

WHAT'S WRONG WITH A RUMOR? WORKPLACE UNDERMINING AND CUSTOMER-
ORIENTED OUTCOMES

By

Ellen McAdams

December, 2023

Director of Thesis: Mark C. Bowler, PhD

Major Department: Psychology

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the customer-oriented outcomes of supervisor and co-worker undermining, specifically, examining the differential impact of supervisor and co-worker undermining on customer- and service-oriented organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and customer-directed counterproductive workplace behavior (CWB). Positive and negative affectivity were assessed, the latter being a commonly utilized control variable within social undermining literature, to identify their moderating impact. Results indicate that supervisor and coworker undermining do not share a significant relationship with customer and service-oriented OCB, and were not adequate in predicting their presence alone. After adding positive and negative affect, the relationship was significant, with positive affect predicting both engagement in service-oriented OCB, as well as customer-oriented OCB. Supervisor and coworker undermining, were, however, significant and positive indicators of engagement in customer-directed CWB, with negative affect also emerging as a strong predictor. Results suggest that, although customer- and service-oriented OCB were not associated to supervisor or

coworker undermining, customer-directed CWB was significantly associated and should be investigated further to unravel the temporal relationship between undermining and engagement in customer-directed CWB, and also to isolate the presence of negative affect in this relationship.

Keywords: Social undermining, stress, affectivity, service outcomes

What's wrong with a rumor?
Workplace Undermining and Customer-Oriented Outcomes

A Thesis
Presented to the Faculty of the Department of Psychology
East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Industrial-Organizational Psychology

By
Ellen McAdams
December, 2023

Director of Thesis: Mark C. Bowler, PhD
Thesis Committee Members:
Jennifer L. Bowler, PhD
Karl L. Wuensch, PhD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	i
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Social Undermining	3
Workplace Stress	5
Service-oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior	7
Customer-oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior	9
Customer-directed Counterproductive Work Behavior	11
Positive and Negative Affectivity	13
CHAPTER TWO: METHODS	16
Procedure	16
Participants	16
Measures	17
Coworker Undermining	17
Supervisor Undermining	18
Workplace Stress	18
Positive and Negative Affectivity	18
Service-oriented OCB	19
Customer-oriented OCB	19
Customer-directed CWB	20
Control Variables	20
CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS	22
Zero Order Correlations	22

Regression Analyses	22
Predicting SO-OCB	22
Predicting CO-OCB	26
Predicting CD-CWB	28
CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION	31
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION.....	33
REFERENCES	34

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Considered a subtle form of interpersonal workplace aggression, workplace social undermining exerts a noxious influence in most organizations (Greenbaum et al., 2012). Social undermining includes behaviors such as withholding important information, gossiping, and belittling others (Duffy et al., 2002). A considerable body of research has illustrated the relationship between workplace social undermining and a host of negative employee and organizational outcomes. For example, after experiences of undermining, employees are more likely to report reduced feelings of self-efficacy and demonstrate lower levels of job performance (Duffy et al., 2002; Duffy et al., 2006a; Rasool et al., 2020). Additionally, a toxic workplace environment has been found to reduce workplace productivity (Rasool et al., 2019) and engagement (Mostafa et al., 2020). Past research has demonstrated that these experiences will likely damage employee job attitude and well-being (Callier, 2021; Duffy et al., 2006a). Similarly, undermined employees are more likely to engage in counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs; Greenbaum et al., 2012) and to harbor intentions to leave the organization (Callier, 2021; Duffy et al., 2006a). Taken together, the financial impact of these behaviors have been estimated to range from \$6 billion (Duffy et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2016) to \$200 billion annually (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Moreover, due to the high likelihood that a victim of undermining will become a perpetrator of undermining (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Aquino & Thau, 2009; Eissa et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2016), these aggressive and dysfunctional behaviors have a way of spreading throughout the organization (Duffy et al., 2006a; Duffy et al., 2006b).

Despite the implications these findings may hold for service sector organizations, with few exceptions (e.g., Lyu et al., 2016; Moon & Hur, 2018; Ye et al., 2019), little research has

examined the influence these undermining behaviors may have on customer-contact employee outcomes. As customer-facing (i.e., service) employees effectively represent the organization to the public (Zeithaml & Bitner, 1996), and have a direct impact on customer satisfaction and loyalty, their impact to an organization's bottom line is sizeable (Bienstock et al., 2003; Dimitriades, 2007; Morrison, 1996). Further, researchers have found the quality of customer-contact employees' relationships with supervisors and coworkers as critical determinants of subsequent customer-employee interactions (Farrell & Oczkowski, 2012; Tangirala et al., 2007). As the service sector employs up to 125 million workers in the United States alone (Webber, 2011), catering to millions of customers worldwide (Lyu, et al., 2016), an examination of the ways in which an employee's work environment influences their extra-role service performance is warranted.

The present research aims to expand the knowledge base relating to the consequences of workplace social undermining by incorporating customer-contact employees' service outcomes. Utilizing conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989; 2001), the present research aims to identify the relative impact of supervisor and coworker undermining on employees' service-oriented organization citizenship behavior (OCB), customer-oriented OCB, and customer-directed CWB. These performance dimensions specifically evaluate extra-role, as opposed to in-role, behaviors, and thus are critical to service sector organizations. Trait positive and negative affectivity has consistently been reported to exert a powerful influence on individual responses to workplace stress (e.g., Aquino & Douglas, 2003; Greenberg & Barling, 1999;). Consistent with current social undermining literature (e.g., Duffy et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2016), both positive and negative affectivity will be assessed, both to determine their respective impact, as well as to be held as controls for comparative analyses.

Social Undermining

The development of social undermining as a construct was heavily influenced by Rook's (1984) research relating to the salience of negative social interactions. Credited as being among the first of contemporary theorists to call out for research investigating "the troublesome aspects of relating to others," Rook's work was critical to the incipient field (1984, p. 1097). Prior to this work, social support researchers were largely focused on the buffering role that support plays in protecting individuals from adverse outcomes, whereas its opposite, the role of negative social interactions, was largely ignored (Rook, 1984; Vinokur & van Ryn, 1993). In an effort to balance the literature, Vinokur and van Ryn developed the construct of social undermining, defined in social psychological literature as behaviors directed at a target that exhibit negative affect and evaluation, and that attempt to hinder a target's attainment of "instrumental goals" (1993, p. 350). Research concerning social undermining remained largely outside of organizational literature until Duffy et al. (2002), in their seminal article, placed it firmly and irrevocably into the work domain.

Conceptually defined within workplace literature as behaviors intended to gradually erode an individual's ability to maintain positive reputation, success at work, and interpersonal relationships, the nature of workplace social undermining (hereafter social undermining) is subtle and insidious (Duffy et al., 2002). Heavily influenced by the broader employee deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995) and antisocial (O'Leary-Kelly et al., 2000) literatures, there are two core requirements for behavior to be considered undermining. First, social undermining involves the assumption of intent; behavior is not considered to be undermining "if it is not perceived as intentionally designed to hinder the target" (Duffy et al., 2002, p. 332). Second, the additive nature of social undermining enables such behaviors to gradually deteriorate a target's social

standing and positive affect (Duffy et al., 2002). This incremental component is critical in the conceptual distinction of social undermining; when undermining behaviors are committed once or twice, they will not result in the deterioration of interpersonal relationships, favorable reputation, or work-related success (Duffy et al., 2002). However, gradually, these undermining behaviors can have sizeable negative effects (Duffy et al., 2002; Duffy et al., 2006a).

Manifesting in a variety of ways, undermining behaviors can be active and direct (e.g., belittling or rejecting someone) or passive and indirect (e.g., withholding important information, failing to defend the target; Duffy et al., 2002). These behaviors may also be verbal (e.g., giving someone the “silent treatment”) or physical (e.g., intentionally slowing work progress or failing to produce promised work materials; Duffy et al., 2002). Associated with a range of negative outcomes, undermining in the workplace has a high likelihood of damaging an employee’s well-being, job-related attitudes, and sense of self-efficacy (Duffy et al., 2006b; Tepper, 2000). Victims of social undermining are more likely to report greater levels of depression (Duffy et al., 2002) and psychosomatic symptoms, in addition to diminished levels of self-esteem (Crossley, 2009). Employees who are undermined are expected to reduce engagement in positive organizational behaviors (e.g., OCB; Lyu et al., 2016; Zellars et al., 2002) and increase their engagement in negative behaviors, resulting in greater intentions to leave the organization (Callier, 2021; Keashly et al., 1994), participate in CWB (Duffy et al., 2002), and reciprocate undermining (Crossley, 2009; Duffy et al., 2012; Eissa et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2016).

As supervisors and coworkers are incredibly salient features in an organization, serving as critical sources of role information (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; Morrison, 2002; Scott et al., 2015), mistreatment from either source constitutes a stressful experience to the victim. Studies have consistently shown that antisocial or aggressive work groups foster and encourage similar

behaviors in individual members (Duffy et al., 2006b; Glomb & Liao, 2003; Greenberg & Barling, 1999; Robinson & O’Leary-Kelly, 1998), however, less research exists examining ways that these negative behaviors might “spill over” to organizational outsiders (i.e., customers), impacting customer service performance (Hunter & Penney, 2014, p. 277). It seems that displaced, or vented, aggression is a common phenomenon within organizational research (e.g., Bies et al., 1997), particularly towards an available and convenient target (e.g., customers; Aquino & Douglas, 2003). In the following sections, drawing on conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989; 2001), we will discuss the influence of workplace stress in experiences of workplace social undermining, before turning to trait positive and negative affectivity in the perception of stressful workplace experiences as well as the extra-role service performance outcomes of service- and customer-oriented OCB and customer-directed CWB.

Workplace Stress

Largely due to its ubiquitous presence and significant association with damaging individual and organizational outcomes (Ganster & Rosen, 2013), research relating to workplace stress (Lazarus, 1966, Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) has been expansive. Although workplace stress has been conceptualized in a variety of ways, resulting in a multitude of definitions, it is generally accepted to be the physical and psychological state which results when individual resources are insufficient in meeting situational pressures or demands (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Michie, 2002). Researchers have repeatedly illustrated the significant and negative relationship between sustained workplace stress and employee well-being (Goetzel et al., 1998; Wang et al., 2020) and performance (Altindag, 2020; Ganster & Rosen, 2013; Sonnentag & Frese, 2003). Further, these negative outcomes impact the organization in a variety of damaging ways, with workplace stressors consistently associated with increased turnover intentions

(Cummins, 1990; Fairbrother & Warn, 2002) and absenteeism, as well as reduced efficiency and productivity (Altindag, 2020; Ganster, 2005; Ganster & Rosen, 2013; Greenberg, 2010; Zellars et al., 2009).

Whereas workplace stressors are generally regarded as demands emerging from the immediate environment, strain is observed as the individual behavioral and psychological response to those demands (Jones & Bright, 2001; Kinman & Jones, 2005). Among other predictors of workplace stress, the quality and availability of social support (Sparks & Cooper, 1999), employee work environment (Michie, 2002; Nelson & Burke, 2000; Wang et al., 2020), and leadership behaviors (Carlopio et al., 1997) have all been shown to be significantly associated with employee stress. Researchers (e.g., Fletcher et al., 2008; Michie, 2002) have demonstrated that uncertainty plays a critical role in experiences of stress, with the situations most associated with increased stress being those that are unpredictable, unfamiliar, ambiguous, or that involve conflict (Michie, 2002). Frequently utilized within stress research (Ganster & Rosen, 2013), conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989; 2001) considers the stress process via a “resource-oriented” lens (Mackey et al., 2017, p. 457). Buttressed by the transactional model of stress put forth by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), conservation of resources theory attempts to explain why individuals are so highly motivated to acquire and maintain resources (Mackey et al., 2017). Social undermining appears to be simultaneously a workplace stressor (i.e., the negative experience of undermining) as well as a resource-depleting experience (i.e., loss of social support and approval), which suggests that undermining in the workplace will likely result in increased levels of stress by the target. Thus,

Hypothesis 1: Coworker and supervisor undermining will be positively associated with workplace stress.

Service-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Upon introduction into organizational literature, OCB (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983) was readily incorporated into varying frameworks and conceptualizations. Indeed, some researchers have suggested (e.g., Dalal, 2005; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000) that employee job performance is contingent upon not only task performance (i.e., those duties that “contribute to the organization’s technical core”; Borman & Motowidlo, 1997, p. 99), but also engagement in OCB (i.e., discretionary behaviors that bolster the organization), and CWB (i.e., discretionary behaviors that harm the organization). Defined by Organ as “discretionary behaviors that are not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that, in the aggregate, promote the effective functioning of the organization” (1988, p. 4), OCB has consistently been shown to improve an organization’s business performance (Podsakoff et al., 1997) and effectiveness (MacKenzie et al., 1991; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). Further, this impact is of considerable importance to service sector organizations, with research suggesting that OCB exhibited by customer-contact employees as having a positive impact on customer perceptions of service quality (Bell & Menguc, 2002; Bettencourt & Brown, 1997; Farrell & Oczkowski, 2012; Hee Yoon & Suh, 2003).

As Hartline et al. pointed out, “in many cases, customer contact employees are the first and only representation of a service firm” (2000, p. 35), this suggests that organizations should be acutely interested in encouraging these positive discretionary behaviors in their customer-facing employees. In response to research calling out for more job-focused and task-relevant measures of OCB (e.g., Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Podsakoff, et al., 1997), Bettencourt et al. (2001) developed a service-oriented measure, intended to more explicitly capture and account for the boundary spanning role that customer-contact employees maintain within an organization

(Bettencourt et al., 2001). Heavily influenced by the foundational OCB literature (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, et al., 1983), in addition to the citizenship dimensions put forth by Van Dyne et al. (1994), the measure intended to capture customer-contact employees' extra-role loyalty, participation (i.e., civic virtue; Moorman, 1991), and conscientiousness behaviors (Bettencourt et al., 2001). Loyalty behaviors, also referred to as loyal boosterism (Moorman et al., 1988) and allegiance (Borman & Motowildo, 1993), are those behaviors intended to promote the interests of the organization to outsiders (i.e., acting as an advocate for the organization), this includes promoting the organization's products and services, but also its image (Bettencourt et al., 2001). The second dimension, participation, is intended to capture individual initiative behaviors designed to improve the organization and service delivery, such as making creative suggestions to solve a customer's problem (Bettencourt et al., 2001). Finally, service delivery, which subsumes conscientiousness (e.g., Moorman, 1991; Organ & Konovsky, 1989), refers to behaviors that display courteous, responsive, and reliable delivery of customer service (e.g., maintaining a positive attitude, performing duties with minimal mistakes; Bettencourt et al., 2001).

Together, these dimensions represent highly valued extra-role behaviors that, cumulatively, benefit service organizations (Bettencourt et al., 2001). Research investigating the antecedents of OCB suggest that employee satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Netemeyer et al., 1997), perceptions of fairness (Farh et al., 1990, Konovsky & Pugh, 1994), trust in management (i.e., leadership supportiveness; Hee Yoon & Suh, 2003; Dimitriades, 2007), and work-life balance (Fiernaningsih et al., 2020) are among the most consistent predictors. Further, Tangirala et al. (2007) found that high-quality relationships between employees and their direct supervisors strongly influenced subsequent relationships and interactions with customers. In

addition to identifying antecedents, researchers have invested great effort in examining the influence of workplace stressors on subsequent OCB engagement. For example, Zellars et al. (2002) illustrated that abusive supervision (with a content domain similar to that of social undermining) was significantly, and negatively, associated with employee engagement in OCB.

. The conservation of resources theory suggests that individuals are highly motivated to attain and maintain important resources, such as “objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies” (Hobfoll, 1989, p. 519; 2001). Central to this theory is the idea that when faced with resource loss, an individual is highly motivated to preserve remaining resources (Hobfoll, 1989). As social undermining is a negative workplace behavior intended to gradually erode an employee’s ability to maintain positive relationships, reputation, and success (Duffy et al., 2002), it can reasonably be considered a stressor, and assumed to deplete an employee’s resources. In line with conservation of resources theory, it is likely that after experiences of undermining, and the resulting loss of resources (e.g., status or position), an employee will be motivated to retain remaining resources. One avenue for employees to maintain those resources is to disengage in behaviors that are discretionary (i.e., OCB), and thus, not part of the employee’s official job description. As such, this study predicts that supervisor and coworker undermining will be negatively related to service-oriented OCB.

Hypothesis 2: Coworker and supervisor undermining will be negatively associated with service-oriented OCBs.

Customer-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Pulling heavily from customer orientation theory within services management literature, Dimitriades (2007) suggested that the essential indicators of customer-oriented service quality (i.e., level of customer satisfaction resulting from employee-customer interaction; Saxe & Weitz,

1982) included three of the five originally suggested by Organ (1988), namely, conscientiousness, altruism, and civic virtue behaviors. Consistent with Bettencourt and colleagues' (2001) previously discussed measure, Dimitriades (2007) incorporated both conscientiousness (i.e., service delivery) and civic virtue (i.e., participation; Bettencourt et al., 2001) into the measure as both have consistently been shown to exert a significant impact on service delivery (Dimitriades, 2007; Morrison, 1996). Whereas Bettencourt et al. (2001) adopted loyalty behaviors as the third critical dimension of service-oriented behavior, Dimitriades (2007) viewed altruism as aligning more closely with prior customer orientation research, specifically, Morrison's (1996) work on enhancing service quality for customer-facing employees. Designed to capture "a constellation of non-mandated and individual-initiated behaviors" that are intended to increase customer satisfaction, the measure was quickly incorporated into a variety of research efforts (Lyu et al., 2016, p. 71).

Of specific interest to this study is the recent research which established the relationship between negative workplace gossip (a specific form of social undermining) and diminished customer-oriented OCB and service performance (Ye, et al., 2019). Further, in an examination of abusive supervision (with a content domain similar to that of social undermining; Lyu et al., 2016), researchers found that abusive supervision was strongly and negatively related to subsequent customer-oriented OCB engagement. Viewing social undermining as a resource-depleting experience, as discussed above and in line with conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989), it seems that one way for individuals to preserve remaining resources is to exercise discretion in one's behavior, specifically by disengaging in those non-mandated, but organizationally advantageous, behaviors (i.e., customer-oriented OCB). Thus, this study

predicts that coworker and supervisor undermining will be negatively related to customer-oriented OCB.

Hypothesis 3: Coworker and supervisor undermining will be negatively associated with customer-oriented OCBs.

Customer-Directed Counterproductive Work Behavior

Within organizational literature, CWB is conceptualized not only as a critical component of job performance, as previously mentioned, but also as an expression of behavioral strain (i.e., negative behavioral response to perceived workplace stress; Jex & Beehr, 1991; Penney et al., 2011; Spector, 1998) Generally defined as employee behaviors that are intended to harm an organization or its interests (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Spector & Fox, 2005), examples include withholding effort, wasting time, and rudeness (Penney et al., 2011). Organizational CWB (i.e., negative acts that harm the organization) and interpersonal CWB (i.e., negative acts that harm an organization's members) are the most commonly employed terms used to describe engagement in negative workplace behaviors (Fox et al., 2001). However, Hunter and Penney (2014) suggest that for service organizations, customers represent a viable target for customer-contact employee CWB. Considering the most frequent customer complaints within service organizations relate to employee rudeness and unresponsiveness (Hunter & Penney, 2014), a better understanding of the antecedents of such behavior is critical for service organizations.

The costly nature of employee engagement in CWB has been well established, with financial loss to organizations and diminished employee productivity consistently cited outcomes (Vardi & Weitz, 2004; Hunter & Penney, 2014). These outcomes are typically worsened when the customer represents the negative behavioral outlet, as they have a direct influence on an organization's bottom line (Hunter & Penney, 2014). Hunter and Penney's conceptualization of

customer-directed CWB, derived from the CWB Checklist created by Spector et al. (2006), includes insulting, ignoring, or threatening customers, along with raising one's voice to a customer or refusing a reasonable customer request. Although research regarding customer-directed CWB is still in its infancy, recent work has considered the influence of trait aggression (Bowler et al., 2019) and coworker incivility (Moon & Hur, 2018) in predicting employee's customer-directed CWB. Although the potential influence that workplace undermining may have in encouraging customer-directed CWB has not been considered in the literature to date, a recent review by Ma, Zhou, & Mu (2021) found a positive relationship between abusive supervision and subsequent customer-oriented service sabotage, conceptualized as any negative workplace behavior intentionally enacted to adversely impact a customer's service experience.

Conservation of resources theory states that psychological strain results from an insufficient level of resources (Hobfoll, 1989), whereas behavioral strain (e.g., customer-directed CWB) may represent "deliberate resource investment strategies" designed to mitigate perceived workplace stressors (Fox & Spector, 2006; Krischer et al., 2010; Penney et al., 2011, p. 60; Penney & Spector, 2007). Indeed, conservation of resources theory supports the notion that when experiencing workplace stressors (e.g., workplace social undermining), individuals are not only motivated to preserve existing resources, but also to obtain new resources (Hobfoll, 1989). Krischer and colleagues (2010) illustrated that employees' engagement in CWB mollified the psychological strain engendered by resource loss. Thus, and in line with conservation of resources theory, after perceptions of resource loss (e.g., social undermining) employees may be "instrumentally motivated" to engage in customer-directed CWB in an effort to reduce overall psychological strain (Penney et al., 2011, p. 61). Further, as employees will not be punished or rewarded for engaging or not engaging in discretionary behaviors, these behaviors constitute a

safe and effective way for the victim to respond to social undermining. Moreover, employees will often hold the organization partially responsible for negative workplace experiences, and so withholding positive discretionary behavior (e.g., customer and service-oriented OCB) and increasing those behaviors that are discretionary, but harmful to the organization (e.g., customer-directed CWB), should serve as effective means to preserve and retain resources. Based on this reasoning, the study predicts that coworker and supervisor undermining will be positively related to customer-directed CWB.

Hypothesis 4: Coworker and supervisor undermining will be positively associated with customer-directed CWBs.

Positive and Negative Affectivity

Long considered the “dominant dimensions” within research relating to affective structures, positive and negative affectivity are conceptualized simply as the way an individual generally “feels” (e.g., happy, nervous, excited; Watson et al., 1988, p. 1063). Whereas “state” affect refers to transient moods and emotions, “trait” affect (the focus of the present research) refers to those “stable and enduring” individual differences that persist through time (Kaplan et al., 2009, p. 5). Considerable research has emerged regarding the underlying dimensionality of affectivity, with some studies viewing positive and negative affect as representing one “bipolar continuum,” whereas others contend that it exists along two discrete dimensions (Burke et al., 1993; Kaplan et al., 2009, p. 5; Watson, et al., 1988). Within Watson and colleagues’ (1988) formulation, negative affect (i.e., negative activation) and positive affect (i.e., positive activation) represent discrete, and relatively independent domains of experience (Kaplan et al., 2009; Watson et al., 1988). Higher levels of positive affect are representative of increased “positive feeling states” such as alertness, enthusiasm, and positive engagement (Kaplan et al., 2009, p. 5;

Watson et al., 1988). Conversely, higher levels of negative affect are indicative of negative feelings such as contempt, nervousness, anxiety, and fear (Watson et al., 1988).

Past research has illustrated the strong relationship between negative affect and both undermining engagement (Hershcovis et al., 2007) and undermining victimization (Aquino & Thau, 2009). Interestingly, Spector and Fox (2002) proposed that positive and negative affect are linked to “action tendencies” (p. 5) that inherently influence an individual’s behavioral responses and intentions. Further, Spector and Fox (2002) suggested that these responses can be constructive (e.g., OCB) or destructive (e.g., CWB), with positive affect being suggested as the “proximal cause” of OCB, and negative affect the driving force behind CWB (Dalal, 2005). Although ambiguous, some studies suggest that engagement in OCB is “designed to maintain positive affect” (e.g., Carlson et al., 1988; George & Brief, 1992), whereas engagement in CWB is “designed to ameliorate negative affect” (Dalal, 2005, p. 1243; Spector & Fox, 2002). Based on this reasoning, the present study predicts that positive affect will be significantly associated with customer and service-oriented OCB, whereas negative affect will be significantly associated with customer-directed CWB.

Hypothesis 5: Positive affectivity will moderate the relationship between coworker and supervisor undermining and service-oriented OCB such that when levels of positive affectivity are high, OCBs will increase more rapidly with increases in undermining.

Hypothesis 6: Positive affectivity will moderate the relationship between coworker and supervisor undermining and customer-oriented OCB such that when levels of positive affectivity are high, OCBs will increase more rapidly with increases in undermining.

Hypothesis 7: Negative affectivity will moderate the relationship between coworker and supervisor undermining and customer-directed CWB such that when levels of negative affectivity are high, CWBs will increase more rapidly with increases in undermining.

CHAPTER TWO: METHODS

Procedure

Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), an online survey pool, was utilized to recruit participants for this study, with all participants required to identify as customer-facing (i.e., interacts regularly with customers) and working at least half-time (i.e., at least 20 hour per week). Participants were provided a brief description of the study purpose, along with an option to electronically consent to participate. Participants were informed of their anonymity, including an assurance that their MTurk worker ID would not be associated with any data collected. Along with demographic information, responses were collected relating to perceptions of undermining, current experiences of workplace stress, affectivity, and extra-role workplace behaviors. Five validity checks were dispersed throughout the survey to ensure data integrity (e.g., “Please answer ‘Strongly Disagree’ to this item”). For inclusion in the study, and monetary compensation, participants were required to successfully answer four of the five validity check items. Upon completion, individuals were debriefed and compensated accordingly.

Participants

A total of 336 responses were received between January 11 and February 8, 2022. Eight participants failed to successfully complete the four required validity check questions, and, thus, were removed from analysis. Twenty-nine respondents completed less than 100% of data entry, and were subsequently removed from data analyses, with an additional three respondents removed due to working less than half-time, leaving a total sample of 296. Weekly hours, (“Years employed at current location”), contained three responses excluded from analyses due to out-of-range reporting (e.g., working 500 hours per week), and ambiguous phrasing within the question related to tenure, (i.e., “Length of employment with current company in years”),

resulted in thirty-four responses providing a physical work location, thus, were removed from analyses. No other missing data were found within the final 296 survey submissions.

Of the 296 survey respondents, 64% identified as male with 36% identifying as a gender minority. Twenty-one percent of respondents identified as Hispanic or Latino/a, 14% identified as being non-white, and 86% identified as being White or Caucasian. Study respondents mean age was reported as being 36.43 years ($SD = 9.44$), with a majority of respondents working roughly forty hours per week ($M = 40.01$, $SD = 5.58$) and employed in their current position for 7.71 years ($SD = 6.26$). In reporting descriptive statistics and correlations, race was coded with zero being white and one being non-white. Gender was coded with zero being male and one being any other gender, or gender minority. Ethnicity was coded as zero being not of Hispanic or Latino/a heritage and one being of Hispanic or Latino/a heritage. Means and standard deviations for all study variables are included in Table 1, with an alpha level of .05 used for all analyses.

Measures

Coworker Undermining

The 13-item coworker undermining scale (CUS) created by Duffy et al. (2002) was utilized to assess perceptions of coworker undermining. Participants were prompted to indicate the frequency with which the coworker closest to them has intentionally performed varying undermining behaviors (e.g. “Insulted you”; “Spread rumors about you”). Participant response options ranged from 1 (*never*) to 6 (*everyday*), with higher scores indicating higher levels of perceived coworker undermining. The reliability of the coworker undermining scale indicated acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.97$), with no reverse-scored items. Mean and standard deviation of the scale are included in Table 1.

Supervisor Undermining

Perceptions of supervisor undermining were evaluated using the supervisor undermining scale (SUS) created by Duffy et al. (2002). The 13-item measure informs participants to indicate how often their supervisor has intentionally engaged in a variety of undermining behaviors. Example items included “Belittled you or your ideas” and “Made you feel incompetent.” Response options ranged from 1 (*never*) to 6 (*everyday*), with higher scores representing higher levels of perceived supervisor undermining. The reliability of the supervisor undermining scale indicated acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.97$), with no reverse-scored items. Mean and standard deviation of the scale are included in Table 1.

Workplace Stress

The Workplace Stress Scale (WSS; Marlin Company & American Institute of Stress, 2009) was used to evaluate current experiences of workplace stress. Response options for the 8-item scale ranged from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*). Participants were asked to express how often various statements (e.g., “I feel that my job is negatively affecting my physical or emotional wellbeing”) reflected experiences in their current position, with higher scores on the measure indicating higher levels of workplace stress. The reliability of the Workplace Stress Scale indicated acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.76$), with three reverse-scored items included within the scale (e.g., I have adequate control or input over my work duties). Mean and standard deviation of the scale are included in Table 1.

Positive and Negative Affectivity

Thompson’s (2007) International Positive and Negative Affect Schedule-Short Form (I-PANAS-SF) was utilized to assess positive and negative affectivity. Response options for this 10-item measure ranged from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*), with participants being asked to indicate

the degree with which they normally feel a variety of positive (e.g., “Inspired”; “Attentive”) and negative (e.g., “Upset”; “Hostile”) emotions, with higher scores indicating higher levels of the corresponding affectivity. The reliability of the I-PANAS-SF scale indicated acceptable internal consistency for both the positive affect subscale ($\alpha = 0.68$) as well as the negative affect subscale ($\alpha = 0.89$), with no reverse-scored items. Mean and standard deviation of the scale are included in Table 1.

Service-Oriented OCB

The 16-item service-oriented OCB (SO-OCB) measure, created by Bettencourt et al. (2001), was used to assess employee participation in OCB. Participants were instructed to indicate how often they engage in a variety of behaviors, with response options for the measure ranging from 1 (*never*) to 6 (*everyday*). The behaviors represented three broad extra-role performance domains, namely, loyalty (e.g., “Says good things about the organization to others”), service delivery (e.g., “Always has a positive attitude at work”), and participation (e.g., “Frequently presents to others creative solutions to customer problems”). Higher scores are representative of higher levels of service-oriented OCB. These three domains were measured as subscales, with reliability of each indicating acceptable reliability (loyalty $\alpha = 0.91$, service delivery $\alpha = 0.82$, and participation $\alpha = 0.90$), with the whole scale also indicating acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.90$). There were no reverse-scored items. For the purposes of the study, the whole scale score was used, with mean and standard deviation of the scale included in Table 1.

Customer-Oriented OCB

Dimitriades’ (2007) 7-item customer-oriented OCB (CO-OCB) measure was used to assess employee participation in OCB, and jointly reflected three extra-role performance

domains (i.e., conscientiousness, altruism, and civic virtue). Response options for the measure ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), and included items such as “To serve customers, I volunteer for things that are not required” and “I make innovative suggestions to improve customer service.” Participants were asked to indicate the degree with which they agree with the statements, with higher scores associated with higher levels of customer-oriented OCB. The scale did not measure the three domains separately, instead using seven items that jointly reflected all three domains. The reliability of the customer-oriented OCB scale indicated acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.85$), with no reverse-scored items. Mean and standard deviation of the scale are included in Table 1.

Customer-Directed CWB

Hunter and Penney’s (2014) 13-item customer-directed CWB (CD-CWB) subscale was used to measure employee customer-directed CWB. Participants were asked to express how often they have intentionally performed a variety of customer-directed actions (e.g., “Lied to a customer” & “Ignored a customer”), with response options ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*everyday*). Higher scores on the measure indicate higher levels of customer directed CWB. The reliability of the customer-oriented OCB scale indicated acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.97$), with no reverse-scored items. Mean and standard deviation of the scale are included in Table 1.

Control variables

Consistent with prior social undermining research (e.g., Duffy et al., 2002), age, gender, race, ethnicity, tenure, and weekly hours were controlled. Prior research (e.g., Duffey et al., 2002; Duffy et al., 2006a) has suggested that the above variables may relate to perceptions and

experiences of workplace social interactions and, thus, may influence employee-related attitudes and outcomes (Lake & Cassady, 1990). Means and standard deviations are included in Table 1.

CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS

Zero-Order Correlations

Hypotheses one through four addressed the association between the customer-directed extra-role service outcome variables and supervisor and coworker undermining. Hypothesis one was supported, with a significant and positive association found between experiences of workplace stress and both coworker, $r(259) = .55, p < .001$, and supervisor, $r(259) = .60, p < .001$, undermining. Hypothesis two was unsupported, as engagement in CO-OCBs was not found to be significantly associated with supervisor, $r(259) = .04, p = .48$, or coworker, $r(259) = .07, p = .26$, undermining. In support of hypothesis three, experiences of supervisor and coworker undermining were both found to be negatively associated with engagement in SO-OCBs, respectively, $r(259) = .22, p < .001$, $r(259) = .24, p < .001$. Hypothesis four was also supported, with workplace undermining found to be significantly and positively associated with engagement in CD-CWBs in both supervisor, $r(259) = .90, p < .001$, and coworker, $r(259) = .89, p < .001$, undermining, with supervisor undermining accounting for a slightly larger effect. Zero-order correlations between all study variables are included in Table 1.

Regression Analyses

Predicting SO-OCB

To test the effectiveness of four models (A-D) in predicting participation in service-oriented organizational citizenship behavior (SO-OCB), a sequential linear regression was conducted. SO-OCB behavior was predicted from experiences of supervisor and coworker undermining, with an alpha level of .05 used for all analyses. Experiences of supervisor and coworker undermining, and control variables of age, gender, race, ethnicity, tenure, weekly hours, and workplace stress were included in the first step (Model A), which was found to be

Table 1.
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. SO-OCB	3.90	0.94	-													
2. CO-OCB	4.91	1.13	.61***	-												
3. CD-CWB	2.07	1.13	.18*	-.03	-											
4. SU	2.36	1.44	.23***	.05	.90***	-										
5. CU	2.31	1.40	.24***	.08	.89***	.95***	-									
6. PA	3.53	0.73	.44***	.29***	-.06	-.01	-.01	-								
7. NA	2.06	0.99	.07	-.02	.75***	.75***	.78***	-.08	-							
8. Age	36.43	9.44	.02	.11	-.47***	-.43***	-.44***	.10	-.39***	-						
9. Gender ^a	0.36	0.48	.10	.13	-.23***	-.16**	-.18**	.11	-.19**	.18**	-					
10. Ethnicity ^b	0.21	0.41	.14	.16**	.11	.14*	.12	.12*	.05	-.05	-.01	-				
11. Race ^c	0.14	0.34	.01	.04	-.08	-.04	-.04	-.06	-.06	.04	.03	.04	-			
12. Tenure ^d	7.71	6.26	.14*	.16**	-.22***	-.19**	-.20***	.21***	-.17**	.52***	.14*	.06	-.02	-		
13. WH	40.01	5.58	.01	.10*	-.28***	-.31***	-.29***	.01	-.21**	.33***	.10	-.09	.04	.02	-	
14. WS	2.61	0.77	-.11	-.18**	.57***	.59***	.55***	-.15*	.59***	-.24***	.00	.03	.02	-.18**	-.13*	-

Note. *N* = 261. SO-OCB = service-oriented organizational citizenship behavior, CO-OCB = customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior, CD-CWB = customer-directed counterproductive work behavior, SU = supervisor undermining, CU = coworker undermining, PA = positive affect, NA = negative affect, WH = weekly hours, WS = workplace stress.

^a 0 = male, 1 = gender minority ^b 0 = not of Hispanic or Latino/a heritage, 1 = of Hispanic or Latino/a heritage. ^c 0 = White, 1 = Not White, ^d years employed in current position.

p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

significant, $R^2 = .22$ 95% CI [.13, .30], $F(9, 249) = 7.60$, $p < .001$, $R^2_{Adjusted} = .19$. As shown in table two, only gender and workplace stress had significant partial effects. As workplace stress decreases, engagement in SO-OCB increases, and as SO-OCB engagement increases, the likelihood that the individual is female increases.

In the second step, positive and negative affect were added to the model, represented in Model B. The increase of R^2 to .34 was found to be statistically significant, $F(11, 247) = 11.42$, $p < .001$. As shown in table two, there were significant partial effects for positive affect, gender, and workplace stress, but the partial effect of negative affect fell short of statistical significance. As positive affect increased so did engagement with SO-OCB.

The third step, Model C, included the interaction of positive affect and coworker undermining in predicting SO-OCB. Adding this interaction did not produce a significant change in R^2 , $\Delta R^2 = .01$ 95% CI [.00, .03], $F(1, 246) = 3.64$, $p = .058$. The interaction was removed from the model and replaced with the interaction between positive affect and supervisor undermining, in Model D, which was also found to be nonsignificant, $\Delta R^2 = .00$ 95% CI [.00, .03], $F(1, 246) = 2.74$, $p = .10$. Unstandardized slopes, confidence intervals, standard errors, effect sizes, and p values for Models A-D are shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Regression Analysis: Predicting Participation in Service-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Effect Size		Estimate	SE	95% CI [UL, LL]	sr	p
	Intercept	-0.69	0.52	[-1.71, 0.33]		.184
	SU	0.21	0.14	[-0.06, 0.49]	0.01	.128
	CU	0.21	0.14	[-0.07, 0.49]	0.01	.137
Model A	Age ^a	0.01	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.00	.436
	Gender ^b	0.33	0.12	[0.09, 0.56]	0.03	.006
	Ethnicity ^c	0.19	0.14	[-0.08, 0.47]	0.01	.169
	Race ^d	0.07	0.16	[-0.24, 0.38]	0.00	.663
	Tenure ^e	0.02	0.01	[-0.00, 0.04]	0.01	.097

Effect Size		Estimate	SE	95% CI [UL, LL]	sr	p
Model B	Weekly hours ^f	0.01	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.00	.331
	WS	-0.49	0.09	[-0.66, -0.31]	0.10	< .001
	Intercept	-2.42	0.55	[-3.50, -1.34]		< .001
	SU	0.20	0.13	[-0.05, 0.46]	0.01	.116
	CU	0.22	0.14	[-0.05, 0.49]	0.01	.107
	PA	0.49	0.07	[0.34, 0.64]	0.14	< .001
	NA	-0.10	0.10	[-0.29, 0.09]	0.00	.304
	Age ^a	0.00	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.00	.504
	Gender ^b	0.23	0.11	[0.01, 0.45]	0.01	.042
	Ethnicity ^c	0.10	0.13	[-0.16, 0.35]	0.00	.456
	Race ^d	0.12	0.15	[-0.18, 0.41]	0.00	.434
	Tenure ^e	0.01	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.00	.420
	Weekly hours ^f	0.01	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.00	.230
	WS	-0.37	0.09	[-0.54, -0.19]	0.05	< .001
Model C	Intercept	-3.39	0.75	[-4.86, -1.92]		< .001
	SU	0.20	0.13	[-0.05, 0.46]	0.01	.117
	CU	0.64	0.26	[0.13, 1.15]	0.02	.014
	PA	0.73	0.14	[0.44, 1.01]	0.08	< .001
	NA	-0.10	0.10	[-0.29, 0.09]	0.00	.285
	Age ^a	0.01	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.00	.354
	Gender ^b	0.23	0.11	[0.01, 0.45]	0.01	.038
	Ethnicity ^c	0.12	0.13	[-0.14, 0.38]	0.00	.350
	Race ^d	0.15	0.15	[-0.14, 0.44]	0.00	.305
	Tenure ^e	0.01	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.00	.549
	Weekly hours ^f	0.01	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.00	.215
	WS	-0.35	0.09	[-0.52, -0.18]	0.05	< .001
	CU*PA	-0.11	0.06	[-0.23, 0.00]	0.01	.058
	Intercept	-3.25	0.74	[-4.71, -1.79]		< .001
Model D	SU	0.53	0.24	[0.07, 1.00]	0.02	.025
	CU	0.24	0.14	[-0.03, 0.51]	0.01	.081
	PA	0.70	0.14	[0.41, 0.98]	0.08	< .001
	NA	-0.10	0.10	[-0.29, 0.09]	0.00	.306
	Age ^a	0.01	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.00	.394
	Gender ^b	0.23	0.11	[0.01, 0.45]	0.01	.042
	Ethnicity ^c	0.13	0.13	[-0.13, 0.39]	0.00	.333
	Race ^d	0.15	0.15	[-0.14, 0.44]	0.00	.319
	Tenure ^e	0.01	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.00	.523
	Weekly hours ^f	0.01	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.00	.223
	WS	-0.35	0.09	[-0.53, -0.18]	0.05	< .001
	SU*PA	-0.10	0.06	[-0.21, 0.02]	0.01	.099

Note. $N = 261$. This table demonstrates the standardized regression coefficients predicting engagement in service-oriented organizational citizenship behavior from SU, CU, PA, NA, WS, CU*NA, and SU*NA across four models. SU = supervisor undermining, CU = coworker undermining, PA = positive affect, NA = negative affect, WS = workplace stress, SU*PA = interaction between SU and PA, CU*PA = interaction between CU and PA, CI = confidence interval, LL = lower limit, UL = upper limit.

^a 0 = male, 1 = gender minority ^b 0 = not of Hispanic or Latino/a heritage, 1 = of Hispanic or Latino/a heritage. ^c 0 = White 1 = Not White, ^d years employed in current position.

Predicting CO-OCB

A second sequential multiple regression analysis was completed to test the effectiveness of four models (E-H) in predicting engagement in customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior (CO-OCB) from experiences of supervisor and coworker undermining. Experiences of supervisor and coworker undermining along with control variables of age, gender, race, ethnicity, tenure, weekly hours, and workplace stress were included in the first step (Model E) and were found to be significant, $R^2 = .17$ CI [.10, .26], $F(9, 249) = 5.63$ $p < .001$, $R^2_{Adjusted} = .14$. As shown in Table 3, gender, ethnicity, weekly hours, and workplace stress all had significant partial effects. As CO-OCB increased, the likelihood that a person's gender was female also increased, as the likelihood that a person was of Hispanic or Latina/o descent increased, so did their participation in CO-OCB, and as an individual's weekly hours increased so did their participation in CO-OCB, however, as workplace stress increased, engagement in CO-OCB decreased.

After adding positive and negative affect to the model in step two (Model F), the R^2 increased to .21 which was a statistically significant increase in R^2 , $F(11, 247) = 5.92$ $p < .001$. As seen in table three, the partial effects of positive affect, gender, ethnicity, weekly hours, and workplace stress were all significant. Negative affect fell short of statistical significance. As positive affect increases, engagement in CO-OCB also increases.

Adding the interaction of positive affect and coworker undermining in predicting CO-OCB, in step three (Model G), was nonsignificant, $\Delta R^2 = .00$ 95% CI [.00, .03], $F(1, 246) =$

1.99, $p = .160$. The interaction was removed and replaced with the interaction of positive affect and supervisor undermining, in step four (Model H), but the overall model was also nonsignificant, $\Delta R^2 = .00$ 95% CI [.00, .03], $F(1, 246) = 2.52$ $p = .114$. Unstandardized slopes, confidence intervals, standard errors, effect sizes, and p values for Models E-H are shown in Table 3.

Table 3
Regression Analysis: Predicting Participation in Customer-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Effect Size		Estimate	SE	95% CI [UL, LL]	sr	p
Model E	Intercept	-1.02	0.55	[-2.10, 0.06]		.064
	SU	0.03	0.15	[-0.26, 0.33]	0.00	.824
	CU	0.27	0.15	[-0.03, 0.56]	0.01	.075
	Age ^a	0.01	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.01	.186
	Gender ^b	0.34	0.13	[0.09, 0.59]	0.03	.007
	Ethnicity ^c	0.35	0.15	[0.05, 0.64]	0.02	.021
	Race ^d	0.11	0.17	[-0.22, 0.44]	0.00	.516
	Tenure ^e	0.01	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.00	.333
	Weekly hours ^f	0.02	0.01	[-0.00, 0.04]	0.01	.086
	WS	-0.44	0.09	[-0.63, -0.25]	0.07	< .001
Model F	Intercept	-2.09	0.62	[-3.31, -0.87]		.001
	SU	0.03	0.15	[-0.26, 0.32]	.00	.849
	CU	0.24	0.15	[-0.06, 0.55]	.03	.114
	PA	0.29	0.08	[0.13, 0.46]	.21	.001
	NA	0.00	0.11	[-0.21, 0.22]	.00	.964
	Age ^a	0.01	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	.07	.190
	Gender ^b	0.29	0.13	[0.04, 0.54]	.14	.021
	Ethnicity ^c	0.29	0.15	[0.00, 0.58]	.12	.048
	Race ^d	0.14	0.17	[-0.18, 0.47]	-.06	.389
	Tenure ^e	0.00	0.01	[-0.02, 0.03]	.02	.671
Model G	Intercept	-2.90	0.84	[-4.56, -1.23]		.001
	SU	0.03	0.15	[-0.26, 0.31]	0.00	.857
	CU	0.59	0.29	[0.02, 1.16]	0.01	.043
	PA	0.49	0.16	[0.17, 0.81]	0.03	.003
	NA	0.00	0.11	[-0.21, 0.21]	0.00	.985
	Age ^a	0.01	0.01	[-0.00, 0.03]	0.01	.135
	Gender ^b	0.29	0.12	[0.05, 0.54]	0.02	.020

Effect Size		Estimate	SE	95% CI [UL, LL]	sr	p
Model G	Ethnicity ^c	0.31	0.15	[0.02, 0.60]	0.02	.035
	Race ^d	0.17	0.17	[-0.16, 0.50]	0.00	.300
	Tenure ^e	0.00	0.01	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.00	.787
	Weekly hours ^f	0.02	0.01	[-0.00, 0.04]	0.01	.067
	WS	-0.38	0.10	[-0.57, -0.18]	0.05	< .001
	CU*PA	-0.10	0.07	[-0.23, 0.04]	0.01	.160
	Intercept	-2.98	0.84	[-4.62, -1.33]		< .001
Model H	SU	0.38	0.27	[-0.14, 0.91]	0.01	.153
	CU	0.26	0.15	[-0.04, 0.57]	0.01	.088
	PA	0.52	0.16	[0.20, 0.84]	0.03	.002
	NA	0.01	0.11	[-0.21, 0.22]	0.00	.958
	Age ^a	0.01	0.01	[-0.00, 0.03]	0.01	.138
	Gender ^b	0.29	0.12	[0.04, 0.54]	0.02	.021
	Ethnicity ^c	0.32	0.15	[0.03, 0.62]	0.02	.029
	Race ^d	0.18	0.17	[-0.15, 0.51]	0.00	.287
	Tenure ^e	0.00	0.01	[-0.02, 0.02]	0.00	.792
	Weekly hours ^f	0.02	0.01	[-0.00, 0.04]	0.01	.068
	WS	-0.37	0.10	[-0.57, -0.18]	0.05	< .001
SU*PA	-0.10	0.07	[-0.23, 0.02]	0.01	.114	

Note. $N = 261$. This table demonstrates the standardized regression coefficients predicting engagement in customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior from SU, CU, PA, NA, WS, CU*NA, and SU*NA across four models. SU = supervisor undermining, CU = coworker undermining, PA = positive affect, NA = negative affect, WS = workplace stress, SU*PA = interaction between SU and PA, CU*PA = interaction between CU and PA, CI = confidence interval, LL = lower limit, UL = upper limit.

^a 0 = male, 1 = gender minority ^b 0 = not of Hispanic or Latino/a heritage, 1 = of Hispanic or Latino/a heritage. ^c 0 = White 1 = Not White, ^d years employed in current position.

Predicting CD-CWB

In predicting customer-directed counterproductive work behavior (CD-CWB) from experiences of coworker and supervisor undermining, a third sequential multiple regression analysis was conducted. Models I-L included control variables of age, gender, race, ethnicity, tenure, weekly hours, and workplace stress. In step 1 (Model I) experiences of supervisor and coworker undermining along with control variables of age, gender, race, ethnicity, tenure, weekly hours, and workplace stress were analyzed. The model was found to be significant, $R^2 = .83$ CI [.79, .87], $F(9, 249) = 139, p < .001, R^2_{Adjusted} = .83$. As seen in table four, social

undermining, coworker undermining, age, gender, and workplace stress all showed significant partial effects. As coworker undermining increased, CD-CWB increased, similarly, when supervisor undermining increased, CD-CWB increased. As age decreased engagement in CD-CWB increased, as CD-CWB increased the likelihood that the individual was male also increased, and as workplace stress increased so did involvement in CD-CWB.

After adding positive and negative affect to the model, in step two (Model J), R^2 increased to .84 which was a statistically significant increase to R^2 , $F(11, 247) = 116.3, p < .001$. In step 3, Model K, the interaction of negative affect and coworker undermining in predicting CD-CWB was found to be nonsignificant, $\Delta R^2 = .00$ 95% CI [.00, .03], $F(1, 246) = .11, p = .742$. The interaction was removed from the model and replaced with the interaction between supervisor undermining and negative affect, which was also found to be nonsignificant, $\Delta R^2 = .00$ 95% CI [.00, .03], $F(1, 246) = 2.10, p = .148$. Unstandardized slopes, confidence intervals, standard errors, effect sizes, and p values for Models I-L are shown in Table 4.

Table 4
Regression Analysis: Predicting Participation in Customer-Directed Counterproductive Work Behavior

Effect Size		Estimate	SE	95% CI [UL, LL]	sr	p
Model I	Intercept	-1.29	0.22	[-1.72, -0.87]		< .001
	SU	0.34	0.06	[0.22, 0.45]	0.10	< .001
	CU	0.23	0.06	[0.12, 0.35]	0.05	< .001
	Age ^a	-0.01	0.00	[-0.01, -0.00]	0.02	.008
	Gender ^b	-0.14	0.05	[-0.23, -0.04]	0.02	.007
	Ethnicity ^c	0.00	0.06	[-0.11, 0.12]	0.00	.973
	Race ^d	-0.13	0.07	[-0.26, 0.00]	0.01	.058
	Tenure ^e	0.00	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.00	.939
	Weekly hours ^f	0.00	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.00	.693
	WS	0.09	0.04	[0.02, 0.17]	0.02	.014
Model J	Intercept	-1.19	0.25	[-1.68, -0.70]		< .001
	SU	0.34	0.06	[0.22, 0.45]	0.11	< .001
	CU	0.19	0.06	[0.07, 0.31]	0.03	.002
	PA	-0.04	0.03	[-0.11, 0.03]	0.00	.243
	NA	0.09	0.04	[0.01, 0.18]	0.01	.032

Effect Size		Estimate	SE	CI [UL, LL]	sr	p
Model J	Age ^a	-0.01	0.00	[-0.01, -0.00]	0.02	.014
	Gender ^b	-0.11	0.05	[-0.21, -0.02]	0.02	.022
	Ethnicity ^c	0.02	0.06	[-0.10, 0.13]	0.00	.783
	Race ^d	-0.12	0.07	[-0.25, 0.01]	0.01	.065
	Tenure ^e	0.00	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.00	.891
	Weekly hours ^f	0.00	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.00	.764
	WS	0.06	0.04	[-0.02, 0.14]	0.01	.143
	Intercept	-1.23	0.27	[-1.76, -0.69]		< .001
	SU	0.34	0.06	[0.23, 0.46]	0.11	< .001
	CU	0.21	0.08	[0.05, 0.37]	0.02	.009
	PA	-0.04	0.03	[-0.10, 0.03]	0.00	.274
	NA	0.12	0.08	[-0.05, 0.28]	0.01	.161
	Model K	Age ^a	-0.01	0.00	[-0.01, -0.00]	0.02
Gender ^b		-0.12	0.05	[-0.21, -0.02]	0.02	.022
Ethnicity ^c		0.02	0.06	[-0.10, 0.13]	0.00	.784
Race ^d		-0.12	0.07	[-0.25, 0.01]	0.01	.068
Tenure ^e		0.00	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.00	.920
Weekly hours ^f		0.00	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.00	.784
WS		0.05	0.04	[-0.03, 0.14]	0.01	.195
CU*NA		-0.01	0.03	[-0.06, 0.04]	0.00	.742
Intercept		-1.35	0.27	[-1.88, -0.82]		< .001
SU		0.42	0.08	[0.26, 0.58]	0.09	< .001
CU		0.19	0.06	[0.07, 0.31]	0.03	.002
PA		-0.03	0.03	[-0.10, 0.04]	0.00	.373
NA		0.20	0.08	[0.03, 0.36]	0.02	.019
Model L	Age ^a	-0.01	0.00	[-0.01, -0.00]	0.02	.020
	Gender ^b	-0.12	0.05	[-0.22, -0.02]	0.02	.019
	Ethnicity ^c	0.01	0.06	[-0.10, 0.13]	0.00	.802
	Race ^d	-0.12	0.07	[-0.25, 0.01]	0.01	.073
	Tenure ^e	-0.00	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.00	.961
	WS	0.00	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.00	.851
	SU*NA	0.04	0.04	[-0.05, 0.12]	0.00	.382

Note. *N* = 261. This table demonstrates the standardized regression coefficients predicting engagement in customer-directed counterproductive work behavior from SU, CU, PA, NA, WS, CU*NA, and SU*NA across four models. SU = supervisor undermining, CU = coworker undermining, PA = positive affect, NA = negative affect, WS = workplace stress, SU*PA = interaction between SU and PA, CU*PA = interaction between CU and PA, CI = confidence interval, LL = lower limit, UL = upper limit.

^a 0 = male, 1 = gender minority ^b 0 = not of Hispanic or Latino/a heritage, 1 = of Hispanic or Latino/a heritage. ^c 0 = White 1 = Not White, ^d years employed in current position.

CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION

In alignment with previous research relating to the negative impact of workplace social undermining, this study found perceptions of social undermining in the workplace to be significantly and positively associated with engagement in CWBs. Specifically, this study highlights the association between workplace social undermining and engagement in a specific, customer-directed, form of CWB that holds direct implications for service sector organizations. The findings indicate that workplace social undermining is highly related to engagement in customer-directed CWBs, with the relationship, along with control variables, accounting for 84% of the variance in the third sequential regression model's variance. The findings indicate that engagement in service-oriented OCB and customer-oriented OCB are only marginally negatively associated with experiences of workplace undermining, with sequential regression models one and two, including control variables, accounting for 34% and 21% of the total variance, respectively.

Although all interactions involving positive and negative affect fell short of significance, there was an association between positive affect and both customer and service-oriented OCB. Adding positive and negative affect to the sequential regression model predicting engagement in service-oriented OCB significantly increased the explained variance/increased the explained variance by 12%. Similarly, the inclusion of positive and negative affect within the model predicting customer-oriented OCB significantly increased the explained variance/increased the explained variance by 4%. Although both positive and negative affect were added to the model, positive affect was found to have the highest association with service and customer-oriented OCB, with negative affect showing little to no association. Within the model predicting customer-directed CWB, the inclusion of positive and negative affect fell short of significance,

with the model including control variables and coworker and supervisor undermining alone providing the best predictive power.

Consistent with prior research, workplace stress was significantly associated with experiences of workplace social undermining across all sequential regression models, and was significantly positively correlated with both coworker and supervisor undermining, with supervisor undermining displaying a marginally larger impact on workplace stress. While there was no support for the hypothesis of supervisor and coworker undermining being correlated with customer-oriented OCB, both forms of undermining were found to be negatively correlated with service-oriented OCB providing an interesting avenue for future research investigating the possible mechanisms through which workplace undermining influences engagement in these discrete, but overlapping, forms of OCB. Future research is also needed to elaborate and clarify the relationship between workplace undermining and the high likelihood of engagement in customer-directed CWB, possibly by considering this relationship through the lens of displaced aggression (Hunter & Penney, 2014) or via the spiraling nature of aggression in the workplace (Andersson & Pearson, 1999).

These findings highlight the significant impact that organizational culture, coworker relations, and leadership style have on effective service sector employee job performance. With findings illustrating the presence of workplace social undermining in service sector organizations as being highly correlated with engagement in customer-directed CWBs, and modestly associated with a decrease in customer and service-oriented OCB, the impact these behaviors have on front-line employees, being the “first and only representation of a service firm” (Maxham & McKee, 2000, p. 35), cannot be overstated.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

Contributing to a toxic work environment, workplace social undermining is destructive in its subtlety. With manifestations that are often elusive and difficult to identify, an employee will likely experience a sense of isolation after exposure to undermining behaviors. Present in most organizations (Greenbaum et al., 2012), these behaviors have been found to decrease employee efficacy (Duffy et al., 2002) well-being (Callier, 2021; Duffy et al., 2006a) and self-esteem (Crossley, 2009). These influences can be particularly damaging to service sector organizations, with outcomes directly impacting employee productivity (Rasool et al., 2019) and job performance (Duffy et al., 2002; Duffy et al., 2006a; Rasool et al., 2020). With customer-facing employees having a direct impact on customer satisfaction and customer perceptions of service delivery (Bettencourt & Brown, 2003) the implications of a reduction in extra-role behaviors can be stark. The main findings from this study highlight the negative impact that workplace social undermining can have on service sector employees engagement in extra-role job performance behaviors. As workplace undermining was significantly related to engagement in customer-directed CWBs, and moderately negatively related to engagement in service and customer-oriented OCB (however, with no correlation between undermining behaviors and customer-oriented OCB), the findings highlight the need for future research relating to the ways in which workplace social undermining may influence service sector employees, and also the need for service sector organizations to promote and support an inclusive and collaborative workplace environment for their customer-facing employees.

References

- Altindag, Z. (2020). Relationship between stress management and job performance in organizations. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 9, 43-49.
- Andersson, L., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 452-471.
- Aquino, K., & Douglas, S. (2003). Identity threat and antisocial behavior in organizations: The moderating effects of individual differences, aggressive modeling, and hierarchical status. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 90(1), 195-208.
- Aquino, K., & Thau, S. (2009). Workplace victimization: Aggression from the target's perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60(1), 717-747.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *The Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595.
- Bell, S. J., & Menguc, B. (2002). The employee-organization relationship, organizational citizenship behaviors, and superior service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 78(2), 131-146.
- Bettencourt, L. A., Gwinner, K. P., & Meuter, M. L. (2001). A comparison of attitude, personality, and knowledge predictors of service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 29-41.
- Bettencourt, L. A., & Brown, S. W. (1997). Contact employees: Relationships among workplace fairness, job satisfaction and prosocial service behaviors. *Journal of Retailing*, 73(1), 39-61.
- Bettencourt, L. A., & Brown, S. W. (2003). Role stressors and customer-oriented boundary-

- spanning behaviors in service organizations. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31(4), 394-408.
- Bienstock, C., DeMoranville, C., & Smith, R. (2003). Organizational citizenship behavior and service quality. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 17(4), 357-378.
- Bies, R. J., Tripp, T. M., & Kramer, R. M. (1997). At the breaking point: Cognitive and social dynamics of revenge in organizations. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 18-36).
- Borman, W. C., & Motowildo, S. M. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations* (pp. 71-98).
- Bowler, M. C., Scanlan, L. N., Bowler, J. L., & Garrenton M. (2019). “The other night I ate at a real nice family restaurant. Every table had an argument going.” Trait aggression in service industry workers.
- Burke, M. J., Brief, A. P., & George, J. M. (1993). The role of negative affectivity in understanding relations between self-reports of stressors and strains: A comment on the applied psychology literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(3), 402-412.
- Caillier, J. G. (2021). The impact of workplace aggression on employee satisfaction with job stress, meaningfulness of work, and turnover intentions. *Public Personnel Management*, 50(2), 159-182.
- Carlopio, J., Andrewartha, G., & Armstrong, H. (1997). *Developing Management Skills in Australia*. South Melbourne: Longman.
- Carlson, M., Charlin, V., & Miller, N. (1988). Positive mood and helping behavior: A test of six hypotheses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(2), 211-229.

- Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(5), 1082-1103.
- Crossley, C. D. (2009). Emotional and behavioral reactions to social undermining: A closer look at perceived offender motives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 108*(1), 14-24.
- Cummins, R. C. (1990). Job stress and the buffering effect of supervisory support. *Group & Organization Studies, 15*(1), 92-104.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1241-1255.
- Dimitriades, Z. S. (2007). The influence of service climate and job involvement on customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior in Greek service organizations: A survey. *Employee Relations, 29*(5), 469-491.
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(2), 331-351.
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., Shaw, J. D., Johnson, J. L., & Pagon, M. (2006a). The social context of undermining behavior at work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 101*(1), 105-126.
- Duffy, M. K., Scott, K. L., Shaw, J. D., Tepper, B. J., & Aquino, K. (2012). A social context model of envy and social undermining. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*(3), 643-666.
- Duffy, M. K., Shaw, J. D., Scott, K. L., & Tepper, B. J. (2006b). The moderating roles of self-

- esteem and neuroticism in the relationship between group and individual undermining behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 1066-1077.
- Eissa, G., Wyland, R., & Gupta, R. (2020). Supervisor to coworker social undermining: The moderating roles of bottom-line mentality and self-efficacy. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 26(5), 756-773.
- Fairbrother K., & Warn, J. (2002). Workplace dimensions, stress, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(1), 8-21.
- Farh, J. I., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 16(4), 705-721.
- Farrell, M. A., & Oczkowski, E. (2012). Organizational identification and leader member exchange influences on customer orientation and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 20(4), 365-377.
- Fiernaningsih, N., Nimran, U., Raharjo, K., & Arifin, Z. (2019). The role of supervisory support and life balance work in increasing organizational citizenship behavior: Study of hotel employees in Malang. *Journal of Public Administration Studies*, 4(2), 76-84.
- Fletcher, T. D., Major, D. A., & Davis, D. D. (2008). The interactive relationship of competitive climate and trait competitiveness with workplace attitudes, stress, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(7), 899-922.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 291-309.
- Ganster, D. C. (2005). Executive job demands: Suggestions from a stress and decision-making

- perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30(3), 492-502.
- Ganster D. C., & Rosen, C. C. (2013). Work stress and employee health: A multidisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 39(5), 1085-1122.
- George, J. M. and Brief, A. P. (1992) Feeling good-doing well: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychology Bulletin*, 112(2), 310-329.
- Glomb, T. M., & Liao, H. (2003). Interpersonal aggression in work groups: Social influence, reciprocal, and individual effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(4), 486-496.
- Goetzel, R. Z., Anderson, D. R., Whitmer, R. W., Ozminkowski, R. J., Dunn, R. L., & Wasserman, J. (1998). The relationship between modifiable health risks and health care expenditures: An analysis of the multi-employer HERO health risk and cost database. *Journal of Occupations and Environmental Medicine*, 40(10), 843-854.
- Greenbaum, R. L., Mawritz, M. B., & Eissa, G. (2012). Bottom-line mentality as an antecedent of social undermining and the moderating roles of core self-evaluations and conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2), 343-359.
- Greenberg, J. (2010). Organizational injustice as an occupational health risk. *Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1), 205-243.
- Greenberg, L., & Barling, J. (1999). Predicting employee aggression against coworkers, subordinates, and supervisors: The roles of person behaviors and perceived workplace factors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(6), 897-913.
- Hartline, M. D., Maxham, J. G., & McKee, D. O. (2000). Corridors of influence in the dissemination of customer-oriented strategy to customer contact service employees. *Journal of Marketing*, 64(2), 35-50.

- Hee Yoon, M., & Suh, J. (2003). Organizational citizenship behaviors and service quality as external effectiveness of contact employees. *Journal of Business Research*, 56(8), 597-611.
- Hershcovis, M. S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A., Dupré, K. E., Inness, M., ...Sivanathan, N. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 228-238.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology*, 50(3), 337-396.
- Hunter, E. M. & Penney, L. M. (2014). The waiter spit in my soup! Antecedents of customer-directed counterproductive workplace behavior. *Human Performance*, 27(3), 262-281.
- Jex, S. M., & Beehr, T. (1991). Emerging theoretical and methodological issues in the study of work-related stress. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 9(3), 313-365.
- Jones, F., & Bright, J. (2001). *Stress: Myth, Theory, and Research*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Kaplan, S., Bradley, J. C., Luchman, J. N., & Haynes, D. (2009). On the role of positive and negative affectivity in job performance: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 162–176.
- Keashly, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L. M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims*, 9(4), 341-357.
- Kinman, G., & Jones, F. (2005). Lay representations of workplace stress: What do people really

- mean when they say they are stressed? *Work and Stress*, 19(2), 101-120.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 656-669.
- Krischer, M. M., Penney, L. M., & Hunter, E. M. (2010). Can counterproductive work behaviors be productive? CWB as emotion-focused coping. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(2), 154-166.
- Lakey, B., & Cassady, P. B. (1990). Cognitive processes in perceived social support. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(2), 337-343.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1966). *Psychological stress and the coping process*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping*. New York: Springer.
- Lee, K., Kim, E., Bhave, D. P., & Duffy, M. K. (2016). Why victims of undermining at work become perpetrators of undermining: An integrative model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(6), 915-924.
- Lyu, Y., Zhu, H., Zhong, H. J., & Hu, L. (2016). Abusive supervision and customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of hostile attribution bias and work engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 53(5), 69-80.
- Ma, J., Zhou, X., & Mu, Z. (2021). Can abusive supervision motivate customer-oriented service sabotage? A multilevel research. *The Service Industries Journal*, 41(9-10), 696-717.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(1), 123-150.
- Mackey, J. D., Perrewé, P. L., & McAllister, C. P. (2017). Do I fit in? Perceptions of

- organizational fit as a resource in the workplace stress process. *Group and Organization Management*, 42(4), 455-486.
- Marlin Company, & American Institute of Stress. (2009). The Workplace Stress Scale: Attitudes in the American Workplace VII.
- Michie, S. (2002). Causes and management of stress at work. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 59(1), 67-72.
- Moon, T. W., & Hur, W. M. (2018). Spillover effects of experienced coworker incivility on customer-directed counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 28(5), 554-575.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.
- Moorman, R. H., Blakey, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1988). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *The Academy of Management Journal*, 41(3), 351-357.
- Morrison, E. W. (1996). Organizational citizenship behavior as a critical link between HRM practices and service quality. *Human Resource Management*, 35(4), 493-512.
- Morrison, E. W. (2002). Information seeking within organizations. *Human Communications Research*, 28(2), 229-242.
- Mostafa, A. M. S., Farley, S., & Zaharle, M. (2020). Examining the boundaries of ethical leadership: The harmful effect of co-worker social undermining on disengagement and employee attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 174(2), 355-368.
- Nelson, D. L., & Burke, R. J. (2000). Women executives: Health, stress, and success. *Academy*

- of Management Executive, 14(2), 107-121.*
- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., McKee, D. O., & McMurrian, R. (1997). An investigation into the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors in a personal selling context. *Journal of Marketing, 61(3), 85-98.*
- O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Duffy, M. K., & Griffin, R. W. (2000). Construct confusion in the study of antisocial behavior at work. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 18(3), 275-303.*
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74(1), 157-164.*
- Penney, L. M., Hunter, E. M., & Perry, S. J. (2011). Personality and counterproductive work behavior: Using conservation of resources theory to narrow the profile of deviant employees. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84(1), 58-77.*
- Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2007). Emotions and counterproductive work behavior. In N. M. Ashkanasy, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Research Companion to Emotion in Organizations* (pp. 183–196).
- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(2), 262-270.*
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research, 31(3), 351-363.*
- Rasool, S. F., Maqbool, R., Samma, M., Zhao, Y., & Anjum, A. (2019). Creating a toxic

- workplace environment for diminishing worker productivity. *Sustainability*, 11(9), 1-18.
- Rasool, S. F., Wang, M., Zhang, Y., & Samma, M. (2020). Sustainable work performance: The roles of workplace violence and occupational stress. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(3), 1-12.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Robinson, S. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (1998). Monkey see, monkey do: The influence of work groups on the antisocial behavior of employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(6), 658-672.
- Rook, K. S. (1984). The negative side of social interaction: Impact on psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(5), 1097-1108.
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 66-80.
- Saxe, R., & Weitz, B. A. (1982). The SOCO Scale: A measure of the customer orientation of salespeople. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19(3), 343-351.
- Scott, K. L., Ingram, A., Zagenczyk, T. J., & Shoss, M. K. (2015). Work-family conflict and social undermining behavior: An examination of PO fit and gender differences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(1), 203-218.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663.
- Sonnentag, S., & Frese, M. (2003). Stress in organizations. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R.

- J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*, Vol. 12, pp. 453-491). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Sparks, K., & Cooper, C. L. (1999). Occupational differences in the work–strain relationship: Towards the use of situation-specific models. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(2), 219-229.
- Spector, P. E. (1998). Employee control and occupational stress. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 11(4), 133-136.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2), 269-292.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work behavior. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets* (pp. 151-174).
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(3), 446-460.
- Tangirala, S., Green, S. G., & Ramanujam, R. (2007). In the shadow of the boss's boss: Effects of supervisors' upward exchange relationships on employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 309-320.
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178-190.
- Thompson, E. R. (2007). Development and validation of an internationally reliable short-form of

- the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 38(2), 227-242.
- 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.
- Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2004). *Misbehavior in organizations: Theory, research, and management*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Vinokur, A. D., & van Ryn, M. (1993). Social support and undermining in close relationships: Their independent effects on the mental health of unemployed persons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(2), 350-359.
- Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8(4), 216-226.
- Wang, Z., Zaman, S., Rasool, S. F., Zaman, Q. U., & Amin, A. (2020). Exploring the relationships between a toxic workplace environment, workplace stress, and project success with the moderating effects of organizational support: Empirical evidence from Pakistan. *Risk Management and Healthcare Policy*, 13(2), 1055-1067.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the PANAS scales. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 54(6), 1063.
- Webber, S. S. (2011). Dual organizational identification impacting client satisfaction and word of mouth loyalty. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(2), 119-125.
- Ye, Y., Zhu, H., Deng, X., & Mu, Z. (2019). Negative workplace gossip and service outcomes:

An explanation from social identity theory. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 82(1), 159-168.

Zeithaml, V.A. and Bitner, M.J. (1996) *Services Marketing*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Zellars, K. L., Meurs, J. A., Perrewé, P. L., Kacmar, C. J., & Rossi, A. M. (2009). Reacting to and recovering from a stressful situation: The negative affectivity-physiological arousal relationship. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(1), 11-22.

Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1068-1076.



EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board
4N-64 Brody Medical Sciences Building · Mail Stop 682
600 Moye Boulevard · Greenville, NC 27834
Office **252-744-2914** · Fax **252-744-2284** ·
rede.ecu.edu/umcirb/

Notification of Exempt Certification

From: Social/Behavioral IRB
To: [Mark Bowler](#)
CC:

Date: 9/30/2019
Re: [UMCIRB 19-002241](#)
Social Undermining

I am pleased to inform you that your research submission has been certified as exempt on 9/30/2019. This study is eligible for Exempt Certification under category #2ab.

It is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted in the manner reported in your application and/or protocol, as well as being consistent with the ethical principles of the Belmont Report and your profession.

This research study does not require any additional interaction with the UMCIRB unless there are proposed changes to this study. Any change, prior to implementing that change, must be submitted to the UMCIRB for review and approval. The UMCIRB will determine if the change impacts the eligibility of the research for exempt status. If more substantive review is required, you will be notified within five business days.

The Chairperson (or designee) does not have a potential for conflict of interest on this study.