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Abstract

Despite its global prevalence and the detrimental effects for organisations, intimate partner aggression (IPA) remains a serious problem that transcends the home to affect the workplace. Grounded in conservation of resources (COR) theory, the present study examines the relationship between IPA and work outcomes, specifically task performance and organisational citizenship behaviour, through the mediating role of psychological distress. Additionally, the current research investigates perceived supervisor support (PSS) as an organisational buffer against the stress of abuse. The moderated-mediation model was tested using two independent samples from Singapore and the Philippines in the pilot study and the main study, providing evidence of constructive replication. Pilot study data using a sample of employed women \((n = 36)\) supported the positive relationship between IPA and psychological distress. Using a temporal research design (i.e. four-week interval between two measurement periods), the main study tested the hypothesised relationships with a sample of 228 employee-supervisor dyads. Results showed that the conditional indirect effects of IPA in predicting work outcomes via psychological distress were stronger at low as opposed to high levels of PSS. Theoretical and practical implications of the findings are discussed.

**Practitioner Points**

- IPA decreases job performance due to experienced psychological distress.
- Supervisors can help alleviate the negative impacts of IPA by offering instrumental and emotional support.
- Organisations can engage employee assistance programs to provide training for supervisors and to help develop workplace policies addressing IPA.
Introduction

Intimate partner aggression is one of the most common forms of non-fatal violence faced by women (Watts & Zimmerman, 2002). In a recent report, the World Health Organisation (WHO) revealed that almost one-third (30%) of women globally have experienced abuse by an intimate partner (WHO, 2013). The lifetime prevalence estimates ranged from partnered women as young as 15 to 19 years old (29.4%) to older women between 65 and 69 years old (22.2%), indicating that women may be exposed to intimate partner aggression from very early on in their relationships and the abuse can last for long periods in their lives (WHO, 2013). Aside from high prevalence rates, governments and international organisations, such as the United Nations (UN), have also recognised the urgent need to intensify efforts to raise awareness and eliminate all forms of violence against women (UN General Assembly, 1993; 2006). Despite this global recognition, current prevalence rates are comparable to findings in studies from more than a decade ago (e.g. Heise et al., 1999). These concerning statistics suggest that women globally remain greatly at risk, and that intimate partner aggression is still a highly-relevant societal problem.

Research has consistently demonstrated that experiencing intimate partner aggression has detrimental impacts on victim’s physical and mental health. These studies found that women who are abused by their male partners reported suffering from headaches, chronic fatigue and chronic pain, gastrointestinal and gynaecological problems, anxiety disorders, depression, suicidal ideations, and post-traumatic stress disorders (Campbell, 2002; Coker, Smith, Bethea, King, & McKeown, 2000; Golding, 1999). Intimate partner aggression victimisation is associated with dysfunctional behaviours,
such as alcohol abuse and drug use (Devries et al., 2014; Testa, Livingston, & Leonard, 2003). Unsurprisingly, the quality of life of abused women is significantly impaired compared with non-abused women (Leung, Leung, Ng, & Ho, 2005). Given the wide array of negative outcomes, progress has been made to identify the antecedents and risk factors for perpetration and victimisation of intimate partner aggression (Flynn & Graham, 2010; Stith, Smith, Penn, Ward, & Tritt, 2004). Similarly, there is a growing interest to better understand the protective factors for intimate partner aggression that may reduce the negative impacts on women. To a limited extent, the protective factors that have been examined are personal variables, such as resilience and health (Carlson, McNutt, Choi, & Rose, 2002; Davis, 2002), the disclosure of abuse in non-work contexts (Ansara & Hindin, 2010; Sylaska & Edwards, 2014), and informal social support (most commonly, emotional support) provided by family and friends (Beeble, Bybee, Sullivan, & Adams, 2009; Bosch & Bergen, 2006; Trotter & Allen, 2009). However, relatively little is known about the buffers for intimate partner aggression that are found within the work domain.

In recent times, the focus in the literature has shifted to understanding the work-related consequences of intimate partner aggression for employed women. Most of the existing research has generally addressed the types of job interference tactic used by perpetrators to disrupt the victim’s work (O’Leary-Kelly, Lean, Reeves, & Randel, 2008), and the impact of intimate partner aggression on the on-going ability of employed women to function at work (LeBlanc, Barling, & Turner, 2014; O’Leary-Kelly et al., 2008). Women who are employed and experienced intimate partner aggression failed to maintain long-term employment; are more likely to display lower
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job productivity; have higher absenteeism rates and more frequent tardiness, and report higher rates of job turnover (LeBlanc et al., 2014; Shaw, Duffy, Johnson, & Lockhart, 2005; Swanberg, Logan, & Macke, 2005). For example, a national study conducted by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) found that intimate partner aggression victimisation resulted in 13.6 million days of lost productivity from paid work among working women (CDC, 2003a). For organisations, incidences of intimate partner aggression in the workplace can also be costly. Non-fatal intimate partner aggression incidents (e.g. injuries, absenteeism, and turnover) cost employers approximately $900 million annually in the United States alone (CDC, 2003b).

Occurrences of intimate partner aggression at work further pose a threat to the safety of other employees and can create a tense and unpleasant work environment, which may result in less apparent costs to organisation. For example, co-workers of the victim may experience lowered motivation, poor health outcomes due to the stress of witnessing the abuse, and frustrations over repeated investment of time and effort to recruit and train new employees (Riger, Raja and Camacho, 2002; Swanberg et al., 2005). Importantly, these indirect costs of intimate partner aggression have a longer-lasting impact on organisational effectiveness. When the negative work outcomes for employees and the substantial organisational costs are considered, intimate partner aggression clearly becomes an important issue to address in the work context.

In the present study, intimate partner aggression is defined as the physical and psychological abuse perpetrated by a former or current male intimate partner towards a woman. This definition does not differentiate between physical and psychological aggression as both dimensions of abuse are highly and significantly correlated
INTIMATE PARTNER AGGRESSION, DISTRESS, AND PSS (O’Leary, 1999). Furthermore, the separation of psychological aggression from physical abuse is difficult because of their frequent co-occurrence (Follingstad, Rutledge, Berg, Hause, & Polek, 1990; Follingstad, 2007). The scope of the present study is limited to male-perpetrated abuse towards their female partners as intimate partner aggression was found to be a higher baseline phenomenon for women (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000).

Women who cohabitate with a male intimate partner experienced significantly higher rates of partner violence, were more likely report incidences of partner aggression, and experienced more intense and longer-lasting victimisation than men (Dobash, Dobash, Cavanagh, & Lewis, 1998; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000).

Despite some advances in our understanding of the work-related effects of intimate partner aggression, there remain several gaps that need to be addressed. First, when studying this phenomenon, most studies to date have only examined direct relationships between intimate partner aggression and work outcomes. For example, it has been found that intimate partner aggression is negatively related to job satisfaction (Swanberg & Macke, 2006). While these associations are important, the limitation of only studying direct relationships is that the underlying mechanism involved in the relationship between intimate partner aggression and negative work outcomes remains unclear. Keeping in mind the significant tangible and intangible costs involved, it is imperative that researchers seek to unpack these associations and explain the process that links intimate partner aggression to the workplace. A deeper understanding of why this domestic issue affects employed women at work is potentially helpful in guiding organisations to develop more effective policies and interventions for employees who experience intimate partner aggression. In doing so, organisations may increase the
chances of alleviating the negative outcomes and reduce the associated costs of intimate partner aggression. To this end, it is worth highlighting the importance of answering the question ‘why’ as a way of making “the most fruitful” (Whetten, 1989, p. 493) kind of theoretical contribution. In fact, it is a “particularly critical” (Whetten, 1989, p. 493), but generally overlooked, aspect of theoretical development. Thus, an appropriate theory elucidating why experiencing intimate partner aggression would result in negative work outcomes is necessary to further our understanding of this relationship.

Second, there is a paucity of research on the buffers against the stress of intimate partner aggression. It is necessary that this gap in the literature be filled as these potential buffers could mitigate the negative effects of intimate partner aggression for employed women. For example, Kaslow et al. (1998) tested three potential protective factors against partner abuse (i.e. coping skills, family strengths, and social support) in their hospital sample of African-American women, and they found that social support was a significant moderator in the relationship between partner abuse and suicidal behaviour. However, the provision of instrumental support, such as access to resources and information, is also crucial in helping women cope with the abuse (Beecham, 2014; Rothman, Hathaway, Stidsen, & de Vries, 2007; Swanberg, Macke, & Logan, 2007). Indeed, the availability of workplace supports offered by supervisors was positively associated with employment stability (Staggs, Long, Mason, Krishnan, & Riger, 2007).

Taken together, these findings suggest that it is insufficient to only investigate informal social support as a buffer, because informal support networks may not have access to the resources that represent instrumental support to women. Therefore, identifying and
understanding plausible organisational buffers constitutes an important research task to further our understanding of how employed women cope with abuse.

Third, researchers have largely considered performance as a single construct in those studies that examined the workplace consequences of intimate partner aggression (e.g. LeBlanc et al., 2014; Lloyd & Taluc, 1999; Swanberg et al., 2007). However, job performance is a multi-dimensional construct and the dimensions of performance are clearly distinguishable from one another (Morrison, 1994; Welbourne, Johnson, & Erez, 1998). Employees who demonstrate high levels of job performance engage in various skill sets, such as people and communication skills and technical abilities. Specifically, employees’ in-role behaviour measures how well the task aspect of the job is fulfilled, while pro-social organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) reflects more on interpersonal aspect of the job (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Thus, it is reasonable to posit that the experience of intimate partner aggression does not affect these aspects of performance to the same extent, making it is essential to consider how different aspects of job performance are individually impacted. This study proposes a moderated-mediation model grounded in Hobfoll’s (1989) conservation of resources (COR) theory (see Figure 1), which accounts for women’s emotions (psychological distress) and the organisational context (perceived supervisor support; PSS), in the relationships between intimate partner aggression, task performance, and OCB.

** Insert Figure 1 here **

The present study aims to address the gaps identified in the literature. First, drawing from COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), the present study proposes a theoretical
framework that may be used to better understand the how intimate partner aggression spills-over to the workplace. Specifically, this study implicates psychological distress as a mediator by conceptualising intimate partner aggression as an event that triggers resource loss and strain. For employed women, incidences of intimate partner aggression are upsetting episodes that result in the loss of resources, which manifests in the form of psychological distress. Indeed, the relationship between stress and strain outcomes have long been acknowledged in stress theories (e.g. Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) and evidenced in empirical studies (e.g. Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Monnier, Cameron, Hobfoll, & Gribble, 2002). Prolonged experiences of psychological distress further drains existing resources, and hinders the ability to recover valued resources. As their resource are continuously being depleted, these women face an increased vulnerability when subsequent incidences of abuse and loss occur (Wells, Hobfoll, & Lavin, 1999). Eventually, insufficient resources affect their ability to work, resulting in poor job performance. Thus, by framing intimate partner aggression from a COR perspective, this study offers an explanation of how intimate partner aggression transcends the home to affect the workplace, leading to negative work-related outcomes.

Second, this study explores organisational factors that may exacerbate or mitigate the effects of intimate partner aggression on negative work outcomes. Research on work and family life has found that resources (e.g. social support) are crucial to employed women’s stress resiliency and have a positive effect on their psychological well-being (Greenglass, 1993; Swanberg et al., 2007). Rothman and colleagues (2007) also explained how having employment is important for victims of intimate partner aggression. Taking into consideration the sensitive nature of the issue and the proximal
nature of supervisors to employed women, the present study examines the buffering role of PSS against the negative impact of resource loss. That is, perceptions of supervisory support represent a gain in resources that would moderate the partner aggression-distress-work outcomes relationship (Hobfoll, 1991; Wells et al., 1999). Indeed, there is a positive relationship between helpful supervisor support (e.g. flexible work schedule or a listening ear) and employee outcomes, including job satisfaction (Saltzstein, Ting, & Saltzstein, 2001). Victims of intimate partner aggression also reported that work supports provided after disclosure to supervisors helped them to remain focused and maintain employment in the short-term (Swanberg & Logan, 2005). Thus, the present study investigates PSS as an organisational buffer that would potentially help employees cope with the abuse and maintain steady employment in the longer term.

The final objective of this study is to delineate the construct of job performance into the outcome variables of task performance (in-role behaviour) and OCB (extra-role behaviour). Existing research does not clearly explain how each aspect of job performance is affected by the experience of intimate partner aggression and psychological distress. It is important to do so as both types of job performance have important consequences for organisations, and they have separate effects on overall job performance (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Specifically, task performance led to higher productivity; whereas OCB created social capital, and led to improved communication among workers and increased levels of customer satisfaction (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). Thus, the present study argues that differentiating between the two aspects of job performance can add theoretical nuance to the current understanding of the link between intimate partner aggression and work
outcomes. In addressing the above gaps, this study makes three important contributions to the intimate partner aggression literature.

**Theory and Hypotheses**

**Intimate Partner Aggression as a Stressor**

Two basic tenets of COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989) central to the arguments in this study are that (a) individuals strive to build, protect, and conserve valuable resources; and (b) stress occurs when individuals are threatened by potential resource loss, experienced depletion of actual resources, or failed to gain adequate resources following the investment of resources. Resources are defined as the objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies valued by individuals, or those that serve to help individuals attain the objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies which they value (Diener & Fujita, 1995; Hobfoll, 1989). Examples of resources include having a job (object), optimism (personal characteristic), married status (condition), and time (energies). As resources inherently have instrumental and/or symbolic value to individuals (Hobfoll, 1989), the loss of valued resources results in stress.

From a COR perspective, intimate partner aggression is conceptualised as a major stressor that significantly depletes employed women’s personal resources. When women experience partner aggression, they suffer from proximal losses in the form of physical injuries and psychological trauma (Campbell, 2002; Golding, 1999). Women may also experience losses as a result of the controlling behaviour of their male perpetrators (Levendosky et al., 2004; Logan, Shannon, Cole, & Swanberg, 2007). For example, having restricted financial access and being prevented from contacting family
and friends. Over time, the constraints of material and psychosocial resources (e.g. loss of self-esteem, loss of time with loved ones, and loss of money and possessions); and the prolonged feelings of betrayal, confusion and dissatisfaction in their intimate relationship have direct implications on their mental health, resulting in psychological distress (e.g. Beeble, Bybee, & Sullivan, 2010; Smith & Freedy, 2000; Thompson et al., 2000).

Furthermore, not only does the occurrence of intimate partner aggression threaten women’s ability to gain and maintain valued resources; it also impacts on other integral parts of her life. As Riger et al. (2002) found, intimate partner aggression has direct first- and second-order effects for women (e.g. poor health, inability to work, and impaired relationships with others); and indirect third-order effects on the people in her life (e.g. threats to family, friends, and co-workers). Thus, intimate partner aggression is considered a highly stressful experience, which results in resource depletion; and in turn, psychological distress (e.g. feelings of powerlessness, guilt, and anger). Indeed, a cross-sectional study of 444 women who attended family practices revealed that male partner-perpetrated aggression was a strong predictor of psychological distress after controlling for other depression risk factors (i.e. unemployment and being divorced) and socio-demographic characteristics (Romito, Turan, & De Marchi, 2005). Compared to non-abused women, women who reported past and current intimate partner aggression were also 5.95 times more likely to report psychological distress (Romito et al., 2005). Based on these findings, the present study proposes that:

Hypothesis 1: Intimate partner aggression is positively associated with psychological distress.
Relationships among Partner Aggression, Distress, and Work Outcomes

The sustained experience of psychological distress can impact on other areas of women’s lives. Notably, the workplace is one of the key life areas of women who are employed that is affected (Reeves, 2004; Riger et al., 2002). Individuals attempt to minimise loss by mobilising their remaining resources to cope with the ongoing stressors (Hobfoll, 1989). However, as the threat or actual loss of resources results in stress, individuals who are stressed become increasingly vulnerable to further resource depletion. This process whereby an initial loss in personal resources induces further loss is termed as loss spirals (Hobfoll, 1991). Additionally, the more intense the stressor is, the quicker the velocity of the loss spirals. In a state of prolonged distress, women lose valued personal and psychosocial resources, such as self-esteem, emotional and financial security, and marital status. Accordingly, these women have insufficient resources to concurrently cope with work demands, which greatly reduces their ability to perform at work. Indeed, empirical studies showed that the psychological strain caused by experiences of intimate partner aggression have detrimental effects on women’s ability to work (Pico-Alfonso et al., 2006). For instance, 71% of 518 recently-employed women reported poor concentration at work due to past-year partner victimisation (Swanberg et al., 2007). A conceptual model presented by Bhagat (1983) also suggested that stressful life events would lead to a deterioration of in job performance. Consequently, they are more vulnerable to losing their jobs due to poor performance appraisals at work (Swanberg et al., 2007).

Consistent with the logic of loss spirals, women who experienced psychological distress tend to have lower levels of task performance (i.e. in-role performance). Task
performance is defined as “the officially required outcomes and behaviours that directly serve organisational objectives” (Bakker & Heuven, 2006). Examples of in-role behaviours include compliance with rules and regulations, and completion of assigned duties on time. Indeed, Butler and Skattebo (2004) found that family-to-work conflict (e.g. absence from work due to family-related issues) was associated with poorer supervisor ratings of performance. Important to note is that the study measured performance using the dimension of planning, which is a commonly assessed dimension of work performance (Thornton & Byham, 1982) and relates to in-role behaviours. In addition, a review of several studies provided support that stressful events create conditions for cognitive fatigue (i.e. resource losses), which reduces the energy available for effective task performance (Cohen, 1980). Thus, it is reasonable to suggest that resource loss due to psychological distress would diminish the ability of women to fulfil their job requirements, leading to low levels of task performance.

Similarly, women who experienced psychological distress tend to perform fewer OCBs (i.e. prosocial extra-role behaviours) compared to non-abused women. Organ defined OCB as “individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognised by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organisation” (1988, p.4). Examples of OCBs are attending meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important; attending functions that are not required, but will help the organisation’s image; keeping up with changes in the organisation; and reading to stay current with organisational announcements and memos. Consistent with COR theory, as the combined stressors of intimate partner aggression and psychological distress drain the resource reserves of employed women,
their ability to cope with stress demands from the work domain is reduced. Accordingly, these women are unlikely to go the extra mile for their organisation because of constrained resources (e.g. energy and time). Past studies have shown that affective variables, such as mood and stress, have important causal effects on OCB (Motowidlo, Packard, & Manning, 1986). In particular, feelings of stress (measured as the intensity and frequency of stressful events) led to depression (i.e. resource loss), which resulted in fewer OCBs (Motowidlo et al., 1986). As such, women are deterred from performing OCB in an effort to conserve remaining resources in the face of multiple resource losses.

In sum, women who experienced intimate partner aggression suffer proximal resource losses, resulting in psychological distress. In turn, the experience of psychological distress triggers a loss spiral as women have fewer and fewer resources to simultaneously cope with the abuse and work demands. Continued efforts to meet demands at work would eventually result in poor job performance in the forms of lower task performance and fewer OCBs.

**Perceived Supervisor Support as a Second-stage Moderator**

A notable principle that emerged from COR theory is that resources are dynamic (i.e. individuals will experience changes in their resource reserve via resource gains and losses). As loss can be damaging to well-being, individuals are motivated to act in ways that would help them gain resources and protect against losses (Halbesleben, Neveu, Paustian-Underdahl, & Westman, 2014; Hobfoll, 1989). Additionally, by actively seeking out other resources during periods of high stress, individuals may attempt to recover their lost resources and conserve remaining reserves (Westman, Hobfoll, Chen,
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Davidson, & Laski, 2004). Similarly, employed women who experience intimate partner abuse commonly try and seek social support and protection at work. However, due to the personal nature of the issue, disclosing intimate partner aggression at work to seek organisational support may be a potential barrier (Swanberg & Macke, 2006). Further, the measure of organisational support includes broader organisational features, such as organisational rewards and job conditions (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), which are less relevant to supporting employees who experience intimate partner aggression. Therefore, supervisor support is a more suitable measure of work-related formal support for two reasons. First, supervisors are more tangible than the organisation to employees. Research found that employees commonly view their supervisors as agents of the organisation as supervisors are directly responsible for managing them, appraising their performance, and communicating with senior management (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Levinson, 1965). As a result, the chances of women disclosing the abuse to their supervisors and receiving the necessary support from work are potentially higher due to the more proximal nature of the supervisor-employee relationship. Second, the perception of supervisor support is related to that of organisational support, because employees usually view supervisors as being the “face” of the organisations. Indeed, research has showed that PSS leads to perception of organisational support (POS); to the extent that employees identified their supervisors with the organisation, their perception of supportive supervision would contribute to their POS and job retention (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenbergh, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Furthermore, supervisor’s
orientation towards employees is indicative of the organisation’s support (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger et al., 2002).

It is argued that PSS can be conceptualised as a type of formal support, because certain supports that supervisors are able to provide stem from their formal position and authority within the organisation. In addition to providing the intangible support (e.g. social companionship or emotional comfort) that informal support networks offer, supervisors are able to offer support in more tangible ways, such as giving referrals to employee assistance programs, permitting flexible workloads during the difficult period, and relocating their place of work. Indeed, employees’ motivations to disclose their abuse and the outcomes of disclosure were found to be “qualitatively and quantitatively distinct” (Sylaska & Edwards, 2014, p.4) between formal members (e.g. supervisors and lawyers) and informal members (e.g. family members).

Finally, the present study highlights that it is the employee’s perception of supervisor support that is of concern. For supervisor support to be perceived as effective and represent a resource gain, there must be a match between the type of support provided and the support desired by the employed women. Specifically, supervisor support must be congruent with the coping needs and situation of women (Perrin, Yragui, Hanson, & Glass, 2011; Yragui, Mankowski, Perrin, & Glass, 2012). Research found that a mismatch between the support provided and the support desired was perceived negatively by recipients, and associated with worse health, well-being, and employment outcomes (Mankowski & Wyer Jr., 1997; Reynolds & Perrin, 2004). Recipients may view the support provided negatively as it may have unintentionally dismissed their feelings as being insignificant, causing them to feel isolated and unable
to discuss their feelings (Wortman & Lehman, 1985). Further, a mismatch signals a possible lack of communication between themselves and the provider (Reynolds & Perrin, 2004). Thus, only perceptions that supervisor’s actions are supportive would represent a gain in resources, which would aid in stress resistance against the partner abuse and mitigate the negative work outcomes. Based on this line of theorising, the present study offers the following predictions:

Hypothesis 2a: The conditional indirect effect of intimate partner aggression on task performance via psychological distress would be stronger for women with low as opposed to high levels of PSS.

Hypothesis 2b: The conditional indirect effect of intimate partner aggression on OCB via psychological distress would be stronger for women with low as opposed to high levels of PSS.

Pilot Study

Method

Participants and Procedure. Participants in the pilot study were female employees working in two multinational companies in the securities technology industry in Singapore. Each employee received a survey kit containing an information sheet (stating the study’s aim, assuring confidentiality and voluntariness of participation), an envelope, and a questionnaire which contained demographic questions and self-report ratings of intimate partner aggression and psychological distress (See Appendix B). The questionnaire was prepared in English, because it is widely-used and regarded as the official and working language of Singapore (Leimgruber, 2013).
Employees were required to be either currently or previously (not more than 12 months) in a relationship with a male partner and cohabit with him. Employees were instructed to seal their completed questionnaire in the envelope before returning it to the researcher. Out of the 50 questionnaires that were distributed, 37 questionnaires were completed and returned yielding a response rate of 74.0%. Out of the 37 questionnaires, 1 was discarded because the employee is a single parent. The final sample included 36 participants.

Employees reported an average age of 36.78 years (SD = 9.51) and an average organisational tenure of 6.44 years (SD = 7.24). Majority of the employees (86.1%) had permanent employee status in the organisation, and 22.2% reported earning more than S$80,000 per annum in salary. They represent diverse occupational backgrounds, including accounting and finance (22.2%), marketing and sales (16.7%), general management and human resources (13.9%), information technology (8.3%), public relations (8.3%), customer service (5.6%), manufacturing and production (2.8%), and others (22.2%). More than half of the sample (55.6%) reported a university or post-graduate degree as their highest educational attainment. On average, the employees have been in a relationship in which they cohabit with their male partner for 10.75 years (SD = 8.17), and 63.9% of the employee sample reported having children, with the average number of children being 1.16 (SD = 1.05). The average age of male partners of the employee sample was 39.64 years (SD = 10.45). Majority of their male partners (63.9%) achieved a university or post-graduate degree as their highest educational attainment, and 88.9% of the male partners are working full-time.
Measures. Established multi-item scales were used to assess the study variables. Unless otherwise specified, participants responded to all questions, excluding demographic questions, using a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Items are coded such that a higher score indicated a greater amount of the focal construct, with the exception of reverse-coded items.

Intimate partner aggression. Intimate partner aggression was measured using three subscales of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS-2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). The CTS-2 is a well-validated instrument for assessing psychological and physical aggression in relationship conflict. The present study measured the frequency of physical assault (12 items), injury (5 items), and psychological aggression (8 items). Ratings are made in terms of frequency (e.g. 0 = never happened; 3 = 3 to 5 times in past year; 7 = not in the past year, but happened before). Straus et al. (1996) established internal consistency reliability ranging from .79 to .95 among a college student sample. There is also evidence for convergent validity between the CTS-2 measures of psychological aggression and physical assault, as empirical studies found a strong association between psychological (verbal) aggression and the risk of physical assault (Murphy & O’Leary, 1989; Straus, 1974). The high correlations between both subscales ($r = .71$ for men, $r = .67$ for women, $p < .01$) demonstrate construct validity of the scale. Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .80.

Employee’s psychological distress. Employee’s psychological distress was measured with a 4-item version of Derogatis’ (1993) Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI). Items were prefaced with the lead-in statement: “In the past six months, how often have you been...” and end with the options: feeling fearful, feeling restless, feeling
worthless, and feeling in panic. Research has found good internal consistency for the full BSI scale in clinical, community and forensic populations with reliability coefficients between .63 and .78 (Kellett, Beail, Newman, & Frankish, 2003). This shorter version has been verified to be highly correlated with ($r = .92$, $p < .001$) and equivalent to the full version (Restubog, Scott, & Zagenczyk, 2011). Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .93.

**Control variables.** In line with prior work, employee’s age and education level, as well as male partner’s education level and employment status were controlled for in the pilot study. Research suggests that these variables affect the occurrence of intimate partner aggression. Older women have lower risk of victimisation as they tend to have developed better negotiation skills that help them to successfully avoiding potential partner aggression (Romans, Forte, Cohen, Du Mont, & Hyman, 2007). Conversely, a disparity in education attainment between the couple increases the likelihood of victimisation (Capaldi, Knoble, Shortt, & Kim, 2012). Being educated reduces perpetration of partner aggression as it increase female empowerment through social networks, self-confidence, and economic independence (Jewkes, 2002). Male partner’s unemployment was significantly associated with increased career and life stress, which increases male-perpetrated aggression (Stith et al., 2004). However, intimate partner aggression is less common when men have paid work (Ansara & Hindin, 2009). Age was measured in years (as of last birthday). Education level was measured by asking employee to encircle one of the four options (i.e. primary school, secondary school, junior college/polytechnic, and university/postgraduate). The present study assessed
male partner’s employment status by asking employee to encircle the appropriate option (i.e. working full-time, working part-time, or not working).

**Results and Discussion**

Descriptive statistics, bivariate correlations, and internal consistency reliabilities for intimate partner aggression and psychological distress are presented in Table 1.

** Insert Table 1 here **

Prior to testing the relationship between intimate partner aggression and psychological distress, inspection of the data revealed no violation of the assumptions in hierarchical multiple regression. The error terms in the regression are independent, with the Durbin-Watson statistic at 1.86 (Durbin & Watson, 1951). However, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality is highly significant, $D(36) = .17$, $p < .01$, indicating that the distribution of the data is not normal and likely to be positively skewed. It is possible that the severity of intimate partner aggression was under-reported in the pilot study, as this is common in research of this nature (Gracia, 2004; Lloyd, 1997). An assessment of the intercorrelations among the independent variables suggested that they were low to moderate, and multicollinearity was not a threat (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Further analyses revealed no evidence of multivariate outliers.

Hypothesis 1 stated that intimate partner aggression would be positively associated with psychological distress, when controlling for the employee’s age, employee’s education level, male partner’s education level, and male partner’s employment status. Multiple regression analysis was used to test this hypothesis. The results of the hierarchical regression analysis is summarised in Table 2.
The results indicated the model explained 30.6% of the variance $R^2 = .30$, $F(1, 30) = 8.64, p < .01$. An examination of the standardised beta weights revealed that intimate partner aggression was positively related to psychological distress ($\beta = .51, p < .01$), over and above the effects of the demographic variables of the employee’s age ($\beta = .05, p = n.s.$), employee’s education level ($\beta = -.07, p = n.s.$), the male partner’s education level ($\beta = .03, p = n.s.$), and the male partner’s employment status ($\beta = -.17, p = n.s.$). Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported. This finding is consistent with those of previous studies that reported negative strain outcomes of intimate partner aggression (e.g. Beeble et al., 2010; Jaquier & Sullivan, 2014; Thompson et al., 2000). However, some features of the pilot study limit the inferences that can be drawn. First, the pilot study tested only for the main effects of intimate partner aggression on psychological distress, but it did not implicate psychological distress as an underlying mechanism that links intimate partner aggression to work outcomes. Second, although the pilot study demonstrated that intimate partner aggression is positively related to psychological distress, it did not consider any work-related outcome variables. Third, the pilot study used a cross-sectional research design, which makes proving a temporal relationship between the explanatory variable (intimate partner aggression) and outcome variable (psychological distress) difficult. Thus, the main study addresses these limitations by extending the pilot study to include the outcome variables of task performance and OCB, and testing the moderating role of PSS. Additionally, the main study included a time lag of four weeks between two points of data collection, thereby strengthening the methodological design.
Main Study

Method

Participants and Procedure. Data for the main study were collected from participants, who are female employees in a local community organisation in Manila, Philippines. As in the pilot study, employees were required to be either currently or previously (not more than 12 months) in a relationship with a male partner and cohabitate with him. In the main study, self-report and supervisor ratings of study variables were collected. All employees created anonymous identity codes to allow their ratings to be match with those of his/her corresponding supervisor. The questionnaire was prepared in English, because it is the common language used in higher education in the Philippines and the language of business spoken by most Filipinos (Bernardo, 2004).

The main study used a temporal research design with two waves of data collection. At Time 1, employees received a survey kit similar to that in the pilot study (See Appendix C). The survey contained demographic questions about the employee and their male partner, and employee’s self-report ratings of intimate partner aggression, psychological distress, emotional stability, and perceived supervisor support. The survey was disseminated to 380 female employees. Employees were instructed to seal their completed questionnaire in the pre-paid reply envelope before returning it to the researcher. A total of 304 employee surveys were received, yielding a response rate of 80%. Twenty-two employee surveys were removed because of a large number of missing responses or missing identity codes. At Time 2, four weeks after the initial survey, the researcher requested the employee to pass on the supervisor survey
for their immediate supervisor to complete (See Appendix D). For ethical reasons, the researcher wanted to provide employees with the control over whether or not they wish to continue participating by forwarding the survey to their supervisor. To maintain the integrity of supervisor data, supervisors were instructed to sign across the flap of the prepaid reply envelope after sealing it and to send the envelope directly to the researcher. The supervisor survey contained questions about the supervisor’s demographic (i.e. age, gender, and organisational tenure) and the supervisor’s rating of the employee’s task performance and OCB. Of the 304 supervisor surveys distributed, 246 surveys were received. After deleting those supervisor surveys with missing identity codes and those with a large number of missing responses \( n = 18 \), the final sample consisted of 228 matched employee-supervisor dyads.

The average age of the female employees was 36.76 years \( (SD = 7.12) \). Most employees (69.5\%) have organisational tenure of more than 5 years, and almost all employees (91.7\%) reported having permanent employment status in the organisation. 82.6\% of employees completed university or post-graduate degree as their highest educational attainment. They represent diverse occupational backgrounds, including general management and human resources (23.1\%), customer service (16.6\%), information technology (16.2\%), marketing and sales (15.3\%), accounting and finance (14.4\%), manufacturing and production (7.9\%), public relations (5.2\%), and others (1.3\%). On average, employees have been married to their male intimate partner for 9.38 years \( (SD = 6.51) \). All employees have children, with the average number of children being 1.75 \( (SD = .65) \). The average age of the male partners was 39.32 years \( (SD = 7.33) \). Majority of the male partners (91.2\%) achieved a university or post-
graduate degree as their highest educational attainment, and 89.9% of the male partners are working full-time. For the supervisor participants, average age was 45.41 years (SD = 6.90). 49.3% were male supervisors. Most supervisors (72.1%) had organisational tenure between 6 to 15 years.

Measures. Similar to the pilot study, established multi-item scales were used to adequately measure each study variable. Employees rated their agreement with each item using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), unless otherwise specified. Time limitations imposed by the participating organisation forced the shortening of some scales.

Intimate partner aggression. Intimate partner aggression was assessed at Time 1. Similar to the pilot study, employees completed the physical assault (12 items), injury (5 items), and psychological aggression (8 items) subscales of the CTS-2 (Straus et al., 1996). Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .95.

Employee’s psychological distress. Employee’s psychological distress was measured at Time 1. Similar to the pilot study, the 4-item version of Derogatis’ (1993) Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) was administered. Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .92.

Employee’s perception of supervisor support. PSS was assessed at Time 1 using a four-item scale developed by Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli (2001). Employees were asked to rate their perception of the level of supervisory support they receive from their immediate supervisor. A sample item is: “Help is available from my supervisor when I have a problem”. Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .95.
Supervisor-rated task performance. At Time 2, employee’s task performance (in-role behaviour) was measured. The four-item scale developed by Williams and Anderson (1991) assess tasks that employees are expected to perform as a normal function of their job. Previous research has found good internal consistency for this scale between .79 and .92 (Restubog, Bordia, & Tang, 2006; Zagenczyk, Restubog, Kiewitz, Kiazad, & Tang, 2011). A sample item is: “This employee fulfils responsibilities specified in the job description”. Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .96.

Supervisor-rated OCB. At Time 2, the civic virtue subscale of OCB (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990) was used to assess employee’s OCBs. The four-item civic virtue subscale was chosen to represent the OCB construct as employee behaviours in the civic subscale indicate that employees take an active interest in the life of their organisation (Podsakoff et al., 2009). Earlier studies have shown that behaviours in this dimension of OCB are directed towards the organisation and are most directly benefit organisational effectiveness (Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr, 2007; Organ, 1988). Past research has also found good internal consistency of Cronbach’s alpha between .80 and .84 for this scale (Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005; Zagenczyk et al., 2011). Additionally, Shoss and colleagues (2013) found that the 4-item civic virtue subscale was highly correlated with the 20-item OCB full scale ($r = .80, p < .01$). A sample item is: “This employee keeps updated of changes in the organisation”. Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .92.

Control variables. The main study measured and controlled for additional demographic variables of employees and their male partner, as compared to the pilot
Employee’s employment status was controlled for, because past studies found that the likelihood of victimisation increases when women are financially dependent on their male partner (Capaldi et al., 2012). Thus, having employment indicates that women are generating income and have the potential to be economically independent. The age of the male partner was controlled for because rates of intimate partner aggression started to decline as the age of the couple increases (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1982). The number of children was controlled for, because male partners perceived an increased stress in the family when children are present, thereby posing a risk for victimisation (Barnett & Fagan, 1993; Stith et al., 2004). Further, the main study controlled for employee’s personality trait of emotional stability using seven items from Goldberg’s (1992) semantic differential scale. As emotional stability was significantly related to psychological distress ($r = -0.29$, $p < .01$), PSS ($r = 0.24$, $p < .01$), task performance ($r = 0.19$, $p < .01$), and OCB ($r = 0.25$, $p < .01$), it was controlled for the analyses. Individuals with high levels of emotional stability tend to be calmer, more imperturbable, and have fewer emotional reactions to stressful situations than those with low levels of emotional stability (Hills & Argyle, 2001). Thus, employee’s trait of emotional stability may act as a form of personal resource that would buffer against the stress of intimate partner aggression. For the present study, Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .92.

**Results**

Descriptive statistics, bivariate correlations, and scale reliabilities for all the study variables are presented in Table 3. Correlations were in the predicted direction. Intimate partner aggression was positively related to psychological distress ($r = 0.18$, $p$
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< .01); and negatively related to supervisor-rated task performance \( r = -.36, p < .01 \)
and supervisor-rated OCBs \( r = -.23, p < .001 \).

** Insert Table 3 **

Hypothesis 1 predicted that intimate partner aggression would be positively
associated with psychological distress. Results indicated that the model predicting
Hypothesis 1 explained 3.1% of the variance, \( R^2 = .03, F (1, 226) = 7.14, p < .01 \).
Intimate partner aggression was positively associated with psychological distress \( \beta = .22, p < .01 \), over and above the effects of the control variables. Hence, Hypothesis 1
was supported.

Hypothesis 2a proposed that the conditional indirect effect of intimate partner
aggression in predicting task performance via psychological distress would be stronger
for women with low as opposed to high levels of PSS. Similarly, Hypothesis 2b
proposed that the conditional indirect effect of intimate partner aggression in predicting
OCBs via psychological distress would be stronger for women with low as opposed to
high levels of PSS. To test these hypotheses, the PROCESS macro (Model 14)
developed by Hayes’ (2012) was used. In addition to estimating coefficients of a model
using OLS regression, PROCESS is able to generate conditional indirect effects for
moderated mediation models. Notably, PROCESS constructs bias-corrected bootstrap
confidence intervals for conditional indirect effects in mediation models as part of its
output, which allows the hypotheses to be tested even when the total and indirect effects
are not normally distributed (Hayes, 2012). The estimates and bias-corrected
bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals (using 5,000 bootstrap samples) for the proposed
conditional indirect effects are presented in Table 4. An examination of the conditional indirect effects at specific values of PSS (i.e. ± 1 standard deviation around the mean) revealed that the indirect effect of intimate partner aggression on task performance via psychological distress was significant under low levels of PSS \((indirect \text{ \hspace{1mm} effect} = -0.05, SE = 0.03, 95\% \text{ \hspace{1mm} CI}: -0.11 \text{ \hspace{1mm} to \hspace{1mm} } -0.01)\), but not under high levels of PSS \((indirect \text{ \hspace{1mm} effect} = -0.01, SE = 0.02, 95\% \text{ \hspace{1mm} CI}: -0.05 \text{ \hspace{1mm} to \hspace{1mm} } -0.02)\). Similarly, the indirect effect of intimate partner aggression on OCB via psychological distress was significant only under low levels of PSS \((indirect \text{ \hspace{1mm} effect} = -0.06, SE = 0.03, 95\% \text{ \hspace{1mm} CI}: -0.13 \text{ \hspace{1mm} to \hspace{1mm} } -0.02)\), but not under high levels of PSS \((indirect \text{ \hspace{1mm} effect} = 0.01, SE = 0.02, 95\% \text{ \hspace{1mm} CI}: -0.03 \text{ \hspace{1mm} to \hspace{1mm} } 0.05)\). Given that the range is negative and the upper bound does not include zero, Hypotheses 2a and 2b were supported.

Hierarchical moderated regression analyses were performed to further assess the interactive effects involving psychological distress and PSS are presented in Table 5. Results revealed that interaction between psychological distress and PSS was statistically significant for both work outcomes of task performance \((B = 0.08, SE = 0.04, p < .05)\) and OCBs \((B = 0.14, SE = 0.04, p < .01)\). Simple slopes were plotted to examine the nature of the significant psychological distress-PSS interaction. There was a significant negative relationship between psychological distress and supervisor-rated task performance at low levels of PSS, \(t(217) = -2.76, p < .01\), as well as at high levels of PSS, \(t(217) = -2.90, p < .01\) (see Figure 2). Similarly, there was a significant negative relationship between psychological distress and supervisor-rated OCB at low
levels of PSS, $t(217) = -3.61, p < .001$, and at high levels of PSS, $t(217) = -3.81, p < .001$ (see Figure 3).

** Insert Table 5 here **

** Insert Figures 2 and 3 here **

In order to rule out alternative explanations for the study’s findings, PSS was also examined as a first-stage moderator of the intimate partner aggression-distress-work outcomes relationship. Results suggested that the interaction between intimate partner aggression and PSS was not significant for both supervisor-rated work outcomes of task performance ($B = -0.02, SE = .07, p = n.s.$) and OCBs ($B = -0.02, SE = .07, p = n.s.$). The indirect effects of intimate partner aggression on supervisor-rated task performance via psychological distress were not significant under low levels of PSS ($indirect\ effect = -0.03, SE = .03, 95\%\ CI: -0.11\ to\ .01$) and high levels of PSS ($indirect\ effect = -0.02, SE = .03, 95\%\ CI: -0.09\ to\ .03$). Similarly, the indirect effects of intimate partner aggression on supervisor-rated OCB via psychological distress were neither significant under low levels of PSS ($indirect\ effect = -0.03, SE = .03, 95\%\ CI: -0.11\ to\ .01$), nor under high levels of PSS ($indirect\ effect = -0.02, SE = .03, 95\%\ CI: -0.09\ to\ .03$). These findings are not surprising. It is unlikely that supervisors can intervene to provide support immediately after the abuse has occurred, because partner abuse occurs most often in the home domain (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989; Walker, 1984). Further, supervisors may not have the chance to intervene, because employees who have insufficient resources (due to resource depletion associated with the experience of abuse and psychological distress) are absent from work (LeBlanc et al., 2014; Reeves &
O’Leary-Kelly, 2007; Swanberg & Logan, 2005). Overall, these results provide further evidence for PSS as a second-stage moderator of the intimate partner aggression-distress-work outcomes relationship.

**General Discussion**

**Theoretical Implications**

While research on intimate partner aggression has affirmed the negative consequences for women both in the home and work domains, majority of these studies focused on direct effect relationships (e.g. Reeves & O’Leary-Kelly, 2007; Rothman & Corso, 2008; Swanberg et al., 2005). The present study had two important goals: (a) to unravel the underlying mechanism that explains why intimate partner aggression would lead to poor job performance, specifically, task performance and OCB; and (b) to examine PSS as an organisational resource that would buffer against the detrimental effects of abuse. Results found in the present study have addressed several gaps in the literature. Firstly, empirical evidence presented in the pilot study and main study suggested that intimate partner aggression is positively associated with psychological distress. Consistent with COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), intimate partner aggression is conceptualised as a form of resource loss that leads to stress and strain outcomes. When employed women suffer from intimate partner aggression, these highly stressful episodes cause the loss of valued personal resources (e.g. self-esteem, health, and marriage status). The prolonged experience of abuse from male partners is damaging to the physical and psychological health of women (Campbell, 2002; Golding, 1999), and this would lead to feelings of distress. In turn, the sustained distress drains their psychosocial resources and further depletes their available resource reserves to cope
with challenges in the workplace. As observed in the present study, employed women who experienced intimate partner aggression reported higher levels of psychological distress and they reflected poorer job performance, in the form of lower levels of task performance and fewer OCBs as rated by their supervisors. Thus, the present study has provided a theoretical framework based on COR to explain how experiences of partner abuse would lead to negative work outcomes through psychological distress. Additionally, the identification of psychological distress as an underlying process in explaining why intimate partner aggression would transcend the home domain to negatively affect work outcomes lends support to existing findings on the cross-domain relationship between work and family conflict (Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011; Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007; Thomas & Ganster, 1995).

Second, the present study has drawn attention to a proximal and concrete form of support found in the workplace – PSS. Support was found for Hypotheses 2a and 2b, which predicted that the conditional indirect effects of intimate partner aggression in predicting work outcomes (i.e. task performance and OCBs) via psychological distress would be stronger for women with low as opposed to high levels of PSS. In particular, the results revealed that the negative impacts of intimate partner aggression on work outcomes at low levels of PSS are not only significant, but also stronger. This pattern of results suggests that PSS is potentially a protective factor for intimate partner aggression that can be found within the organisation. To this end, the present study offers a possible reason why intimate partner aggression resulted in more severe work outcomes for women who perceived little or no supervisory support. Recall that this study previously argued that the cumulative stressful experiences of intimate partner
aggression and psychological distress would trigger a loss spiral, which manifests in the form of poor job performance for women who are employed. However, through the supervisor’s ability to offer practical support and emotional support, women could regain the lost resources. Taken together, this suggests that employed women could continue to be trapped in a cycle of loss until they have access to sufficient helpful resources that would stop the momentum of the loss spiral from increasing. In other words, low levels of PSS imply that women do not have access to additional resources at work that they can use to buffer against the stress of abuse. Consequently, they continue to remain in a loss spiral that constantly gains momentum; and this affects their work through poorer task performance and fewer OCBs. Following this line of reasoning, women with high levels of PSS have additional resources to manage ongoing stressors. Therefore, they are able to prevent the loss spiral from escalating, resulting in relatively better work outcomes. Indeed, recent studies found that employed women who were offered the options of schedule and workload flexibility from their supervisors had greater chances of maintaining longer term employment as they were able to better manage their time (Perrin et al., 2011; Swanberg et al., 2007).

With regards to the contributions of the present study, two issues are especially significant. First, this study is able to provide a theoretical framework under COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989) to explain why and how intimate partner aggression would result in poorer task performance and fewer OCBs at work. Specifically, this study showed that experiencing partner aggression was related to feelings of psychological distress, which triggered a loss cycle leading to poorer job performance. In doing so, the present study has drawn attention to one plausible way (i.e. psychological distress) of theorising
the link between intimate partner aggression and negative work outcomes. Additionally, results from this study provided further empirical evidence for the concept of loss spirals (Hobfoll, 1991), wherein an initial loss of resources due to intimate partner aggression led to an increased vulnerability to further resource loss (i.e. psychological distress and work consequences). Secondly, the present study showed that supervisors have an important responsibility to assume in reducing the organisational costs of intimate partner aggression. That is, supervisors have the ability to provide emotional and practical supports to employed women, in order to help them regain resources and cope their work demands. By focusing on PSS as a more proximal measure of organisational support, this study acknowledged the dynamic nature of stress, whereby losses and gains in resources could alter the level of stress faced by women who experience intimate partner aggression; and also advanced understanding of the potential organisational buffers against intimate partner aggression.

**Implications for Management**

Knowing now that occurrences of intimate partner aggression drain resource reserves and have a negative effect on employees’ job performance, organisations must ensure that employees who experience intimate partner aggression are supported in a way that would help them regain valued resources, in order to reduce the negative effects in the workplace. The results of the present study offer several implications for management practice. Specifically, organisations can provide appropriate and desired support at two levels – the interpersonal level (via supervisors) and the community level (Heijnders & Van Der Meij, 2006).
First, organisations should recognise that supervisors are tangible representations of the organisation, and that employees interact with them to form judgements about the organisation. That is, supervisors are like the “human face” of the organisation. Indeed, research has found that employed women relied on their immediate supervisors for the provision of desired workplace supports regardless of the stages of change they experience in the abusive relationship (Perrin et al., 2011). Importantly, PSS was found to be helpful in reducing the psychological distress experienced by abused women. In an empirical study of 355 managers, supervisory support for work-family balance was a significant moderator for the relationship between work-family conflict and psychological strain (O'Driscoll et al., 2003). Taken together, these findings suggest that organisations should encourage and increase supervisors’ awareness for employee needs, in order to prevent the development of work-family conflict-related strain and alleviate the negative work outcomes. Organisations should also communicate to employees that their supervisors are the first point of contact when they require direction, advice, and support relating to their work.

Second, as the stigma of partner abuse makes this issue a particularly difficult topic to discuss in certain cultures and work environments (Menjívar & Salcido, 2002; Nelson, 1996), supervisors should be encouraged to act in a manner that reduces the stigma associated with being a victim of partner abuse in the workplace. For example, supervisors could promote open discussions (e.g. via informal conversations or group meetings) about the type of support employees would desire if they are experiencing abuse from their intimate partner. These informal conversations allow supervisors to gain a good understanding of the possible workplace supports that could be offered, and
have the added advantage of letting those employees who are victims to voice their desired support without having to first disclose their situation. Concurrently, organisations must raise awareness amongst their employees about the issue of intimate partner aggression and the fact that this problem goes beyond the domestic domain. One way of doing so is to engage external employee assistance programs (EAPs) to conduct awareness-raising workshops to educate employees about intimate partner aggression and how to recognise signs of abuse among employees (Lindquist et al., 2010). Awareness can also be raised through communication materials circulated to employees, such as monthly newsletters and putting up posters around the organisation. Heijnders and Van Der Meij (2006) found that these intervention strategies are effective in modifying the environment around the stigmatised individual and can be targeted at the stigmatised individual, their work environment, and their support networks. Indeed, it is insufficient for organisations to simply implement family-friendly policies and provide benefits to employees. For these organisational benefits to be effective in buffering stress, research has found that they must be accompanied by support from supervisors (Kofodimos, 1995) and changes in organisational norms and values relating to work and family interaction (Galinsky & Stein, 1990; Lobel & Kossek, 1996).

Lastly, organisations could develop workplace policies that address intimate partner aggression and establish training programs to guide supervisors on how to effectively support employees. Workplace policies, such as zero-tolerance and mandatory reporting of intimate partner aggression, demonstrate to employees that the organisation is supportive of victims of intimate partner aggression and willing to take an active stance towards tackling this issue. However, researchers discovered that
organisations tend to avoid taking a proactive approach towards addressing this issue, because they are uncertain about their role in what is traditionally regarded as a private matter and want to avoid being caught in the middle for legal reasons (O’Leary-Kelly et al., 2008). As such, seeking external consultation from reputable EAPs during the development of appropriate organisational policies can be potentially useful (Lindquist et al., 2010). Further, the establishment of a training program for supervisors can help in three ways: (a) educate supervisors about what intimate partner aggression is, its relation to and consequences at the work, and how to identify if their employees are victims; (b) define and clarify the responsibilities that employers have towards employees affected by intimate partner aggression; and (c) facilitate the creation of organisational protocols that supervisors can use when dealing with employees who disclose abuse to them. Organisations can communicate that these training programs for supervisors are a way that the organisation acknowledges the challenging role as a supervisor, and a way of showing their support of this role. Research found that supervisors who feel supported by the organisation reciprocate with giving more supportive treatment to their subordinates, which in turn is positively related to subordinates’ POS, in-role performance, and extra-role performance (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006). This finding also lends support to the notion that supervisors act as agents of the organisation. Organisations that are interested in setting up such a training program can start by referring to the Corporate Alliance to End Partner Violence (CAEPV) website, which provides information on how organisations and business leaders can work together to help eliminate partner aggression (CAEPV, 2014).
Strengths, Limitations, and Future Research Directions

This section highlights the strengths that enhanced the study’s contribution to the literature, acknowledges the potential limitations of the study, and notes key areas where additional research would be valuable. First, the sample of employees used in the pilot and main studies presents a methodological strength, as the participants represent the larger majority of women in the general population. Focal participants are educated women, who are employed professionals across diverse occupations and live at home with their partners. Most studies in this research area have used samples of women living in shelters (e.g. Wingood, DiClemente, & Raj, 2000); college students (Straus, 2008); or women with low socio-economic status, such as those in a community battered women’s programs (Mechanic, Weaver, & Resick, 2008) and support groups (Shepard & Pence, 1988). It is plausible that educated and employed women have been generally ignored in the literature due to the under-reporting of the abuse (Lloyd, 1997). Another possible reason why this group of educated and employed women have been overlooked is because their victimisation is much less severe and less obvious than women from low socio-economic background (Swanberg et al., 2007). This omission is crucial as intimate partner aggression affects employed women as much as disadvantaged women from vulnerable population subgroups (Jones et al., 1999). In addition to poor health, women who are employed suffer from relatively greater losses because they also have negative outcomes at work (Swanberg et al., 2005). However, employed women also face a different situation compared to women in disadvantage sub-groups, because they may have access to organisational support and benefits, such as medical allowance and work flexibility, that could help them cope with the abuse.
(Kwesiga, Bell, Pattie, & Moe, 2007). Hence, this sample is a relevant and important one to examine. Future research is strongly encouraged to conduct comparative studies between women across all economic brackets and age groups (Kwesiga et al., 2007). Not only would such research assist the development of targeted and more effective interventions for the different groups of women, it would also potentially tease out the subtleties between the experiences of different women to permit a richer and more in-depth understanding of the impact of intimate partner aggression on employment.

A second strength in the methodology is reflected in the use of supervisor-ratings to measure employee outcomes at work. In general, individuals tend to respond in socially desirable ways. This means that it is common for participants to over-report behaviours that are viewed as socially appropriate and under-report behaviours that are deemed undesirable or inappropriate (Donaldson & Grant-Vallone, 2002). Depending on what behaviour the items are measuring, participants’ responses could reflect an upward or downward bias. In addition to social desirability, common method variance (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) also poses a threat to the validity of the findings when only self-report measures are used (Donaldson & Grant-Vallone, 2002). By examining employee work behaviours of task performance and OCBs using data from a separate data source (i.e. supervisors), the present study is able to reduce social desirability bias (Arnold & Feldman, 1981). As recommended by Podsakoff and Organ (1986), future research could consider using multiple data sources to measure conceptually crucial variables, in order to minimise the susceptibility to social desirability and strengthen the validity of the data. For instance, measures of employee’s work outcomes could be rated
by the employee, her supervisor, and her peers, and then averaged to give a general measure of the variables.

Another strength of this study lies in the temporal research design employed. Between the two points of data collection, there was a four-week interval – intimate partner aggression and psychological distress were measured at Time 1, and supervisor’s rating of employees’ work outcomes were measured at Time 2. Most of the earlier studies examining work-related outcomes of intimate partner aggression have generally measured all the key variables at one point in time (Brush, 2000; Lloyd & Taluc, 1999; Riger et al., 2002; Swanberg, & Logan, 2005). As noted in Swanberg et al. (2005), cross-sectional studies fail to highlight the complex nuances associated with partner abuse and employment. Although having a time lag between measurements of study variables (i.e. intimate partner aggression distress, and work outcomes) does not ascertain the temporal ordering of the study variables; it is an effective strategy employed to address the problem of common method variance as it minimises response contamination. In other words, a temporal lag reduces the likelihood that respondents will intentionally bias the response to remain cognitively consistent with their previous answers (Doty & Glick, 1998; Podsakoff, & Organ, 1986).

While time lag design is an advantage over previous research that only used a cross-sectional design, this research design could also be a potential limitation in that the time lag is not a long enough period for the impact of intimate partner aggression on women’s work outcome to be conclusive (especially for non-severe cases of abuse). The four-week interval was chosen, because of time constraints of the Honours thesis. Thus, it restricts the ability of this study to ascertain causality that intimate partner aggression
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predates the negative work outcomes. As intimate partner aggression is usually long-term and pervasive issue, cross-sectional studies, including temporal studies, fail to adequately capture the extent to which barriers to work persist over time and the potential impacts that these barriers have on longer-term employment (Danziger & Seefeldt, 2002). Consequently, it is difficult to determine whether or not the negative work outcomes displayed were due to the stress of intimate partner aggression or other factors, such as preceding health status (Deyessa et al., 2009). It is recommended that future research utilise a longitudinal design to investigate whether casual inferences about the relationship between intimate partner aggression and work outcomes are justified. Longitudinal studies would also allow researchers time to attain a more complete and richer understanding of the long-term ramifications that intimate partner aggression have on women’s employment. With regards to those women who maintain employment despite experiencing intimate partner aggression, longitudinal research in this area could also further our understanding of the personal and organisational factors that help them cope with the abuse.

Another possible drawback of the present study is the use of a general measure of PSS, instead of a measure of PSS that is specific to work-family conflict. The present study used a four-item measure of PSS, which measured perceived supervisory support for employee’s general work effectiveness or work role. However, prior research noted that supervisor work-family support is related to supervisory helping behaviours and attitudes that are specifically directed at facilitating the employee’s ability to manage both work and family demands (Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner, & Hanson, 2009; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Examples of such support would be when supervisors
express care and empathy over employee’s work-family well-being; when supervisors give employees more autonomy and flexibility to decide when and where to work from so that they can manage their family and work demands; and when supervisors provide more access to information on the organisation’s work-family policies. These specific supervisor supports towards work-family demands are not present in the general measure of PSS used in this study (Thomas & Ganster, 1995), which indicates that the buffering effect of PSS may be potentially greater than what was found. Indeed, a validation study found work-family-specific supervisor support to be significantly related to lower work-family conflict compared to a general measure of supervisor support (Hammer et al., 2009). Future research could use a more specific measure of PSS, because it may provide more explanatory power for the buffering role of PSS against the stress of intimate partner aggression. Indeed, supervisor support specifically targeted at helping employees manage work and family demands provides employee with more relevant tangible and psychological resources (Allen, 2001; Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, & Hammer, 2011). Thus, it would not only buffer stress from work, but also represent a resource gain that aid with resource conservation in both domains.

Finally, it is important to note that intimate partner aggression is a culturally sensitive issue in the Southeast Asian countries (i.e. Singapore and the Philippines) where the data were collected. Both countries have a collectivistic culture and such cultures view the family unit as a social unit (Hofstede, 1998). Collectivist cultural groups are largely concerned with preserving “face” of the family unit and keeping personal information within the family, making it more unlikely for participants to disclose the perceived shame of partner aggression to third parties, such as researchers
and organisations (Sanchez-Hucles & Dutton, 1999). As such, the sensitive nature of the survey is likely to bias results in the direction of under-reporting. Unsurprisingly, the rating of intimate partner aggression in this study strongly tended towards zero. However, given that the observed pattern of results is similar to other non-Western studies (e.g. Babu & Kar, 2009; Hassan et al., 2004), the low reported rates of intimate partner aggression are congruent with previous research. Future research with participants from non-Western collectivist cultures could include an initial rapport-building session to discuss related issues in a non-threatening environment to facilitate trust between the participants and researchers. As Yick and Berthold (2005) suggested, fostering trust and credibility with participants is a strategy that could potentially improve disclosure rates among participants.
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INTIMATE PARTNER AGGRESSION, DISTRESS, AND PSS


Table 1
Mean, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations among the pilot study variables (N = 36).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.   Employee’s age</td>
<td>36.78</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.   Employee’s education</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.   Partner’s education</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.   Partner’s employment</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.   Intimate partner aggression</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.   Employee’s psychological distress</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The reliability coefficients appear in the parentheses along the main diagonal.

**p < .01, ***p < .001.
Table 2

Summary of hierarchical regression analyses for the pilot study variables (N = 36).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Employee’s age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Employee’s education</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Partner’s education</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Partner’s employment</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intimate partner</td>
<td>1.05**</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. B = unstandardized beta coefficients; SE = standard error.

**p < .01.
### Table 3

Means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations among the main study variables (N = 228).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employee’s age</td>
<td>36.76</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Employee’s employment</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employee’s education</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of children</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Partner’s age</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Partner’s education</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Partner’s employment</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Emotional stability</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>(1.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. IPA</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Psychological distress</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. PSS</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.24***</td>
<td>-.40***</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Task performance</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. OCB</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Reliability coefficients appear in parentheses in the main diagonal. IPA = intimate partner aggression; PSS = perceived supervisor support; OCB = organisational citizenship behaviour.

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
Table 4

Estimates and bias-corrected bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals at ± 1 standard deviation of PSS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of PSS</th>
<th>Supervisor-rated task performance</th>
<th>Supervisor-rated OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IE (SE)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−1 SD PSS</td>
<td>-.05 (.03)</td>
<td>-.11 to -.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD PSS</td>
<td>-.01 (.02)</td>
<td>-.05 to .02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Bootstrapped estimates and the standard errors of the conditional indirect effects are presented.

*Note.* IE = indirect effect; SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; PSS = perceived supervisor support; OCB = organisational citizenship behaviour.
Table 5

Summary of regression analyses of the interactive effects of psychological distress and PSS on work outcomes (N = 228).

<p>| Variables and steps | Supervisor-rated task performance | | | | Supervisor-rated OCB | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee’s age</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>- .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee’s employment</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee’s education</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner’s age</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner’s education</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner’s employment</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological distress</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological distress X PSS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\Delta R^2$          | .11**   | .20***  | .08*    | .04     | .10**   | .12***  | .04**   |

Note. $B =$ unstandardized beta coefficients. PSS = perceived supervisor support; OCB = organisational citizenship behaviour.

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
Figure 1. The proposed theoretical model.
Figure 2. Interactive relationship between psychological distress and PSS in predicting supervisor-rated task performance.
Figure 3. Interactive relationship between psychological distress and PSS in predicting supervisor-rated OCB.
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Employee Information Sheet and Questionnaire for the Pilot Study
Information Sheet for Participant

Dear Participant,

My name is Cheryl Ng. I am currently pursuing a Bachelor of International Business (Honours) at the Australian National University. I am under the joint supervision of Professor Simon Lloyd D. Restubog (Principle Supervisor) and Dr. Patrick Raymund James M. Garcia.

The purpose of this study is to examine employees’ family experiences and its relationship with their work attitudes and behaviours. We would like to invite you to participate in this study.

- The Survey asks questions about your family and home life, and your experiences at work.
- It should take approximately 15-20 minutes to fill up the Survey. Please address each item carefully, but do not spend considerable time on any particular question.
- Please be assured that the questions in the Survey are not meant to trick you in any way. All the questions are important items and have been part of previous researches. Please answer as honestly as possible.

Confidentiality, Participant Rights, and General Instructions

- Participation in the study is completely voluntary and strictly anonymous. Please do not write your name on the Survey. Responses are strictly confidential and will only be seen by myself and my supervisors. Your organisation will not be given any record of these information.
- You have the right to, without any penalty, decline to take part or withdraw from the study at any point in time. If you decide to withdraw your participation, all the information provided by you will be destroyed securely.
- You will receive a self-report survey, which you have to complete. For this study to be successful, it is necessary for you to respond as honestly as possible, even if the information that you provide is not favourable. We understand that it is not always possible to maintain a desired balance between family and work, and often, the world of work is also not a pleasant place. Hence, some of the issues that we seek to address here reflect both good and bad elements of your home and working life.

Collection of the Survey

- Please place the completed survey in the enclosed envelope and seal the envelope prior to returning it. I will be personally collecting this envelope back from you.

If you have any questions about this research, you can contact myself or my Principle Supervisor with the contact details provided below. This research has been approved by the ANU Human Research Ethics Committee (2010/545). If you have any concerns of an ethical nature, you may contact the ethics committee at the ANU at human.ethics.officer@anu.edu.au or +61 (2) 6125 3427.

Thank you once again for your time and participation.

Cheryl Ng
Phone: +61 4 1264 7061
Email: cheryl.ng@anu.edu.au

Professor Simon Lloyd D. Restubog
Phone: +61 2 6125 7319
Email: simon.restubog@anu.edu.au

______________________________________________________________________________________

Please sign below if you agree to participate in the study.

I, ___________________________ (print name), agree to participate in this study. I have read the research information sheet and understand my rights as a participant.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: _______________
**SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

This section is needed to help analyze the data and draw more meaningful conclusions from the survey results. Your responses are completely confidential and no one at your current organization will have access to this information.

1. Gender (please encircle): 1 Male 2 Female
2. Age (as of last birthday): _________
3. How long have you been working with your current organization (in years)? _________
4. Please indicate your current employment status (please encircle):
   1 permanent 2 probationary 3 contractual 4 casual
5. How long have you been in a relationship and live together with your partner? _______ year(s)
6. What is your highest educational attainment (please encircle)?
   1 primary school 2 secondary school 3 junior college 4 university/post-graduate
7. What type of job are you currently engaged in (please encircle)?
   1 accounting and finance 2 customer service
   3 marketing and sales 4 public relations
   5 general management and HR 6 information technology
   7 manufacturing and production 8 others: __________________
8. What is your gross salary per annum (figures in Singapore dollars, please encircle)?
   1 less than 10,000 2 10,001 to 20,000 3 20,001 to 30,000 4 30,001 to 40,000
   5 40,001 to 50,000 6 50,001 to 60,000 7 60,001 to 70,000 8 greater than 80,000
9. Do you have children? 1 Yes 2 No If yes, how many? _________
10. Age of your partner (as of last birthday)? _________
11. What is your partner’s highest educational attainment (please encircle)?
   1 primary school 2 secondary school 3 junior college 4 university/post-graduate
12. Is your partner working...?  
   1 full-time 2 part-time 3 not working
13. What is your partner’s gross salary per annum (figures in Singapore dollars, please encircle)?
   1 less than 10,000 2 10,001 to 20,000 3 20,001 to 30,000 4 30,001 to 40,000
   5 40,001 to 50,000 6 50,001 to 60,000 7 60,001 to 70,000 8 greater than 80,000
14. What type of job is your partner currently engaged in (please encircle)?
   1 accounting and finance 2 customer service
   3 marketing and sales 4 public relations
   5 general management and HR 6 information technology
   7 manufacturing and production 8 others: __________________
Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of things that might happen when you have differences. Please circle how many times your partner did each of these things towards you in the past year. If your partner did not do one of these things in the past year, but it happened before that, circle 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Insulted or swore at me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Shouted or yelled at me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Stomped out of the room or house during a disagreement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Said something to spite me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Called me fat or ugly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Destroyed something belonging to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Accused me of being a lousy lover</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Threatened to hit or throw something at me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Threw something at me that could hurt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Twisted my arm or hair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Pushed or shoved me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Grabbed me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Slapped me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Used a knife or gun on me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Punched or hit me with something that could hurt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Chocked me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Slammed me against a wall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Beat me up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Burned or scalded me on purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Kicked me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with him</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I felt physical pain the next day because of a fight with him</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I passed out from being hit on the head by him in a fight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I went to a doctor because of a fight with him</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I needed to see a doctor due to a fight with him, but I didn't</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I had a broken bone from a fight with him</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how often you have experienced the following feelings with respect to your partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Feeling fearful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Feeling restless</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Feeling worthless</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Feeling in panic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION C: ABOUT YOUR WORK AND FAMILY**

Unless specified, please use the following rating scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. The demands of my family life interfere with work-related activities
46. I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home
47. Things I want to do at work don’t get done because of the demands of my family
48. My home life interferes with my responsibilities at work, such as getting to work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime
49. Family-related problems/strains interfere with my ability to perform job-related duties
50. It is often difficult to tell where my family life ends and my work life begins
51. I tend to integrate my work and family duties when I work in my workplace
52. In my life, there is a clear boundary between my career and my role as a partner

**SECTION D: ASSESSMENT OF YOURSELF**

Please encircle the number closest to the adjective descriptive of you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angry</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Nervous</th>
<th>Envious</th>
<th>Unstable</th>
<th>Discontented</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At ease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not envious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unemotional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Employee Information Sheet and Questionnaire for the Main Study
Information Sheet for Participant

Dear Participant,

My name is Cheryl Ng. I am currently pursuing a Bachelor of International Business (Honours) at the Australian National University. I am under the joint supervision of Professor Simon Lloyd D. Restubog (Principle Supervisor) and Dr. Patrick Raymund James M. Garcia.

The purpose of this study is to examine employees’ family experiences and its relationship with their work attitudes and behaviours. We would like to invite you and your immediate supervisor to participate in this study.

There are two sets of questionnaires. The first is a self-report survey that asks questions about your family and home life, and your experiences at work. It should take approximately 15-20 minutes to fill up the survey. Please address each item carefully, but do not spend considerable time on any particular question. Please be assured that the questions in the survey are not meant to trick you in any way. All the questions are important items and have been part of previous researches. Please answer as honestly as possible. The second survey involves a supervisor rating form. You will need to pass on this form to your immediate supervisor, and he/she will be asked to state their view about your work attitudes and behaviour. It should take approximately 10-15 minutes to fill up the rating form.

Confidentiality, Participant Rights, and General Instructions

- Participation in the study is **completely voluntary and strictly anonymous**. Please do not write your name on the Survey. Responses are strictly confidential and will only be seen by myself and my supervisors. Your organisation will not be given any record of these information.
- You have the right to decline to take part or withdraw from the study at any point in time. If you decide to withdraw your participation, all the information provided by you will be destroyed securely.
- You will receive a self-report survey, which you have to complete. For this study to be successful, it is necessary for you to respond as honestly as possible, even if the information that you provide is not favourable. We understand that it is not always possible to maintain a desired balance between family and work, and often, the world of work is also not a pleasant place. Hence, some of the issues that we seek to address here reflect both good and bad elements of your home and working life.

Collection of the Survey

- Please place the completed survey in the enclosed envelope and seal the envelope prior to returning it. I will be personally collecting this envelope back from you.

If you have any questions about this research, you can contact myself or my Principle Supervisor with the contact details provided below. This research has been approved by the ANU Human Research Ethics Committee (2010/545). If you have any concerns of an ethical nature, you may contact the ethics committee at the ANU at human.ethics.officer@anu.edu.au or +61 (2) 6125 3427.

Thank you once again for your time and participation.

Cheryl Ng
Phone: +61 4 1264 7061
Email: cheryl.ng@anu.edu.au

Professor Simon Lloyd D. Restubog
Phone: +61 2 6125 7319
Email: simon.restubog@anu.edu.au

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Please sign below if you agree to participate in the study.

I, _______________________________________ (print name), agree to participate in this study. I have read the research information sheet and understand my rights as a participant.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: _______________
**SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

This section is needed to help analyze the data and draw more meaningful conclusions from the survey results. Your responses are completely confidential and no one at your current organization will have access to this information.

1. Gender (please encircle): 1 Male 2 Female
2. Age (as of last birthday): __________
3. How long have you been working with your current organization (in years)? __________
4. Please indicate your current employment status (please encircle):
   1 permanent 2 probationary 3 contractual 4 casual
5. How long have you been in a relationship and live together with your partner? _______ year(s)
6. What is your highest educational attainment (please encircle):
   1 primary school 2 college 3 university/post-graduate
7. What type of job are you currently engaged in (please encircle):
   1 accounting and finance 2 customer service 3 marketing and sales 4 public relations
   5 general management and HR 6 information technology 7 manufacturing and production 8 others: __________
8. How many children do you have? __________
9. Age of your partner (as of last birthday)? __________
10. What is your partner’s highest educational attainment (please encircle)?
    1 primary school 2 college 3 university/post-graduate
11. Is your partner working...?
    1 full-time 2 part-time 3 not working

**SECTION B: RELATIONSHIP WITH YOUR PARTNER**

Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of things that might happen when you have differences. Please circle how many times your partner did each of these things towards you in the past year. If your partner did not do one of these things in the past year, but it happened before that, circle 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Once in the past year</th>
<th>Twice in the past year</th>
<th>3-5 times in the past year</th>
<th>6-10 times in the past year</th>
<th>11-20 times in the past year</th>
<th>More than 20 times in the past year</th>
<th>Not in the past year, but happened before</th>
<th>This has never happened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Insulted or swore at me
13. Shouted or yelled at me
14. Stomped out of the room or house during a disagreement
15. Said something to spite me
16. Called me fat or ugly
17. Destroyed something belonging to me
18. Accused me of being a lousy lover
19. Threatened to hit or throw something at me
### INTIMATE PARTNER AGGRESSION, DISTRESS, AND PSS

| 20. Threw something at me that could hurt | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 21. Twisted my arm or hair | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 22. Pushed or shoved me | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 23. Grabbed me | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 24. Slapped me | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 25. Used a knife or gun on me | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 26. Punched or hit me with something that could hurt | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 27. Choked me | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 28. Slammed me against a wall | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 29. Beat me up | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 30. Burned or scalded me on purpose | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 31. Kicked me | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 32. I had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with him | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 33. I felt physical pain the next day because of a fight with him | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 34. I passed out from being hit on the head by him in a fight | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 35. I went to a doctor because of a fight with him | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 36. I needed to see a doctor because of a fight with him, but I didn’t | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |
| 37. I had a broken bone from a fight with him | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 |

Please indicate how often you have experienced the following feelings with respect to your partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the past months, how often have you been...</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38. Feeling fearful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Feeling restless</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Feeling worthless</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Feeling in panic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION C: ABOUT YOUR WORK AND FAMILY

Unless specified, please use the following rating scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 42. Demands of my family life interfere with work-related activities | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 43. I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 44. Things I want to do at work don’t get done because of the demands of my family | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 45. My home life interferes with work responsibilities, such as getting to work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 46. Family-related problems/strains interfere with my ability to perform job-related duties | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 47. It is often difficult to tell where my family life ends and my work life begins | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
48. I tend to integrate my work and family duties when I work in my workplace.  
49. In my life, there is a clear boundary between my career and my role as a partner.

SECTION D: ABOUT YOU IN GENERAL AND THE SUPPORT YOU GET

53. My organization strongly considers my goals and values.  
54. My organization really cares about my well-being.  
55. My organization shows concern for me.  
56. My organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part.  
57. My organization cares about my opinions.  
58. If given the opportunity, my organization would not take advantage of me.  
59. Help is available from my organization when I have a problem.  
60. My organization is willing to help me when I need a special favour.

61. Help is available from my supervisor when I have a problem.  
62. My supervisor really cares about my well-being.  
63. My supervisor shows a lot of concern for me.  
64. My supervisor cares about my general satisfaction at work.

SECTION E: ASSESSMENT OF YOURSELF

Please encircle the number closest to the adjective descriptive of you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
<td>4  5  6</td>
<td>7  Calm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
<td>4  5  6</td>
<td>7  Relaxed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
<td>4  5  6</td>
<td>7  At ease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envious</td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
<td>4  5  6</td>
<td>7  Not envious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
<td>4  5  6</td>
<td>7  Stable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontented</td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
<td>4  5  6</td>
<td>7  Contented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
<td>4  5  6</td>
<td>7  Unemotional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION F: ANONYMOUS CODE

Please create an anonymous code using the following information. This code enables the researchers to match your responses to the self-report survey to the supervisor rating form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>YOUR RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first two letters of your first name</td>
<td>My first name is Maria [M] [A]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The last two letters of your surname</td>
<td>My surname name is Cruz [U] [Z]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The date (in the month) of your birthday</td>
<td>Born December 3, 1970 [0] [3]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Supervisor Information Sheet and Questionnaire for the Main Study
Information Sheet for Supervisors

Dear Participant/Supervisors,

The purpose of this supervisor’s rating form is to examine another viewpoint of the participant’s work attitudes and behaviours. The ratings in this form obtained are extremely useful in our study on understanding relationships between employees and employers.

Please be assured that the ratings that are collected will only be used for research purposes and does not represent a formal evaluation of the participant’s work in any way. Please note that only my research supervisors and I will have access to the ratings in this form and that the confidentiality of the participant and his/her supervisor are assured.

Instructions for the Participant:

- Please write your anonymous identification code generated in Section F of the Survey below. This code enables me to match your responses in the self-report survey to this supervisor rating form.

  Anonymous code: ________________________

- Please pass this form to your immediate supervisor. Your immediate supervisor is the person to whom you report to for your work responsibilities.

Instructions for the Supervisor:

- The above participant has consented for you to rate his/her attitudes and behaviours at work. In order to ensure that this study remains confidential and anonymous, we ask that you do not make a copy or keep a record of the ratings you make. It should take around 10 minutes to complete the questions.

- Please place your completed ratings in the enclosed envelope. Seal the envelope and affix your signature across the flap. The envelope is already pre-paid and has a printed label of the return address of the researcher. Please send your completed response directly back to the researcher.

If you have any questions about this research, you can contact myself or my Principle Supervisor with the contact details provided below. This research has been approved by the ANU Human Research Ethics Committee (2010/545).

Thank you once again for your time and participation.

Cheryl Ng
Phone: +61 4 1264 7061
Email: cherylng@anu.edu.au

Professor Simon Lloyd D. Restubog
Phone: +61 2 6125 7319
Email: simon.restubog@anu.edu.au
SECTION A: SUPERVISOR'S BACKGROUND

1. Gender (please encircle): 1 Male  2 Female
2. Age (as of last birthday): ______________ years
3. How long have you been working with your current organization (in years)? ______________
4. How long have you been working with this employee? ______________ years ______________ months

SECTION B: SUPERVISOR RATING OF WORK BEHAVIOUR

Please encircle your response based on how much you agree or disagree with the following statements that describe this employee's behavior at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Meets formal requirements of his/her job 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. Fulfils responsibilities specified in his/her job description 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. Performs task that are expected of him or her 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. Adequately completes assigned duties 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Helps others who have heavy workloads 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. Helps others who have been absent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. Willingly gives time to help others who have work-related problems 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. Helps orient new people even though it is not required 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. Keeps updated of changes in the organization 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. Attends functions that are not required, but help the company image 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. Attends optional meetings that are considered important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. Keeps up to date with changes in the organization 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. Tends to consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. Tends to make problems bigger than they are 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. Constantly talks about wanting to quit his/her job 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. Always focuses on what's right with the situation, rather than the negative side of it 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. Is always punctual 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. Never takes long lunches or breaks 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. Does not take extra breaks 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. Obey company rules, regulations and procedures even when no one is watching 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25. Consults others who may be affected by their actions or decisions 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. Does not abuse the rights of others 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. Takes steps to prevent problems with other employees 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. Informs others before taking any important actions 1 2 3 4 5 6 7