

Perceived Subordinate Support (PSubS):
Identifying its Unique Impact on Positive Employee Outcomes

By

Stephen Michael Elkourie

Brian J. O'Leary
Associate Professor of Psychology
(Thesis Chair)

Michael D. Biderman
Professor of Psychology
(Committee Member)

Christopher J. L. Cunningham
Associate Professor of Psychology
(Committee Member)

Bart Weathington
UC Foundation Professor
(Committee Member)

PERCEIVED SUBORDINATE SUPPORT (PSUBS):
IDENTIFYING ITS UNIQUE IMPACT OF POSITIVE EMPLOYEE OUTCOMES

By
Stephen Elkourie

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the University
of Tennessee at Chattanooga in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements of the Degree Master of
Science: Psychology

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee

May 2015

Copyright © 2015

By Stephen Michael El Gourie

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

The present study is a replication and extension of research assessing the positive relationship between Perceived Subordinate Support (PSubS) and positive employee behaviors. We relate those relationships to those of Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and Perceived Supervisor Support (PSS). We also address whether PSubS is a unique construct from POS and PSS. We also explored the possibility of a Generalized Perception of Support (GPS) underlying all three support constructs using the bifactor model. Results provide support for a unique PSubS construct, while the existence of an underlying GPS was not supported. The research serves as further construct validation to the perceived support literature.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| ABSTRACT | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES | vii |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS..... | viii |
| CHAPTER | |
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Perceived Organizational Support | 2 |
| Perceived Supervisor Support | 3 |
| Positive Employee Reactions | 4 |
| Job Satisfaction | 4 |
| Organizational Commitment | 5 |
| Organizational Citizenship Behaviors | 6 |
| Trust | 6 |
| Supervisor Self-Efficacy | 7 |
| Perceived Subordinate Support | 8 |
| Bifactor Structural Model | 10 |
| Generalized Perceptions of Support | 10 |
| II. METHOD..... | 12 |
| Participants | 12 |
| Measures | 13 |
| Demographics | 13 |
| Perceived Subordinate Support | 13 |
| Perceived Organizational Support | 13 |
| Perceived Supervisor Support | 14 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Supervisor Self-Efficacy | 14 |
| Organizational Commitment | 15 |
| Job Satisfaction | 15 |
| Organizational Citizenship Behaviors | 15 |
| Trust | 15 |
| Generalized Perceived Support | 16 |
| Procedures | 16 |
| | |
| III. RESULTS | 18 |
| | |
| IV. DISCUSSION | 24 |
| | |
| Limitations and Future Research | 25 |
| Research Implications | 28 |
| Practical Implications | 29 |
| | |
| V. CONCLUSION | 30 |
| | |
| REFERENCES | 31 |
| | |
| APPENDIX | |
| | |
| A. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL | 37 |
| B. MEASURES | 39 |
| C. TABLES | 49 |
| | |
| VITA | 52 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| 1 Correlations of Study Variables..... | 18 |
| 2 Job Satisfaction predicted by Perceived Support..... | 19 |
| 3 Organizational Commitment predicted by Perceived Support..... | 20 |
| 4 Organizational Citizenship Behaviors predicted by Perceived Support..... | 20 |
| 5 Trust in Subordinates predicted by Perceived Support | 21 |
| 6 Supervisor Self-Efficacy predicted by Perceived Support..... | 21 |
| 7 Correlated Factor Model Correlations..... | 22 |
| 8 Bifactor Model Correlations..... | 22 |
| 9 Dependent Correlations..... | 23 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

PSubS, Perceived Subordinate Support

POS, Perceived Organizational Support

PSS, Perceived Supervisor Support

GPS, General Perceived Support

OCB, Organizational Citizenship Behavior

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The perceived support literature has primarily focused on the top-down impact of support, as is the case with perceived organizational support (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986) and perceived supervisor support (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). O'Leary, Clayton, and Cunningham (2012) proposed and evaluated a new construct, perceived subordinate support, which examines support from the opposite direction (i.e., bottom-up, subordinate-to-supervisor).

The present study is an extension of O'Leary et al. (2012) that examines the relationship of PSubS to similar constructs and important organizational criteria, including job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviors, and organizational commitment. We also explore the possibility of a common factor (Reise, 2012) underlying perceived organizational support, perceived supervisor support, and perceived subordinate support, which we term General Perceptions of Support (GPS).

In the following sections, we will review the literature related to PSubS and similar constructs, provide examples of how perceived support relationships can influence the organization, identify the measures taken to examine the relationships of PSubS with job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviors, and organizational commitment. Lastly, we will address the possibility of general perceived support as the underlying general support

construct and what the presence of general perceived support could mean for the perceived support literature.

Perceived Organizational Support

Employees interpret their world based on their interactions with other employees, their supervisors, and their organizations (Eisenberger et al., 1986). For example, employees typically form perceptions of their organization based on how supportive they feel their organization is to them and fellow employees. Eisenberger et al. (1986) introduced the construct of perceived organizational support (POS), which refers to the extent to which employees feel the organization is committed to them. Eisenberger et al. (1986) demonstrated that employees in organizations that facilitate their growth through training, or hire for positions internally, generally have higher levels of POS.

Several studies have found relationships between high levels of POS and positive employee outcomes. Shore and Wayne (1993) used surveys of supervisor perceptions to identify a positive relationship between POS and both affective and continuance organizational commitment. Job satisfaction has also been shown to have a positive relationship with POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Thus, research suggests that affective states of job satisfaction and organizational commitment are related to subordinate and supervisor POS and these relationships are likely to affect job performance and trust (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006).

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) have also been found to positively correlate with POS (Coyle-Shapiro & Conway, 2005; Kaufman, Stamper, & Tesluk, 2001; Shore & Wayne, 1993) The level of POS appears to amplify the effect affective commitment on OCBs, with longer-lasting effects than continuance commitment (Shore & Wayne, 1993). Kaufman et

al. (2001) stated that POS encourages more impersonal OCBs that contribute to the organization as a whole (OCBO; e.g., innovation, and promoting organizational goals outside the workplace), instead of directing OCBs toward individual coworkers (OCBI; e.g., cooperation and covenant relationships). The research suggests that employees with higher levels of POS are generally happier and perform better (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002; Shore & Wayne, 1993; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994).

Perceived Supervisor Support

Perceived supervisor support (PSS) is a more proximal construct than POS, suggesting that it may have a more immediate impact on employee attitudes and behaviors; PSS measures the extent to which employees feel they are supported by their immediate supervisor rather than by the greater organization (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). Where POS refers to the overall support an employee feels with the organization, PSS reflects the quality of the relationship employees have with a supervisor with whom they have frequent and direct individual contact. Accordingly, this is a more personal relationship than POS and can be influenced more directly by supervisor behaviors.

As with POS, research on PSS has identified positive correlations between important employee behaviors and reactions to the supervisor support, including increased intrinsic motivation, reduced fatigue, and a decrease in turnover (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Van Yperen & Hagedoorn, 2003). PSS also engenders employee reactions similar to those of POS, such as better subordinate job performance, job satisfaction, and motivation (Kuvaas & Dysvik, 2010). Eisenberger et al. (2002) found that PSS influences OCBs and affective organizational commitment as well. Additionally, the combination of PSS and POS in the workplace tends to

amplify the effects of these positive employee reactions (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006). Work environments in which employees perceive high levels of organizational (POS) and supervisor support (PSS) should, therefore, result in more positive employee reactions and behaviors.

Positive Employee Reactions

Positive employee reactions refer to a behavior or perception that affects the actions of an employee at work for the better (Eisenberger et al., 1986). These can be further characterized as productive behaviors and outcomes that share relationships with an employee's overall performance. Positive employee reactions are often mediated by organizational, environmental, or political factors. Accordingly, perceived support from both organizational and supervisor levels influence positive employee reactions (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Several commonalities in employee reactions have been found between POS and PSS, including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors.

Job Satisfaction. Perhaps the most studied attitudinal form of workplace reaction in the literature is job satisfaction, which refers to the extent to which the employee feels favorably or unfavorably regarding his or her job (Locke, 1976; Spector, 1997). Job satisfaction consists of feelings, thoughts, and behaviors relevant to the job that can be measured at the subordinate or supervisor level. A low level of employee job satisfaction affects a variety of affective, attitudinal variables including job involvement, frustration, tension and conflict, or anxiety (Hopkins & Weathington, 2006). A decrease in self-esteem due to low job satisfaction can negatively influence overall job performance, absenteeism, turnover, and organizational commitment.

Three broad approaches are typically used to predict employee job satisfaction: job characteristics, social information processing, and dispositional. The job characteristics and dispositional approaches are influenced by external factors of the job, such as the cost/benefits of performing tasks or the innate personal preferences of the individual (Jex & Britt, 2008). Social information processing however, considers the affective relationship of the employee with the organization, position, and fellow employees. Considering this approach to job satisfaction, POS and PSS are more likely to have a positive relationship with affective job satisfaction than cognitive job satisfaction (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Appropriately, social aspects, such as personal interaction and emotion, influence affective job satisfaction.

Organizational Commitment. Klein, Molloy, and Brinsfield (2012) define commitment as the psychological bond reflecting the individual's feelings of dedication and responsibility for a particular target. Organizational commitment represents the behaviors and perceptions that employees have toward the organization. Employee perceptions of fair social support from the organization or fellow employees can influence both job satisfaction and organizational support (Hopkins & Weathington, 2006).

While the literature suggests that POS and PSS influence both affective and continuance organizational commitment, the relationship is much stronger for affective commitment (Eisenberger et al., 2002). Affective commitment is most positively correlated to POS and procedural justice, compared to continuance and normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Employees tend to develop affective commitment when they feel important and competent while at work and instrumental to organizational objectives (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). Perceived support has positive relationships to affective commitment

because POS and PSS represent the extent to which the employee feels valued and that they are ultimately needed or helpful to the organization.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. OCBs are general behaviors at work that are not necessarily part of the employee's formal job description or duties, and are not typically formally rewarded (Organ, 1977). OCBs include altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue (Organ, 1977, 1994). OCBs are related to positive affect (George & Brief, 1992). Consistent with Equity Theory (Adams, 1965), however, if employees perceive that they are being treated fairly in their position in relationships with colleagues, supervisors, or the organization, they are more likely to reciprocate this in the form of OCBs and job performance. OCBs also have positive relationships with perceived fairness, justice, and support. Accordingly, a high level of POS or PSS would amplify the occurrence of OCBs in the workplace (Kaufman et al., 2001).

Trust

Similar to employee perceptions of support, the level of trust may also impact relationships between supervisors and subordinates. Trust refers to "...the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other party will perform a particular action important to the trustor irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party" (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995, p. 712). While perceived support refers to the extent to which an employee feels supported by the organization or another employee (Eisenberger et al., 1986), trust reflects a social-exchange that reflects the extent to which an employee believes that they will not be taken advantage of by the organization or co-

workers (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). Trust has been shown to have positive relationships with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and OCBs (Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002). Social exchange-based relationships are characterized by affective factors of trust, such as loyalty, goodwill, and perceived support (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994).

In an organizational context, perceived trust can occur across various channels of social exchange (Aryee et al., 2002). Relationships between the employee and the organization are most common in determining perceived trust, but research has also indicated similar affects for relationships between supervisor and subordinate, suggesting that the direction of this relationship is not as crucially significant of a predictor as the overall presence of perceived trust (Aryee et al., 2002). These relationships can ultimately account for varying levels of job performance, job satisfaction, overall commitment, turnover, and organizational citizenship behaviors.

Supervisor Self-Efficacy

Employee behaviors are not only influenced by their perceived support from others, but also their perceptions of their own abilities. Specifically, the influence of self-efficacy is a determining factor in overall employee performance (Heslin & Latham, 2004). Erez and Judge (2001) describe self-efficacy as an overall attitude towards himself or herself. Individuals demonstrating high self-efficacy are likely to have improved performance by engaging in strategic knowledge, problem solving, persistence, and overall confidence in ability to accomplish tasks (Heslin & Latham, 2004). Furthermore, self-esteem maintains a relationship with performance even while controlling for conscientiousness, experience, and actual ability (Erez & Judge, 2001).

Perceived support relationships between the supervisor and the subordinate (such as PSubS) are primarily influenced by self-efficacy. O'Leary et al. (2012) developed the Supervisor Self-Efficacy scale to measure self-efficacy in the context of a supervisor's role in relation to his or her subordinates. They defined supervisor self-efficacy as "the belief a supervisor has in his or her ability to perform his or her role as a supervisor" (O'Leary et al., 2012, p. 5). Because supervisor self-efficacy moderates supervisor behavior and subordinate feedback, higher levels of supervisor self-efficacy can lead to improved employee performance and perceived support. When supervisors feel supported by their subordinates, they are more likely to interact and engage in affective communication with their subordinates. Accordingly, frequent communication from supervisors increases levels of PSS (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). Such interaction is likely to improve feedback and inevitably improve perceived support.

Perceived Subordinate Support

While POS and PSS have been studied extensively, there has been little attention given to how supervisors respond to perceived support from their subordinates. Perhaps the best prior example of supervisor reactions to subordinate attitudes has been upward feedback, wherein supervisor behavior is induced or altered based on their awareness of subordinate reactions (Hegarty, 1974; Seifert, Yukl, & McDonald, 2003; van Dierendonck, Haynes, Borrill, & Stride, 2007). However, it is unlikely that an organizationally controlled, systematic process, such as upward feedback, motivates all supervisor reactions (Crowe, Bochner, & Clark, 1972; Mount, 1984).

In this study, we examined whether PSubS acts as a primary determinant of supervisor reactions in the workplace. O'Leary et al. (2012) defined PSubS as "a supervisor's perceptions of

subordinate support of his or her in the role of a supervisor” (p. 10). This construct offers a unique perspective that may provide additional insight into supervisor behaviors and attitudes. Therefore, consistent with existing research supporting the positive relationships of both POS and PSS with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and OCBs (Eisenberger et al., 2002), We believe that the newly defined PSubS construct has similar effects at the supervisor level.

Hypothesis 1a: PSubS is positively related to supervisor job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1b: PSubS is positively related to supervisor organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 1c: PSubS is positively related to supervisor OCBs.

Hypothesis 1d: PSubS is positively related to supervisor trust of subordinates.

Hypothesis 1e: PSubS is positively related to supervisor self-efficacy.

To determine the incremental validity of PSubS relative to POS and PSS, we also measured PSS and POS to compare their relationships with other study variables and with PSubS.

Hypothesis 2a: PSubS explains unique variance in supervisor job satisfaction above and beyond that explained by POS and PSS.

Hypothesis 2b: PSubS explains unique variance in supervisor organizational commitment above and beyond that explained by POS and PSS.

Hypothesis 2c: PSubS explains unique variance in supervisor OCBs above and beyond that explained by POS and PSS.

Hypothesis 2d: PSubS explains unique variance in supervisor trust of his/her subordinates above and beyond that explained by POS and PSS.

Hypothesis 2e: PSubS explains unique variance in supervisor self-efficacy above and beyond that explained by POS and PSS.

Bifactor Structural Model

While Holzinger and Harman (1938) originally developed the bifactor model, it has only recently been rediscovered as an application in structural equation modeling and alternative structural representation of multidimensionality. It specifies that the correlated item responses included in scales measuring similar constructs may be accounted for by an underlying general factor (Reise, 2012). The common variance among all scale items for the group factors typically have similar content and are highly correlated. A general factor in the bifactor model represents the underlying factor across multiple constructs, while the group factors are measures that are highly correlated and less broad (Reise, 2012). The model is relevant to the present study as it is particularly useful when there are three or more scales that measure similar constructs, such as in POS, PSS, and PSubS. Overall, the bifactor model is an ideal structural model for determining the presence, cause, possible applications associated with common method bias in a survey with several correlated factors.

Generalized Perceptions of Support

Because POS, PSS, and PSubS are all forms of employee perceptions of support within a work environment, it is likely that a general factor influencing all items may influence the perceived support relationships with satisfaction, organizational commitment, and OCBs (Reise, 2012). Stated differently, it is likely that PSS, POS, and PSubS may all be measuring slightly different facets of a higher-order, general workplace support. It should be noted that no clear measure of general perceived social support has been developed.

While PSubS is still a relatively new construct, existing research has shown a strong positive correlation between POS and PSS (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006; Tepper & Taylor, 2003). Based on Reise (2012), we introduce a new construct that may

underlie POS, PSS and PSubS, which we call *Generalized Perception of Support* (GPS), that could account for these commonalities in the perceived support literature. We define GPS as an employee's perception of the overall support they receive from in the workplace. We, therefore, provide the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 3a: GPS is positively related to supervisor job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3b: GPS is positively related to supervisor organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 3c: GPS is positively related to supervisor OCBs.

Hypothesis 3d: GPS is positively related to supervisor trust of subordinates.

Hypothesis 3e: GPS is positively related to supervisor self-efficacy.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Participants

Supervisors, for the purposes of the present study, were any employee with at least one subordinate as a direct report. The sample is an amalgamation of various supervisor positions and roles. We used snowball sampling to reach a broad range of professionals. Several diverse professional executives provided their professional networks to be included in this sampling method. The sample includes organizations ranging from goods and services to medical care and insurance companies. No particular demographic was targeted; we were only interested in supervisory status.

Respondents were recruited through personal and professional networks. We emailed a total of 48 supervisors directly, but also posted the survey on LinkedIn.com. The survey instructions requested that the participant send the survey to five or more supervisors after completion. Accordingly, we predicted a relatively low response rate because this was an online survey with no monetary incentive attached. A total of 62 individuals participated in the study, although only 50 completed the survey. The survey was not facilitated through an organization, but was shared with personal and professional contacts with supervisory experience. Participants were not randomly selected, but were included in our sample based on their self-reported supervisory status.

The mean age of participants was 49 ($n=49$; $SD=11.20$) and 58.8% male ($n=30$). The participants were predominantly Caucasian/White non-Hispanic (80.4%), but also included, Hispanic (3.9%), Asian (2%), Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (2%). The supervisors had a mean of 10.19 years tenure in their organization ($n=44$, $SD=7.711$), 7.96 years tenure in their current position ($n=46$, $SD=8.672$), 10.33 years of supervisory experience ($n=46$, $SD=10.77$), and a mean of seven direct reports ($n=49$, $SD=8.71$).

Measures

Demographics. We collected data on age, sex, race, tenure with the organization, tenure in current position, amount of supervisory experience, number of subordinates, and industry. These factors are included as control variables.

Perceived Subordinate Support. We measured PSubS using the Survey of Perceived Subordinate Support (O'Leary et al., 2012). The measure consists of an 8-item self-report questionnaire using a seven-point Likert scale, with 1 = strongly disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. Questions on the survey identify supervisor perceptions of subordinate support, such as “My subordinates trust my decision making ability,” or “My subordinates want me to succeed.” This measure does not include reverse scored items. A high score on this measure indicates a high level of perceived subordinate support from the perspective of a supervisor.

Perceived Organizational Support. We used the shortened version of Eisenberger Eisenberger et al. (1986) *Survey of Perceived Organizational Support* to measure POS. Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) suggest the version used in this study for identifying perceived

organizational support in similar context. Example questions include, “The organization values my contribution to its well-being” and “The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.” It includes 16 items measured on a seven-point Likert scale, with 1 = strongly disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. A high score on this measure indicates high level of POS.

Perceived Supervisor Support. PSS was measured using the *Survey of Perceived Supervisor Support* developed by Kottke and Sharafinski (1988). Based on the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support, this survey identifies the extent to which the subordinate feels supported by the supervisor. The items are very similar to those in the SPOS, such as, “My supervisor values my contribution to the well-being of our department” and “My supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments.” The survey contains 16 items and was adapted to a seven point Likert scale, with 1 = strongly disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. A high level of this scale indicates a high level of subordinates perceived support from their supervisor.

Supervisor Self-Efficacy. We measured supervisor self-efficacy with the *Survey of Supervisor Self-Efficacy* developed by O'Leary et al. (2012). The measure includes six items from the IPIP general measure of self-efficacy (<http://ipip/ori/org>) previously adapted to reflect a supervisor's level of self-efficacy in his or her role as a supervisor. The survey utilizes a seven-point Likert scale, with 1 = strongly disagree, and 7 = strongly agree. Items include, “I excel as a supervisor” and “I am sure of my role as a supervisor”. A high rating on this scale indicates a high level of self-efficacy for the supervisor.

Organizational Commitment. We measured organizational commitment with the *KUT* (Klein et al. Unidimensional Target-free) *Measure of Commitment* (Klein, Cooper, Molloy, & Swanson, 2014). The KUT measure provides a perspective of organizational commitment that excludes confounds, such as work ethic, intention to withdrawal, or identification, that effect other measure of organizational commitment such as described in Meyer and Allen (1991). This measure does not break organizational commitment into levels of continuance, normative, and affective commitment, but instead captures all aspects and attributes of organizational commitment. This measure includes four items adapted to a seven-point Likert scale with 1 = “never” and 7 = “completely.” A high score on this measure indicates a high level of affective commitment.

Job Satisfaction. We used the *Index of Job Satisfaction* from Brayfield and Rothe (1951) to measure job satisfaction. This measure is a shortened version of the job satisfaction scale created by Hoppock (1960). The measure is eighteen items long, and is adapted to a seven-point Likert scale with 1 being strongly disagree and 7 being strongly agree. This gives a holistic measure of job satisfaction. A high score on this measure indicates high levels of employee job satisfaction at the supervisor and subordinate levels.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior. We measured OCBs using the 20 item Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (Van Dyne et al., 1994) adapted to a seven-point Likert scale with 1 = “never” and 7 = “always.” Excludes confounds that typically effect OCB measures such as items that measure CWBs, scales based on level of agreement rather than frequency, and supervisory halo effects. Items include “I pick up a meal for others at work” and

“I help new employees get oriented to the job.” High scores indicate a high level of general OCBs, as well as the level and rating of each respective OCB category. This measure contains no reverse scored items.

Trust. We measured trust with an adapted version of the Aryee et al. (2002) *Trust in the Organization Scale*. The survey consists of seven-item scale on a seven-point Likert scale with 1 being strongly disagree and 7 being strongly agree and three reverse scored items. The survey measures the extent to which the supervisor trusts the subordinate, a factor that may indirectly influence the supervisor-subordinate relationship. A high rating on this survey indicates a high level of trust in the supervisor’s subordinates in their department.

Generalized Perceived Support – There is currently no measure of GPS. To estimate the presence of GPS we utilized the bifactor model (Reise, 2012) to identify a general factor that would account for item similarity and common method bias amongst perceived support constructs. Ultimately we aimed to determine the extent of influence by a general factor among the perceived support constructs. GPS was indicated by all support items (POS, PSS, and PSubS) in the questionnaire. Factor scores were used to create the actual GPS variable.

Procedure

Supervisors were recruited late fall of 2014 through spring of 2015. Participants were either emailed directly to complete the study, responded to our survey request on LinkedIn.com, or were requested to complete the survey by our other respondents in the survey. The questionnaire was provided with the intent of the survey and the information we were recording.

Participants were given full disclosure and had the opportunity to complete or quit the survey at any time. Participants were also able to finish part of the survey and come back to it at a later date. The questionnaire was developed, managed, and facilitated using the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga's web survey tool, Qualtrics.

We conducted several levels of pilot testing to insure that the entire survey was without error and simple to fill out and completed. The survey was measured to take about 15 minutes to complete. The survey was a total of 108 questions. Demographics were saved till the end of the survey to reduce the effects of burnout and fatigue in completion. After completing the survey participants were asked to send the survey to 5 others in their professional network, or other supervisors that they knew professionally.

A total of 62 surveys were submitted. Before any analyses were performed, the responses were screened to ensure that the data was usable. Responses were omitted from the sample based on the following criteria: duplicate entries, surveys that were less than 25% completed, and completed surveys without an indication of supervisory status. This procedure resulted in 50 usable survey responses. The appropriate reverse coding was performed on necessary items and scales scores calculated to reflect overall mean scores.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Hypotheses 1a through 1e, that PSubS would be positively correlated with various organizational measures, were tested using simple correlations. Significant correlations were found between PSubS and job satisfaction ($r=.36; p=.007$), trust in subordinates ($r=.53; p=.000$), and supervisor self-efficacy ($r=.61; p=.000$). It is worth noting that PSubS was correlated with OCBs at $r=.24$, but failed to reach significance. PSubS did not correlate significantly with Organizational Commitment ($r=.21, ns$).

Table 1 Correlations of Study Variables

| Measure | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|---|
| 1. POS | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 2. PSS | .82** | 1 | | | | | | |
| 3. PSubS | .52** | .44** | 1 | | | | | |
| 4. Job Satisfaction | .53** | .54** | .36* | 1 | | | | |
| 5. Organizational Commitment | .67** | .50** | .23 | .61** | 1 | | | |
| 6. OCBs | .13** | .10** | .25 | .06 | .03 | 1 | | |
| 7. Trust in Subordinates | .44** | .31** | .49* | .33* | .28* | .25 | 1 | |
| 8. Supervisor Self-efficacy | .23** | .22** | .63** | .36** | .00 | .40** | .34* | 1 |

Note. N=50, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Hypotheses 2a through 2e stated that PSubS would explain unique variance in various organizational variables when controlling for POS and PSS. Multiple regression was used to

control for the influence of POS and PSS on the dependent variable. Table 2 provides a summary of the results. Significant incremental validity over POS and PSS were found in the analyses of trust and supervisor self-efficacy. These results indicate that PSubS explains unique variance in trust in subordinates and supervisor self-efficacy. Perceived organizational support explained unique variance for job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Perceived supervisor support did not provide unique variance for any of the variables and none of the perceived support constructs had a significant relationship with OCBs.

Table 2 Job Satisfaction predicted by Perceived Support

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β |
| POS | .59 | .12 | .61** | .47 | .20 | .49* | .45 | .21 | .46* |
| PSS | | | | .15 | .20 | .15 | .14 | .21 | .14 |
| PSubS | | | | | | | .14 | .33 | .06 |
| <i>R</i> ² | | .37 | | | .37 | | | .38 | |
| <i>Adjusted R</i> ² | | .35 | | | .35 | | | .33 | |
| <i>F</i> | | 26.67** | | | 13.46** | | | 8.87** | |

Note. N=50, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 3 Organizational Commitment predicted by Perceived Support

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β |
| POS | .86 | .15 | .63** | .96 | .26 | .73** | 1.01 | .27 | .80** |
| PSS | | | | -.13 | .26 | -.09 | -.11 | .26 | -.08 |
| PSubS | | | | | | | -.53 | .41 | -.17 |
| <i>R</i> ² | | .43 | | | .43 | | | .45 | |
| <i>Adjusted R</i> ² | | .41 | | | .40 | | | .41 | |
| <i>F</i> | | 34.20** | | | 16.93** | | | 11.99** | |

Note. N=50, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 4 Organizational Citizenship Behaviors predicted by Perceived Support

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β |
| POS | .03 | .12 | .04 | -.10 | .20 | -.12 | -.20 | .21 | -.26 |
| PSS | | | | .16 | .20 | .20 | .14 | .20 | .20 |
| PSubS | | | | | | | .55 | .32 | .30 |
| <i>R</i> ² | | .00 | | | .01 | | | .08 | |
| <i>Adjusted R</i> ² | | -.02 | | | -.03 | | | .01 | |
| <i>F</i> | | .06 | | | .33 | | | 1.22 | |

Note. N=50, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 5 Trust in Subordinates predicted by Perceived Support

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | |
|-------------------------------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β |
| POS | .30 | .10 | .40** | .34 | .17 | .47 | .19 | .17 | .27 |
| PSS | | | | -.06 | .18 | -.08 | -.08 | .16 | -.11 |
| PSubS | | | | | | | .78 | .26 | .44** |
| R^2 | | .16 | | | .17 | | | .31 | |
| <i>Adjusted R²</i> | | .15 | | | .13 | | | .26 | |
| <i>F</i> | | 8.99** | | | 4.46* | | | 6.58** | |

Note. N=50, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 6 Supervisor Self-Efficacy predicted by Perceived Support

| Variable | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | |
|-------------------------------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β |
| POS | .19 | .11 | .24 | .14 | .20 | .17 | -.10 | .17 | -.12 |
| PSS | | | | .07 | .20 | .08 | .03 | .17 | .04 |
| PSubS | | | | | | | 1.24 | .26 | .65** |
| R^2 | | .06 | | | .06 | | | .37 | |
| <i>Adjusted R²</i> | | .04 | | | .02 | | | .33 | |
| <i>F</i> | | 2.82 | | | 1.44 | | | 8.77** | |

Note. N=50, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Hypotheses 3a through 3e stated that GPS would explain common method bias for perceived support and share positive relationships above and beyond that of a single direction of perceived support. We ran a bifactor model and a correlated factors model in Amos to evaluate the level of common method variance between the perceived support constructs using the Chi-square test of model fit to determine goodness-of-fit. The goodness-of-fit of the bifactor model ($p=.000$, $df=814$, $value=2182.42$) with a general common factor is significantly better than that of the correlated factors model ($p=.000$, $df=857$, $value=2333.53$), although that difference is

fairly small ($df=43$, $value=151.12$). Moreover, the loadings of items on the general factor were not all of the same sign. This indicates that the common factor did not account for a substantial amount of common variance across all of the items.

While POS, PSS, and PSubS are correlated, the correlations among the three factors in the two models – the correlated factors model and the bifactor model – were about the same. Thus, there is little evidence that these correlations are due to a common factor influencing all items. Therefore, measuring the relationships of GPS with positive employee reactions would not demonstrate significant relationships over the significant relationships already identified by POS and PSubS. As a result, we did not test these hypotheses.

Table 7 Correlated Factor Model Correlations

| | Perceive Support | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-------|-----|
| | PSubS | POS | PSS |
| Perceived Subordinate Support | 1 | | |
| Perceived Organizational Support | .49** | 1 | |
| Perceived Supervisor Support | .40* | .91** | 1 |

Note. N=50, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 8 Bifactor Model Correlations

| | Perceive Support | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-------|-----|
| | PSubS | POS | PSS |
| Perceived Subordinate Support | 1 | | |
| Perceived Organizational Support | .56** | 1 | |
| Perceived Supervisor Support | .44* | .92** | 1 |

Note. N=50, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 9 Dependent Correlations

| | Perceive Support | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-------|-----|
| | PSubS | POS | PSS |
| Perceived Subordinate Support | 1 | | |
| Perceived Organizational Support | .52** | 1 | |
| Perceived Supervisor Support | .44* | .82** | 1 |

Note. N=50, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

In summary, the results of the present study indicate high positive correlations between POS and PSS with each having a weaker relationship to PSubS. To test this hypothesis further, we used a test for dependent correlations (Meng, Rosenthal, & Rubin, 1992). The test measured the correlations between each perceived support construct and yielded significant results for each case. However, the correlation between POS and PSS ($r = .82, p = .000$) is much larger than that between either POS and PSubS ($r = .49; p = .000$) or PSS and PSubS ($r = .40; p = .002$). This suggests that PSubS is a unique construct.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

In this study, we validated and expanded on PSubS as described in O'Leary et al. (2012). Results indicated that PSubS is positively correlated with job satisfaction, trust in subordinates, and supervisor self-efficacy. Further, the positive correlations of trust in subordinates and supervisor self-efficacy with PSubS remained significant when controlling for POS and PSS. This demonstrates that there are significant differences in how these perceived support constructs affect positive employee behaviors. Supervisor-self efficacy and trust in subordinates demonstrate a more proximal relationship between the supervisor and subordinate, while job satisfaction and organizational commitment resemble a relationship that is more distal from the employee. These distal responses appear to be influenced by the organization as a whole, rather than the individual relationship of supervisor and subordinate.

In each analysis, either PSubS or POS was a significant predictor of positive employee reactions. PSS was not a significant predictor of any of the study dependent variables when controlling for POS and PSubS. This finding leads to many possible implications. First, PSubS and POS may be better predictors of the observed dependent variables. Second, it is possible that PSubS is simply a more effective proximal predictor of the study dependent variables than PSS. Finally, the results may have been skewed by the biased sample of supervisors. Because our sample was entirely supervisors, the relationship of direct subordinates may hold greater weight to the respondent than the relationship of current supervisors with their own supervisors. That is,

this direction of support is more predictive of our dependent variables for supervisors because they are interacting more with their subordinates than their supervisors. Thus, the perceived support of their subordinates impacts supervisor's supervisor self-efficacy, and the trust they place in their subordinates.

Because the results indicated that POS, PSS, and PSubS are not affected by common method bias and, therefore, there is no influence of a GPS factor, we did not test Hypothesis 3. However, all three perceived support constructs were correlated with one another to some extent. POS and PSS are highly correlated, whereas their correlations with PSubS are much lower. There are a few factors arguing against a general factor underlying PSS. First, the differences in goodness-of-fit, between the correlated factors model without a general factor and the bifactor model with a general factor, while significant, are relatively small. Next, the loadings of items on the general factor were not consistently positive for positively worded items and negative for negatively worded items, as would be expected if it influenced all items in the same way. Lastly, the latent variable correlations were about the same in both the correlated factors model, without a general, and in the bifactor model in which there was a general factor. This suggests that those correlations are not affected by common method bias and provides support for PSubS as a unique construct.

Limitations and Future Research

There are several limitations to this study. The primary limitation is the small, 50 participant sample size. The demographics are heavily weighted toward older white males with several years of supervisory experience. This may ultimately affect the generalizability of the findings. Relatedly, we distributed the survey through snowball sampling of social and

professional networks. Respondents may have shared the survey with other supervisors with whom they have professional similarities and, therefore, may have provided similar responses to the survey.

The small sample size negatively affected our ability to identify significant differences across all of our analyses. This was most obvious with our attempt to identify an underlying GPS. While the results did not provide enough evidence to suggest that GPS is a general factor of perceived support, this finding may have been influenced by the sample size. In implementing statistical analyses in AMOS, Mplus, and SPSS to determine the presence of GPS, we found different item loadings during each implementation. These applications also provided different outcomes depending on the starting value of the analysis. This could be due to small sample size or some missing values. A larger sample may have provided greater support for GPS as an underlying factor of perceived support. Our analyses required a much larger sample size due to the statistical packages used, the utilization of the bifactor structural model, and the multitude of items from POS, PSS, and PSubS. To adequately examine the relationships addressed in the present study, as well as to determine the existence of GPS, we will need to collect additional data.

The small sample size may also have reduced levels of overall significance of the relationships of some of the study variables with PSubS, specifically organizational commitment ($r = .23, ns$) and OCBs ($r = .25, ns$), although the correlations themselves were relatively strong. Further, organizational commitment and job satisfaction are typically found to be highly correlated and consistently related to similar constructs (Brooke, Russell, & Price, 1988), and that relationship held in the present study ($r = .61; p < .01$). Interestingly, we also found that, while both were significantly related to POS and PSS, only job satisfaction was significantly

correlated with PSubS. Existing research also indicates that OCBs are positively related to POS and PSS, but these relationships were not supported in the present study, although there was a stronger, but still non-significant relationship with PSubS. Because OCBs reflect affective relationships in the workplace, it would make sense that these behaviors would be influenced by a proximal relationship such as PSubS. As stated earlier, the respondents were largely supervisors, so the PSubS relationship with direct subordinates may be a better predictor of proximal, affective relationships than PSS. A larger sample may have identified stronger relationships for PSubS and OCBs or organizational commitment.

Future research should place increased emphasis on acquiring a more diverse sample in terms of race and sex. The survey was passed between colleagues of professional networks. Respondents may have sent the surveys to people that are similar to themselves and therefore hold similar preconceived notions or beliefs about perceived support and its place in the work environment. Distributing the survey through several diverse organizations could circumvent this bias in response behavior by increasing diverse perspective and responses.

The web survey provider used in the present study, Qualtrics, provided another limitation. Qualtrics has documented compatibility issues with most versions of Internet Explorer. Its performance can be slowed or even made unresponsive on certain browsers or in companies that have various security software applications installed. As most employers use Internet Explorer rather than other browsers, such as Mozilla Firefox or Google Chrome, the survey responses may have been stifled and some not completed, to the point of omission, because Qualtrics does not allow respondents to easily submit survey responses.

Future research should further investigate the role PSubS plays in the exchange relationship between supervisor and subordinate. Although PSubS does not consider both sides

of dyadic relationships, as does LMX, there may be similar affects and relationships at play. It would be interesting to examine the implications for performance and other important organizational outcomes of a match or mismatch of subordinate PSS with their supervisor's PSubS. Another interesting research direction would be to examine the moderating effect of PSubS on LMX exchange relationships. Research could also evaluate the differential levels of performance associated with LMX and PSubS. Wilson, Sin, and Conlon (2010) describe categories of exchange relationships from affective to transactional. Research should investigate the relationship of performance with various levels of PSubS and categories of LMX.

Research Implications

When there are several factors that are similar in what they measure, such as in perceived support, researchers often assume that there is some level of common method bias acting on them (Biderman, Nguyen, Cunningham, & Ghorbani, 2011; Reise, 2012). That is, the related factors are all measuring different facets of the same overarching construct. However, the results of the present study provide some evidence that common method bias is not an issue with regard to POS, PSS, and PSubS, suggesting that they are, indeed, independent constructs. GPS was estimated as a straw man to see if it was the reason for the relatively high correlations between POS, PSS, and PSubS. The small chi-square difference and the lack of consistent item loadings argue against the existence of a common GPS variable. This finding implies that future research using highly correlated factors should not assume that there is common method bias interacting between them. These are relationships that should be measured for unique and significant variance, as in perceived support. Overall, this study highlights the significance in employing the

bifactor model to measure correlated factors, and dispels a common research assumption that highly correlated factors are essentially measuring the same construct.

Practical Implications

While limited by the sample size, the results of the present study suggest that organizations should consider the impact of PSubS on supervisor behavior. Most managers do not consider how their subordinates affect them. Such a myopic view assumes that the supervisor-subordinate relationship is unidirectional, ultimately ignoring the impact of the dyadic relationship. This study demonstrates that supervisor self-efficacy is largely determined by PSubS. Because self-efficacy is a significant predictor of overall performance, supervisors with higher levels of supervisor self-efficacy are likely to perform better than supervisors with lower supervisor self-efficacy. Placing a value on PSubS and supporting the supervisor-subordinate relationship is likely to influence overall supervisor performance.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This study further validates PSubS as described in O'Leary et al. (2012). PSubS was found to have unique variance over POS and PSS when considering our observed positive employee reactions. Specifically, PSubS is significantly related to trust in subordinates and supervisor self-efficacy. These results provide practical implications to managers with at least one direct report. Increasing levels of PSubS may ultimately lead to higher supervisor performance. Because there was no support for the existence of an overarching generalized perception of support (GPS), these findings also suggest that PSubS, POS, and PSS are unique constructs. However, because of the study limitations, future research should continue to address the possibility of GPS. As is demonstrated in this study, research should not assume that correlated factors demonstrate levels of common method bias. Instead, we suggest implementing the bifactor model as a way to further test these hypotheses.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 2, 267-299.
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 267-286. doi: 10.1002/job.138
- Biderman, M. D., Nguyen, N. T., Cunningham, C. J., & Ghorbani, N. (2011). The ubiquity of common method variance: The case of the Big Five. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 45(5), 417-429.
- Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35(5), 307-311. doi: 10.1037/h0055617
- Brooke, P. P., Russell, D. W., & Price, J. L. (1988). Discriminant validation of measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(2), 139.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. M., & Conway, N. (2005). Exchange Relationships: Examining Psychological Contracts and Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 774-781. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.774
- Crowe, B. J., Bochner, S., & Clark, A. W. (1972). The effects of subordinates' behaviour on managerial style. *Human Relations*, 25(3), 215-237. doi: 10.1177/001872677202500303

- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(3), 500-507. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.71.3.500
- Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 565-573. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.3.565
- Erez, A., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations to goal setting, motivation, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(6), 1270-1279.
- 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*(2), 310-329. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.112.2.310
- Hegarty, W. H. (1974). Using subordinate ratings to elicit behavioral changes in supervisors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59*(6), 764-766. doi: 10.1037/h0037507
- Heslin, P. A., & Latham, G. P. (2004). The effect of upward feedback on managerial behavior. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53*(1), 23-37. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2004.00159.x
- Holzinger, K. J., & Harman, H. H. (1938). Comparison of two factorial analyses. *Psychometrika, 3*(1), 45-60.
- Hopkins, S. M., & Weathington, B. L. (2006). The Relationships Between Justice Perceptions, Trust, and Employee Attitudes in a Downsized Organization. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 140*(5), 477-498. doi: 10.3200/JRLP.140.5.477-498

- Hoppock, R. (1960). A twenty-seven year follow-up on job satisfaction of employed adults. *Personnel & Guidance Journal*, 38, 489-492. doi: 10.1002/j.2164-4918.1960.tb02587.x
- Jex, S., & Britt, T. (2008). Occupational stress and employee health. *Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach*, 199-232.
- Kaufman, J. D., Stamper, C. L., & Tesluk, P. E. (2001). Do supportive organizations make for good corporate citizens? *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13(4), 436-449.
- Klein, H. J., Cooper, J. T., Molloy, J. C., & Swanson, J. A. (2014). The assessment of commitment: Advantages of a unidimensional, target-free approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(2), 222-238. doi: 10.1037/a0034751
- Klein, H. J., Molloy, J. C., & Brinsfield, C. T. (2012). Reconceptualizing Workplace Commitment to Redress a Stretched Construct: Revisiting Assumptions and Removing Confounds. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(1), 130-151. doi: 10.5465/amr.2010.0018
- Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 656-669. doi: 10.2307/256704
- Kottke, J. L., & Sharafinski, C. E. (1988). Measuring perceived supervisory and organizational support. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48(4), 1075-1079. doi: 10.1177/0013164488484024
- Kuvaas, B., & Dysvik, A. (2010). Exploring alternative relationships between perceived investment in employee development, perceived supervisor support and employee outcomes. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 20(2), 138-156. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-8583.2009.00120.x

- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, *20*(3), 709-734. doi: 10.2307/258792
- Meng, X.-l., Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. B. (1992). Comparing correlated correlation coefficients. *Psychological Bulletin*, *111*(1), 172-175. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.111.1.172
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, *1*(1), 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *61*(1), 20-52.
- Mount, M. K. (1984). Psychometric properties of subordinate ratings of managerial performance. *Personnel Psychology*, *37*(4), 687-702. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1984.tb00533.x
- O'Leary, B. J., Clayton, T. J., & Cunningham, C. J. L. (2012). *Defining Perceived Subordinate Support*. Paper presented at the 2012 Annual Meetings of the Society for Industrial Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA. Conference Presentation retrieved from
- Organ, D. W. (1977). A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction-causes-performance hypothesis. *Academy of Management Review*, *2*(1), 46-53.
- Organ, D. W. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior and the good soldier. *Personnel selection and classification*, 53-67.
- Reise, S. P. (2012). The rediscovery of bifactor measurement models. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *47*(5), 667-696. doi: 10.1080/00273171.2012.715555

- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 698-714. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.698
- Seifert, C. F., Yukl, G., & McDonald, R. A. (2003). Effects of multisource feedback and a feedback facilitator on the influence behavior of managers toward subordinates. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(3), 561-569. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.561
- 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*(3), 689-695. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.689
- 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*(5), 774-780. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.78.5.774
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C. (2003). Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*(1), 97-105. doi: 10.2307/30040679
- van Dierendonck, D., Haynes, C., Borrill, C., & Stride, C. (2007). Effects of upward feedback on leadership behaviour toward subordinates. *Journal of Management Development, 26*(3), 228-238. doi: 10.1108/02621710710732137

- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 765-802. doi: 10.2307/256600
- 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(3), 339-348. doi: 10.2307/30040627
- Wilson, K. S., Sin, H.-P., & Conlon, D. E. (2010). What about the leader in leader-member exchange? The impact of resource exchanges and substitutability on the leader. *The Academy of Management Review*, 35(3), 358-372. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2010.51141654

APPENDIX A
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

Institutional Review Board

Dept. 4915

615 McCallie Avenue

Chattanooga, TN 37403-2598

Phone: (423) 425-5867

Fax: (423) 425-4052

instrb@utc.edu

<http://www.utc.edu/irb>

MEMORANDUM

TO: Stephen El Gourie **IRB #14-161**
Dr. Brian O'Leary

FROM: Lindsay Pardue, Director of Research Integrity
Dr. Bart Weathington, IRB Committee Chair

DATE: November 21, 2014

SUBJECT: IRB #14-161: Perceived Subordinate Support: Identifying Positive Employee Behaviors

The IRB Committee Chair has reviewed and approved your application and assigned you the IRB number listed above. You must include the following approval statement on research materials seen by participants and used in research reports:

The Institutional Review Board of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (FWA0004149) has approved this research project #14-161.

Please remember that you must complete a Certification for Changes, Annual Review, or Project Termination/Completion Form when the project is completed or provide an annual report if the project takes over one year to complete. The IRB Committee will make every effort to remind you prior to your anniversary date; however, it is your responsibility to ensure that this additional step is satisfied.

Please remember to contact the IRB Committee immediately and submit a new project proposal for review if significant changes occur in your research design or in any instruments used in conducting the study. You should also contact the IRB Committee immediately if you encounter any adverse effects during your project that pose a risk to your subjects.

For any additional information, please consult our web page <http://www.utc.edu/irb> or email instrb@utc.edu

Best wishes for a successful research project.

APPENDIX B
MEASURES

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 trust my decision-making ability
2. My subordinates believe I treat them fairly
3. My subordinates value me as a leader
4. My subordinates trust me to do the right thing
5. My subordinates care about my opinions
6. My subordinates believe I'm a good manager
7. If I make a mistake, my subordinates will easily forgive me
8. My subordinates enjoy working for me
9. If I make a mistake my subordinates will still value me as a leader
10. My subordinates admire my leadership skills
11. My subordinates want me to succeed

Survey of Perceived Organizational Support:

Listed below are statements that represent possible opinions that YOU may have about working with your organization. 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 organization. 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. The organization values my contribution to its well-being
2. If the organization could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary it would do so (R)
3. The organization fails to appreciate any extra effort from me. (R)
4. The organization strongly considers my goals and values
5. The organization would ignore any complaint from me (R)
6. The organization disregards my best interests when it makes decisions that affect me (R)
7. Help is available from the organization when I have a problem
8. The organization really cares about my well-being
9. Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice (R)
10. The organization is willing to help me when I need a special favor
11. The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work
12. If given the opportunity, the organization would take advantage of me (R)
13. The organization shows very little concern for me (R)
14. The organization cares about me opinions
15. The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work
16. The organization tries to make my job as interesting as possible

Survey of Perceived Supervisor Support

Listed below are statements that represent possible opinions that YOU may have about working with your supervisors. 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 supervisors. 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 supervisor values my contribution to the well-being of our department
2. If my supervisor could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary he/she would do so
3. My supervisor appreciates extra effort from me
4. My supervisor strongly considers my goals and values
5. My supervisor wants to know if I have any complaints
6. My supervisor takes my best interests into account when he/she makes decisions that affect me
7. Help is available from my supervisor when I have a problem
8. My supervisor really cares about my well-being
9. If I did the best job possible, my supervisor would be sure to notice
10. My supervisor is willing to help me when I need a special favor
11. My supervisor cares about my general satisfaction at work
12. If given the opportunity my supervisor would take advantage of me (R)
13. My supervisor shows a lot of concern for me
14. My supervisor cares about my opinions
15. My supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments
16. My supervisor tries to make my job as interesting as possible

Supervisor Self-Efficacy Scale items:

The following 6 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 | 6 | 7 |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neither Disagree or Agree | Slightly Agree | Moderately Agree | Strongly Agree |

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.

KUT Commitment Measure

Listed below are statements that represent possible opinions that YOU may have regarding your commitment to your organization. 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 commitment to your organization. Please choose from the following answers:

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Never | Slightly | Somewhat | Moderately | Mostly | Very | Completely |

1. How committed are you to the organization
2. To what extent do you care about the organization
3. How dedicated are you to the organization
4. To what extent have you chosen to be committed to the organization

Index of Job Satisfaction:

Please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with the statement by filling in the circle on your answer sheet that best represents your point of view about your satisfaction in your job. 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 job is like a hobby to me
2. My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored
3. It seems that my friends are more interested in their jobs (R)
4. I consider my job rather unpleasant (R)
5. I enjoy my work more than my leisure time
6. I am often bored with my job (R)
7. I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job
8. Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work (R)
9. I am satisfied with my job for the time being
10. I feel that my job is no more interesting than others I could get (R)
11. I definitely dislike my work (R)
12. I feel happier in my work than most other people
13. Most days I am enthusiastic about my work
14. Each day of work seems like it will never end (R)
15. I like my job better than the average worker does
16. My job is pretty uninteresting (R)
17. I find real enjoyment in my work
18. I am disappointed that I ever took this job (R)

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist:

Listed below are statements that represent possible opinions that YOU may have regarding your commitment to your organization. Please indicate the frequency you perform each statement by filling in the circle on your answer sheet that best represents your perceived behavior. Please choose from the following answers:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|-------|--------|--------------|-----------|------------|---------|--------|
| Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Sometimes | Frequently | Usually | Always |

1. I pick up a meal for others at work
2. I take time to advise, coach, or mentor a co-worker
3. I help co-worker learn new skills or shared job knowledge
4. I help new employees get oriented to the job
5. I lend a compassionate ear when someone has a work problem
6. I lend a compassionate ear when someone has a personal problem
7. I change vacation schedule, workdays, or shifts to accommodate co-worker's needs
8. I offer suggestions to improve how work is done
9. I offer suggestions for improving the work environment
10. I finish something for co-workers who has to leave early
11. I help a less capable co-worker lift a heavy box or other object
12. I help a co-worker who has too much to do
13. I volunteer for extra work assignments
14. I take phone messages for absent or busy co-worker
15. I say good things about your employer in front of others
16. I give up meal and other breaks to complete work
17. I volunteer to help a co-worker deal with a difficult customer, vendor, or co-worker
18. I go out of the way to give co-worker encouragement or express appreciation
19. I decorate, straighten up, or otherwise beautify common work space
20. I defend co-workers who were being 'put-down' or spoken ill of by other co-workers or supervisor

Trust in Subordinates:

Listed below are statements that represent possible opinions that YOU may have regarding your trust in your subordinates. Please indicate the frequency you perform each statement by filling in the circle on your answer sheet that best represents your perceived behavior. 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. I believe my subordinates have high integrity
2. I can expect my subordinates to treat me in a consistent and predictable fashion
3. My subordinates are not always honest and truthful (R)
4. I believe my subordinates motives and intentions are good
5. I don't think my subordinates treat me fairly (R)
6. My subordinates are open and upfront with me
7. I am not sure I fully trust my subordinates (R)

Demographic Questions:

1. What is your tenure (in years) with your organization? Use decimals for partial years (e.g. 2.5 years)
2. What is your tenure (in years) in your current position in your organization? Use decimals for partial years (e.g. 2.5 years)
3. What is your total length of experience (in years) as a supervisor, including previous organizations? Use decimals for partial years (e.g. 2.5 years)
4. What is your current number of subordinates?
5. What is your age?
6. What is your ethnicity?
7. What is your sex?
8. Please identify your current organization or enter “Other” if you do not wish to respond.

APPENDIX C
TABLES

Item Loadings of Perceived Support

| Items | Correlated Factors Model | | | | Bifactor Model | | | |
|-------|--------------------------|-------------|------------------|----------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|----------|
| | <i>Estimate</i> | <i>S.E.</i> | <i>Est./S.E.</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>Estimate</i> | <i>S.E.</i> | <i>Est./S.E.</i> | <i>p</i> |
| POS1 | 0.71 | 0.08 | 9.38 | 0.000** | 0.416 | 0.178 | 2.331 | 0.020* |
| POS2 | 0.61 | 0.09 | 6.42 | 0.000** | -0.486 | 0.150 | -3.236 | 0.001** |
| POS3 | 0.75 | 0.06 | 11.26 | 0.000** | -0.376 | 0.177 | -2.125 | 0.034* |
| POS4 | 0.76 | 0.06 | 11.95 | 0.000** | 0.328 | 0.177 | 1.849 | 0.064 |
| POS5 | 0.48 | 0.11 | 4.26 | 0.000** | -0.335 | 0.159 | -2.107 | 0.035* |
| POS6 | 0.58 | 0.10 | 5.88 | 0.000** | -0.138 | 0.176 | -0.786 | 0.432 |
| POS7 | 0.45 | 0.12 | 3.80 | 0.000** | -0.314 | 0.175 | -1.795 | 0.073 |
| POS8 | 0.86 | 0.04 | 21.35 | 0.000** | 0.049 | 0.211 | 0.234 | 0.815 |
| POS9 | 0.81 | 0.05 | 15.09 | 0.000** | -0.461 | 0.176 | -2.622 | 0.009** |
| POS10 | 0.30 | 0.14 | 2.22 | 0.026* | -0.163 | 0.167 | -0.976 | 0.329 |
| POS11 | 0.89 | 0.03 | 27.32 | 0.000** | 0.298 | 0.189 | 1.575 | 0.115 |
| POS12 | 0.62 | 0.09 | 6.63 | 0.000** | -0.399 | 0.154 | -2.589 | 0.010** |
| POS13 | 0.84 | 0.05 | 18.09 | 0.000** | -0.376 | 0.178 | -2.115 | 0.034* |
| POS14 | 0.83 | 0.05 | 16.79 | 0.000** | 0.398 | 0.177 | 2.243 | 0.025* |
| POS15 | 0.79 | 0.06 | 13.47 | 0.000** | 0.303 | 0.184 | 1.648 | 0.099 |
| POS16 | 0.65 | 0.09 | 7.40 | 0.000** | 0.217 | 0.177 | 1.220 | 0.222 |
| PSS1 | 0.72 | 0.08 | 9.60 | 0.000** | 0.108 | 0.207 | 0.521 | 0.602 |
| PSS2 | -0.64 | 0.09 | -7.05 | 0.000** | -0.487 | 0.160 | -3.053 | 0.002** |
| PSS3 | 0.85 | 0.04 | 19.60 | 0.000** | 0.066 | 0.217 | 0.304 | 0.761 |
| PSS4 | 0.85 | 0.04 | 19.94 | 0.000** | 0.113 | 0.199 | 0.568 | 0.570 |
| PSS5 | 0.69 | 0.08 | 8.52 | 0.000** | -0.369 | 0.190 | -1.944 | 0.052 |
| PSS6 | 0.84 | 0.05 | 18.92 | 0.000** | 0.270 | 0.184 | 1.463 | 0.144 |
| PSS7 | 0.75 | 0.07 | 11.36 | 0.000** | -0.238 | 0.207 | -1.148 | 0.251 |
| PSS8 | 0.84 | 0.04 | 19.03 | 0.000** | 0.080 | 0.202 | 0.397 | 0.691 |
| PSS9 | 0.90 | 0.03 | 28.73 | 0.000** | 0.330 | 0.198 | 1.667 | 0.096 |
| PSS10 | 0.74 | 0.07 | 10.84 | 0.000** | -0.153 | 0.201 | -0.763 | 0.445 |
| PSS11 | 0.89 | 0.03 | 27.33 | 0.000** | 0.096 | 0.202 | 0.475 | 0.634 |
| PSS12 | 0.64 | 0.09 | 7.03 | 0.000** | -0.399 | 0.162 | -2.467 | 0.014* |
| PSS13 | 0.87 | 0.04 | 22.30 | 0.000** | 0.260 | 0.192 | 1.354 | 0.176 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------|------|-------|---------|--------|-------|--------|---------|
| PSS14 | 0.92 | 0.03 | 36.37 | 0.000** | 0.370 | 0.193 | 1.922 | 0.055 |
| PSS15 | 0.82 | 0.05 | 16.51 | 0.000** | 0.378 | 0.178 | 2.121 | 0.034* |
| PSS16 | 0.79 | 0.06 | 13.85 | 0.000** | 0.112 | 0.193 | 0.582 | 0.561 |
| PSubS1 | 0.64 | 0.09 | 6.94 | 0.000** | -0.161 | 0.184 | -0.870 | 0.384 |
| PSubS2 | 0.56 | 0.11 | 5.23 | 0.000** | -0.107 | 0.182 | -0.590 | 0.555 |
| PSubS3 | 0.80 | 0.06 | 12.57 | 0.000** | -0.083 | 0.183 | -0.455 | 0.649 |
| PSubS4 | 0.73 | 0.08 | 9.37 | 0.000** | -0.147 | 0.173 | -0.849 | 0.396 |
| PSubS5 | 0.79 | 0.07 | 12.11 | 0.000** | 0.040 | 0.191 | 0.209 | 0.835 |
| PSubS6 | 0.70 | 0.09 | 8.19 | 0.000** | -0.213 | 0.175 | -1.213 | 0.225 |
| PSubS7 | 0.46 | 0.12 | 3.81 | 0.000** | -0.054 | 0.160 | -0.339 | 0.734 |
| PSubS8 | 0.46 | 0.12 | 3.81 | 0.000** | 0.232 | 0.159 | 1.458 | 0.145 |
| PSubS9 | 0.47 | 0.12 | 3.82 | 0.000** | 0.038 | 0.166 | 0.228 | 0.819 |
| PSubS10 | 0.29 | 0.14 | 2.04 | 0.041* | 0.306 | 0.148 | 2.065 | 0.039 |
| PSubS11 | 0.31 | 0.14 | 2.24 | 0.025* | 0.626 | 0.109 | 5.770 | 0.000** |

Note. N=50, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

VITA

Stephen Elkourie was born in Atlanta, GA and raised by his parents Michael Elkourie and Susan Vaughn. He is the eldest of two sons. He graduated from Georgia College with a Bachelors of Science degree in Psychology. After working in counseling and clinical psychology, he decided to pursue a graduate degree. Stephen will receive his Master of Science degree in Industrial-Organizational Psychology from the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga in May of 2015.