

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Timothy Paul Clayton, Jr. entitled "Examining Perceived Subordinate Support." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Industrial-Organizational Psychology.

Brian O'Leary  
Major Professor

We have read this thesis  
and recommend its acceptance:

Christopher J. Cunningham

Michael D. Biderman

Accepted for the Council

Carolyn R. Hodges  
Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records)

Examining Perceived Subordinate Support

A Thesis Presented for the Master of Science Degree  
The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Timothy Paul Clayton, Jr.  
May 2010

Copyright © 2010 by Timothy Paul Clayton, Jr.  
All rights reserved.

## Abstract

Support relationships within organizations have been the subject of numerous empirical studies. Much of this research has focused on the influence of perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support and their effects on subordinates. To date, however, no research has focused on how supervisors are influenced by their beliefs about support from their subordinates. I define perceived subordinate support (PSubS) as the extent to which a supervisor feels subordinates are concerned with the supervisor's well-being and value the supervisor as a leader. Previous research suggests that subordinates' opinions and behaviors do influence supervisor behavior. In the present study, a measure of PSubS and a measure of supervisor self-efficacy (SSE) were created and administered along with Eisenberger et al.'s (1986) measure of perceived organizational support (POS) to two samples of supervisors. The two new measures were validated using principle components factor analysis. The results indicated that PSubS is a unique construct distinct from POS and SSE. Implications and recommendations for future research are discussed.

## Table of Contents

<b>Rationale for Studying PSubS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Method .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<i>Participants .....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Procedure.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Measures.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Survey of PSubS.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Perceived Organizational Support.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Supervisor Self-Efficacy.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<b>Results.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<i>Scale Refinement.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Initial Validation of Constructs.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<b>Discussion.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>List of References.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix A.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Appendix B.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Table 1.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Table 2.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Table 3.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Table4.....</b>	<b>34</b>

## Rationale for Studying PSubS

At its core, leadership is understood by most researchers to imply influence over others (Vroom & Jago, 2007). However, influence is not necessarily a unidirectional phenomenon. It is also possible for followers to influence leaders. Review of leadership research and theory shows that the research is predominantly focused on leader influence on subordinates (Chemers, 2000; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Vroom & Jago, 2007). Because of this tendency in the existing research, it may be informative then, to examine the potential for the influence of subordinates on important supervisor attitudes, behaviors and performance. Smither, Brett and Atwater (2008) stress the point that we should pay attention to how subordinates view their supervisors because a supervisor's success often requires the cooperation of his subordinates. Furthermore, researchers have stressed the importance of studying the reciprocal relationship between the leader and his subordinate(s) (Hollander, 1992; Van Vugt et al., 2008; Vecchio, 1997).

The role of the follower has been included in a limited number of leadership theories. The *Idiosyncrasy Credit (IC) theory* (Hollander, 1958) describes a system of credits that are theoretically issued to leaders by peers and/or subordinates. These credits result from and are distributed according to the followers' positive perceptions of the leader (Estrada, Brown, & Lee, 1995). The credits allow the leader to deviate from group norms; thus, the more credits a leader has, the more he can deviate from the expected group behavior. According to IC theory, a leader loses his/her influencing potential when they run out of idiosyncrasy credits. What made IC theory unique was its acknowledgement that, while power and influence may be exerted from the top down, it is given from the bottom up.

Another leadership theory that was somewhat follower-focused was French and Raven's (1962) bases of power theory. This theory posited that leadership derived power from six

resources, one of which was referent power. Referent power was conceived as power derived from a group of followers. While not a theory completely based on subordinate influence like IC theory, French and Raven's theory does place some power completely in the hand of subordinates.

A final leadership theory that emphasizes subordinates is the Leader-Member Exchange theory (LMX) proposed by Dansereau, Graen, and Haga (1975). LMX proposes that leader-follower dyads are a result of a series of exchanges of goods (both tangible and behavioral) between the two parties. Theoretically, LMX is supposed to measure the leader-follower dyad in terms of what each side contributes to the relationship. However, as Paglis and Green (2002) pointed out, even LMX theory was predominately one-sided in its infancy, measuring what the leader contributes from the follower's perspective, but not vice versa. Given this shortcoming, LMX theory is still commonly viewed as another step toward understanding the relationship between the leader and the follower.

While the leadership theories discussed above provide us with theoretical frameworks to propose how subordinates influence supervisors, other veins of research have gone as far as to demonstrate that subordinate opinions and behaviors do influence certain leader outcomes. These topics range from systematically induced processes such as upward feedback to perceptions that result from interactions between supervisors and subordinates.

Upward feedback is a systematic process through which subordinates' opinions of a supervisor are communicated back to the supervisor. Upward feedback is part of a bigger process known as multi-source feedback (or 360-degree feedback) which gathers assessments on supervisors from more than one rater from multiple levels within the organization. What makes upward feedback relevant to the PSubS construct is that it actually gives us insight into whether

subordinate opinions influence supervisors and how they affect supervisors. Upward feedback studies have shown that leaders' behaviors can be influenced by subordinate. Hegarty (1974) conducted one of the earliest studies on the influence of upward feedback finding that providing supervisors with upward feedback significantly improved leadership behaviors. Other studies have also shown positive influences of upward feedback on supervisors' behaviors (Dierendonck, Haynes, Borrill, & Stride, 2007; Seifert, Yukl, & McDonald, 2003).

Supervisors' behavior is not the only factor being influenced by upward feedback. A number of upward feedback studies have issued self-rating measures to leaders at Time 1 prior to receiving feedback and at Time 2 after receiving feedback to measure the difference or lack thereof caused by the upward feedback. Atwater, Roush, and Fischtal (1995) found that at Time 2 supervisors who rated themselves higher or lower than their subordinates at Time 1 adjusted their self-ratings closer to their subordinates' ratings. Meaning for example, if a supervisor rated herself lower than her subordinates did at Time 1, she would adjust her score at Time 2 to more closely match her subordinates' score. This is consistent with previous studies on upward feedback and self-ratings (Dierendonck et al., 2007; Johnson & Ferstl, 1999). The research on upward feedback demonstrates that supervisors' behaviors and perceptions are influenced when supervisors are made aware of their subordinates' opinions. However, not all reactions from supervisors are induced by systematic processes such as upward feedback. Some reactions are the result of relational exchanges between supervisors and subordinates.

In one quasi-experiment, Crowe, Bochner, and Clark (1972) found that managers tended to adapt their leadership style to the behavioral style exhibited by the subordinate. The researchers matched both democratic and autocratic leaders with democratic and autocratic subordinates and measured how the leaders' styles of leadership changed over time. Not only

did they find that managers who exhibited both styles of leadership changed their styles when matched with subordinates with opposite styles (i.e., autocratic leader matched with a democratic follower and vice versa), Crowe, Bochner, and Clark also found that groups with democratic subordinates were more productive regardless of whether they were led by autocratic or democratic leaders. This study indicates that subordinates have the potential to influence a supervisor's style of leadership.

Mount (1984) found a relationship between managerial effectiveness and subordinate satisfaction, demonstrating that a subordinate's affect may influence supervisor behaviors. Similarly, Fodor (1974) found a relationship between subordinate satisfaction or lack thereof and how a manager distributes rewards to his subordinate, regardless of performance levels.

Furthermore, researchers have discovered that employee's have the tendency to form perceptions based on their interactions with both the organization and other employees. Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986) found that employees tend to form perceptions regarding whether or not their organization is supportive of them. This study was the first to explore the idea of support and its various origins and influences. Tangirala and Green (2007) stated that organizations are made up of exchange relationships among members of all levels of the organization. Support is but one of the many commodities traded among the members and has been measured by both LMX (Maertz, Jr., Griffeth, Campbell, & Allen, 2007; Tangirala, Green, & Ramanujam, 2007) and Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa's (1986) Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (Shanock & Eisenberg, 2006; Harris, Harris, & Harvey, 2007). Numerous studies have provided evidence for the general idea that any form of support often produces significant and positive effects (e.g. increased performance, more

positive behaviors) (Harris et al., 2007; Maertz, Jr. et al., 2007; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006; Tangirala et al., 2007).

Originally, support was measured from the perspective of the employee's relationship with the organization. Perceived organizational support (POS) was created to determine the extent to which the employee believed the organization was 'committed' to them. POS can and has been measured from the subordinate's and supervisor's perspectives (Maertz, Jr. et al., 2007; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006). A number of studies have found relationships between high POS and positive outcomes from employees such as job performance and job satisfaction (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006), leading readers to infer that perceptions that employees form regarding their organization influence their behaviors.

Furthermore, Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) discovered that employees prefer support and feedback from more proximal entities. Settoon, Bennett, and Liden (1996) confirmed this idea when they found that LMX was a stronger predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors than was POS. Thus Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) developed the survey of perceived supervisor support (SPSS). The SPSS measures the extent to which employees feel their immediate supervisor supports them. Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski and Rhoades (2002) and Van Yperen and Hagedoorn (2003) found that perceived supervisor support (PSS) was significantly related to desirable outcomes in subordinates. Furthermore, Maertz, Jr. et al. (2007) found that perceived supervisor support (PSS) was a strong determinant of turnover, meaning the less a subordinate felt supported the more likely she was to leave the organization (whether voluntarily or involuntarily).

Finally, self-efficacy has been defined as, "belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (Bandura, 1997, p. 3).

Heslin and Latham (2004) point out that self-efficacy has been found to predict the translation of strategic knowledge into improved performance (Cervone, 1993), and persistence in the face of setbacks (Schaefer, Epperson, & Nauta, 1997). In the context of the present study, self-efficacy is the belief a supervisor has in his or her ability to successfully perform his or her role as a supervisor. Because self-efficacy is a perception the supervisor forms that influences his behavior, I believe the research on self-efficacy lends further support to the need to study PSubS.

### *PSubS*

As I have shown, research has demonstrated that supervisors respond to both the perceptions and behaviors of their subordinates (Crowe, Bochner, & Clark, 1972; Dierendonck, Haynes, Borrill, & Stride, 2007; Fodor, 1974; Mount, 1984; Seifert, Yukl, & McDonald, 2003). Similarly, supervisors' perception of themselves (self-efficacy) has also been found to influence their own behavior. However, to date, researchers have not identified or measured this construct. Upward feedback induces behavioral responses from supervisors (Dierendonck, Haynes, Borrill, & Stride, 2007; Hegarty, 1974; Seifert, Yukl, & McDonald, 2003) when supervisors are made aware of their subordinates' perceptions of them. Such responses to subordinate attitudes and behaviors do not necessarily have to be induced by systematic feedback. I propose that supervisors carry with them perceptions of their subordinates' support that result from constant interaction with subordinates. Thus, these perceptions are what I define as PSubS.

As stated above, PSubS is defined as the extent to which a supervisor feels his or her subordinates are concerned with the supervisor's well-being and value the supervisor as a leader. This definition was adapted from Eisenberger et al.'s (1986) definition of perceived organizational support. Thus the newly developed Survey of Perceived Subordinate Support

(SPSubS) includes items that I believe reflect this definition of PSubS. I believe this scale to be different from any other measure previously created, and I propose that responses to these items will emerge in a pattern that represents my definition of PSubS.

Eisenberger et al. (1986) proposed that the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support measured an employee's global perception of support from the organization. However, Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) demonstrated that employees differentiate between perceived organizational support (POS) and perceived supervisor support (PSS) when they found very little overlap between the Survey of POS and the Survey of PSS ( $r = .13$ ). Kottke and Sharafinski stated that these findings supported earlier research that states that employees prefer feedback from sources closer to them (Greller & Herold, 1975). Similarly, I believe that results of a correlational analysis between PSubS scaled scores and POS scale scores will result in the same manner. Because PSubS is a form of support that is more proximal to employees than POS, I believe there will be very little overlap between PSubS scaled scores and POS scale scores.

Bandura (1977) proposed self-efficacy to be a person's belief in his or her ability to successfully perform a given task. Within the context of the present research, a supervisor's belief in his or her ability to successfully supervise will have an influence on his or her actual supervising behaviors. In fact, Heslin and Latham (2004) found that supervisors' self-efficacy moderated the relationship between subordinate feedback and subsequent behavioral reactions to the feedback. Given that both SSE and PSubS are personal beliefs held by supervisors that concern their job, I believe that the two constructs will be closely related. However, because I believe the two constructs are influenced by different sources – SSE is a perception originating from the supervisor, while PSubS is a perception induced by interactions with subordinates – I

expect that correlations between scaled scores will not be so strong – .40 to .60 – as to indicate they are the same construct.

## Method

### *Participants*

The criterion for participation in this study was being a supervisor with a minimum of one subordinate/direct report; there were no other exclusionary criteria. The three scales were completed by 401 participants across two samples. First, the survey was sent to 613 supervisors in a large manufacturing organization and was completed by 332 for a response rate of 54%. The surveys were also sent to 75 students in the local MBA program and were completed by 69 for a response rate of 92% within this subsample. The mean age of participants was 42.76 years ( $SD = 10.28$ ), while 76% were male ( $n = 253$ ) and 24% were female ( $n = 79$ ). Participants represented a variety of ethnicities with 73% being White ( $n = 309$ ), 3% Black ( $n = 13$ ), 2% Asian ( $n = 7$ ), 1% Hispanic ( $n = 5$ ), and 1% reporting as Other ( $n = 2$ ). Participant education level was reported as Some High School ( $n = 1$ ), High School Graduate ( $n = 16$ ), Some College ( $n = 45$ ), College Graduate ( $n = 179$ ), Some Graduate School ( $n = 47$ ), and Completed Graduate School ( $n = 45$ ). Additionally, demographic information regarding tenure and supervisory experience was collected. Participants reported a mean of 15.31 ( $SD = 9.35$ ) years of supervisory experience, a mean of 14.28 ( $SD = 9.93$ ) years with current employer, and a mean of 6.02 ( $SD = 6.02$ ) years in current position. Finally, the mean number of subordinates a supervisor had was 25.06 ( $SD = 59.42$ ).

### *Procedure*

The study was conducted with two samples. One sample consisted of supervisors within a large manufacturing organization, while the other was comprised of MBA students at a local

University. All participants completed the survey, which was administered with the SurveyMonkey internet survey program. All factor analyses were conducted with both of the groups together and separated. The factor analysis results were virtually identical and the two samples were combined for the analyses presented here.

### *Measures*

Three scales were administered to participants: the Survey of PSubS, the Survey of POS (Eisenberger et al., 1986), and another newly created measure of supervisor self-efficacy. Demographic information was also collected including age, sex, race, tenure with organization, tenure in current position, and amount of supervisory experience, and number of subordinates.

*Survey of PSubS.* Because the PSubS construct is new and unmeasured, it is necessary to describe the scale-development efforts that were taken to create a reliable and valid survey of PSubS (SPSubS). The SPSubS is designed to measure two components of PSubS identified in our original definition of the construct: the extent to which supervisors perceive their subordinates are concerned with the supervisor's well-being and the extent to which supervisors perceive that subordinates value the supervisor's the ability to lead. Example items concerning the supervisor's well-being are "Help is available from my subordinates when I have a problem", "My subordinates would forgive an honest mistake on my part", and "My subordinates are unconcerned with whether I am paid fairly or not." Example items measuring a supervisor's perception of the extent to which subordinates value the supervisor as a leader are "If my subordinates could appoint someone else to lead them they would", "My subordinates value my ideas as a leader", and "My subordinates feel that anyone could perform my job as well as I do."

The scale development process was initiated by adapting Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa's (1986) measure of POS to capture a supervisor's perception of the extent

to which his or her subordinates displayed support to the supervisor. This is consistent with other studies that have adapted Eisenberger et al.'s POS survey to measure PSS (Maertz, Jr., et al., 2007; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006). For the present purposes, the original items of the POS were adapted to focus on supervisors' perceptions regarding support from their subordinates. For example, the POS item, "The organization values my contribution to its well-being" was modified to, "My subordinates value my contribution to their well-being." Some items required more adjustment than just replacing the word organization with subordinates to make them relevant. After adapting the 36 original POS items, 16 were removed for not matching the construct definition of PSubS. A total of 20 items from the original POS were retained after this adaptation process. In addition to these items, 24 new items were created and added to the S PSubS.

Respondents responded to these 44 SPsubS items on a 7-point Likert scale anchored "strongly disagree" (1) and "strongly agree" (7) which is consistent with the Survey of POS (Eisenberger et al., 2006) and the Survey of PSS (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). The process through which the final version of the survey (Appendix A) was created is described in detail in the Results section.

*Perceived Organizational Support.* Participants were measured on Eisenberger et al.'s (1986) survey of POS (SPOS). The SPOS was originally 36 items with a reliability of  $\alpha = .97$ . However, a shorter version consisting of the 16 items with the highest factor loading was developed by Eisenberger et al. and was used for the present study.

*Supervisor self-efficacy.* The measure of supervisor self-efficacy (SSE) was adapted from a general measure of self-efficacy (<http://ipip.ori.org>). The original items regarding general self-efficacy were changed to reflect a supervisor's self-efficacy in the context of his or her role as a

supervisor. The survey of supervisor self-efficacy can be found in Appendix B. The SSE measure was created and administered as recommended by the creators of the original measure (<http://ipip.ori.org>).

## Results

### *Scale Refinement*

The Survey of PSubS and the measure of SSE were both initially analyzed using principal component factor analyses and internal consistency reliability analyses. First, the 44 items in the Survey of PSubS were subjected to an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using an unrestricted principal component factor analysis with an oblique rotation. The initial results indicated that the 44 items of the PSubS scale loaded on more than one factor. Upon further examination of these loadings and the actual item content, all negatively worded items were eliminated as they all loaded heavily on a single factor that was not conceptually aligned with the definition of PSubS. Along with the negatively worded items, other items were removed from the SSubS to improve the clarity of this measure and on the basis of ambiguous item content or cross-loadings on multiple factors.

Another EFA was run with the previously mentioned items removed. The results of this EFA suggested that there were two possible subcomponents to the PSubS measure: a *job-related support* component and a *personal-support* component. Further review and analysis suggested that the job-related component had two further sub-factors which were identified as *attitudinal* and *behavioral*. To test this possibility more clearly, this EFA was re-run with the number of factors restricted to three. The resulting loadings largely supported the conceptual appropriateness of this solution (as summarized in Table 1).

Two separate EFAs were then run for the items pertaining to the two subdimensions of the SPSubS. The first EFA included the items of the personal support subdimension. This EFA resulted in one factor that explained 52.6% of the total variance in these items. The second EFA included the items of the job-related support subdimension. These results indicated a pattern of two sub-components of job-related support: attitudinal and behavioral, together accounting for 58% of the total variance in these items. The results of this analysis can be seen in Table 2. The final survey of PSubS was comprised of nine personal support items, four behavioral job-related support items, and ten attitudinal job-related items for a total of twenty-three items. The finalized list of PSubS items can be seen in Table 1. The internal consistency reliability of these subscales was found to be adequate: attitudinal job-related PSubS scale had an alpha of .92, the behavioral job-related PSubS scale had an alpha of .75, and the personal PSubS scale had an alpha of .88.

Following these analyses, the newly developed measure of SSE was subjected to an EFA using principal components factor analysis. The results of this analysis suggested a two-factor solution (as summarized in Table 3). The second EFA included the items of the job-related support subdimension. As with the SPSubS analysis, the loadings indicated that the negatively worded SSE scale items were either cross-loading heavily or not consistently loading with the rest of the items as would be expected. For these reasons, all negatively worded items were removed from further consideration. Another EFA with only the six remaining positively worded SSE items resulted in a one-factor solution that explained 60.7% of the variance in the items. The internal consistency reliability of this final scale was adequate (alpha = .87).

### *Initial Validation of Constructs*

All scale scores and demographic variables were then studied jointly in a bivariate correlation format (Table 4). From these zero-order correlations it was evident that POS was related to the attitudinal component of job-related PSubS ( $r = .01, p < .01$ ), the behavioral component of job-related PSubS ( $r = .05, p < .01$ ), and the personal component of PSubS ( $r = .03, p < .01$ ). The low correlations between the subcomponents of PSubS and POS indicated that the two scales are distinct from each other. I also found that SSE was related to attitudinal job-related support ( $r = .61, p < .01$ ), to behavioral job-related support ( $r = .35, p < .01$ ), and to personal support ( $r = .54, p < .01$ ). As I expected, these correlations were predominately in the moderate range (.40 to .60). The size of these correlations offer mixed support for my proposition that PSubS and SSE are different constructs.

Demographic information was also correlated with scaled scores. Participant sex was not significantly related to any of the subcomponents of PSubS. Age was positively related to the behavioral component of job-related PSubS ( $r = .12, p < .05$ ) and personal PSubS ( $r = .15, p < .05$ ). Education was only significantly related to POS ( $r = -.13, p < .05$ ). Years of supervisory experience was positively related to both the attitudinal component of job-related PSubS ( $r = .14, p < .05$ ) and the behavioral component of job-related PSubS ( $r = .12, p < .05$ ), the personal component of PSubS ( $r = .19, p < .01$ ), and SSE ( $r = .15, p < .05$ ). Number of subordinates each supervisor had was not related to any of the scales. The years a supervisor had been with their current employer was positively related to both the behavioral component of job-related PSubS ( $r = .15, p < .05$ ) and the personal component of PSubS ( $r = .12, p < .05$ ). Finally, years in current position was positively related to the behavioral component of job-related PSubS ( $r = .17, p < .05$ ) and the personal component of PSubS ( $r = .18, p < .01$ ).

## Discussion

The original definition of the new PSubS construct was proposed as the extent to which a supervisor feels his/her subordinates are concerned with the supervisor's well being and value the supervisor as a leader. The personal support component of PSubS, which emerged as a unique construct from my EFA, closely aligned with the first half of the proposed definition. Items that make up the personal support scale of PSubS demonstrate a strong affective attachment to the supervisor (e.g. "My subordinates really care about my well-being" or "My subordinates consider me a friend"). Similarly, the attitudinal component of job-related PSubS that I uncovered closely aligns with the second half of this proposed definition. Items that make up this scale like "My subordinates believe I evaluate them fairly" and "My subordinates value me as a leader", measure the supervisor's felt affective support from his or her subordinate. However, no part of this definition captures the behavioral component of the job-related factor of PSubS that was discovered in my EFA. Therefore, I propose a new definition of PSubS that captures all three subcomponents: *PSubS is the extent to which a supervisor feels subordinates are concerned with the supervisor's well being (personal), value the supervisor as a leader (job-related: attitudinal), and behave in a manner that contributes to the supervisor's ability to perform in his or her role (job-related: behavioral)*. This definition captures each of the three factors that emerged in the factor analyses and gives researchers a framework upon which to build future research related to PSubS.

In regards to determining discriminant validity, I expected that POS and PSubS would be two distinctly different constructs. Results indicated that POS was not strongly related to any of the three sub-factors of PSubS. The sub-factor of PSubS most strongly related to POS was the behavioral component of job-related support ( $r = .05, p < .01$ ). Similarly, Kottke and Sharafinski

(1988) found PSS was weakly related to POS ( $r = .13, p < .05$ ), and concluded that the two scales were distinct from each other. These findings are consistent with Kottke and Sharafinski's proposal that employees prefer feedback and support from more personal sources, rather than obscure entities such as the employee's organization. I believe that PSubS may have a unique influence from POS because it is more easily identifiable. Meaning, PSubS can be linked to an actual individual rather than an impersonal organization. The low correlations between POS and the subcomponents of PSubS support the present argument that PSubS and POS are different constructs.

More overlap was expected, however, between the PSubS and SSE scale scores, due to construct similarity. The correlations between SSE and the subcomponents of PSubS, as seen in Table 4, all fall within the moderate range of  $r = .40$  to  $r = .70$ . While SSE and the sub-factors of PSubS only moderate, the correlations are higher than those between PSubS and POS. These correlations warrant further discussion.

I believe that the moderate correlations among the subcomponents of PSubS and SSE could be partially due to two things. First, DeVellis (2003) pointed out that correlations among separate measures can be caused by more than similarities in the construct that is measured. Friedrich, Byrne, and Mumford (2009) noted that common method bias – similar data collection methods – can account for shared variance in measures. Furthermore, given that both SSE and PSubS are personal beliefs held by supervisors that concern their job, I expected moderate correlations between the measures to exist. As discussed below, the nature of the relationship between SSE and PSubS warrants further research in the future.

Results indicated that sex, number of subordinates, and education were not related to any of the subcomponents of PSubS. However, correlations among the subcomponents of PSubS

and other demographic variables may warrant further exploration. PSubS subcomponents were positively related age, years of supervisor experience, years with current employer, and years in current position. Each of these variables contributes to the length of the relationship between supervisors and subordinates. I believe that supervisor-subordinate relationship tenure could possibly influence PSubS outcomes. However, Paglis and Green (2002) found no moderating effect of dyad tenure on the relationship between supervisors and subordinates perceptions of leader member exchange. This issue needs to be explored further in future research.

The development of this new and unique scale opens the door to extensive future research. First, researchers will want to further validate this measure with other samples by conducting thorough confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling. Administering the twenty-three item measure of PSubS to other samples would lend further support to the results of this study, and would demonstrate whether or not the survey was valid across various organizational settings.

As mentioned above, researchers will need to further assess the relationship between PSubS and SSE. I explained some of the possible reasons for overlap between the two measures; however, there is more that can be done to assess this issue. In re-administering these scales, researchers may want to include both PSubS and SSE items in a single factor analysis to observe if items from the two scales converge on similar factors. This will contribute to the understanding of how PSubS and SSE are both similar but different.

Also, researchers may want to include a measure of leader-member exchange (LMX) to assess its relationship with PSubS. Liden and Maslyn's (1993) multi-dimensional measure of LMX assesses the quality of relationship between the supervisor and subordinate (from the supervisor's perspective) on four dimensions: loyalty, respect, contribution, and affect. A low

correlation between the survey of PSubS and this measure of LMX would further validate the uniqueness of our construct.

Another area of interest to researchers may be the relationship between PSubS and their subordinates' perceived supervisor support. Researchers should examine whether there is a strong correlation between how supervisors perceive their subordinates support for them, and how subordinates perceived they are supported by their supervisors or the extent to which subordinates perceive they support their supervisor, and subsequently whether that correlation influences supervisor attitudes, behaviors and performance. Tee, Ashkanasy, and Paulsen (2010) found a strong, positive relationship between leader self-reported positive affect and follower expressed positive affect toward the leader ( $r = .53, p < .01$ ). This leads me to believe that perceptions of supervisors and subordinates may be strongly correlated. Furthermore, this relationship may be moderated by LMX. It is probable that the higher the quality of relationship between supervisor and subordinate, the more congruent their respective results on measures of PSubS and PSS, particularly with regard to the personal support component of PSubS. Lower quality relationships may result in less congruence on the two measures. Researchers may also be interested in the relationship between PSubS and supervisors' job satisfaction ratings. I believe that a lack of perceived support from subordinates would influence a supervisor's satisfaction on the job.

Finally, researchers will need to determine how PSubS relates to supervisor behavior, and subsequent supervisor performance. As stated above, SSE has been found to moderate the relationship between upward feedback and supervisor behavior (Heslin & Latham, 2004). Future research will need to investigate if and how PSubS will influence the relationship between

upward feedback and supervisor behavior. I believe that PSubS will operate similarly to but separate from SSE in the relationship between upward feedback and supervisor performance.

This is by no means an exhaustive list of areas that researchers will need to investigate. The nature of this new construct lends itself to a whole new field of research. Much research in regards to PSubS is still left to be done. However, I do believe that demonstrating the validity of SPSubS and that PSubS is a construct distinct from POS and SSE provides a strong foundation upon which future research can be conducted.

## List of References

- Atwater, L., Roush, P., & Fischthal, A. (1995). The influence of upward feedback of self- and follower ratings of leadership. *Personnel Psychology, 48*(1), 35-59.
- Atwater, L., & Waldman, D. (1998). Accountability in 360 degree feedback. *HR Magazine, 43*, 96-104.
- Atwater, L.E., Waldman, D.A., Atwater, D., & Cartier, P. (2000). An upward feedback field experiment: Supervisors' cynicism, reactions, and commitment to subordinates. *Personnel Psychology, 53*, 275-297.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215.
- Cervone, D. (1993). The role of self-referent cognitions in goal setting, motivation, and performance. In M. Rabinowitz (Ed.), *Applied cognition* (pp. 57-95). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Chemers, M. M. (2000). Leadership research and theory: A functional integration. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 4*(1), 27-43.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social Exchange Theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 874-900.
- Crowe, B.J., Bochner, S., & Clark, A.W. (1972). The effects of subordinate's behavior on managerial style. *Human Relations, 25*(3), 215-237.
- Dansereau, F., Alutto, J. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (1984). A vertical dyad approach to leadership within formal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13*, 46-78.

- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale Development: Theory and Application* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dierendonck, D.V., Haynes, C., Borrill, C., & Stride, C. (2007). Effects of upward feedback on leadership behavior toward subordinates. *Journal of Management Development*, 26(3), 228-238.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507.
- Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, R., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 565-573.
- Erdogan, B., & Enders, J. (2007). Support from the top: Supervisor's perceived organizational support as a moderator of leader-member exchange to satisfaction and performance relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 321-330.
- Estrada, M., Brown, J., & Lee, F. (1995). Who gets the credit? Perceptions of idiosyncrasy credit in work groups. *Small Groups Research*, 26(1), 56-76.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leader effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fodor, E.M. (1974). Disparagement by a subordinate as an influence on the use of power. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(5), 652-655.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Friedrich, T. L., Byrne, C. L., & Mumford, M. D. (2009). Methodological and theoretical considerations in survey research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(2), 57-60.

- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Greller, M. M., & Herold, D. M. (1975). Sources of feedback: A preliminary investigation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 244-256.
- Harris, R. B., Harris, K. J., & Harvey, P. (2007). A test of competing models of the relationships among perceptions of organizational politics, perceived organizational support, and individual outcomes. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 147(6), 631-655.
- Haythorn, W., Couch, A., Haefner, D., Langham, P., & Carter, L. (1956). The effects of varying combinations of authoritarian and equalitarian leaders and followers. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 53(2), 210-219.
- Hegarty, W.H. (1974). Using subordinate ratings to elicit behavioral changes in supervisors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(6), 764-766.
- Heller, F. A., & Yukl, G. (1969). Participation, Managerial decision making and situational variables. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4(3), 227-241.
- Heslin, P. A., & Latham, G. P. (2004). The effect of upward feedback on managerial behavior. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53(1), 23-37.
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology*, 9, 169-180.
- Hollander, E.P. (1958). Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit. *Psychological Review*, 65(2), 117-127.
- Hollander, E. P., (1992). *The essential interdependence of leadership and followership*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kelley, R. E. (1988). In praise of followers. *Harvard Business Review*, 66(6), 142-147.
- Klein, K. J., Dansereau, F., & Hall, R. J. (1994). Levels issues in theory development, data collection and analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(2), 195-229.
- Kottke, J. L., & Sharafinski, C. E. (1988). Measuring perceived supervisory and organizational support. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48(4), 1075-1079.
- Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, 24(1), 43-72.
- London, M., Smither, J. W., & Adsit, D. J. (1997). Accountability: The Achilles heel of multisource feedback. *Group and Organization Management*, 22, 162-184.
- Maertz, Jr., C. P., Griffeth, R. W., Campbell, N. S., & Allen, D. G. (2007). The effects of perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support on employee turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 1059-1075.
- Meindl, J. R. (1990). On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. In B. A. Staw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol 12, pp. 159-203). New York: JAI Press.
- Morgeson, F. P., Mumford, T. V., & Campion, M. A. (2005). Coming full circle: Using research and practice to address 27 questions about 360-degree feedback programs. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 57(3), 196-209.
- Mount, M.K. (1984). Supervisor, self- and subordinate ratings of performance and satisfaction with supervision. *Journal of Management*, 10(3), 305-320.
- Paglis, L.L., & Green, S.G. (2002). Both sides now: Supervisor and subordinate perspectives on relationship quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 32(2), 250-276.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698-714.

- Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological Contracts in Organizations: Understanding Written and Unwritten Agreements*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications.
- Schaefer, K. G., Epperson, D. L., & Nauta, M. M. (1997). Women's career development: Can theoretically derived variables predict persistence in engineering majors? *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44*(2), 173-183.
- Seifert, C.F., Yukl, G., & McDonald, R.A. (2003). Effects of multi-source feedback and a feedback facilitator on the influence behavior of managers toward subordinates. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(3), 561-569.
- Shanock, L. R., & Eisenberger, R. (2006). When supervisors feel supported: Relationships with subordinate' perceived supervisor support, perceived organizational support, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(3), 689-695.
- 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*(3), 219-227.
- Smither, J. W., Brett, J. F., & Atwater, L. E. (2008). What do leaders recall about their multi-source feedback? *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 14*(3), 202-218.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Taberner, C., & Wood, R. E. (1999). Implicit theories versus the social construal of ability in self-regulation and performance on a complex task. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 78*(2), 104-127.

- Tangirala, S., Green, S. G., & Ramanujam, R. (2007). In the shadow of the boss' boss: Effects of supervisors' upward exchange relationship on employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2), 309-320.
- Tee, E. E. J., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Paulsen, N. (2010, April). *Perceptions and expressions of affect as follower-centric collective action*. Poster presentation presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial & Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.
- VandeWalle, D., & Cummings, L. L. (1997). A test of the influence of goal orientation on the feedback-seeking process. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(3), 390-400.
- Van Vugt, M., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. (2008). Leadership, Followership, and Evolution: Some lessons from the past. *American Psychologist, 63*(3), 182-186.
- Van Yperen, N. W., & Hagedoorn, M. (2003). Do high job demands increase intrinsic motivation or fatigue or both? The role of job control and job social support. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*, 339-348.
- Vecchio, R. P. (1997). *Effective followership: Leadership turned upside down*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist, 62*(1), 17-24.
- Walker, A.G., & Smither, J.W. (1999). A five-year study of upward feedback: What managers do with their results matters. *Personnel Psychology, 52*, 393-423.
- Yammarino, F. J., & Atwater, L. E. (1997). Do managers see themselves as others see them? Implications of self-other rating agreement for human resources management. *Organizational Dynamics, 25*(4), 35-44.

Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 6-16.

## Appendices

## Appendix A

### Survey of Perceived Subordinate Support

Listed below are statements that represent possible opinions that YOU may have about working with your subordinates. Please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by filling in the circle on your answer sheet that best represents your point of view about your subordinates. Please choose from the following answers:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Disagree or Agree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

1. My subordinates strongly consider my goals and values when performing their job. \*
2. My subordinates believe I evaluate them fairly.
3. My subordinates value my contribution to their well-being. \*
4. My subordinates would replace me if they could. (R) \*
5. My subordinates fail to appreciate any extra effort from me. (R) \*
6. My subordinates would ignore any complaint from me. (R) \*
7. My subordinates support my decisions that affect their job.
8. Help is available from my subordinates when I have a problem. \*
9. My subordinates really care about my well-being. \*
10. My subordinates are willing to extend themselves in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability. \*
11. My subordinates trust my decision making ability.
12. My subordinates believe I treat them fairly.
13. My subordinates would forgive an honest mistake on my part. \*
14. My subordinates respect my opinions related to their job.
15. My subordinates believe raises are fairly determined.
16. My subordinates value me as a leader.
17. Even if I did the best job possible, my subordinates would fail to notice. (R) \*
18. My subordinates trust me to do the right thing.
19. My subordinates would rather work for another supervisor. (R)
20. My subordinates are willing to help me when I need a special favor. \*
21. My subordinates care about my general satisfaction at work. \*
22. If given the opportunity, my subordinates would take advantage of me. (R) \*
23. My subordinates show very little concern for me. (R) \*
24. If I decided to quit, my subordinates would try to persuade me to stay. \*
25. My subordinates care about my opinions. \*
26. My well being is not a concern of my subordinates. (R)
27. If given the opportunity, my subordinates would undermine my authority. (R)
28. My subordinates care more about making money than me. \*
29. My subordinates would defend me in a crisis.
30. My subordinates consider me a friend.

31. My subordinates feel that anyone could perform my job as well as I do. (R) \*
32. My subordinates believe I'm a good manager.
33. My subordinates try to make my job as easy as possible. \*
34. My subordinates are proud to be a part of my team. \*
35. If I make a mistake, my subordinates will easily forgive me.
36. I can rely on my subordinates to do what I ask them to do.
37. When I request things of my subordinates I am met with little resistance.
38. My subordinates speak well of me when I am not around.
39. My subordinates enjoy working for me.
40. My subordinates do not value me as a leader. (R)
41. My subordinates want me to succeed.
42. If I make a mistake my subordinates will still value me as a leader.
43. My subordinates believe I am a hard worker.
44. My subordinates admire my leadership skills.

*Note.* (R) indicates items the item is reversed scored

\* These items were adapted from the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986)

## Appendix B

The following 10 phrases describe people's behavior. Please use the rating scale below to rate how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Please respond honestly.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Inaccurate nor Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

1. I supervise my subordinates successfully.
2. I excel as a supervisor.
3. I handle supervisory tasks smoothly
4. I am sure of my role as a supervisor
5. I come up with good solutions to supervisory dilemmas.
6. I know how to supervise my subordinates.
7. I do not judge situations regarding my subordinates well. (R)
8. I don't understand my role as a supervisor. (R)
9. I demonstrate little supervisory ability. (R)
10. I don't see how my decisions as a supervisor affect my subordinates. (R)

*Note.* (R) indicates the item is reversed scored.

Table 1

	PSubS Items	Factors		
		1	2	3
Job-Related Behavioral	9. My subordinates really care about my well-being.	-0.099	<b>0.673</b>	0.324
	21. My subordinates care about my general satisfaction at work.	0.038	0.093	<b>0.666</b>
	25. My subordinates care about my opinions.	<b>0.605</b>	0.225	0.100
	29. My subordinates would defend me in a crisis.	-0.003	0.339	<b>0.472</b>
	30. My subordinates consider me a friend.	-0.161	0.207	<b>0.710</b>
	37. When I request things of my subordinates I am met with little resistance.	<b>0.661</b>	0.088	-0.034
	38. My subordinates speak well of me when I am not around.	0.123	-0.008	<b>0.716</b>
	39. My subordinates enjoy working for me.	0.310	-0.068	<b>0.660</b>
	41. My subordinates want me to succeed.	0.277	-0.009	<b>0.641</b>
	7. My subordinates support my decisions that affect their job.	0.183	<b>0.506</b>	0.015
	8. Help is available from my subordinates when I have a problem.	0.098	<b>0.838</b>	-0.201
	10. My subordinates are willing to extend themselves in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.	0.254	<b>0.628</b>	0.138
	20. My subordinates are willing to help me when I need a special favor.	0.126	<b>0.542</b>	0.159
	2. My subordinates believe I evaluate them fairly.	<b>0.642</b>	0.014	0.025
Job-Related Attitudinal	14. My subordinates respect my opinions related to their job.	<b>0.840</b>	0.076	-0.111
	16. My subordinates value me as a leader.	<b>0.700</b>	0.044	0.137
	18. My subordinates trust me to do the right thing.	<b>0.705</b>	0.099	0.019
	32. My subordinates believe I'm a good manager.	<b>0.500</b>	-0.076	0.405
	35. If I make a mistake, my subordinates will easily forgive me.	<b>0.596</b>	0.061	0.185
	42. If I make a mistake my subordinates will still value me as a leader.	<b>0.450</b>	0.073	0.374
	43. My subordinates believe I am a hard worker.	0.234	-0.070	<b>0.538</b>
	44. My subordinates admire my leadership skills.	0.360	-0.128	<b>0.593</b>

Table 2

<b>Job Related PSubS</b>	<b>Factors</b>	
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
2. My subordinates believe I evaluate them fairly.	<b>0.612</b>	0.073
7. My subordinates support my decisions that affect their job.	0.140	<b>0.512</b>
8. Help is available from my subordinates when I have a problem.	-0.178	<b>0.931</b>
10. My subordinates are willing to extend themselves in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.	0.278	<b>0.672</b>
12. My subordinates believe I treat them fairly.	<b>0.770</b>	0.029
14. My subordinates respect my opinions related to their job.	<b>0.680</b>	0.107
16. My subordinates value me as a leader.	<b>0.782</b>	0.049
18. My subordinates trust me to do the right thing.	<b>0.657</b>	0.151
20. My subordinates are willing to help me when I need a special favor.	0.156	<b>0.650</b>
32. My subordinates believe I'm a good manager.	<b>0.830</b>	-0.053
35. If I make a mistake, my subordinates will easily forgive me.	<b>0.722</b>	0.081
42. If I make a mistake my subordinates will still value me as a leader.	<b>0.715</b>	0.115
43. My subordinates believe I am a hard worker.	<b>0.728</b>	-0.096
44. My subordinates admire my leadership skills.	<b>0.885</b>	-0.157

Table 3

## Supervisor Self-Efficacy EFA

	Factors	
	1	2
1. I supervise my subordinates successfully.	<b>0.713</b>	0.005
2. I excel as a supervisor.	<b>0.779</b>	0.028
3. I handle supervisory tasks smoothly.	<b>0.800</b>	0.164
4. I am sure of my role as a supervisor.	<b>0.844</b>	0.068
5. I come up with good solutions to supervisory dilemmas.	<b>0.743</b>	0.071
6. I know how to supervise my subordinates.	<b>0.791</b>	0.036
7. I do not judge situations regarding my subordinates well.	0.012	<b>-0.993</b>
8. I don't understand my role as a supervisor.	0.594	-0.131
9. I demonstrate very little supervisory ability.	0.491	-0.135
10. I don't see how my decisions as a supervisor affect my subordinates.	0.377	-0.156

Table 4

Correlations												
	PSubS Job Attitude	PSubS Job Behavioral	PSubS Personal	POS	SSE	SEX	Age	Education	Years of supervisor experience	Number of subords	Years with current employer	Years in current position
PSubS_Job_Attrit	1											
PSubS_Job_Behavioral	0.549*	1										
PSubS_Personal	0.818**	0.632**	1									
POS_Scaled	0.009	0.051	0.029	1								
SSE_Scaled	0.611**	0.345**	0.540**	0.045	1							
SEX recorded	0.113	0.031	0.070	0.042	0.010	1						
Age education	0.089	0.119*	0.150*	0.049	0.014	-0.164*	1					
# yrs superv experience	-0.042	-0.002	-0.075	-0.130*	0.033	0.056	-0.231*	1				
# of subords	0.141*	0.120*	0.191**	0.005	0.151*	-0.265*	0.748**	-0.197**	1			
# yrs current employer	-0.008	0.033	-0.031	-0.060	0.103	-0.086	0.020	0.138	0.138*	1		
# yrs in current position	0.061	0.148*	0.121*	0.057	-0.015	-0.071	0.607**	-0.323**	0.544*	0.019	1	
	0.086	0.174*	0.182**	0.113	-0.025	-0.036	0.507**	-0.224**	0.511**	-0.102	0.535**	1

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.  
\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

## VITA

Timothy Clayton is originally from Charleston, SC where he graduated from Fort Dorchester High School. After high school, Timothy attended the College of Charleston where he majored in Philosophy and minored in both Political Science and Religious Studies. During his undergraduate studies, Timothy was inducted into the National Society for Collegiate Scholars, and was also a delegate to the 2003 Harvard National Model United Nations. Upon graduating in 2005, Timothy took time off to travel to five of the seven continents. In 2008, Timothy and his wife moved to Chattanooga, TN so that he could begin graduate school in Industrial-Organizational Psychology. During this time Timothy was inducted into PSI-CHI and was awarded the 2010 Outstanding Graduate Student for the Psychology department. In 2010 Timothy graduated from the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga with a Master's of Science.