results indicate that employees with greater tenure received lower OCB ratings from their supervisors. However, previous research on OCB and POS fails to uncover any significant relationships with tenure. In their meta-analysis of OCB and its correlates, Organ and Ryan (1995) reported an insignificant correlation between tenure and the OCB facets of altruism ($r = .06$) and generalized compliance ($r = .03$). According to organizational support theory, tenure should also not exhibit strong relationships with POS. In their POS meta-analysis, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) found a very small relationship between tenure and POS ($r = .02$; $p < .01$).

Due to the lack of theoretical and empirical support for the relationship found between tenure and OCB in the present study, the logical explanation to pursue is again contextual. One trend was identified based on this researcher's observation and time spent in the organization that comprised the majority of the Time 2 sample – the community college. The average tenure for employees at this organization was eight years and only twenty-five percent of employees ranged from twelve years to the maximum tenure length of thirty-seven years. Employees at this organization with greater tenure tended to hold a more skeptical attitude toward the organization and expressed a long history of poor relations with the administration. Particular references were made to a series of organizational and administrative changes and decisions in the last ten to twenty years that were construed quite negatively by this sample. This environment could possibly provide an explanation for the negative relationship between tenure and OCB, such that employees with more negative experiences like those mentioned above might be less willing to exhibit extra-role behaviors and would thus receive lower OCB ratings by their supervisors.

Research Implications

Given the strong role of supervisors in employee perceptions of organizational and supervisory support, future research should thoroughly investigate the dynamics of the relationship. One particular avenue of research concerns the relationship between supervisors' POS and supervisors' assessment of subordinate-directed support. Shanock and Eisenberger (2006) found that supervisors' POS predicted subordinates' PSS and that subordinates' PSS mediated positive relationships of the supervisors' POS with the subordinates' POS and performance, suggesting that supervisors who perceive support

from their organization reciprocate with more supportive treatment for subordinates. Further research should examine the extent of agreement between supervisors' POS and supervisors' assessment of their subordinate-directed support. In addition, the extent of agreement between supervisors' assessment of their subordinate-directed support and subordinates' PSS has yet to be examined.

A second potential focus for future research concerns measurement of specific supervisory behaviors. Current measures of PSS do not allow for the assessment of specific supervisory behaviors that might lead subordinates to experience increased PSS and POS. Future investigations might include objective assessment of such behaviors as positive feedback, coaching, opinion-seeking, inclusion, flexibility, etc.

Previous research indicates that POS might exhibit different relationships with performance outcomes based on the referent. For example, research indicates that POS predicts both extra-role behaviors directed toward individuals and the organization as a whole (Ladd & Henry, 2000). However, Randall and colleagues (1999) found that POS better predicted extra-role behaviors directed toward the organization, while PCS better predicted extra-role behaviors directed toward individuals. Considering these findings, future research should more thoroughly address the possible predictive value of differentiating between CWB directed toward individuals and CWB directed toward the organization.

Practical Implications

It is clear from the present findings and the abundance of previous research that supervisors play a strong role in employees' assessment of the work environment. In addition to the present results, research has shown that supportive and caring treatment by

employees' supervisors such as leader consideration, leader communication, participative leadership, and high-quality leader-member exchanges have been positively related to employees' commitment and performance (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Settoon et al., 1996). Supportive treatment from supervisors is clearly related to not only employees' POS, but also employees' commitment and performance. Developing supervisors' leadership skills, communication skills, and consideration for employees might have important commitment and performance consequences that should be considered by practitioners and organizations.

Given the prevalence and expense of workplace deviance for organizations, a second practical implication of the present findings is increased justification for emphasizing the importance of employees' POS. The annual costs of workplace deviance have been estimated to be as high as \$4.2 billion for workplace violence (Bensimon, 1994), \$40 to \$120 billion for theft (Buss, 1993; Camara & Schneider, 1994), and \$6 to \$200 billion for a wide range of delinquent organizational behavior (Murphy, 1993). The present results provide evidence that not only will POS result in less absenteeism and tardiness, but also employees will actually perform fewer deviant behaviors such as gossip, theft, and sabotage. This results in great cost savings to the organization in terms of asset protection and employee tenure.

A third consideration for organizations and practitioners is the role of collectivism in the workplace. Based on previous findings regarding the role of collectivism in an employee's identification with a coworker in-group and the employee's resulting POS thereof, more collective environments and organizational cultures might cultivate a deeper sense of shared meaning and support in the workplace. This collective focus might

heighten support relationships involving POS, PCS, and PSS, resulting in increased positive work behaviors and reduced negative work behaviors.

Limitations

Common Method Variance

One limitation of the present study is that subordinate PSS and POS measures come from the same source – the subordinate. In addition, subordinates self-reported ratings of CWB. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff (2003) discuss common method variance, or variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the constructs the measures represent, and indicate that it is one of the main sources of measurement error, which threatens the validity of researchers' conclusions. Obtaining construct measures from the same individual and using measures that are worded similarly both potentially contribute to common method bias. Common method variance could weaken the findings in the present study with regard to POS, PSS, and CWB.

Statistical Power

As previously discussed, the power and sample size of Time 2 performance measures stand as a second limitation of this study. Considering the factors in this study pertinent to its predictive power of in-role performance at Time 2 from POS (e.g. multiple regression analysis, $\alpha = .05$, and a small effect size), the sample size for the Time 2 administration was not large enough to detect the small effect size of POS on in-role performance. Using Cohen's power tables, the sample size required to detect a small effect size would have to be considerably larger than the participating sample in the present study. Given a larger sample size, it is likely that POS would predict in-role performance at Time 2.

Population

The population and settings involved in this study may have reduced external validity. Participants are limited to the corrections, counseling, and academic occupations. Therefore, results may not generalize to all occupations and all organizations. For example, different findings might emerge when studying team-based organizations, for-profit organizations, or occupations compensated with bonuses or commissions in addition to a base salary.

Conclusion

In conclusion, there are two key findings. The first concerns the extent of the relationship between PSS and POS. Previous research has examined individual support measures and POS, reporting consistent positive relationships between PSS, PCS, and POS. However, the present study was able to examine the predictive value of each support measure and found that PSS was the only significant predictor of POS, stifling the effects of all other support variables. This finding is an addition to existing literature on this topic and indicates that perhaps future research and practice should focus more clearly on PSS, its components, and resulting behaviors.

The second key finding concerns the relationship between POS and performance outcomes. The present results indicate that POS is indeed a robust predictor of both in-role and extra-role performance, which supports previous literature on this topic. Additionally, a strong negative relationship was found between POS and CWB such that employees performed fewer negative or deviant behaviors with increased POS. This is an addition to existing literature on this topic, which has to date focused only on the relationship between POS, in-role and extra-role performance, and withdrawal behaviors.

These results provide evidence that POS is not only an important predictor of lessening withdrawal behaviors, but also of lessening deviance. A clear distinction exists between the characterization of performance outcomes as active deviant behaviors (CWBs) and withdrawal of positive behaviors (withdrawal behaviors). According to the present findings, POS can now be considered a strong predictor of the most widely measured performance outcomes including active deviance and positive withdrawal.

List of References

List of References

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A. (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Andrews, M. C., & Kacmar, K. M. (2001). Discriminating among organizational politics, justice, and support. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22, 347-366.
- Armeli, S., Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Lynch, P. (1998). Perceived organizational support and police performance: The moderating influence of socioemotional needs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 288-297.
- Batson, C. (1993). Communal and exchange relationships: What is the difference? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19(6), 677-683.
- Bensimon, H.F. (1994). Crisis and disaster management: Violations in the workplace. *Training and development*, 28, 27-32.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on negotiation in organizations*, 1, 43-55.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 710-725.
- Buss, D. (1993). Ways to curtail employee theft. *Nation's Business*, 36-38.

- Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 468-478.
- Camara, W. J., & Schneider, D. L. (1994). Integrity tests: Facts and unresolved issues. *American Psychologist, 49*, 112-119.
- Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., Vol.1, pp. 687-732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (vol.12, pp. 317-372). New York: Wiley.
- Cropanzano, R., Howes, J. C., Grandey, A. A., & Toth, P. (1997). The relationship of organizational politics and support to work behaviors, attitudes, and stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22*, 159-180.
- Dornbusch, S. M., & Scott, W. R. (1975). *Evaluation and the exercise of authority*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eisenberger, E., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P., Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 42-51.

- Eisenberger, R., Cotterell, N., & Marvel, J. (1987). Reciprocation ideology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 743-750.
- Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 812-820.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 51-59.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.
- Eisenberger, R., Rhoades, L., & Cameron, J. (1999). Does pay for performance increase or decrease perceived self-determination and intrinsic motivation? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 1026-1040.
- Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Rhoades, L., Jones, J. R., & Aselage, J. (2002a). Perceived organizational support: Influences of collectivism and competitiveness. Manuscript, University of Delaware.
- Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I., & Rhoades, L. (2002b). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 565-573.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press.
- Fasolo, P. M. (1995). Procedural justice and perceived organizational support: Hypothesized effects on job performance. In R. Cropanzano & K. M. Kacmar

- (Eds.), *Organizational politics, justice, and support: Managing social climate at work* (pp. 185-195). Westport, CT: Quorum Press.
- Foa, U. G., & Foa, E. B. (1974). *Societal structures of the mind*. Oxford, England: Charles C. Thomas.
- George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good – doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work – organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 310-329
- George, J. M., Reed, T. F., Ballard, K. A., Colin, J., & Fielding, J. (1993). Contact with AIDS patients as a source of work-related distress: Effects of organizational and social support. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 157-171.
- Graen, G., & Cashman, J. (1975). A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers* (pp. 143-166). Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- Gruys, M. L. (1999). *The dimensionality of deviant employee performance in the workplace*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Guzzo, R. A., Noonan, K. A., & Elron, E. (1994). Expatriate managers and the psychological contract. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 617-626.
- Hoffman, D. A., & Morgeson, F. P. (1999). Safety-related behavior as social exchange: The role of perceived organizational support and leader – member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 286-296.

- Holmes, J. G. (1981). The exchange process in close relationships: Microbehavior and macromotives. In M. J. Lerner & S. C. Lerner (Eds.), *The justice motive in social behavior* (pp. 261-284). New York: Plenum.
- House, J. S. (1981). *Work stress and social support*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hutchison, S. (1997). A path model of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 12, 159-174.
- Kacmar, K. M., & Ferris, G. R. (1991). Perceptions of organizational politics scale (POPS): Development and construct validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 51, 193-205.
- Kelloway, E. K., Loughlin, C., Barling, J., & Nault, A. (2002). Self-reported counterproductive behaviors and organizational citizenship behaviors: Separate but related constructs. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1/2), 143-151.
- Kotter, J. P. (1973). The psychological contract: Managing the joining-up process. *California Management Review*, 15, 91-99.
- Kottke, J. L., & Sharafinski, C. E. (1988). Measuring perceived supervisory and organizational support. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48, 1075-1079.
- Ladd, D., & Henry, R. A. (2000). Helping coworkers and helping the organization: The role of support perceptions, exchange ideology, and conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 2028-2049.

- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp.27-55). New York: Plenum.
- Levinson, H. (1965). Reciprocation: The relationship between man and organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 9(4), 370-390.
- Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1993, August). *Scale development of a multidimensional measure of leader – member exchange*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Atlanta, GA.
- Liden, R.C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader – member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 15, 47-119.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 738-748.
- Mathieu, J. E. & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miceli, M. P., & Mulvey, P. W. (2000). Consequences of satisfaction with pay systems: Two field studies. *Industrial Relations*, 39, 62-87.
- Miles, D. E., Borman, W. E., Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviors: A comparison of counterproductive work

- behavior with organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1/2), 51-57.
- Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 351-357.
- Motowidlo, S. J. (2003). Job performance. In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.), W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Vol. 12. Industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 39-53). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organizational linkages*. New York: Academic Press.
- Murphy, K. R. (1993). *Honesty in the workplace*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Nielsen, T.M., Sundstrom, E., & Halfhill, T. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and work team performance: A field study. In T.M. Nielsen (Chair) & T. Halfhill (Co-chair), *Work group composition and effectiveness: Personality, diversity, and citizenship*. Symposium conducted at the 2002 Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nye, L. G., & Witt, L. A. (1993). Dimensionality and construct-validity of the Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS). *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 821-829.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance, 10*, 85-97.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 775–802.
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 3-72.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994, August). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research, 31*, 351-363.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 879-903.
- Randall, M. L., Cropanzano, R., Bormann, C. A., & Birjulin, A. (1999). Organizational politics and organizational support as predictors of work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*, 159-174.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 698-714.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 825-836.

- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995) A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 555-572.
- Robinson, S. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (1998) Monkey see, monkey do: The influence of work groups on the antisocial behavior of employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 658-672.
- Rousseau, D. M., & McLean Parks, J. (1993). The contracts of individuals and organizations. *Research in Organizational Behaviors*, 15, 1-43.
- Sackett, P. R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviors: Dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1/2), 5-11.
- Scandura, T. A., & Graen, G. B. (1984). Moderating effects of initial leader – member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 428-436.
- Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 219-227.
- Shanock, L. R., & Eisenberger, R. (2006). When supervisors feel supported: Relationships with subordinates' perceived supervisor support, perceived organizational support, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 689-695.
- Sheridan, J. E., Slocum, J. W., Buda, R., & Thompson, R. C. (1990). Effects of corporate sponsorship and departmental power on career tournaments. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 578-602.

- Shore, L. M., & Shore, T. H. (1995). Perceived organizational support and organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano & M. Kacmar (Eds.), *Organizational politics, justice and support: Managing the social climate in the work place* (pp.149-164). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Shore, L. M., & Tetrick, L. E. (1991). A construct validity study of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 637-643.
- Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior: Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 774-780.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- Sparrowe, R. T., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Process and structure in leader – member exchange. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 522-552.
- Spector, P. E. & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale, Organizational Constraints Scale, Quantitative Workload Inventory, and Physical Symptoms Inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3, 356-367.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, I. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Van Katwyk, P. T., Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (1999). Using the Job-related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 219-230.

- Walker, H. A., Thomas, G. M., & Zelditch, M., Jr. (1986). Legitimation, endorsement, and stability. *Social Forces*, 64, 620-643.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., Bommer, W. H., & Tetrick, L. E. (2002). The role of fair treatment and rewards in perceptions of organizational support and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 590-598.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 82-111.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617.
- Witt, L. A. (1991). Exchange ideology as a moderator of job-attitudes-organizational citizenship behaviors relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 1490-1501.
- Witt, L. A., & Nye, L. G. (1992). Organizational goal congruence and job attitudes revisited (FAA-AM Publication No. 92-8, pp. 92-98). Washington, DC: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Aviation Medicine.
- Yoon, J., Han, N., & Seo, Y. (1996). Sense of control among hospital employees: An assessment of choice process, empowerment, and buffering hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 686-716.
- Yoon, J., & Lim, J. (1999). Organizational support in the workplace: The case of Korean hospital employees. *Human Relations*, 52, 923-945.

Yoon, J., & Thye, S. (2000). Supervisor support in the work pace: Legitimacy and positive affectivity. *Journal of Social Psychology, 140*, 295-316.

Appendices

Appendix A

Participant Survey

Perceived Support & Performance Survey

Thank you for participating in this project, your participation is crucial for its success. This study is about your perceptions of the support you receive from your organization, supervisors, coworkers, and direct reports/internal customers, and how your perceived support might be related to your performance. Benefits of participation include: 1) The identification of performance strengths and/or deficits; and 2) If you choose, access to a written report summarizing all project results.

Participation in this study is voluntary and you may decline to participate without penalty at any time. **The information that you provide will be used for research purposes only and will not be revealed to other employees, supervisors, or management.** These results will not appear in anyone's personnel file. At the completion of this project, we will destroy the names/identifiers of all participants. Returning this survey constitutes your authorization for your supervisor to rate your performance. In addition, returning this survey constitutes your agreement and informed consent to participate in this study.

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Sarah K. Nielsen, at (404) 259-0311 or sarahknielsen@yahoo.com. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, please contact the Office of Research at (865) 974-3466.

Demographic Information:

1. Name: _____ (**needed to match you with performance ratings from your supervisor)
2. Age: _____
3. Gender: M F
4. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
Circle one:
a) Grade School
b) High School/GED
c) Undergraduate College Degree/Associates Degree
d) Graduate Degree
5. How long have you worked for this organization?
 _____ Years _____ Months
6. Please check one of the following:
_____ I would like to receive a written report summarizing all project results. Please send the report to the following address:

_____ I would **not** like to receive a written report summarizing all project results.

There is a series of 31 statements below regarding the level of support you receive from your organization, supervisor, coworkers, and direct reports/internal customers. Please read each statement carefully and indicate your level of agreement with the statement by circling the appropriate response to the right.

SD = Strongly disagree D = Disagree N = Neutral A = Agree SA = Strongly agree

1.	My organization is supportive of my goals and values.	SD	D	N	A	SA
2.	Help is available from my organization when I have a problem.	SD	D	N	A	SA
3.	My organization really cares about my well-being.	SD	D	N	A	SA
4.	My organization is willing to offer assistance to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.	SD	D	N	A	SA
5.	Even if I did the best job possible, my organization would fail to notice.	SD	D	N	A	SA
6.	My organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.	SD	D	N	A	SA
7.	My organization shows very little concern for me.	SD	D	N	A	SA
8.	My organization cares about my opinions.	SD	D	N	A	SA
9.	My organization is complimentary of my accomplishments at work.	SD	D	N	A	SA
10.	My supervisor cares about my opinions.	SD	D	N	A	SA
11.	My work supervisor really cares about my well-being.	SD	D	N	A	SA
12.	My supervisor strongly considers my goals and values.	SD	D	N	A	SA
13.	My supervisor shows very little concern for me.	SD	D	N	A	SA
14.	My coworkers are supportive of my goals and values.	SD	D	N	A	SA
15.	Help is available from my coworkers when I have a problem.	SD	D	N	A	SA
16.	My coworkers really care about my well-being.	SD	D	N	A	SA

17.	My coworkers are willing to offer assistance to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.	SD	D	N	A	SA
18.	Even if I did the best job possible, my coworkers would fail to notice.	SD	D	N	A	SA
19.	My coworkers care about my general satisfaction at work.	SD	D	N	A	SA
20.	My coworkers show very little concern for me.	SD	D	N	A	SA
21.	My coworkers care about my opinions.	SD	D	N	A	SA
22.	My coworkers are complimentary of my accomplishments at work.	SD	D	N	A	SA
23.	My direct reports/internal customers are supportive of my goals and values.	SD	D	N	A	SA
24.	Help is available from my direct reports/internal customers when I have a problem.	SD	D	N	A	SA
25.	My direct reports/internal customers really care about my well-being.	SD	D	N	A	SA
26.	My direct reports/internal customers are willing to offer assistance to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.	SD	D	N	A	SA
27.	Even if I did the best job possible, my direct reports/internal customers would fail to notice.	SD	D	N	A	SA
28.	My direct reports/internal customers care about my general satisfaction at work.	SD	D	N	A	SA
29.	My direct reports/internal customers show very little concern for me.	SD	D	N	A	SA
30.	My direct reports/internal customers care about my opinions.	SD	D	N	A	SA
31.	My direct reports/internal customers are complimentary of my accomplishments at work.	SD	D	N	A	SA

Please continue to the next page.

The next set of 14 statements below concern ***your*** extra-role/citizenship behaviors. Please read each statement carefully and indicate your level of agreement with the statement by circling the appropriate response to the right.

SD = Strongly disagree **D** = Disagree **N** = Neutral **A** = Agree **SA** = Strongly agree

1.	I willingly give of my time to help other employees who have work-related problems	SD	D	N	A	SA
2.	I am willing to take time out of my own busy schedule to help with recruiting or training new employees.	SD	D	N	A	SA
3.	I “touch base” with others before initiating actions that might affect them.	SD	D	N	A	SA
4.	I take steps to try to prevent problems with other employees and/or other personnel in the company.	SD	D	N	A	SA
5.	I encourage other employees when they are down.	SD	D	N	A	SA
6.	I act as a “peacemaker” when others in the company have disagreements.	SD	D	N	A	SA
7.	I am a stabilizing influence in the company when dissention occurs.	SD	D	N	A	SA
8.	I attend functions that are not required but help the company image.	SD	D	N	A	SA
9.	I attend training/information sessions that employees are encouraged but not required to attend.	SD	D	N	A	SA
10.	I attend and actively participate in company meetings.	SD	D	N	A	SA
11.	I consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters.	SD	D	N	A	SA
12.	I always find fault with what the company is doing.	SD	D	N	A	SA
13.	I tend to make “mountains out of molehills” (make problems bigger than they are).	SD	D	N	A	SA
14.	I always focus on what is wrong with my situation rather than the positive side.	SD	D	N	A	SA

Please continue to the next page.

Directions - The following survey is designed to assess **your performance**. When responding to each statement, think about your typical performance.

When rating please remember the following:

- Your rating should reflect a typical range of performance for yourself.
- When you are making ratings, try to think of specific examples of behavior that you have exhibited in actual job performance.

Here are the categories you will use to rate yourself:

PRODUCTIVITY

- Achieve a high level of productivity on the job.
- Put forth a lot of effort.
- Accomplish as much or more than what your superiors could expect.
- Make effective use of your time even during “downtime.”
- Willing to work overtime when asked to do so.
- Work hard to meet deadlines.

QUALITY

- Is neat and orderly in your approach to tasks.
- Take the time to understand what your superiors mean by a high quality product.
- Look after the little details of a task to make sure everything is done right.
- Is rarely sloppy or haphazard in approaching tasks.
- Try to do the best possible work you are capable of -- doesn't settle for good enough.

OPENNESS TO NEW LEARNING

- Learn new job-related information quickly.
- Learn new job-related skills and practices quickly.
- Willing to try out new procedures, practices, or equipment (do not show resistance, negativity, or opposition.)
- Views change positively -- recognize that change leads to a better future in the long run.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER ASSOCIATES

- Relate to people at work in a friendly, cordial manner.
- Develop friendships with other workers.
- Show respect for individual differences/diversity.
- Do not talk about people in a negative manner behind their backs.

DEPENDABILITY AND RELIABILITY

- Keep your word even when it is inconvenient / unpleasant to do so.
- Follow instructions fully even when you do not want to.
- Do not violate company rules or policies.
- Follow through on what you commit to do.
- Are honest -- do not lie or tell “half truths” to create the wrong impression.

ABILITY TO FUNCTION UNDER STRESS:

- Keep cool when jobs are time-pressured.
- Stay reasonably calm when during crises.
- Maintain composure even under very demanding work conditions.

ATTENDANCE AND TIMELINESS

- Have a good attendance record.
- Have a valid excuse whenever you are absent.
- Get to work a little early so that you can start work promptly.
- Do not take too long on breaks / lunch periods.

Please go to the next page. Thank you.

Directions - Please rate **yourself** on the previously described categories.

Here are the ratings you will use for each category of performance:

- 1 = Performance does not meet, or rarely meets, minimum job standards.
- 2 = Performance is less than satisfactory in many respects.
- 3 = Performance is satisfactory in most respects but not all.
- 4 = Performance is satisfactory in all respects.
- 5 = Performance is above average but not superior.
- 6 = Performance is superior in almost all respects.
- 7 = Performance is definitely superior in all respects.
- 8 = **Single best** performance I have ever exhibited or even hope to exhibit.

After reading the descriptions in each category, please provide ratings for this individual:

_____ Productivity	_____ Dependability and Reliability
_____ Quality	_____ Ability To Function Under Stress
_____ Openness to New Learning	_____ Attendance and Timeliness
_____ Relationships With Other Associates	_____ Overall Job Performance Rating

The following 12 statements refer to **counterproductive work behaviors**. Please read each statement carefully and indicate how often you have exhibited the behavior by circling the appropriate response to the right.

N = Never VR = Very rarely S = Sometimes O = Often VO = Very often

1.	Exaggerated about your work hours.	N	VR	S	O	VO
2.	Started negative rumors about your company.	N	VR	S	O	VO
3.	Gossiped about your coworkers.	N	VR	S	O	VO
4.	Covered up your mistakes.	N	VR	S	O	VO
5.	Competed with your coworkers in an unproductive way.	N	VR	S	O	VO
6.	Gossiped about your supervisor.	N	VR	S	O	VO
7.	Stayed out of sight to avoid work.	N	VR	S	O	VO
8.	Taken company equipment or merchandise.	N	VR	S	O	VO
9.	Blamed your coworkers for your mistakes.	N	VR	S	O	VO
10.	Intentionally worked slowly.	N	VR	S	O	VO

Finished! Thank you so much for your help, your assistance is greatly appreciated!!

Appendix B
Supervisor Survey

Directions - The following survey is designed to assess the performance of **your subordinate**. When responding to each statement, think about the typical performance of **your subordinate**.

When rating each individual please remember the following:

- Your rating should reflect a typical range of performance for the employee.
- When you are making ratings, try to think of specific examples of behavior that you have observed from actual job performance.
- Bear in mind that the lowest rating (1) on your form will be used for people who are performing so poorly that they are possibly going to lose their jobs or you wish they had never been hired.
- And, the highest rating (8) will be attained by only one person, if that many.

Here are the categories you will use to rate each employee:

PRODUCTIVITY

- Achieves a high level of productivity on the job.
- Puts forth a lot of effort.
- Accomplishes as much or more than what you expect.
- Makes effective use of his/her time even during “downtime.”
- Willing to work overtime when asked to do so.
- Works hard to meet deadlines.

QUALITY

- Is neat and orderly in his approach to tasks.
- Takes the time to understand what you mean by a high quality product.
- Looks after the little details of a task to make sure everything is done right.
- Is rarely sloppy or haphazard in approaching tasks.
- Tries to do the best possible work he/she is capable of -- doesn't settle for good enough.

OPENNESS TO NEW LEARNING

- Learns new job-related information quickly.
- Learns new job-related skills and practices quickly.
- Willingly tries out new procedures, practices, or equipment (does not show resistance, negativity, or opposition.)
- Views change positively -- recognizes that change leads to a better future in the long run.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER ASSOCIATES

- Relates to people at work in a friendly, cordial manner.
- Develops friendships with workers in his team.
- Shows respect for individual differences/diversity.
- Does not talk about people in a negative manner behind their backs.

DEPENDABILITY AND RELIABILITY

- Keeps his/her word even when it is inconvenient / unpleasant to do so.
- Follows instructions fully even when he/she does not want to.
- Does not violate company rules or policies.
- Follows through on what he/she commits to do.
- Is honest -- does not lie or tell “half truths” to create the wrong impression.

ABILITY TO FUNCTION UNDER STRESS:

- Keeps cool when jobs are time-pressured.
- Stays reasonably calm when during crises.
- Maintains composure even under very demanding work conditions.

ATTENDANCE AND TIMELINESS

- Has a good attendance record.
- Has a valid excuse whenever he/she is absent.
- Gets to work a little early so that he/she can start work promptly.
- Does not take too long on breaks / lunch periods.

Person being rated: _____ Rated by: _____

Directions - Please rate **the above named employee** on the previously described categories.

Here are the ratings you will use for each category of performance:

- 1 = Performance does not meet, or rarely meets, minimum job standards.
- 2 = Performance is less than satisfactory in many respects.
- 3 = Performance is satisfactory in most respects but not all.
- 4 = Performance is satisfactory in all respects.
- 5 = Performance is above average but not superior.
- 6 = Performance is superior in almost all respects.
- 7 = Performance is definitely superior in all respects.
- 8 = **Single best** performance I have ever observed or even hope to observe.

After reading the descriptions in each category, please provide ratings for this individual:

_____ Productivity and Reliability	_____ Dependability
_____ Quality Function Under Stress	_____ Ability To
_____ Openness to New Learning Timeliness	_____ Attendance and
_____ Relationships With Other Associates	_____ Overall Job

Performance Rating

The following questions refer to your perceptions of **how supportive you are** toward this employee. Please read the following statements and indicate your agreement by circling the appropriate response.

SD = Strongly disagree **D** = Disagree **N** = Neutral **A** = Agree **SA** = Strongly agree

- | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 1. I care about this employee's opinions. | SD | D | N | A | SA |
| 2. I really care about his/her well-being. | SD | D | N | A | SA |
| 3. I strongly consider his/her goals and values. | SD | D | N | A | SA |
| 4. I believe I show little concern for him/her. | SD | D | N | A | SA |

Please continue on the next page. Thank you.

These next questions refer to your direct report's **extra-role/citizenship behaviors**. Please read the following items in reference to the individual named above and indicate your agreement by circling the appropriate response.

SD = Strongly disagree D = Disagree N = Neutral A = Agree SA = Strongly agree

1.	Willingly gives of his or her time to help other employees who have work-related problems	SD	D	N	A	SA
2.	Is willing to take time out of his or her own busy schedule to help with recruiting or training new employees.	SD	D	N	A	SA
3.	“Touches base” with others before initiating actions that might affect them.	SD	D	N	A	SA
4.	Takes steps to try to prevent problems with other employees and/or other personnel in the company.	SD	D	N	A	SA
5.	Encourages other employees when they are down.	SD	D	N	A	SA
6.	Acts as “peacemaker” when others in the company have disagreements.	SD	D	N	A	SA
7.	Is a stabilizing influence in the company when dissention occurs.	SD	D	N	A	SA
8.	Attends functions that are not required but help the company image	SD	D	N	A	SA
9.	Attends training/information sessions that employees are encouraged but not required to attend.	SD	D	N	A	SA
10.	Attends and actively participates in company meetings.	SD	D	N	A	SA
11.	Consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters.	SD	D	N	A	SA
12.	Always finds fault with what the company is doing.	SD	D	N	A	SA
13.	Tends to make “mountains out of molehills” (makes problems bigger than they are).	SD	D	N	A	SA
14.	Always focuses on what is wrong with his or her situation rather than the positive side of it.	SD	D	N	A	SA

Thank you very much for your participation! Your efforts are greatly appreciated.

Appendix C

Tables

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<i>Demographics (N=154)</i>												
1. Organization	.99	.93	-									
2. Age	44.19	12.78	-.05	-								
3. Gender	.49	.51	.30**	.09	-							
4. Education	2.11	.85	-.63**	.05	-.17*	-						
5. Full-/Part-Time	.14	.35	-.18*	-.13	-.21**	-.03	-					
6. Job Category	2.04	1.77	.95**	-.02	.31**	-.68**	-.08	-				
7. Tenure	98.09	97.47	.10	.51**	.18*	.02	-.29**	.08	-			
<i>Employee Self-ratings (N=154)</i>												
8. POS	3.77	.80	-.10	-.16	-.15	.14	.16*	-.06	-.19*	(.95)		
9. PSS	4.15	.82	-.20*	-.11	-.13	.24**	.16*	-.15	-.18*	.68**	(.92)	
10. PCS	3.93	.71	-.11	.04	-.11	.11	.07	-.03	-.01	.49**	.54**	(.94)
11. DRS (N=74)	3.84	.74	-.23	.09	-.13	.28*	.16	-.11	-.04	.57**	.70**	.60**
12. OCB	4.06	.41	-.07	.02	-.02	.18*	-.09	-.04	-.1	.48**	.42**	.28**
13. CWB	1.28	.30	-.01	.00	.03	.05	.01	-.04	.18*	-.30**	-.23**	-.21**
14. Performance	6.03	1.06	.04	.00	.04	.09	-.15	.03	.03	.11	.16	.12
<i>Time 1 - Supervisor Ratings (N=154)</i>												
15. Performance	5.49	1.28	.04	-.02	-.16*	.00	.16*	.12	-.18*	.29**	.33**	.20*
16. OCB	3.90	.62	.05	-.08	-.17*	-.05	.12	.10	-.26**	.31**	.31**	.21*
<i>Time 2 – Supervisor Ratings (N=87)</i>												
17. Performance	5.56	1.55	.17	-.19	-.25*	.01	.10	.24*	-.28**	.26*	.19	.16
18. OCB	4.01	.71	.18	-.25*	-.31**	-.03	.06	.09	-.46**	.34**	.30**	.13

Note. The alpha internal-consistency reliabilities appear in parentheses along the main diagonal. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 1: Continued.

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
<i>Demographics (N = 154)</i>										
11. DRS (N=74)	3.84	.74	(.96)							
12. OCB	4.06	.41	.54**	(.79)						
13. CWB	1.28	.30	-.25*	-.26**	(.75)					
14. Performance	6.03	1.06	.12	.36**	-.21**	(.93)				
<i>Time 1 - Supervisor Ratings (N=154)</i>										
15. Performance	5.49	1.28	.39**	.17*	-.13	.08	(.95)			
16. OCB	3.90	.62	.29*	.15	-.14	.04	.72**	(.93)		
<i>Time 2 - Supervisor Ratings (N=87)</i>										
17. Performance	5.56	1.55	.58**	.22*	.00	.05	.84**	.65**	(.97)	
18. OCB	4.01	.71	.09	.34**	.03	.08	.78**	.90**	.71**	(.95)

Note. The alpha internal-consistency reliabilities appear in parentheses along the main diagonal. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 2: Hierarchical Regression Analyses – Individual Support Variables and POS

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Perceived Organizational Support</i>		
	Adjusted R^2	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	.15**	.21**	
Education			.27
Tenure			.00
Org1			-.05
Org2			.30*
Status			.12
Step 2	.44**	.28**	
Education			.09
Tenure			.05
Org1			-.08
Org2			.23*
Status			-.01
PSS			.60**
Step 3	.44**	.01	
Education			.11
Tenure			.03
Org1			-.08
Org2			.21*
Status			.00
PSS			.53**
PCS			.11
Step 4	.45**	.01	
Education			.10
Tenure			.02
Org1			-.09
Org2			.19
Status			-.01
PSS			.45**
PCS			.06
DRS			.15

Note. $n = 154$. Standardized regression coefficients are reported. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$.

Table 3: Hierarchical Regression Analyses – POS and Performance Outcomes

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Time 1 – Performance (n = 154)</i>			<i>Time 2 – Performance (n = 87).</i>			<i>Time 1 – Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (n = 154)</i>			<i>Time 2 – Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (n = 87)</i>		
	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	β	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	β	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	β	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	.04*	.05*		.09**	.11**		.07**	.08**		.24**	.26**	
Tenure			-.16*			-.24*			-.23**			-.42**
Gender			-.14			-.20			-.12			-.22*
Step 2	.09**	.06**		.10**	.02		.13**	.07**		.26**	.03	
Tenure			-.11			-.19			-.19*			-.37**
Gender			-.11			-.17			-.09			-.19*
POS			.25**			.16			.26**			.18

Note. Time 2 data based on two out of three organizations. Adjusted *R*² and standardized regression coefficients are reported.

p* ≤ .05. *p* ≤ .01.

Table 3: Continued.

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Counterproductive Work Behaviors</i> (<i>n</i> = 154)		
	R^2	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	.02	.03	
Tenure			.18*
Gender			.00
Step 2	.09**	.08**	
Tenure			.13
Gender			-.04
POS			-.28**

Note. Time 2 data based on two out of three organizations. Adjusted R^2 and standardized regression coefficients are reported.

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$.

Vita

Sarah K. Nielsen was born in Caribou, Maine on September 11, 1976. Growing up in an Air Force family, she moved a great deal and spent several years each in Guam, Michigan, Texas, the Philippines, and Mississippi. She graduated in 1994 from Heritage Academy in Columbus, MS and graduated magna cum laude with a BA in psychology from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville in 1998. Sarah then returned to the University of Tennessee, earning both a master's degree in May 2003 and completing the requirements for a PhD in December 2006 with a major in psychology and a concentration in industrial applied psychology. Sarah is currently an Assistant Professor of Psychology at Germanna Community College in Fredericksburg, Virginia and plans to continue her career in academia and organizational development consulting. She happily lives in Woodbridge, VA with her husband of 3 years, her daughter, two dogs, and cat.