

The Receipt of Task-Related Help: Developing and Validating a Scale

by

Denise Law

A thesis

presented to the University of Waterloo

in fulfillment of the

thesis requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2018

© Denise Law 2018

### **Author's Declaration**

I hereby declare I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners. I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

## **Abstract**

Helping behaviors have been subjected to a substantial amount of research attention. However, organizational researchers have disproportionately focused on the help giver, neglecting the recipient of help. To stimulate future research on the recipient of help, I developed a receipt of task-related help scale. In Study 1, I adopted an inductive approach to generate examples of different types of task-related helping behaviors that employees receive at work. Study 1 revealed three general types of task-related helping behaviors - namely, materials, labor, and knowledge. The results of Study 1 were used to guide item development for the receipt of task-related help scale. In Study 2, I provided evidence of the items' substantive validity. In Study 3, I explored the factor structure of the scale. In Study 4, I verified that the scale assesses three dimensions of task-related help that employees can receive. In Study 5, I developed an initial nomological network for the receipt of task-related help. I hope this research will stimulate future research to adopt the recipient's perspective to understand helping behaviors at work.

*Keywords:* task-related helping behaviors, receiving help.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors, Dr. Doug Brown and Dr. James Beck. The completion of this project would not be possible without their expertise and support. I am grateful for their valuable feedback and advice, patience, and for always believing in me. They were always available to answer my questions, provide words of encouragement, and listen to my worries and concerns. But, perhaps most importantly, *What is the issue?* and *Why is the issue important?* will forever be the first two thoughts I have when I am developing a research idea.

I would also like to thank Midori Nishioka, a collaborator and fellow grad student, for her direct involvement in this project, emotional support, and for always challenging my thoughts. She has taught me to always be skeptical and question everything, which helped me to develop my critical-thinking skills. All I can say is that there will always be “a little Midori” in me and I am grateful for that.

Thank you to my reader, Dr. Winny Shen, for your valuable comments and feedback. I would also like to thank Chris Lee, another grad student at UWaterloo, for helping me gain 30 lbs; without your help, I may not be here today. Thank you to my family and my support system in Calgary (Josee, Wendy, Laura) and in Waterloo (Tiffany, Mona, Rochelle, Canaan, Vincent, Sylvie, Anna, Roxy, Erica). Finally, thank you to my Beyonce, Stewart Graham-Hu, for always being there for me and making me smile.

## Table of Contents

Author’s Declaration .....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements .....	iv
Table of Contents .....	v
List of Tables.....	vii
Introduction.....	1
Help.....	4
Measuring The Receipt of Help .....	6
Task-Related Help .....	9
Types of Task-Related Help May Be Important For Recipient Experiences.....	11
Phase 1: Qualitative Study and Item Generation .....	14
Study 1: Qualitative Study of Task-Related Helping Behaviors.....	14
Participants .....	14
Procedure.....	15
Content Analysis and Findings.....	16
Supplemental Analysis.....	21
Discussion .....	21
Item Generation .....	22
Phase 2: Item Reduction .....	23
Study 2: Initial Item Reduction .....	23
Participants .....	23
Procedure.....	23
Results.....	24
Study 3: Final Item Reduction.....	25
Participants .....	25
Procedure.....	25
Results.....	26
Phase 3: Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Nomological Network .....	27
Study 4: Confirmatory Factor Analysis .....	27
Participants .....	27
Procedure.....	28
Results.....	28
Study 5: Nomological Network.....	30
Participants and Procedure .....	40
Measures .....	40
Results.....	44
Supplemental Analysis.....	47

Discussion .....	51
General Discussion .....	52
Implications.....	52
Limitations and Future Research Directions.....	54
Conclusion .....	56
References.....	57
Appendix.....	71

## List of Tables

Table 1 .....	72
Table 2 .....	73
Table 3 .....	74
Table 4 .....	75
Table 5 .....	76
Table 6 .....	77
Table 7 .....	78
Table 8 .....	79
Table 9 .....	80
Table 10 .....	81
Table 11 .....	82
Table 12 .....	83
Table 13 .....	84

## Introduction

Helping behaviors are behaviors that facilitate the social and psychological environment in which employees work (Organ, 1997; Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). Research on helping behaviors has disproportionately focused on the help-giver, identifying *who* (e.g., Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001), *when* (e.g., Spence, Ferris, Brown & Heller, 2011), and *why* employees provide help (Rioux & Penner, 2001), and the *consequences* of helping behaviors for the helper (e.g., Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). However, organizational researchers have largely ignored the recipient of help, with the exception of a few articles that investigated the predictors of receiving help (Bowler & Brass, 2006; De Jong, Van Der Vegt, & Molleman, 2007; Hofmann, Lei, & Grant, 2009; Scott & Judge, 2009). This issue is important because, although *providing help* can feel good (Dalal, Lam, Weiss, Welch, & Hulin, 2009), helping interactions involve an element of power – that is, someone has resources (e.g., knowledge, skills) to provide to a person who lacks those resources – and the inequality can make *receiving help* a threatening experience (Nadler & Fisher, 1986; Nadler & Halabi, 2006). Indeed, receiving task-related help may threaten the recipient's self-esteem (Fisher, Nadler, & Whitcher-Alagna, 1982), competence, and independence (Lee, 1997; Nadler & Chernyak-Hai, 2014). This suggests that the experience of receiving help may differ from the generally positive experience of giving help. As a result, more research is needed to understand the receipt of help.

However, the literature on the receipt of help has been impeded due to the lack of a validated measure of help from the recipient's perspective. Previously, organizational researchers have measured the receipt of help by adapting existing measures of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) to reflect the help recipient's perspective (e.g., Deckop, Cirka, & Andersson, 2003; Lyons & Scott, 2012; Tsai, Chen, & Liu, 2007). However, this approach has three



important limitations. First, existing OCB scales were validated for the purpose of measuring helping behaviors that employees *give*, whereas adapted versions have not undergone rigorous validation procedures. As a result, using adapted versions assumes that helpers and recipients agree on which behaviors should be considered as help, but helpers and recipients might disagree on the content of helping behaviors. Second, although OCB measures are intended to measure both emotional and task assistance, several items intended to measure task assistance may be overly simplistic (e.g., “help others who have been absent”) by failing to specify what *help* entails. As a consequence, the construct measured in adapted versions of OCB scales might share conceptual overlap with coworker support, which is the extent to which employees perceive their coworkers are caring and considerate (Mossholder, Settoon, & Henagan, 2005), more than the receipt of task-related help. Third, experimental studies suggest that employees might receive a variety of task-related helping behaviors, including hints, instructions, or a full solution to a work-related problem (Nadler & Halabi, 2006), but adapted versions of OCB measures do not capture different *types* of task-related help. Capturing different types of task-related help is important because the consequences of receiving help could depend on the type of task-related help received.

To address these limitations, in the current research, I created a validated measure of task-related help from the recipient’s perspective. Following Hinkin’s (1998) guide to scale development, I conducted five studies to develop and validate the measure. In Study 1, I conducted a qualitative study to understand the different types of help that employees can receive with their work tasks. Although past research has investigated different types of help, such as hints and the full solution to a problem, I adopted an inductive approach in order to reveal any types of task-related help that might be missing in the literature. The results of Study 1 were used

to guide item development for the scale. In Study 2, I assessed the substantive validity of the items by conducting an item-sort task (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991; Howard & Melloy, 2016). In Study 3, I assessed the dimensionality of the scale and refined the measure. In Study 4, I verified the factor structure of the scale. Lastly, in Study 5, I created an initial nomological network for the measure of task-related help by demonstrating its convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity.

The present research makes several important contributions to the helping behaviors literature. First, I provide scholars with a validated measure to extend research on the receipt of task-related helping behaviors. For example, the measure can be used to examine research questions, such as who, when, and why do employees receive task-related help, what predicts the type of task-related help that employees receive, and what are the consequences of receiving different types of task-related helping behaviors. Answering these questions will enhance our understanding of the receipt of task-related help at work. Second, similar to recent research (e.g., Geller & Bamberger, 2012; Thompson & Bolino, 2018), I adopted the recipient's perspective to understand helping behaviors, which is important because, as other researchers have noted, the literature has disproportionately focused on the help giver and relatively less is known about the receipt of help in the workplace (Bamberger, 2009; Thompson & Bolino, 2018). Studying the receipt of help will provide a more balanced view of helping behaviors in the workplace. Third, whereas existing survey items assume that task-related help consists of only one facet (e.g., *helps others who have been behind in their work*), I conducted a qualitative study to identify different types of task-related helping behaviors that employees receive at work. Receiving certain types of help may facilitate the recipient's advancement in the organization, whereas receiving other types of help may contribute less (Nadler & Halabi, 2006). Lastly, I clarify the construct, task-

related help, and define its construct space. In doing so, I hope to stimulate future research on the receipt of help.

## **Help**

From the *help giver's* perspective, help is typically viewed as behaviors that are *intended* to benefit another person (Lennard & Van Dyne, 2018), specifically, the help recipient (Williams & Anderson, 1991). The word *intended* in this definition refers to a person's motive to bring about a particular goal or outcome (Laurent, Clark, & Schweitzer, 2015) – namely, to benefit the help recipient. Thus, this definition focuses on the helper's motives for helping another person, which must be to benefit the help recipient for a given behavior to be considered as help. However, adopting this definition of *help* to study the *receipt of help* is problematic for two reasons. First, this conceptualization of help requires that help recipients are able to accurately infer that the helpers' motive was to benefit the recipient. However, it is often difficult to accurately identify an individual's motives (Cheung, Peng, & Wong, 2014) and as a result, recipients may misattribute the helper's motive (Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003). This is especially likely because employees may have a variety of motives for providing help that may not necessarily be to benefit the help recipient, such as to make oneself look good in the eyes of others, to express concern for the organization's welfare (Rioux & Penner, 2011), to express responsibility to the organization or team, to secure the reception of benefits in the future, or to fulfill a job responsibility (Taber & Deosthali, 2014). As a consequence, a given behavior will not be considered to be help if the help recipient does not believe the helper's intentions were to benefit the recipient, even if the helper did.

Another issue with adopting this conceptualization of help to study the receipt of help is that many of the behaviors intended to be helpful are not really helpful (Podsakoff &

MacKenzie, 1994). For instance, as noted by Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994) when an employee attempts to give help, he or she may inadvertently give bad advice or perform behaviors that harm the help recipient. Thus, this definition would include (a) behaviors that are *intended* to benefit the recipient, but *do not*, and (b) attempts at providing help, regardless of whether or not the recipient benefits from the helper's actions. As a consequence, whether a given behavior will be considered as help will depend on whether the help recipient believes that the actor intended to benefit him/her, rather than whether the recipient perceived to benefit from the actor's behavior.

Instead, from the recipient's perspective, help is defined as *intentional behaviors that benefit a recipient*. This is consistent with conceptualizations of interpersonal helping behaviors as autonomous, self-determined (Uy, Lin, & Ilies, 2017), volitional (Organ, 1988), and directed towards a person (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Specifically, interpersonal helping behaviors involve a conscious decision to act towards other individuals rather than nonconscious, nondirectional (or nontargeted) behaviors. For example, if Coworker A accidentally deleted a file from the company computer that Coworker B planned to delete in the future, I would not consider Coworker A's behavior to be help because Coworker A did not make a conscious decision to delete the file nor direct his/her actions towards Coworker B. In contrast, if Coworker A purposely deleted a file for Coworker B, I would consider Coworker A's behavior to be help because Coworker A engaged in a purposeful action that was directed towards another coworker (i.e., delete file for Coworker B). Thus, by *intentional behaviors*, I mean behaviors that employees choose to perform, as opposed to behaviors that employees accidentally perform, and these actions are directed towards another person (i.e., the recipient).

By defining help as *intentional behaviors that benefit a help recipient*, I focus on

behaviors that help recipients perceive to be beneficial and directed towards them, rather than the helper's motive to benefit the help recipient. This is because regardless of the helper's motives, if employees perceive themselves to have benefited from their coworker's actions, then they would perceive their coworker's behavior to be helpful. In this case, if employees also believe they were the target of their coworker's actions, then they would indicate that they received help from their coworker. This is consistent with previous research suggesting that the experience of receiving help may be contingent upon whether or not the recipient perceives oneself to be the target and beneficiary of another individual's behavior (McCullough, Kilpatrick, Emmons, & Larson, 2001). It is important to focus on behaviors that individuals perceive themselves to be the target and beneficiary (e.g., "Coworker A gave me X") because in doing so, I take into consideration the quality of the help (Ehrhart, 2018). The quality of the help may have a profound impact on the recipients' experience during the helping interaction, felt gratitude, and reaction to receiving help (Ehrhart, 2018; Malhotra, 2004; Wood, Brown, & Maltby, 2011).

### **Measuring The Receipt of Help**

To measure the receipt of help, however, organizational researchers have adapted existing interpersonal OCB items by changing the items to reflect the help recipient's perspective. These measures were originally created and validated for the purpose of measuring helping behaviors that helpers provide. Thus, OCB items reflect the help *giver's* perspective. However, adapting OCB items to reflect the help recipient's perspective may not provide an accurate assessment of the receipt of help. This is because helpers and help recipients might disagree on which behaviors should be considered as help. On the hand, helpers might believe that help includes *attempts* at providing help, which is reflected in items such as, "Try to act like peacemakers when other crew members have disagreements" (Podsakoff, Ahearne, &

Mackenzie, 1997) and “Tried to be considerate to others” (Dalal et al., 2009). However, help recipients might disagree, which is reflected in instances in which helpers try to give advice to a recipient, but the recipient perceives the advice to be bad or unhelpful. As a consequence, it might not be appropriate to use adapted versions of OCB items to measure the receipt of help because they were not created for that purpose.

Moreover, interpersonal OCB items appear to assess two forms of help that employees can give: emotional assistance and task assistance. Emotional assistance involves “the sharing of feelings and/or demonstration of sympathy, caring, empathy, affection, understanding, friendship, and group belonging” (Bamberger, Geller, Doveh, 2017, p. 1721), which is reflected in items, such as “Takes time to listen to coworkers’ problems and worries” (Williams & Anderson, 1991) and “Encourage each other when someone is down” (Podsakoff et al., 1997). In contrast, task assistance involves helping the recipient complete his/her task (Bamberger et al, 2017), which is reflected in items, such as “Help each other out if someone falls behind in his/her work” (Podsakoff et al., 1997) and “Helps others who have been absent” (Lee & Allen, 2002). However, adapting OCB items to reflect the help recipient’s perspective could change the construct assessed, particularly for the adapted task assistance items. Specifically, adapted emotional assistance items might reflect emotional support (i.e., the expression of concern, compassion, friendship, and sympathy to a distressed individual; Cohen & Wills, 1985; Zellars & Perrewé, 2001), which retains the emotional element of emotional assistance, whereas adapted task assistance items could reflect social support, which refers to the perception that one is loved, cared for, and valued by other individuals, and involves the perceived availability of individual(s) in one’s network who can help manage stress and improve well-being (Cobb 1976; McIntosh, 1991; Winnubst, 1993). This is, in part, due to the fact that several task assistance

items do not specify what *help* entails (e.g., Help each other out if someone falls behind in his/her work) and adapted items emphasize the circumstances under which help occurs (e.g., help me if I fall behind in my work) rather than the actual behavior received. This suggests that adapted OCB items could be contaminated with “support” and lead to error in measurement.

By failing to specify what *help* entails, using adapted OCB items could fail to provide important insights into why receiving help may not always be helpful. For instance, drawing on research on person-environment fit (Lambert, Tepper, Carr, Holt, & Barelka, 2012), if an employee seeks task-related assistance, implicitly looking for instructions on how to complete a task, but the helper completes the task for the recipient, the misfit between the recipient’s needs and the help given may lead the recipient to perceive that the actor’s behavior was unhelpful. Thus, combining all types of task-related assistance into an overall term of “help” may not permit researchers to understand why receiving help may not always be helpful if the root cause is that the recipient did not receive the type of task-related help desired. As a consequence, it could be beneficial to differentiate between different types of task-related assistance or clarify the specific task-related behavior enacted.

I acknowledge that there are a few task assistance items that do specify the behavior enacted, which is reflected in items, such as “Share personal property with others to help their work” (Lee & Allen, 2002) and “Takes on extra responsibilities in order to help coworkers when things get demanding at work” (Settoon & Mossholder, 2002). However, these items were created and validated for the purpose of measuring interpersonal or task-focused citizenship behaviors that employees can provide. As a result, they reflect behaviors intended to benefit another person, emphasizing the helper’s motive for their actions rather than behaviors that recipients perceive to be beneficial to them. Thus, adapting these items might not be appropriate

to assess the receipt of task-related help.

For the remainder of the paper, I focus on task-related help, which is a type of instrumental assistance (Bamberger et al., 2017), rather than emotional help. I focus on task-related help due to its prevalence in the workplace (Colbert, Bono, & Purvanova, 2015), its importance for facilitating the completion of task responsibilities (Geller & Bamberger, 2011), and the need to distinguish between different types of task-related helping behaviors (i.e., clarify what *help* entails). In the next section, I describe the conceptualization of task-related help that I adopted in the present research.

### **Task-Related Help**

When employees receive task-related help, they receive help with “a piece of work to be accomplished” (Locke & Latham, 1990, p. 25), including the duties and responsibilities of a given job. From the recipient’s perspective, task assistance has been defined as “helped me get my work done” (Colbert et al, 2015, p. 1203). The latter part of this definition (i.e., “get my work done”) implies that task-related help are behaviors that benefit the recipient’s task performance – that is, behaviors that contribute to the organization’s technical core, such as completing the duties and responsibilities of the job (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Murphy, 1989; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Receiving task-related help can benefit the recipient’s task performance for several reasons. For instance, receiving task-related help can facilitate task completion (Colbert et al., 2016; Ehrhart, 2018), especially when the helper provides the solution to a problem (Nadler & Halabi, 2006) or when the helper completes the recipient’s work task. Receiving task-related help can also reduce uncertainty (Hofmann et al., 2009) and contribute to task-related learning because the recipient can receive instructions on how to solve a task-related problem on their own (Nadler, 2002) or observe the helper’s behavior and then model the behavior in the



future (Bandura, 1977), both of which can enhance the recipient's task performance.

Therefore, I define task-related help as an *intentional behavior carried out by an employee that benefits another employee's task performance*. This definition acknowledges that interpersonal helping interactions involve at least two parties – a helper and a recipient; in particular, one employee purposely engages in a behavior that benefits another employee's task performance. This definition also emphasizes that the receipt of task-related helping behaviors offers instrumental benefits (Colbert et al., 2016) to the recipient's task performance. Specifically, I argue that the recipient of help must perceive a given behavior to be beneficial to his/her task performance in order to indicate that he/she received task-related help. This is because, for example, if Coworker A engages in a behavior towards Coworker B, but Coworker B does not believe their task performance was benefited from Coworker A's actions, then Coworker B would not indicate that he/she received help from Coworker A. Thus, the receipt of task-related help requires the recipient to perceive that an employee's behavior was beneficial to their (i.e., the recipient's) task performance.

This definition does not exclude the possibility of additional beneficiaries or consequences. For example, a given action can be considered to be task-related help, even if it benefits the recipient *and* the helper or the organization. This is consistent with research that demonstrates that interpersonal helping behaviors can have beneficial effects on the help recipient, helper, and the organization (see Lennard & Van Dyne, 2018 for a review). Moreover, in addition to benefiting the recipient's task performance, receiving task-related help can result in positive and negative outcomes for the help recipient. For instance, although receiving task-related help can increase job satisfaction (Colbert et al., 2015), strengthen the affective relationship between the help recipient and the helper (DePaulo, Brittingham, & Kaier, 1983;

Venkataramani & Dalal, 2007), enhance recipient perception of the socially supportive resources available, and increase trust towards the helper (Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2015), receiving help can also lower self-esteem (Fisher et al., 1982) and make the recipient feel incompetent and dependent on the helper (Lee, 1997; Nadler & Halabi, 2006). However, regardless of whether or not receiving help results in these other outcomes for the help recipient, or benefits the helper or the organization, so long as the recipient perceives that his/her task performance benefited from another person's actions, then the recipient received task-related help.

Furthermore, although OCB are discretionary behaviors that typically extend beyond the employee's formal role requirements (Bolino & Turnley, 2005), this definition of task-related help includes behaviors that may be included or excluded in the actor's job description. This is important because employees vary in the extent to which they consider helping behaviors to be in-role or extra-role (Morrison, 1994). As a result, helping behaviors may include behaviors that are discretionary that extend beyond the employee's formal role requirements and behaviors that are included in the employee's job description (Organ, 1988; Organ et al., 1997). This is consistent with research that suggests that employees can engage in discretionary prosocial organizational behaviors (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986) and partake in mentoring (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004) and coaching relationships (Jones, Woods, & Guillaume, 2016) that can involve assisting coworker with their tasks or job. Thus, the receipt of task-related assistance can include receiving behaviors that the actor may be required or not required to perform, which differs from the receipt of OCB that involves receiving discretionary, extra-role behaviors.

### **Types of Task-Related Help May Be Important For Recipient Experiences**

One critical component of task-related help that I identified in the literature was that

employees might receive different types of task-related helping behaviors at work. I made this inference based on survey research on different help orientations and experimental studies conducted by social psychologists. Specifically, past survey research has focused on enduring and stable orientations of the help seeker and the help giver. For instance, Geller and Bamberger (2011) argued that help seekers vary in the extent to which they endorse a dependent or an autonomous help-seeking logic, which represent implicit and stable assumptions about help-seeking. Specifically, dependent help-seeking logic is characterized by a tendency to focus on resolving an immediate problem in order to obtain the immediate, instrumental benefits of seeking help, whereas autonomous help-seeking logic is characterized by a tendency to focus on achieving independent mastery in order to maximize the long-term benefits of seeking help. Similarly, Komissarouk, Harpaz, and Nadler (2017) argued that individuals have stable, personal tendencies to seek help. Specifically, individuals may have a tendency to seek an expert solution to a problem, seek tools to solve a problem on their own, or avoid seeking the assistance of others. In contrast, Bamberger et al. (2017) argued that some *helpers* offer immediate, short term solutions, whereas other helpers offer tools that allow help recipients become self-reliant. Taken together, this suggests that individuals may have stable cognitive and behavioral tendencies for seeking and providing certain types of help.

Experimental studies have provided operationalizations of these different types of help. In Arie Nadler's work, he made a distinction between autonomy-oriented help and dependency-oriented help. Dependency-oriented help consists of providing help recipients with the solution to their problems (Nadler, 2015), which reflects the helper's view that help recipients lack the competence to complete their own work (Brickman et al., 1982). In contrast, autonomy-oriented help involves providing help recipients with the tools to solve their problems (Nadler, 2015),

which reflects the helper's view that, with the appropriate tools, recipients can cope with their problems on their own (Nadler, 2002). Experimental studies that examine the effect of receiving these different types of helping behaviors tend to manipulate autonomy-oriented help by providing participants with hints or instructions on how to solve a problem (e.g., math equations; Nadler & Chernyak-Hai, 2014), whereas dependency-oriented help tends to be manipulated by giving participants the answer to anagrams or by completing a task for the participant (e.g., Shnabel, Bar-Anan, Kende, Bareket, & Lazar, 2015). This research suggests that employees might receive hints or instructions, which provides them with the tools to deal with problems on their own, or employees might receive the full solution to a problem, which may reinforce the recipient's dependency on the helper.

Based on the research reviewed, I made an inference that the type of help received would be important for the study of the receipt of task-related help. This is because receiving certain types of help could reflect inferiority on an ego-relevant dimension (e.g., intelligence) and thus be more self-threatening compared to receiving other types of help (Van Dyne & LePine, 2017). For instance, receiving dependency-oriented help requires help recipients to rely on others to complete their task for them, which can make recipients feel inferior and dependent on other individuals (Nadler, 2015; Shnabel et al., 2015; Van Leeuwen & Täuber, 2010). In contrast, receiving autonomy-oriented help permits help recipients to maintain some degree of independence, competence, and self-worth (Alvarez & Van Leeuwen, 2011; Nadler & Halabi, 2006; Nadler, 2015). Thus, the experience of receiving help may be drastically different depending on the type of help received, which suggests that the type of help may be a critical component when understanding the experience of receiving task-related help.

## **Phase 1: Qualitative Study and Item Generation**

### **Study 1: Qualitative Study of Task-Related Helping Behaviors**

Although past experimental research has identified some types of task-related help that employees could receive (e.g., hints, instructions, solutions to problems), I did not want to limit my focus on types of task-related help that have been discussed previously. This is because the types of task-related help received on the job might differ from the types of task-related help that researchers have experimentally manipulated in the past, or employees might receive types of task-related help that has not been revealed in the literature. Thus, I adopted an inductive approach to generate examples of different types of task-related help that employees receive at work. An inductive approach is appropriate when there is little understanding of the construct of interest (Hinkin, 1998); indeed, whereas prior research has qualitatively assessed the reasons why employees provide task-related helping behaviors, I am unaware of any research that qualitatively assessed the types of task-related helping behaviors that employees receive at work. Therefore, in this first study, I asked full-time employees to describe a time when they received task-related help. The primary objective of this study was to reveal different types of task-related help that could guide item development for the Receipt of Task-Related Help Scale (ROTHS).

**Participants.** I started with a panel of 156 working adults from Amazon's Mechanical Turk who had previously participated in qualitative research for my research lab and had previously indicated that they were interested in participating in future studies. To ensure that my participants had ample opportunities to receive task-related help, I made an a priori decision to screen out people who work part-time (i.e., work less than 35 hours per week). I also screened out employees who did not receive task-related help within the past month. I chose this time frame to ensure that employees have ample opportunities to receive help and to facilitate

accurate recall and memory of a helping event. This left me with a sample of 106 employees who met the study criteria (i.e., they were employed full-time and received task-related help within the past month) and were subsequently invited to participate in an online survey.

103 employees participated in the online survey. After removing careless respondents ( $n = 4$ ), I obtained a final sample of 99 participants whose responses were coded for the type of task-related help received. Participants had an average age of 38.44 years ( $SD = 10.45$ ), 54.50% were female, 45.50% were male, and they worked an average of 43.48 hours per week ( $SD = 8.04$ ). The participants were employed in a variety of departments, including customer service (24.20%), information technology (13.10%), accounting/finance (12.10%), research and development (8.10%), human resources (7.10%), distribution (5.10%), manufacturing (3.0%), purchasing (3.0%), and none of the above (24.20%).

**Procedure.** Participants were first given a prescreen questionnaire that enabled me to identify full-time employees who received help within the past month. In the prescreen questionnaire, participants reported the average number of hours they work per week. Next, to ensure the sample understood the construct, the receipt of task-related help, I provided a definition of helping (i.e., “helping is an action that benefits a recipient”), a description of the receipt of task-related help (i.e., a recipient of task-related help must believe that the helper’s actions benefit the performance of that task), and five vignettes that depicted different helping scenarios for which participants indicated whether the focal employee depicted in each vignette had received help, based on the definition provided. The vignettes allowed participants to practice their understanding of the definition of the receipt of task-related help. Afterwards, participants were asked to think about the employees at their workplace, which included their supervisors, coworkers, subordinates, temporary workers, contract workers, and full-time and

part-time employees; I allowed participants to consider a variety of actors in the organization because I was interested in generating examples of different task-related helping behaviors that employees receive, regardless of the source of the helping behavior, which would, in turn, be used to create a general-purpose receipt of task-related help scale. After considering the employees in their workplace, I asked participants if they received task-related help from a fellow employee, which was the last question of the prescreen questionnaire.

For participants who met my study criteria, I used the critical incident technique (e.g., Bobocel, 2013) to elicit recall of a helping event. Specifically, participants were instructed to “think about one instance where a fellow employee helped you with one of your work tasks within the last month” and to recall an incident they remember most vividly in terms of what their fellow employee did and how they felt after being helped.” Afterwards, they were asked to record the helper’s initials.

Immediately after reporting the helper’s initials, participants were asked to describe a time when a fellow employee helped them with their work task. Specifically, they were asked to “Please describe how [initials] helped you with one of your work tasks. What was the task? What did [initials] do? What did [initials] say? Please be as detailed as you can in your response.”

**Content Analysis and Findings.** To analyze the data, two graduate students independently read each response and created categories to summarize participant responses. This resulted in eight preliminary categories of task-related help: Explanation, information, instruction, suggestion, work together, take over task, act as substitute, and resource. The two graduate students met to discuss the preliminary categories of help until agreement was reached on the final categories of help. Table 1 shows example responses for each preliminary category and how the preliminary categories were categorized into the three final categories: Labor,

Knowledge, and Materials.

Afterwards, the two graduate students wrote a definition for each category of help (see Table 2). Using the definitions created, the two graduate students independently read and coded each response. Some responses could be categorized into more than one category of help; as a result, some responses received multiple codes. Inter-rater agreement was calculated for each category of help using Cohen's kappa (average  $\kappa = .79$ ). Disagreements were resolved through rater discussion.

**Labor.** The most frequently reported type of task-related help was Labor (70.75%). This category reflects instances in which an employee works directly on a task for a recipient. For example, several participants described instances in which an employee either finished part or the entire task for the participant. As an example, one participant wrote, "I had to identify and label various project accounts for our research office. [Initials] created an excel template to help me get started on the project, and filled in the information for a few of the ones he knew easily. This reduced the number of accounts left for me to identify and provided me with the set-up to finish the task accurately." This response is an example of an instance in which an employee finished part of another employee's work task because the employee started the project by creating an excel template and filling in information that he or she knew, whereas the participant completed the rest of the task. In contrast, one participant wrote, "I... was asked by my boss to forward an email... I got busy with other work and it slipped my mind. I had to leave early and [initials] checked to see if the email was forwarded and did it for me". This response is an example in which an employee completed an entire task for the recipient. These responses suggest that an employee can do all or part of a task for a recipient.

Furthermore, several participants described a time when an employee either worked



together with the participant or completed the task instead of the recipient. As an example of the former, one participant wrote, “I had several boxes of books, 20 pounds a piece, that needed to be shipped to China. I was having difficulty packaging the boxes. [Initials] came over and helped me package the books in the box... they held the box while I taped it up and applied the mailing label”. This example is consistent with previous research suggesting that employees may work together to complete a task (Arthur Jr., Edwards, Bell, Villado, & Bennett Jr., 2005). On the other hand, other participants described an instance in which an employee acted on behalf of the participant or completed the task instead of the participant. For example, one participant wrote, “My car broke down one morning and I couldn't make an appointment for repairs. I called [initials] and he was able to cover that appointment for me.” Taken together, these responses suggest that an employee can work together with the recipient, or act on behalf of the recipient, to finish the recipient's work task.

Completing a task for an employee is consistent with one way that experimental studies have operationalized dependency-oriented help (e.g., Shnabel et al., 2015). Dependency-oriented help involves “providing the recipient with the full solution to the problem” (Nadler, 2002, p. 492), which reflects the view that the help recipient is unable to solve their problems on their own (Nadler, 1997). One representative response was: “The task was to make an IV line in the baby patient. I missed the vein on my first try, and my coworker nurse was nearby. [Initials] took over and was able to make the stick on her first try.” However, because dependency-oriented help reinforces the help recipient's dependency on the helper (Nadler, 2002), conceptualizations of dependency-oriented help assume that recipients of this type of help lack the knowledge or skills necessary to complete their task. In contrast, several participants merely indicated that they were unavailable to complete their task at the moment, not necessarily that they lack task-

relevant knowledge or skills to perform their task. For example, one participant wrote, “The task was attending a scheduling meeting to schedule upcoming blocks of time with client. This is done at the same time each week and it is imperative someone from our division attend. I fell ill and [initials] attended the meeting in my place. She properly got all of our client times blocked out on the upcoming schedule.” Thus, labor can involve completing a task for an employee, which may or may not reflect the idea that the help recipient is unable to complete the task on their own.

**Knowledge.** The next most frequently reported category was Knowledge (24.77%). This category reflects instances in which an employee communicates task-relevant information to the recipient. Past research suggests that employees can provide autonomy-oriented help, which involves giving the recipient the tools to solve a problem on their own (Nadler, 2002). Although examples of autonomy-oriented help include providing instructions, hints, or advice to a help recipient (Alvarez & Van Leeuwen, 2011; Komissarouk et al., 2017; Komissarouk & Nadler, 2014), past research tends to operationalize hints as instructions on how to solve a problem (e.g., Alvarez & Van Leeuwen, 2011, Shnabel et al., 2015). Instructions are messages that describe the steps required for completing a task (Eiriksdottir & Catrambone, 2011). In contrast, advice are messages that convey a recommended course of action (Brooks, Gino, & Schweitzer, 2015). Instructions and advice were reflected in the participants’ responses. For instance, one participant wrote, “I did not know how to install a compressor. These guys came over and showed me how to do it”, which suggests that employees can demonstrate the steps involved in performing a task to a recipient (i.e., instructions). As an example of advice, one participant wrote, “I’m in charge of virus protection at our company. I was trying to fight a bug on a computer... He suggested stopping anything in msconfig that was not needed”, which suggests that employees can receive

advice or suggestions on how to perform a task. Receiving task-relevant information in the form of instructions or advice implies the view of help recipients as capable of solving their problems once they receive the appropriate tools (Nadler, 2002).

In contrast, several participants described a time when they received general task-relevant facts from an employee. For example, one participant wrote, “I asked her a question about the amount of money limit to purchase gift cards with credit. She told me it was 50.” This behavior is similar to operationalizations of dependency-oriented help as the solution to math problems or anagrams (Nadler & Chernyak-Hai, 2013; Nadler & Halabi, 2006), because the latter two (i.e., solution to math problems or anagrams) are task-relevant facts. However, unlike dependency-oriented help, providing task-relevant facts may not reinforce a help recipient’s dependency on the helper. For instance, the same participant explained that the information “gave me a clear guideline to follow when confronted with [t]hat situation”, which suggests that the employee’s actions gave the participant the tools to perform the task in the future. Thus, knowledge can involve receiving task-relevant facts, which may not necessary reinforce the help recipient’s dependency on the helper.

**Material.** The last category was Material (3.67%). Although this category occurred relatively infrequently, I kept this category because it was distinct from the other categories of task-related help. Material reflects instances in which an employee provides material good(s) that the recipient uses to perform his or her work task. For instance, one participant wrote, “At work my computer crashed... [initials] loaned me his personal laptop...so I could finish my work.” This response reflects an instance in which an employee provided a physical object that the recipient used to complete their task. However, this category is not limited to physical objects. For instance, an employee can provide an electronic document to a recipient. As an example, one

participant described a time when he/she received a computer software program that he or she used to merge PDF files. Thus, employees can provide material good(s), digital or physical objects, that the recipient uses to perform his or her task.

This category also reflects instances in which an employee provides material good(s) that the recipient turns into a finished product or service. For example, one participant wrote, “I was making copies of appeals from CD to CD. I ran out of CDs and cases. I did not have time to go to the supply room and fill out an order and wait for it to be filled. I asked [initials] if she had any CDs and cases I could borrow until I could get a supply order filled. She gave me her CDs and cases so I would not have to wait.” Thus, an employee can provide material goods a recipient modifies to create a finished product or service.

**Supplemental Analysis.** In my qualitative study, I asked participants to describe behaviors that employees engage in to help with a work task. However, some participants also described ways in which the employee’s behavior benefited their task performance. Representative responses include: “we were able to unload the truck without incident and much faster than if I were doing it alone”, “so thanks to her I did not make a mistake”, “my rate increased and I had less quality errors”, “[I] finish the task accurately”, “the order was sent out correctly”, “got the issue resolved”, and “we were able to successfully finish them all in time.” These results suggest that task-related help can prevent failure, resolve problems, increase work quality, or increase the pace at which an employee works.

**Discussion.** In summary, the results reveal three general categories of task-related help. Specifically, employees can work directly on a task for a help recipient, employees can communicate task-relevant information to a recipient, and employees can provide material good(s) that a recipient uses to perform their task or turns into a finished product or service.

Furthermore, my supplemental findings revealed that task-related help can benefit a recipient's task performance by preventing failure, resolving problems, improving work quality, or increasing the pace at which an employee works. To account for these findings, I modified my definition of task-related help to include the different categories of task-related help and the different ways that task-related help can benefit a recipient's task performance that were revealed in the qualitative study. Specifically, I define task-related help as *an intentional behavior that benefits a recipient's task performance. This includes engaging in task-relevant actions, communicating task-relevant information, and providing task-relevant materials. Task-related help can prevent failure, resolve problems, increase work quality, or increase the pace at which an employee works.*

### **Item Generation**

Adopting an inductive to item generation, I created items based on the types of help revealed in my qualitative study. As recommended by Hambleton and Rogers (1991), three graduate students reviewed the items for technical quality - specifically, for grammar and wording. In total, I created 30 Knowledge items, 30 Labor items, and 30 Materials items.

## Phase 2: Item Reduction

### Study 2: Initial Item Reduction

As recommended by Hinkin (1998), I assessed the substantive validity of the items to eliminate items that were conceptually inconsistent with the receipt of task-related help.

Substantive validity is the extent to which an item assesses the intended construct as opposed to another construct (Holden & Jackson, 1979). To assess the substantive validity of the items, I administered an item-sort task (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991; Howard & Melloy, 2016).

Administering this task allowed me to identify substantively valid items to retain and substantively invalid items to remove.

**Participants.** 103 individuals were recruited from MTurk for an online survey. I made an a priori decision to screen out employees that work less than 20 hours a week; thus, current employment was stated as a participation requirement. 99 participants met the study criteria and subsequently completed the online survey. After removing careless responders ( $n = 2$ ), I obtained a final sample of 97 participants who participated in the online survey ( $M = 40.62$  hours per week,  $SD = 8.35$ ). Their average age was 35.93 ( $SD = 10.00$ ), 50.50% were male, and 49.50% were female. The participants were employed in a variety of departments, including customer service (27.8%), information technology (15.5%), accounting/finance (7.2%), research and development (7.2%), manufacturing (6.2%), human resources (5.2%), distribution (2.1%), purchasing (2.1%), and none of the above (26.8%).

**Procedure.** First, participants were given a prescreen questionnaire that enabled me to identify individuals who work at least 20 hours per week. Specifically, in the prescreen questionnaire, participants reported the average number of hours they work per week. Participants who met the study criteria were subsequently invited to participate in an online

survey. In the survey, participants were presented with the definition of task-related help, along with a definition of positive workplace gossip and emotional support written in nontechnical language<sup>1</sup>, which were chosen due to their relevance in interpersonal interactions. All definitions were presented at the top of each page for the remainder of the survey wherein participants were presented with the list of 90 task-related help items, the construct labels (“task-related help, “emotional support”, “positive workplace gossip”), and they were instructed to pick the one construct that each item describes.

**Results.** Howard and Melloy’s (2016) statistical test is appropriate for item-sort tasks that includes multiple alternative choices. Thus, I followed their recommendations because participants were given two alternative choices - namely, emotional support and positive workplace gossip. Following their recommendations, items were deemed substantively valid if the frequency with which a given item was assigned to its intended construct was greater than the critical number of assignments ( $m$ ) at which the cumulative binomial probability of a certain number of responses occurring, starting with the maximum possible amount and decreasing, is still less than .05 (see Howard & Melloy, 2016, for the full description of this statistical test). I determined the critical number of assignments to be 58. As shown in Tables 3-5, the number of times each item was assigned to its intended construct was greater than 58. Thus, all 90 of the items were substantially valid and no items were removed at this stage of the scale development process.

---

<sup>1</sup> Construct definitions: Emotional Support – “The expression of concern, compassion, and sympathy toward a coworker. Emotional support includes listening to a coworker talk about his or her feelings, being accepting of a coworker’s personal characteristics, and comforting a coworker in distress” and Positive Workplace Gossip – “the exchange of positive and evaluative information about a coworker who is not present to hear what is said. For instance, while talking to a work colleague, an employee can compliment another coworker's actions, express admiration of another coworker's talents and accomplishments, or defend another coworker against criticism.”

### **Study 3: Final Item Reduction**

According to Hinkin (1998), it is recommended to conduct an exploratory factor analysis in order to refine a new scale. An exploratory factor analysis permits the reduction of items to a smaller set and allows researchers to identify the number of latent constructs that a set of items assesses (Hinkin, 1998, Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999). Because it is recommended to assess a measure's internal consistency reliability in conjunction with factor analysis (Cortina, 1993), I also assessed the internal consistency reliabilities for each of the subscales.

**Participants.** I recruited 1352 individuals from MTurk for an online survey. I made an a priori decision to screen out part time employees (i.e., work less than 35 hours per week) to ensure that the participants had ample opportunity to receive task-related help. 1009 participants met the study criteria and subsequently completed the online survey. After removing careless respondents ( $n = 31$ ), I obtained a final sample of 978 participants. The participants had an average age of years 34.95 ( $SD = 10.04$ ) and they worked, on average, 42.74 hours per week ( $SD = 6.63$ ). In terms of gender, 55.8% were female, 43.9% were male, and 0.3% indicated "other". The participants were employed in a variety of departments, including customer service (30.7%), information technology (11.9%), accounting/finance (8.0%), human resources (7.9%), research and development (7.1%), manufacturing (4.8%), distribution (4.3%), purchasing (2.1%), and none of the above (23.1%).

**Procedure.** Participants first completed an online prescreen questionnaire that asked them to indicate the number of hours they work per week. Participants who met the study criteria (i.e., work for at least 35 hours per week) were subsequently invited to participate in an online survey. In the survey, participants were asked to think about the employees they work with,



including supervisors, subordinates, coworkers, temporary workers, contract workers, and full-time and part-time employees. Afterwards, participants were presented with each subscale, in randomized order; they were given the stem, “During the last month, an employee...” and they were asked to rate how often an employee performs each behavior for them (1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = very often).

**Results.** I conducted an exploratory factor analysis with maximum likelihood estimation and an oblimin rotation to examine the factor structure of my scale (Fabrigar et al., 1999). With all items in the analysis, an examination of the scree plot suggested a three-factor model. For item elimination, I first removed items that did not load onto the appropriate factor, which resulted in the elimination of two labor items. Next, I eliminated 49 poorly worded items (e.g., “shared their personal property with me so that I do not fail to complete my task”). Afterwards, I eliminated 21 redundant items; for example, I kept the item, “lent me a hand with fulfilling my task responsibilities”, whereas I eliminated the item, “provided an extra hand with completing my task-relevant duties.” To ensure that the factor structure did not change due to the elimination of these items, I factor analyzed the remaining 18 items that I retained. The results are presented in Table 6. As indicated in Table 6, all items loaded cleanly on their appropriate factor. The factors were positively intercorrelated, ranging from .50 to .59, and the alpha reliabilities were greater than .90 (see Table 7).

### **Phase 3: Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Nomological Network**

#### **Study 4: Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

Next, as recommended by Hinkin (1998), I conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using an independent sample of employees. During the scale development process, a CFA is often used to examine the latent structure of a scale and verify the number of factors that a scale assesses (Brown & Moore, 2012), in order to provide evidence of construct validity of a new scale (Hinkin, 1998). Based on the results of the EFA analysis conducted in the previous phase, in the CFA analysis, I tested the hypothesis that my scale assesses three factors by quantifying the goodness of fit of a three-factor solution (Long, 1983).

Confirmatory factor analysis provides information that can be used to further evaluate construct validity. Specifically, the results of CFA can provide evidence of factor-level convergent and discriminant validity (Brown & Moore, 2012; Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). Thus, I used the CFA results to evaluate the factor-level convergent and discriminant validity (Hair et al., 2010) in order to demonstrate that materials, knowledge, and labor are related, yet distinct constructs.

**Participants.** 1263 individuals were recruited from MTurk for an online survey. I made an a priori decision to screen out people who work part-time (i.e., work less than 35 hours per week) to ensure that the participants had ample opportunities to receive task-related help. I also screened out individuals who did not interact with at least one other employee at work because my scale assumes that respondents interact with other individuals at work. I obtained a sample of 1006 participants who met the study criteria and completed the survey. After removing careless respondents ( $n = 71$ ), I obtained a final sample of 935 participants. Participants had an average age of 34.28 years ( $SD = 10.55$ ) and they worked an average of 42.49 hours per week ( $SD =$

6.43). In terms of gender, 57.80% were female, 42.1% were male, 0.1% indicated “other”. The participants were employed in a variety of departments, including customer service (32.2%), information technology (23.1%), accounting/finance (8.3%), research and development (7.7%), human resources (5.7%), manufacturing (5.2%), distribution (4.0%), purchasing (1.8%), and none of the above (23.1%).

**Procedure.** First, participants completed a prescreen questionnaire that asked them to indicate the number of hours they work per week and the number of employees with whom they typically interact. Participants who met the study criteria were subsequently invited to participate in an online survey. In the survey, participants were asked to think about the employees they work with, including supervisors, subordinates, coworkers, temporary workers, contract workers, and full-time and part-time employees. Afterwards, participants were given the stem, “During the last month, an employee...”, and they were asked to rate how often an employee performs each behavior for them (1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = very often). Each subscale was presented in randomized order. See Appendix for full scale instructions.

**Results.** I conducted a CFA to verify that the measure assesses three factors. To examine the fit of the model, I used the comparative fit index (CFI) and the root mean square error of approximation. The three-factor model provided reasonable fit for the data,  $\chi^2(132) = 977.56$ , CFI = .93, RMSEA = .08<sup>2</sup> (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). The standardized factor loadings for each item are presented in Table 8. As shown in Table 8, each item loaded significantly onto its hypothesized factor ( $p < .001$ ).

To test the extent to which each factor contributes uniquely to the overall measure, I examined the factor-level convergent validity (Thompson & Bolino, 2018). Evidence for factor-

---

<sup>2</sup>This result was replicated in a second confirmatory factor analysis that I conducted with an independent sample of 915 full-time employees recruited from MTurk,  $\chi^2(132) = 936.49$ , CFI = .94, RMSEA = .08.

level convergent validity is provided when the average variance extracted (AVE) for each factor is greater than .50 and composite reliability is greater than .70 (Hair et al., 2010). AVE is “the average amount of variation that a latent construct is able to explain in the observed variance to which it is theoretically related” (Farrell, 2010, p. 324). Unlike Cronbach’s alpha, which is an estimate of reliability that assumes that each item’s loading is equally weighted, composite reliability is an estimate of “true” reliability (estimated using structural equation modelling) in which the construct loadings are allowed to vary (Peterson & Kim, 2013). As indicated in Table 9, the AVE estimates were greater than .50, which suggests that the hypothesized factors accounted for more than 50% of the variances in the observed items, and the composite reliabilities were greater than .70. These estimates provide evidence of the scale’s factor-level convergent validity.

Next, I tested the factor-level divergent validity of the scale in two ways. First, I compared the three-factor solution to a one-factor solution ( $\chi^2(135) = 5451.08$ , CFI = .57, RMSEA = .21). A chi-square difference test suggested that a three-factor solution fit the data better than a one-factor solution,  $\chi^2_{\text{diff}}(3) = 4473.52$ ,  $p < .001$ . Second, I conducted the average variance extracted (AVE) versus the shared variance test (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). In this test, a construct is distinct if its AVE is greater than the shared variance with other constructs. Table 9 presents each factor’s AVE and maximum shared variance. As shown in Table 9, the maximum shared variance for each type of help was less than the AVE. Taken together, these results provide evidence that materials, labor, and knowledge, are distinct constructs.

The interfactor correlations provide support that for the scale’s factor-level convergent and divergent validity. As shown in Table 10, the factors were moderately intercorrelated. These results suggest that materials, labor, and knowledge are related, yet distinct.

## **Study 5: Nomological Network**

To provide further evidence of my scale's construct validity, I collected additional data from the sample described in the previous study. Specifically, I tested the extent to which the receipt of task-related help is positively and negatively correlated with constructs that should be theoretically related. I also assess my measure's convergent validity by testing the extent to which the receipt of task-related help relates to a similar construct, OCB received.

**Supplication.** Supplication is an impression management tactic that is often used to avoid additional or unwanted work assignments (Becker & Martin, 1995; Kowalski & Leary, 1990). Employees who supplicate often “play dumb” or appear needy to other employees (Becker & Martin, 1995) by exaggerating their ineptitude (Jones & Pittman, 1982), pretending they know less than they do, and communicating their weaknesses or shortcomings (Bolino & Turnley, 1999). By acting needy and emphasizing their incompetency, supplicants solicit the help from sympathetic employees by taking advantage of the social-responsibility norm (Lai, Lam, & Liu, 2010), which states that people should help those in need of help (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1963). The tendency to help needy individuals has been found in previous studies (Harrel, 1994; Shotland & Stebbins, 1983)

I expect supplication to be positively related to the receipt of materials, knowledge, and labor help. To obtain material help, supplicants may appear needy by pretending that they do not know which material they need or where to get materials, so that other employees fetch materials for them. In contrast, supplicants may elicit labor help from other employees by pretending they do not have the skills, or they do not know how, to complete their work. Lastly, supplicants may obtain knowledge help by pretending they are unable to find a pertinent piece of task-relevant

information. By appearing needy, supplicants will likely elicit help from other employees due to the social-responsibility norm to help those in need.

*Hypothesis 1:* Supplication will be positively correlated with the receipt of materials, knowledge, and labor help.

**Help Seeking.** Most helping occurs in response to a direct request of help (Flynn, 2005). Past research suggests that employees tend to seek one of two types of helping behaviors: dependency-oriented help and autonomy-oriented help. Dependency-oriented help seeking involves searching for the complete solution or relying on others to solve a task-related problem (Geller & Bamberger, 2012; Komissarouk et al., 2017), which solves the recipient's immediate problem, but contributes little to the recipient's ability to solve a similar problem in the future (Komissarouk et al., 2017). I expect dependency-oriented help seeking to be positively correlated with materials, knowledge, and labor help. This is because when dependency-oriented help seekers encounter a task-related problem, they may ask other employees to fetch materials for them without asking where the materials can be found; they may ask an employee for the answer to a task-relevant problem without learning the sequence of steps necessary arrive at the answer on their own; or they may ask other employees to directly work on their task to resolve their task-related problem for them. Drawing from this reasoning and because past research suggests that receiving help often results from a direct solicitation of aid (Flynn, 2005; Grant & Hofmann, 2011), I hypothesize that:

*Hypothesis 2:* Dependency-oriented help seeking will be positively related to the receipt of materials, labor, and knowledge help.

Similarly, I expect that autonomy-oriented help seeking will be positively correlated with the receipt of materials, knowledge, and labor help. Autonomy-oriented help seeking involves

asking others for tools that will lead them to solve problems on their own (Komissarouk et al., 2017). For instance, when autonomy-oriented help seekers encounter a problem, they may ask other employees for materials (e.g., documents, manuals) that they can refer to while they solve their task-relevant problem; they may ask other employees to describe how they solved a similar issue and try to learn from their experiences before attempting to solve the problem again (Geller & Bamberger, 2011; Komissarouk et al., 2017); or they may watch another employee resolve their problem and then model their behavior in the future (Bandura, 1977). This suggests that seeking autonomy-oriented help can involve asking employees to work directly on the seeker's task, or to share their materials or knowledge with the help seeker. Because of this reasoning and because most helping occurs in response to a direct request for help (Flynn, 2005; Grant & Hofmann, 2011), I hypothesize that:

*Hypothesis 3:* Autonomy-oriented help seeking will be positively correlated with the receipt of materials, knowledge, and labor help.

**Self-Reported Task Performance.** Receiving task-related help involves receiving behaviors that are perceived to benefit the recipient's task performance. However, I expect that the frequency with which an employee receives task-related help will be negatively associated with their self-report task performance. Task performance are behaviors that are required in a given job and formally rewarded (Williams & Anderson, 1991). When employees receive help with their tasks, they receive help from someone who has resources (i.e., knowledge and skills) that they can confer onto the recipient who lacks necessary resources (Nadler & Halabi, 2006) to perform their work. Thus, employees with low task performance may be more likely to seek and receive help. Receiving help, in turn, can involve acknowledging incompetence and inequality relative to the helper (Nadler, 2014), which can be a threatening experience for the help recipient

(Fisher et al., 1982; Nader & Fisher, 1986). As a result, recipients of task-related help may exhibit lower self-esteem (Fisher et al., 1982) and higher feelings of personal inadequacy to perform their work. Therefore, recipients of task-related help may report lower task performance.

*Hypothesis 4:* Self-reported task performance will be negatively associated with the receipt of materials, knowledge, and labor help.

**Negative Beliefs About Accepting Coworker Help.** Employees may have negative beliefs about accepting coworker help (NBACH; Thompson & Bolino, 2018), which may affect the extent to which they receive help from other employees. These negative beliefs include coworker incompetence belief (i.e., coworkers lack the necessary knowledge and skills to provide high-quality assistance), self-reliant belief (i.e., work should be completed by oneself), diminished image belief (i.e., accepting help will make the recipient look less capable to other employee), reciprocity obligation belief (i.e., accepting help make the recipient feel obligated to return the help received), and coworker mistrust belief (i.e., coworkers may have ulterior motives when providing help). However, Employees with NBACH may be less likely to partake in helping interactions. For instance, Thompson and Bolino (2018) found that NBACH was negatively associated with help provided to the negative believer (as rated by coworkers and supervisors; that is, the helpers) and providing help to other employees. Logically, if employees (coworkers and supervisors; Thompson & Bolino, 2018) are less likely to provide help to employees who have NBACH, then employees with NBACH will be less likely to receive help from other employees.

This research suggests that NBACH may be negatively related to the receipt of help. Employees with self-reliant beliefs may be less likely to receive task-related help because they believe work should be completed alone and thus, they may likely work independently and



refrain from depending on others for assistance (Thompson & Bolino, 2018). Coworker incompetence beliefs may be negatively associated with the receipt of task-related help because if coworkers are perceived to lack the relevant knowledge, skills, or materials necessary to provide assistance, then employees may be less likely to ask their coworkers for help (Hofmann et al, 2009; Nadler, Ellis, & Bar, 2003; Morrison, 1993), or accept and receive help from their coworkers (Thompson & Bolino, 2018). Employees with diminished image beliefs may be less likely to receive task-related help because receiving help with their tasks that could highlight their incapacities and as a result, employees may try to avoid looking bad in front of others by refraining from accepting and receiving help (Lee, 1997). Reciprocity obligation beliefs may be negatively associated with the receipt of task-related help because felt obligation is associated with negative affective states, indebtedness, and avoidance tendencies (Watkins, Scheer, Ovnicsek, & Kolts, 2006) and as a result, employees may seek to avoid this negative state (Higgins, 1997) by refraining from receiving help from others. Lastly, employees with coworker mistrust beliefs may be less likely to receive task-related help simply because their coworkers are perceived to be untrustworthy, whereas past research has found that employees tend to seek and receive help from trusted individuals and refrain from receiving help from untrustworthy individuals (De Jong et al., 2007; Hofmann et al., 2007). Taken together, I hypothesize that:

*Hypothesis 5:* Negative beliefs about accepting coworker help (NBACH) will be negatively related to the receipt of materials, knowledge, and labor help.

**Task Interdependence.** Organizational researchers have considered task interdependence to be an important determinant of interpersonal helping behaviors (Anderson & Williams, 1996; De Jong et al., 2007). Task interdependence represents the extent to which employees rely on other employees for information, materials, and support to be able to complete

their job (Brass, 1981; Somech, Desivilya, & Lidogoster, 2009; Van Der Vegt, Van De Vliert, & Oosterhof, 2003). As De Jong et al. (2007) noted, task interdependence may increase employee interaction, which may increase awareness of employee need of assistance and provide greater opportunities for interpersonal helping behaviors. Thus, when tasks are highly interdependent, employees may be more likely to exchange information, work together (Arthur Jr. et al., 2012), and exchange materials to perform their tasks.

*Hypothesis 6:* Task interdependence will be positively correlated with the receipt of knowledge, materials, and labor help.

**Coworker Support.** Researchers have argued that the receipt of help is associated with the socially supportive resources that employees have available (Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2015; Hofmann et al., 2009). Scholars have speculated that, “because of the physical and psychological closeness of coworkers, coworkers should act as a primary source of social support [for employees]” (Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2015, p. 1632). Social support is the extent to which an employee believes that he or she is cared for, valued, and has resources available that can be drawn upon to manage work demands (McIntosh, 1991; Van Daalen, Willemsen, & Sanders, 2006; Winnubst, 1993; Wills, 1991). When employees believe their coworkers care about them, value them, and are available to assist them, they may be more likely to approach their coworkers for materials, knowledge, and labor help, and subsequently receive these types of help. This is consistent with research that demonstrates that employees tend to seek and receive help from individuals they perceive to be available and trustworthy (Hofmann et al., 2009). However, other research suggests that that receiving materials, knowledge, or labor help may result in higher perceived coworker support (Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2015). Regardless of the directionality of the relationship between receipt of help and perceived coworker support, these

results suggest that there may be a positively relationship between the receipt of help (e.g., materials, labor, and knowledge) and perceived coworker support.

*Hypothesis 7:* Perceived coworker support will be positively related to the receipt of knowledge, materials, and labor help.

**Emotional Support.** Employees are likely to receive both instrumental support and emotional support at work. Instrumental support, such as task-related help, involves the provision of problem-focused, concrete, or tangible assistance (Bamberger et al. 2017; Mikulincer & Florian, 1997), whereas emotional support (or emotional help) involves the expression of sympathy, caring, compassion, empathy, affection, understanding, friendship, and belongingness to a distressed individual (Bamberger et al, 2017; Zellars & Perrewé, 2001). Past research has found a strong, positive relationship between the receipt of instrumental support and emotional support. For instance, Shakespeare-Finch and Obst (2011) found a correlation of .69, whereas Bamberger et al. (2017) found a correlation of .79, suggesting that employees are likely to receive both instrumental help (or task-related help) and emotional help. Employees are likely to receive task-related help and emotional support because they represent important functions of interpersonal transactions (House, 1981) that may reduce employee stress (Cohen & Wills, 1985).

*Hypothesis 8:* Emotional support will be positively correlated with the receipt of materials, knowledge, and labor help.

**Need Satisfaction.** Receiving task-related help may be associated with employees' need satisfaction. According to self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), humans have three psychological needs that must be satisfied to optimize functioning - the need for autonomy, the need for relatedness, and the need for competence. The need for autonomy refers to the desire to

experience a sense of volition and choice when performing a task (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Individuals may experience autonomy satisfaction when they have the opportunity to choose their course of action (Soenens et al., 2007). In contrast, the need for relatedness refers to the desire to feel connected to others (Deci & Ryan, 2000); that is, to love and care for other individuals and to be loved and cared for by other individuals (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Relatedness satisfaction occurs when individuals develop close, intimate relationships with other individuals (Deci & Ryan, 2000, Van Den Broeck, Vansteenkiste, De Witte, Soenens, & Lens, 2010). Lastly, the need for competence refers to the desire to feel capable of influencing the environment and obtaining outcomes from it (Deci & Ryan, 2000; White, 1959). Satisfying the need for competence involves the affective experience of effectiveness that can result from mastering one's tasks (Van Den Broeck et al., 2010). In turn, satisfying these three basic needs has been associated with enhanced employee well-being and work engagement (Van Den Broeck et al., 2010; Van Den Broeck, Vansteenkiste, De Witte, & Lens, 2008).

I expect that the receipt of materials will be correlated with the satisfaction of the need of autonomy. When employees receive materials from other employees, they may be able to exercise a great deal of freedom in choosing how and whether they use the materials to perform their job. As a result, receiving materials may be associated with experiencing psychological freedom and a sense of choice when employees perform their tasks. Thus, I hypothesize that:

*Hypothesis 9:* The receipt of materials will be positively associated with the satisfaction of the need for autonomy.

I expect that the receipt of labor help will be positively associated with the satisfaction of the need for relatedness. This is because labor help can involve working together with the recipient to perform the recipient's work task and thus, receiving labor help is interpersonal in

nature and involves direct contact and coordination with the helper. As a result, receiving labor help may promote closeness with the helper and a sense of togetherness, cohesion, and intimacy. Thus, receiving labor help may stimulate feelings of relatedness and belonging.

*Hypothesis 10:* The receipt of labor help will be positively associated with the satisfaction of the need for relatedness.

Lastly, I expect that the receipt of knowledge help will be negatively associated with the satisfaction of the need for competence. This is because receiving knowledge involves obtaining task-relevant information that the recipient does not possess, but the helper does possess. Thus, receiving knowledge help from an employee may involve acknowledging incompetence and inferior knowledge (Lee, 1997). As a consequence, the receipt of knowledge help may decrease the recipient's sense of competence and self-esteem (Fisher et al., 1982; Lee, 1997).

*Hypothesis 11:* The receipt of knowledge will be negatively associated with the satisfaction of the need for competence.

**OCB Provided.** I expect the receipt of task-related help to be associated with providing OCB. OCB are voluntary behaviors that facilitate the social and psychological environment in which employees work (Organ, 1997; Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). OCB includes helping behaviors directed at other individuals (OCB-I) and helping behaviors directed at the organization (OCB-O) (Williams & Anderson, 1991). These behaviors are typically discretionary and outside the employee's job description (Organ, 1988; Bolino & Turnley, 2005). To explain the occurrence of OCB, social exchange theory is often adopted. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Emerson, 1976) posits that relationships are developed by exchanging resources between two or more parties. These exchanges are guided by the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) wherein people expect to return beneficial treatment – in other words, *you scratch my back, I'll*

*scratch yours*. Thus, social exchanges entail obligations (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), a feeling that one is bound to do something (Florey & Harrison, 2000). In the context of helping behaviors, social exchange theory suggests that receiving help from others will instill a sense of obligation to help others in return. Indeed, past organizational research suggests that the greater the amount of help received, the greater the amount of help given (Deckop et al., 2003; Wilke & Lanzetta, 1970). Thus, I hypothesize that:

*Hypothesis 12:* The receipt of knowledge, materials, and labor help will be positively associated with OCB provided.

**OCB Received.** I expect the receipt of knowledge, materials, and labor help to be related, yet distinct from, the receipt of OCB. Receiving OCB involves the perception that an employee has voluntarily assisted with work-related or personal problems (Settoon & Mossholder, 2002), which suggests that the receipt of OCB includes the receipt of task-related help and emotional help. In particular, the receipt of OCB can involve receiving assistance when behind in one's work, receiving assistance when absent from work, receiving information, using the helper's personal property, having an employee listen to one's problems and worries, having an employee adjust their schedule to accommodate requests for time off, and receiving courteous behaviors (Lee & Allen, 2002; Williams & Anderson, 1991; Scott & Judge, 2009), which suggests that OCB is a broader construct. Furthermore, receiving OCB involves receiving voluntary behaviors that are typically outside of the actor's job description (Bolino & Turnley, 2005), whereas the receipt of task-related help can include receiving behaviors that are inside or outside the actor's role requirements. Thus, although the receipt of task-related help shares conceptual similarity with the receipt of task-relevant OCB, the inclusion of emotional forms of help and discretionary

behaviors in the receipt of OCB suggests that OCB received and the receipt of task-related help may be positively, but moderately, correlated. Thus, I hypothesize that:

*Hypothesis 13:* There will be a moderate, positive correlation between OCB received and the receipt of materials, labor, and knowledge help.

**Participants and Procedure.** To test these hypotheses, I made an a priori decision to use the data from Study 4 and then administer a second survey for Study 5 to assess the measure's nomological network. 995 participants were invited for Study 5 one week after they completed Study 4. I decided to separate my surveys across two time points in order to reduce common method variance (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). A total of 674 participants completed Study 5 seven to eleven days after they completed Study 4. After removing careless respondents ( $n = 84$ ), I obtained a final sample of 590. The participants had an average age of 34.68 ( $SD = 10.42$ ), 56.6% female, 43.4% male, and they worked, on average, 41.87 hours ( $SD = 5.31$ ) per week. Participants were employed in a variety of departments, including customer service (32.4%), information technology (12.4%), accounting/finance (9.0%), research and development (7.6%), human resources (5.4%), manufacturing (3.9%), distribution (3.4%), purchasing (2.4%), and none of the above (23.6%). In the survey, each scale was presented to participants in randomized order.

### **Measures**

**Supplication.** I measured supplication using 5 items ( $\alpha = .93$ ) developed by Bolino and Turnley (1999). I used the same instructions and response scale as Bolino and Turnley. Specifically, participants were instructed to rate the frequency in which they used each strategy in the last 6 months while at work (1 = never behaved this way, 2 = very rarely behaved this way, 3 = occasionally behaved this way, 4 = sometimes behaved this way, and 5 = often behaved

this way). A sample item was “Act like you know less than you do so people will help you out.”

***Help-Seeking Tendencies.*** I measured help-seeking tendencies using 13 items from an unpublished manuscript by Harpaz-Gorodeisky and Nadler (see Nadler, 2009) that previous research has used (Geller & Bamberger, 2012). I administered the same instruction set as Geller and Bamberger (2012). Specifically, participants were asked to think about how they typically cope with challenges they confront at work. Then, participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each item using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree). Six items assessed autonomy-oriented help seeking tendency (e.g., “When I encounter a task-related problem at work, I speak with others in order to enhance my ability to handle such issues”;  $\alpha = .85$ ) and 7 items assessed dependency-oriented help seeking tendency (e.g., “I frequently ask for assistance in solving a problem at work even if I'm able to solve it myself”;  $\alpha = .88$ ).

***Self-Reported Task Performance.*** I measured self-reported task performance using 7 items ( $\alpha = .86$ ) from Williams and Anderson (1991). Participants were instructed to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with seven statements regarding their task performance on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree). A sample item was: “I adequately complete assigned duties”.

***Negative Beliefs About Accepting Coworker Help.*** I measured negative beliefs about accepting coworker help using 20 items ( $\alpha = .88$ ) developed by Thompson and Bolino (2018). This measure assesses five negative beliefs: diminished image beliefs (e.g., “Finishing my work without help improves how others perceive me”), reciprocity obligation beliefs (e.g., “So I don't owe coworkers favors, I normally decline their offers to help me finish my work”), self-reliant beliefs (e.g., “Working independently without the help of my coworkers ensures I will be most



successful”), coworker mistrust belief (e.g., “If I let them help me, my coworkers might sabotage my work”), and coworker incompetence belief (e.g., “Most of my coworkers are competent enough to help me improve my work” (R)). Participants were instructed to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each statement on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree).

***Task Interdependence.*** I measured task interdependence by using 6 items from the Work Design Questionnaire developed by Morgeson and Humphrey (2006). Three items assess initiated interdependence (e.g., “Other jobs depend directly on my job”;  $\alpha = .83$ ), which is the extent to which work affects the work of other jobs, and three items assess received interdependence (e.g., “My job cannot be done unless others do their work”;  $\alpha = .85$ ), which is the extent to which work is affected by the work of other jobs. Participants were given the following instructions: “The questions in this section concern characteristics of the job itself. Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement. Remember to think only about your job itself, rather than your reactions to the job.” Responses were made on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree).

***Coworker Support.*** I measured coworker support by adapting 6 items ( $\alpha = .91$ ) developed by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986). I chose the 6 highest-loading items and changed the referent to be the participant’s coworkers (e.g., “My coworkers really care about my well-being”). I adapted Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) instruction set to reflect coworker support. Specifically, participants were given the following instructions: “Below are a series of statements that represent possible feelings individuals might have about their coworker. With respect to your own feelings about your coworker, please indicate the degree of your

agreement or disagreement with each statement.” Participants provided their responses on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree).

***Emotional Support.*** I measured emotional support using 8 items ( $\alpha = .89$ ) from the Inventory of Socially Supportive Behaviors developed by Barrera, Sandler, and Ramsay (1981). I adapted Barrera et al.’s (1981) instruction set for the work context by changing the referent from “other people” to “other employees”. Specifically, I gave participants the following instructions: “We are interested in learning about some of the ways that you feel other employees have helped you or tried to make life more pleasant for you over the past four weeks. Below you will find a list of activities that other employees might have done for you, to you, or with you in recent weeks. Please read each item carefully and indicate how often these activities happened to you during the past four weeks. Please read each item carefully and select the rating that you think is the most accurate. During the past four weeks, how often did other employees do these activities for you, to you, or with you?” A sample item was “Told you she/he feels very close to you.” Participants provided their responses on 5-point frequency scale (1 = not at all, 2 = once or twice, 3 = about once a week, 4 = several times a week, 5 = about every day).

***Basic Need Satisfaction.*** I measured basic need satisfaction using 16 items developed by Van Den Broeck et al. (2010). The measure assesses the satisfaction of three needs: need for competence (e.g., “I really master my tasks at my job”;  $\alpha = .88$ ), need for relatedness (e.g., “At work, I feel part of a group”;  $\alpha = .91$ ), and need for autonomy (e.g., “I feel free to do my job the way I think it could best be done”;  $\alpha = .80$ ). Adopting Van Den Broeck et al.’s original instruction set, I told participants that the items aim to tap their personal experiences at work. They were then instructed to indicate their level of agreement with each item on a 5-point scale

(1 = totally disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree to 5 = totally agree).

**OCB Provided.** I measured the performance of OCB using 16 items from Lee and Allen (2002). Eight items assess OCB-I (e.g., “Help others who have been absent”;  $\alpha = .88$ ) and eight items assess OCB-O (e.g., “Attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image“,  $\alpha = .92$ ). Participants were instructed to indicate how often they engaged in each behavior at work. Responses were made on a 7-point scale (1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = rarely, 4 = sometimes, 5 = often, 6 = very often, 7 = always).

**OCB Received.** I measured the receipt of OCB using 8 items ( $\alpha = .90$ ) adapted from Lee and Allen (2002) that previous research has used to measure the OCB received (e.g., Scott & Judge, 2009). With Dr. Scott’s permission, I used the same stem, instructions, and response scale that Dr. Scott and his colleagues has used to measure the receipt of OCB in his research. Specifically, participants were given the stem, “My coworkers...”, and they were asked to rate the frequency in which each behavior occurred (1 = almost never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = very often). A sample item was “helps me when I have been absent.”

**Results.** The means, standard deviations, correlations, and reliabilities for all variables are presented in Table 11.

**Supplication.** For Hypothesis 1, I predicted that supplication will be positively correlated with the receipt of knowledge, materials, and labor help. As expected, supplication was positively correlated with the receipt of materials ( $r = .12, p < .01$ ), knowledge ( $r = .28, p < .001$ ), and labor help ( $r = .25, p < .001$ ). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

**Dependency-Oriented Help Seeking.** Hypothesis 2 predicted that dependency-oriented help seeking tendency will be positively correlated with the receipt of materials, knowledge, and labor help. As predicted, dependency-oriented help seeking tendency was positively correlated

with the receipt of materials ( $r = .20, p < .001$ ), knowledge ( $r = .34, p < .001$ ), and labor help ( $r = .36, p < .001$ ). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was supported.

***Autonomy-Oriented Help Seeking.*** Hypothesis 3 predicted that autonomy-oriented help seeking tendency will be positively correlated with the receipt of knowledge, materials, and labor help. As hypothesized, autonomy-oriented help seeking tendency was positively correlated with the receipt of materials ( $r = .13, p < .01$ ), knowledge ( $r = .10, p < .05$ ), and labor help ( $r = .10, p < .05$ ). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was supported.

***Self-Reported Task Performance.*** For Hypothesis 4, I predicted that the receipt of materials, labor, and knowledge help will be negatively associated with self-reported task performance. Supporting Hypothesis 4, self-reported task performance was negatively correlated with the receipt of materials ( $r = -.09, p < .05$ ), knowledge ( $r = -.20, p < .001$ ) and labor help ( $r = -.21, p < .001$ ).

***NBACH.*** Hypothesis 5 predicted that NBACH will be negatively associated with the receipt of help. I found that NBACH was not significantly related to the receipt of materials ( $r = -.02, p = .659$ ), knowledge ( $r = .01, p = .929$ ) and labor help ( $r = -.06, p = .133$ ). Thus, Hypothesis 5 was not supported.

***Task Interdependence.*** Hypothesis 6 predicted that task interdependence will be positively correlated with the receipt of knowledge, materials, and labor help. I found that initiated interdependence was positively correlated with the receipt of materials ( $r = .13, p < .01$ ), but not significantly related to the receipt of knowledge ( $r = -.06, p = .158$ ) or labor help ( $r = .08, p = .066$ ), whereas received interdependence was positively correlated with the receipt of materials, ( $r = .19, p < .001$ ) and labor ( $r = .16, p < .001$ ), but not significantly related to the receipt of knowledge help ( $r = .05, p = .190$ ). Therefore, Hypothesis 6 was partially supported.

**Coworker Support.** For Hypothesis 7, I predicted that coworker support will be positively associated with the receipt of knowledge, labor, and material help. I found that coworker support was positively associated with the receipt of materials ( $r = .11, p < .01$ ) and labor help ( $r = .14, p < .001$ ), but not significantly related to the receipt of knowledge help ( $r = .08, p = .058$ ). Thus, Hypothesis 7 was partially supported.

**Emotional Support.** Hypothesis 8 predicted that emotional support will be positively related to the receipt of knowledge, materials, and labor help. As expected, emotional support was positively correlated with the receipt of materials ( $r = .18, p < .001$ ), knowledge ( $r = .20, p < .001$ ), and labor help ( $r = .29, p < .001$ ). Thus, Hypothesis 8 was supported.

**Satisfaction of the Need for Autonomy.** For Hypothesis 9, I predicted that the satisfaction of the need for autonomy will be positively correlated with the receipt of materials. As predicted, the satisfaction of the need for autonomy was positively associated with the receipt of materials ( $r = .08, p < .05$ ). Thus, Hypothesis 9 was supported.

**Satisfaction of the Need for Relatedness.** Hypothesis 10 predicted that the satisfaction of the need for relatedness will be positively correlated with the receipt of labor help. Supporting Hypothesis 10, the satisfaction of the need for relatedness was positively correlated with the receipt of labor ( $r = .19, p < .001$ ).

**Satisfaction of the Need for Competence.** Hypothesis 11 predicted that the satisfaction of the need for competence will be negatively correlated with the receipt of knowledge. Supporting Hypothesis 11, the satisfaction of the need for competence was negatively associated with the receipt of knowledge ( $r = -.18, p < .001$ ).

**OCB Provided.** Hypothesis 12 predicted that the receipt of knowledge, materials, and labor will be positively correlated with OCB provided. I found that OCB-I was positively

correlated with the receipt of materials ( $r = .17, p < .001$ ), knowledge ( $r = .11, p < .05$ ), and labor help ( $r = .22, p < .001$ ), and OCB-O was positively correlated with the receipt of materials ( $r = .19, p < .001$ ) and labor ( $r = .15, p < .001$ ), but not significantly related to the receipt of knowledge help ( $r = .06, p = .162$ ). Thus, Hypothesis 12 was partially supported.

**OCB Received.** For Hypothesis 13, I predicted that there would be a moderate, positive correlation between OCB received and the receipt of knowledge, materials, and labor help. Supporting Hypothesis 12, I found that OCB received was moderately correlated with the receipt of knowledge ( $r = .28, p < .001$ ), materials ( $r = .23, p < .001$ ), and labor help ( $r = .37, p < .001$ ).

### **Supplemental Analysis**

**NBACH.** NBACH is composed of five dimensions in which Thompson and Bolino (2018) found that one-factor solution was an acceptable representation of their scale. However, they also provided evidence that a five-factor solution may be superior to a one-factor solution. Indeed, for the present study, a five-factor solution ( $\chi^2(160) = 486.71, CFI = .95, RMSEA = .06$ ) fit the data better than a one-factor solution ( $\chi^2(170) = 4085.21, CFI = .44, RMSEA = .20$ ),  $\chi^2_{diff}(10) = 3598.5, p < .001$ . These findings suggest that it may be more appropriate to examine the relationships between my measure and each NBACH.

Therefore, in an exploratory way, I examined the relationship between each of the five dimensions of NBACH and my three dimensions of task-related help. The means, standard deviations, and correlations are presented in Table 12. I found that self-reliant beliefs was negatively correlated with the receipt of materials ( $r = -.12, p < .01$ ), labor ( $r = -.22, p < .001$ ), and knowledge help ( $r = -.13, p < .01$ ). Coworker incompetence beliefs was negatively correlated with the receipt of materials ( $r = -.15, p < .001$ ), labor ( $r = -.16, p < .001$ ), and knowledge help ( $r = -.20, p < .001$ ). In contrast, coworker mistrust beliefs was positively

correlated with the receipt of materials ( $r = .08, p < .05$ ) and labor ( $r = .10, p < .05$ ), but not significantly related to the receipt of knowledge help ( $r = .07, p = .086$ ). Diminished image beliefs was positively correlated with the receipt of knowledge ( $r = .14, p < .001$ ), but not significantly related to the receipt of labor ( $r = .01, p = .819$ ) or materials ( $r = .04, p = .302$ ). Finally, reciprocity obligation beliefs was not significantly related to the receipt of materials ( $r = .05, p = .205$ ), knowledge ( $r = .07, p = .075$ ), or labor help ( $r = .05, p = .246$ ). These results suggest that certain negative beliefs about accepting coworker help was associated with the receipt of materials, labor, and knowledge help, which provides initial evidence of my scale's discriminant validity.

***OCB Received.*** In an exploratory way, I sought to determine if the receipt of task-related help differs from OCB received, which is a similar construct to the receipt of task-related help. To do this, I compared the patterns of correlations that my scale and OCB received exhibited with the nomological network variables. These correlations are presented in Table 13. Of note, I observed that OCB received and the receipt of task-related help exhibited different relationships with competence-related variables. For instance, I found that the satisfaction of the need for competence was negatively correlated with the receipt of knowledge help ( $r = -.18, p < .001$ ), but positively correlated with OCB received ( $r = .14, p < .001$ ). Furthermore, diminished image beliefs was positively correlated with the receipt of knowledge ( $r = .14, p < .001$ ), but negatively correlated with OCB received ( $r = -.12, p < .01$ ). Self-reported task performance was negatively associated with labor ( $r = -.09, p < .05$ ), materials ( $r = -.21, p < .001$ ), and knowledge ( $r = -.20, p < .001$ ), but not significantly related to OCB received ( $r = .04, p = .284$ ). Lastly, supplication was positively correlated with the receipt of knowledge ( $r = .28, p < .001$ ), materials ( $r = .12, p < .01$ ), and labor ( $r = .25, p < .001$ ), but not significantly related to OCB received ( $r = .02, p =$

.572). These patterns of correlations suggest that the receipt of task-related help may be related to employee *incompetence*, whereas OCB received may have a small relationship with employee competence.

I also observed that OCB received and the receipt of task-related help exhibited differential relationships with warmth-related variables. For instance, OCB received was highly correlated with coworker support ( $r = .69, p < .001$ ), whereas the receipt of knowledge, labor, and materials had low to nonsignificant correlations with coworker support. Furthermore, OCB received was highly correlated with the satisfaction of the need for relatedness ( $r = .60, p < .001$ ), whereas the receipt of knowledge, labor, and materials had low to non-significant correlations with the satisfaction of the need for relatedness. Lastly, OCB received was moderately correlated with emotional support ( $r = .49, p < .001$ ), whereas the receipt of knowledge, materials, and labor help had low to moderate correlations with emotional support. These patterns of correlations suggest that OCB may be strongly related to a supportive component, whereas the receipt of task-related help exhibited weak relationships with support.

Furthermore, I observed that, of all the nomological network variables, OCB received was most strongly correlated with coworker support ( $r = .69, p < .001$ ), whereas the receipt of materials ( $r = .11, p < .01$ ), knowledge ( $r = .08, p = .058$ ), and labor ( $r = .19, p < .001$ ) had weaker correlations with coworker support. Thus, I decided to partial out coworker support from OCB received in order to (1) test whether coworker support explained the bivariate correlations between OCB received and nomological network variables, and (2) test whether OCB received (with coworker support partialled out) and the receipt of task-related help would exhibit similar relationships with the nomological network variables.

The semi-partial correlations for OCB received are presented in the last column of Table



13. The results presented in Table 13 suggest that coworker support explained a lot of the variance that OCB received accounted for in several of the nomological network variables, including the satisfaction of the need for relatedness, coworker mistrust beliefs, coworker incompetence beliefs, and emotional support. For example, the bivariate relationship between OCB received and satisfaction of the need for relatedness was .60, which means that OCB received explained 36% of the variance in satisfaction of the need for relatedness. However, when the effects of coworker support on OCB received was controlled for, OCB received accounted for only 1.96% of the variance in the satisfaction of the need for relatedness ( $r = .14$ ,  $p < .001$ ), which was similar to the amount of variance explained by materials, labor, and knowledge. The bivariate correlation with OCB received might be observed because OCB received was strongly related to coworker support ( $r = .69$ ), which, in turn was strongly related to the satisfaction of the need for relatedness ( $r = .72$ , see Table 11). Taken together, this suggests that coworker support might explain a lot of the variance that OCB received accounted for in the satisfaction of the need for relatedness.

The results in Table 13 suggest that the receipt of task-related help and OCB received (with coworker support partialled out) explained a similar amount of variance in several variables, such as satisfaction of the need for relatedness, emotional support, self-reported task performance, and supplication. For example, with coworker support partialled out, the correlation between OCB received and supplication strengthened from  $r = .02$  ( $p = .572$ ) to  $sr = .19$  ( $p < .001$ ), whereas the bivariate correlations between supplication and the receipt of materials, knowledge, and labor were  $r = .12$  ( $p < .01$ ),  $r = .28$  ( $p < .001$ ), and  $r = .25$  ( $p < .001$ ), respectively. Although these results suggest that the receipt of task-related help scale might be associated with one aspect that might be captured by OCB received, the correlations between

OCB received (with coworker support partialled out) and the receipt of knowledge, materials, and labor were less than .40. This provides evidence suggesting that the receipt of task-related help and OCB received (with coworker support partialled out) are distinct constructs.

**Discussion.** The purpose of this study was to develop an initial nomological network for the receipt of task-related help. I found that employees who receive materials, knowledge, or labor help may be more likely to act needy, seek the solution to their problems, seek the tools to solve problems on their own, perceive themselves to be bad performers, receive emotional support, and perform interpersonal helping behaviors, but they may be less likely to believe their coworkers are incompetent or that work should be completed alone. I also found that employees who receive materials or labor help may be more likely to perform helping behaviors directed at the organization, perceive their coworkers to be supportive, and believe their coworkers help them with ulterior motives. The three types of task-related help also exhibited distinct relationships with certain variables; specifically, I found that employees who receive materials may be more likely to work on interdependent tasks and perceive their need for autonomy to be satisfied; employees who receive labor help may be more likely to work on tasks that are affected by other employees' work and perceive their need for relatedness to be satisfied; and employees who receive knowledge help may be less likely to perceive their need for competence to be satisfied. Finally, I found evidence that the receipt of task-related help scales were distinct from an adapted version of an OCB scale; specifically, I found that the receipt of task-related help was correlated with employee incompetence, whereas OCB received was correlated with support. Taken together, these findings provide evidence for my scale's construct validity.

## General Discussion

Although helping behaviors has received a substantial amount of research attention, organizational researchers have largely neglected the recipient of help, focusing instead on the help giver. In the few organizational studies on the help recipient, the receipt of help was measured by adapting existing OCB items to reflect the help recipient's perspective. However, OCB items were originally created and validated for the purpose of measuring help *giving*, not help receiving, and the items do not specify the task-related helping behaviors that employees can perform. As a consequence, using adapted versions of OCB items might not provide an accurate assessment of the receipt of task-related help.

To address these limitations and to facilitate future research on the receipt of help, I developed and validated a measure that assesses three types of task-related helping behaviors that employees can receive. In Study 1, I found three general categories of task-related help - namely, knowledge, materials, and labor, which was used to guide item development for the scale. I conducted four studies to provide evidence that the scale is a valid and reliable measure of the receipt of task-related help. Specifically, in Study 2, I provided evidence that my scale is substantively valid. In Study 3 and 4, I demonstrated and confirmed that the scale assesses the three types of task-related help. I also provided evidence that the three types of help were related, yet distinct from each other. In Study 5, I developed an initial nomological network for the receipt of task-related help and I demonstrated that the scale was distinct from an adapted version of an OCB measure. Together, Studies 2-5 provide construct validity evidence for the receipt of task-related help scale.

### Implications

There are several theoretical and practical implications of the present research. First, to

my knowledge, this was the first study that qualitatively assessed helping behaviors from the recipient's perspective. In contrast to several existing OCB items that do not specify the task-related helping behaviors that employees can perform (e.g., helps others who have been absent), I found that employees perceive three types of task-related help to be beneficial to their task performance - namely, providing materials, sharing task-relevant information, and working directly on an employee's task, and I created and validated a measure that assesses these three types of help. Thus, I fill an important gap in the literature by identifying what task-related *help* can entail. In turn, the measure provides a useful framework for understanding task-related helping behaviors from the help recipient's perspective. Specifically, the present research suggests that if potential helpers (e.g., managers, employees) want their helping behaviors to be helpful from the recipient's perspective, they should be aware that sharing task-relevant information, sharing materials, and working directly on another employee's task may be perceived by the recipient to be beneficial to his/her task performance. In turn, companies can use the scale to assess the extent to which employees receive these types of help.

Second, by demonstrating how the receipt of help differs from OCB received, the results have important implications for measuring the receipt of help. Specifically, the correlations between OCB received and the receipt of knowledge, materials, and labor were less than .40, which suggests that the receipt of task-related help scale was related, yet distinct from an adapted measure of OCB. Furthermore, the results indicate that OCB received was related to coworker support (which might explain several of the relationships that OCB exhibited), whereas the receipt of task-related help may be related to recipient incompetence. This provides evidence demonstrating that the measure of the receipt of task-related help differs from an adapted measure of OCB. Thus, researchers should strongly consider the measure they use to assess the

receipt of help because they could find different effects depending on which measure they use.

Third, I demonstrate that the type of help could matter when understanding the receipt of help. Specifically, the type of task-related help can have important implications on recipients' basic need satisfaction. I found that the receipt of materials was associated with higher autonomy and the receipt of labor was associated with higher relatedness, but the receipt of knowledge was associated with lower competence. In light of these findings, managers and employees (or potential helpers) should be aware that receiving task-relevant information could have negative effects on recipient perceived competence, whereas receiving materials and working directly on the recipient's task could contribute positively to the recipient's feelings of autonomy and relatedness, respectively. These findings contradict the traditional notion that helping behaviors are generally good by suggesting that helping behaviors may not always have positive effects.

### **Limitations and Future Research Directions**

The present research, however, has several limitations that should be addressed in future research. First, although I provided initial evidence of the receipt of task-related help's nomological network, the receipt of task-related help generally exhibited low to moderate correlations with the nomological net variables. Although this suggests that I may not have sampled from the appropriate construct domain, only significant correlations are necessary for demonstrating a scale's nomological network (Hinkin, 1998). Nevertheless, future research could investigate the relationship between the receipt of task-related help and competence-related variables, such as self-efficacy and intelligence. Doing so could provide further evidence of the scale's validity.

Another limitation of the present research was that I only collected self-report data for the nomological network study, which may introduce common source bias. However, I measured the

receipt of help and the nomological network variables across two time points, which decreases the likelihood that the data were distorted by responses biases (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Nevertheless, by collecting self-report data, I was not able to test whether the receipt of help was related to other-rated outcomes, such as supervisor-rated task performance and OCB. Thus, future research could collect data from multiple sources to confirm the validity of my findings.

Another avenue for future research is to investigate the extent to which changes in the receipt of task-related help relates to changes in supervisor-rated task performance over time. In doing so, future research could reveal the relative importance of the receipt of materials, knowledge, and labor help on supervisor-reported task performance. Specifically, this could reveal which types of task-related help contribute to employee task performance. This could be important given that the three types of task-related help were based on retrospective accounts of task-related helping behaviors perceived to be beneficial to their task performance, and past research suggests that receiving help can facilitate the completion of task responsibilities (Geller and Bamberger, 2011).

Future research could also examine how changes in the receipt of task-related help relates to changes in self-reported task performance. In the current research, I found that the receipt of task-related help was negatively related to self-reported task performance. This might be because employees who receive help may believe they are bad at their jobs, or receiving help can threaten the recipient's self-esteem. However, because the behaviors included in the scale were based on behaviors that employees perceive to be beneficial to their task performance, it is likely that recipients of task-related help may perceive their task performance to increase after they receive help. Thus, the negative relationship between receiving task-related help and self-reported task performance may conceal a more complicated relationship.

## **Conclusion**

The purpose of this research was to develop a validated measure of task-related help from the recipient's perspective in order to facilitate future research on the receipt of task-related help. I developed and validated a receipt of task-related help scale that assesses three different types of task-related helping behaviors that employees can receive - namely, materials, knowledge, and labor help. I conducted 4 studies to validate this measure. I hope this research will stimulate future research to adopt the recipient's perspective to understand helping behaviors in the workplace.

## References

- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégée: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 127-136.
- Alvarez, A., & Van Leeuwen, E. (2011). To teach or to tell? Consequences of receiving help from experts and peers. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*, 397-402.
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1991). Predicting the performance of measures in a confirmatory factor analysis with a pretest assessment of their substantive validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 732-740.
- Arthur, W., Jr., Glaze, R. M., Bhupatkar, A., Villado, A. J., Bennett, W., Jr., & Rowe, L. J. (2012). Team task analysis: Differentiating between task using team relatedness and team workflow as metrics of team task interdependence. *Human Factors, 54*, 277-295.
- Arthur, W., Jr., Edwards, B. D., Bell, S. T., Villado, A. J., & Bennett, W. (2005). Team task analysis: Identifying tasks and jobs that are team based. *Human Factors, 47*, 654-669.
- Bamberger, P. A., Geller, D., & Doveh, E. (2017). Assisting upon entry: Helping type and approach as moderators of how role conflict affects newcomer resource drain. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*, 1719-1732.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215.
- Barrera, M., Jr., Sandier, I. N., & Ramsay, T. B. (1981). Preliminary development of a scale of social support: Studies on college students. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 9*, 435-447.
- Baumeister, R., & Leary, M. (1995). The need to belong. Desire for interpersonal attachments as



- a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
- Becker, T. E., & Martin, S. L. (1995). Trying to look bad at work: Methods and motives for managing poor impressions in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 174-199.
- Berkowitz, L., & Daniels, L. R. 1963. Responsibility and dependency. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66, 664-669.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley.
- Bobocel, D. R. (2013). Coping with unfair events constructively or destructively: The effects of overall justice and self-other orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 720-731.
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (1999). Measuring impression management in organizations: A scale development based on the Jones and Pittman taxonomy. *Organizational Research Methods*, 2, 187-206.
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2005). The personal costs of citizenship behavior: The relationship between individual initiative and role overload, job stress, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 740-748.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 52-69.
- Bowler, W. M., & Brass, D. J. (2006). Relational correlates of interpersonal citizenship behavior: A social network perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 70-82.
- Brass, D. J. (1981). Structural relationships, job characteristics, and worker satisfaction and

- performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 331-348.
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 11, 710-725.
- Brickman, P. B., Rabinowitz, V. C., Karuza, J., Coates, D., Cohn, E., & Kidder, L. (1982). Models of helping and coping. *American Psychologist*, 37, 368-384.
- Brooks, A. W., Gino, F., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2015). Smart people ask for (my) advice: Seeking advice boosts perceptions of competence. *Management Science*, 61, 1421-1435.
- Brown, T. A., & Moore, M. T. (2012). Confirmatory factor analysis. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Handbook of structural equation modeling* (pp. 361-379). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equations models* (pp. 136-162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Cheung, M. Peng, K. K., & Wong, C. S. (2014). Supervisor Attribution of Subordinate's Organizational Citizenship Behavior Motives. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29, 922-937.
- Cobb, S. (1976). Social support as a moderator of life stress. *Psychomatic Medicine*, 38, 300-314
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98, 310-357.
- Colbert, A. E., Bono, J., & Purvanova, R. (2016). Flourishing via workplace relationships: Moving beyond instrumental support. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59, 1199-1223.
- Cropanzano, R. & Mitchell, M.S. (2005). Social exchange theory: an interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31, 874-900.

- Dalal, R. S., Lam, H., Weiss, H. M., Welch, E. R., & Hulin, C. L. (2009). A within-person approach to work behavior and performance: Concurrent and lagged citizenship-counterproductivity associations, and dynamic relationships with affect and overall job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *52*, 1051-1066.
- De Jong, S. B., Van Der Vegt, G. S., & Molleman, E. (2007). The relationships among asymmetry in task dependence, perceived helping behavior, and trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 1625-1637.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*, 319-338.
- DePaulo, B. M., Brittingham, G. L., & Kaiser, M. K. (1983). Receiving competence-relevant help: Effects on reciprocity, affect, and sensitivity to the helper's nonverbally expressed needs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *45*, 1045-1060.
- Deckop, J. R., Cirka, C. C., & Andersson, L. M. (2003). Doing unto others: The reciprocity of helping behavior in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *47*, 101-114.
- Ehrhart, M. G (2018). Helping in organizations: A review and directions for future research. In P. M. Podsakoff, S. B. Mackenzie, & N. P. Podsakoff, *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Citizenship Behavior*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Eiriksdottir, E., & Catrambone, R. (2011). Procedural instructions, principles, and examples: how to structure instructions for procedural tasks to enhance performance, learning, and transfer. *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, *53*, 749-770.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*, 500-507.

- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 335-362.
- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 272-299.
- Farrell, A. M. (2010). Insufficient discriminant validity: a comment on Bove, Pervan, Beatty, and Shiu (2009). *Journal of Business Research*, 63, 324-327.
- Fisher, J. D., Nadler, A., & Whitcher-Alagna, S. (1982). Recipient reactions to aid. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91, 27-54.
- Florey, A. T., & Harrison, D. A. (2000). Responses to informal accommodation requests from employees with disabilities: Theory and evidence on the willingness to comply. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 224-233.
- Flynn, F. J. (2005). Identity orientations and forms of social exchange in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 737-750.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39-50.
- Geller, D., & Bamberger, P. A. (2012). The impact of help seeking on individual task performance: The moderating effect of help seekers' logics of action. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 487-497.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- Grant, A. M., & Hofmann, D. A. (2011). It's not all about me: Motivating hospital hand hygiene by focusing on patients. *Psychological Science*, 22, 1494-1499.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis*

- (Vol. 7). Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Wheeler, A. R. (2015). To invest or not? The role of coworker support and trust in daily reciprocal gain spirals of helping behavior. *Journal of Management, 41*, 1628-1650.
- Hambleton, R. K., & Rogers, H. J. (1991). Advances in criterion-referenced measurement. In R. K. Hambleton & J. N. Zaal (Eds.), *Advances in educational and psychological testing* (pp. 3-43). Boston: Kluwer Academic.
- Harrell, W. A. (1994). Effects of Blind Pedestrians on Motorists, *Journal of Social Psychology, 134*, 529-539.
- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist, 52*, 1280-1300.
- Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*, 104-121.
- Hofmann, D. A., Lei, Z., & Grant, A. M. (2009). Seeking help in the shadow of a doubt: The sensemaking processes underlying how nurses decide whom to ask for advice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 1261-1274.
- Holden, R. R., & Jackson, D. N. (1979). Item subtlety and face validity in personality assessment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47*, 459-468.
- House, J. S. (1981). *Work stress and social support*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Howard, M. C., & Melloy, R. C. (2016). Evaluating item-sort task methods: The presentation of a new statistical significance formula and methodological best practices. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 31*, 51-62.
- Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 1, pp. 231-262). Hillsdale, NJ:

Erlbaum.

- Jones, R. Woods, S. W. & Guillaume, Y. (2016). The effectiveness of workplace coaching: A meta-analysis of learning and performance outcomes from coaching. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 89*, 249-277.
- Komissarouk, S., Harpaz, G., & Nadler, A. (2017). Dispositional differences in seeking autonomy- or dependency-oriented help: Conceptual development and scale validation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 108*, 103-112.
- Komissarouk, S., & Nadler, A. (2014). "I" seek autonomy, "we" rely on each other: Self construal and regulatory focus as determinants of autonomy- and dependency-oriented help-seeking behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40*, 726-738.
- Kowalski, R. M., & Leary, M. R. (1990). Strategic self-presentation and the avoidance of aversive events: Antecedents and consequences of self-enhancement and self-depreciation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 26*, 322-336.
- Lai, J. Y. M., Lam, L. W., & Liu, Y. (2010). Do you really need help? A study of employee supplication and job performance in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 27*, 541-559.
- Lambert, L. S., Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., Holt, D. T., & Barelka, A. J. (2012). Forgotten but not gone: An examination of fit between leader consideration and initiating structure needed and received. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*, 913-930.
- Laurent, S. M., Clark, B. A. M., and Schweitzer, K. A. (2015). Why side-effect outcomes do not affect intuitions about intentional actions: properly shifting the focus from intentional outcomes back to intentional actions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 108*, 18-36.

- Lee, F. (1997). When the going gets tough, do the tough ask for help? Help seeking and power motivation in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 72, 336-363.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 131-142.
- Lennard, A. C., & Van Dyne, L., (2018). Helping that hurts intended beneficiaries: A new perspective on the dark side of helping organizational citizenship behavior. In P. M. Podsakoff, S. B. Mackenzie, & N. P. Podsakoff, *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Citizenship Behavior*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting & task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Long, J. S. (1983). *Confirmatory factor analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lyons, B. J., & Scott, B. A. (2012). Integrating social exchange and affective explanations for the receipt of help and harm: A social network approach. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117, 66-79.
- Malhotra, D. (2004). Trust and reciprocity decisions: The differing perspectives of trustors and trusted parties. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 94, 61-73.
- McCullough, M. E., Kilpatrick, S., Emmons, R. A., & Larson, D. (2001). Is gratitude a moral affect? *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 249-266.
- McIntosh, N. J. (1991). Identification and investigation of properties of social support. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 72, 201-217.
- Mikulincer, M., & Florian, V. (1997). Are emotional and instrumental supportive interactions beneficial in times of stress? The impact of attachment style. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*,

10, 109-127.

- Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 1321-1339.
- Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 1543-1567.
- Mossholder, K. W., Settoon, R. P., & Henegan, S. C. (2005). A relational perspective on turnover: Examining structural, attitudinal, and behavioral predictors. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*, 607-618.
- Murphy, K. R. (1989). Is the relationship between cognitive ability and job performance stable over time? *Human Performance, 2*, 183-200.
- Nadler, A. (1997). Personality and help seeking: Autonomous versus dependent seeking of help. In G. R. Pierce, B. Lakey, & I. G. Sarason, *Sourcebook of social support and personality* (pp. 379–407). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Nadler, A. (2015). The other side of helping: Seeking and receiving help. In D. A. Schroeder & W. G. Graziano, *The Oxford Handbook of Prosocial Behavior*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Nadler, A. (2002). Inter-group helping relations as power relations: Maintaining or challenging social dominance between groups through helping. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*, 487-502.
- Nadler, A. (2009). Interpersonal and intergroup helping as power relations: Implications for real-world helping. In S. Stürmer & M. Snyder (Eds.), *The psychology of prosocial behavior: Group processes, intergroup relations, and helping* (pp. 242-269). Oxford, England:



Blackwell

- Nadler, A., & Chernyak-Hai, L. (2014). Helping them stay where they are: Status effects on dependency/autonomy-oriented helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *106*, 58-72.
- Nadler, A., Ellis, S., & Bar, I. (2003). To seek or not to seek: The relationship between help seeking and job performance evaluations as moderated by task relevant expertise. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *33*, 91-109.
- Nadler, A., & Fisher, J. D. (1986). The role of threat to self-esteem and perceived control in recipient reaction to help: Theory development and empirical validation. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 19, pp. 81-122). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Nadler, A., & Halabi, S. (2006). Intergroup helping as status relations: Effects of status stability in-group identification and type of help on receptivity to help from high status group. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 97-110.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, *10*, 85-97.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Peterson, R. A., & Kim, Y. (2013). On the relationship between coefficient alpha and composite reliability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*, 194-198.

- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 262-270.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). An examination of the psychometric properties and nomological validity of some revised and reduced "substitutes for leadership" scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 702-713.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 879-903.
- Podsakoff NP, Whiting SE, Podsakoff PM, Blume BD. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 122-141.
- Rioux, S. M., & Penner, L. A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 1306-1314.
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 66-80.
- Scott, B. A., & Judge, T. A. (2009). The popularity contest at work: Who wins, why, and what do they receive? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 20-33.
- Settoon, R. P., & Mossholder, K. W. (2002). Relationship quality and relationship context as antecedents of person- and task-focused interpersonal citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 255-267.
- Shakespeare-Finch, J., & Obst, P. L. (2011). Development of the 2-Way Social Support Scale: A

- measure of giving and receiving, emotional and instrumental support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 93, 483-490
- Shnabel, N., Bar-Anan, Y., Kende, A., Bareket, O., & Lazar, Y. (2016). Help to perpetuate traditional gender roles: Benevolent sexism increases engagement in dependency-oriented cross-gender helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 110, 55-75.
- Shotland, R. L., & Stebbins, C. A. (1983). Emergency and cost as determinants of helping behavior and the slow accumulation of social psychological knowledge. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 46, 36-46.
- Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Lens, W., Luyckx, K., Goossens, L., Beyers, W., & Ryan, R. M. (2007). Conceptualizing parental autonomy support: Adolescent perceptions of promotion of independence versus promotion of volitional functioning. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 633-646.
- Somech, A., Desivilya, H. S., & Lidogoster, H. (2009). Team conflict management and team effectiveness: The effects of task interdependence and team identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 359-378.
- Spence, J. R., Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., & Heller, D. (2011). Understanding daily citizenship behaviors: A social comparison perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32, 547-571.
- Taber, T. D., & Deosthali, K. (2014). Analysis of self-reported motives for task-related helping: Implications for an integrated theory of helping. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29, 343-366.
- Thompson, P. S., & Bolino, M. C. (2018). Negative beliefs about accepting coworker help: Implications for employee attitudes, job performance, and reputation. *Journal of Applied*

- Psychology*, 103, 842-866.
- Tsai, W. C., Chen, C.-C., & Liu, H. L. (2007). Test of a model linking employee positive moods and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1570-1583.
- Uy, M., Lin, K., Ilies, R. (2017). Is it better to give or receive? The role of help in buffering the depleting effects of surface acting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60, 1442-1461.
- Van Daalen, G., Willemsen, T. M., & Sanders, K. (2006). Reducing work- family conflict through different sources of social support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 462-476.
- Van Den Broeck, A., Vansteenkiste, M., De Witte, H., & Lens, W. (2008). Explaining the relationships between job characteristics, burnout and engagement: The role of basic psychological need satisfaction. *Work and Stress*, 22, 277-294.
- Van Den Broeck, A., Vansteenkiste, M., De Witte, H., Soenens, B., & Lens, W. (2010). Capturing autonomy, relatedness and competence at work: Construction and initial validation of the work-related basic need satisfaction scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 83, 981-1002.
- Van Der Veegt, G S., Van De Vliert, E., & Oosterhof, A. 2003. Informational dissimilarity and OCB: The role of intrateam interdependence and team identification. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 715-727.
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Botero, I. C. (2003). Conceptualizing employee silence and employee voice as multidimensional constructs. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40, 1359-1392.
- Van Leeuwen, E., & Täuber, S. (2010). The strategic side of outgroup helping. In S. Stürmer & M. Snyder (Eds.), *The psychology of prosocial behavior: Group processes, intergroup relations, and helping* (pp. 81-102). Chichester, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Venkataramani, V., & Dalal, R. S. (2007). Who helps and harms whom? Relational antecedents

- of interpersonal helping and harming in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 952-966.
- Watkins, P. C., Woodward, K., Stone, T., & Kolts, R. (2003). Gratitude and happiness: Development of a measure of gratitude, and relationships with subjective well-being. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 31, 431-452.
- White, R. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review*, 66, 279-333.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617.
- Wills, T. A. (1991). Social support and interpersonal relationships. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, 12, 265-289.
- Winnubst, J. (1993). Organizational structure, social support, and burnout. In W. B. Schaufeli, C., Maslach, & T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 151-162). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Wilke, H., & Lanzetta, J. T. (1970). The obligation to help: The effects of amount of prior help on subsequent helping behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 6, 488-493.
- Wood, A. M., Brown, G. D., & Maltby, J. (2011). Thanks, but I'm used to better: A relative rank model of gratitude. *Emotion*, 11, 175-180.
- Zellars, K., & Perrewé, P. (2001). Affective personality and the content of emotional social support: Coping in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 459-467.

## Appendix

### Instructions

1. Please think about the **employees at your workplace**. This includes supervisors, coworkers, subordinates, temporary workers, contract workers, or full-time or part-time employees.
2. Below are a list of statements that may describe the interactions you had with them within the **last month**.

Please rate how often each of the following interactions occurred during the last month.

During the last month, an employee...

#### Knowledge items

1. Showed me what I should do to complete my task correctly
2. Walked me through the steps to do my task in the best possible way
3. Described the steps that I should take to complete my task-relevant duties
4. Told me the meaning of terms and concepts that were necessary for achieving success on my task
5. Recommended a procedure that I should follow to avoid failing to complete my task
6. Explained why following a procedure was important for accomplishing many of my tasks

#### Labor items

1. Provided an extra hand with completing my task quickly
2. Took some of the workload off my shoulders to prevent me from failing to complete my task
3. Lent me a hand with completing a lot of my work
4. Lend me a hand with fulfilling my task responsibilities
5. Completed part of my task so that my work was high-quality
6. Took over part of my project to prevent me from failing to complete it

#### Materials items

1. Provided supplies that were necessary for performing my task-relevant duties
2. Gave me items that were necessary for completing my task correctly
3. Handed me materials that allowed me to make a lot of progress on my work
4. Sent me materials that I needed to accomplish high-quality work
5. Brought me things that I needed to maximize my productivity
6. Shared items that I needed to perform my task in a safe way

Responses were made on a 5-point frequency scale: 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = very often.

Table 1

*Category Development*

Example Response	Preliminary Category (Student #)	Consolidated Category
“...he took the time to explain to me these confusing concepts...”	Explanation (1)	Knowledge
“[Initials] verified that private RX insurance did not count as private health insurance...”	Information (1, 2)	
“He walked me through the procedure.”	Instruction (1, 2)	
“He suggested stopping anything in misconfig that was not needed”	Suggestion (1, 2)	
“I did all the physical and heavy stuff (I need to move the boxes, which can be pretty heavy) while she was writing everything down, counting them, and making sure everything was in order.”	Work together (1)	Labor
“The task was to make an IV line in the baby patient. I missed the vein on my first try, and my coworker nurse was nearby. [Initials] took over and was able to make the stick on her first try.”	Take over task (1, 2)	
“I had to quote a couple of insurance customers who were referalls [sic]. I had a customer coming in and I had not time to quote. [The helper] was nice enough to call them and provide the quotes on my behalf.	Act as substitute (1, 2)	
“At work my computer crashed and I couldn’t get it past the blew [sic] screen and I had a project due. [Initials] loaned me his personal laptop”	Resource (1, 2)	Material

Table 2

*Construct Definitions For Each Type of Task-related help*

Construct	Definition
Knowledge	<p>An employee communicates task-relevant information to the employee. The information can be communicated using any method, including written communication and physical demonstration. An employee may provide ideas, suggestions, or an explanation for why a procedure is done a certain way. An employee may also provide the definition of a concept or describe the procedure involved in performing a work task.</p> <p>However, if the employee communicates personal information that is not task-relevant, this action does not count as Knowledge. This is because this action does not involve the helper communicating task-relevant information, which is essential for the help to be considered as Knowledge.</p>
Labor	<p>An employee directly works on the task for the recipient. The employee can do part or all of the task. This may include acting as a substitute for the recipient or working together with the recipient. For example, if an employee's task is to load a truck with boxes, a helper might carry the boxes into the truck for the employee.</p> <p>However, if the employee brings a trolley for the employee to use or suggests a better way to arrange the boxes, these actions do not count as Labor/Service. This is because these actions do not involve the helper directly working on the task, which is essential for the help to be considered as Labor/Service.</p>
Materials	<p>An employee provides material good(s) that the recipient uses to perform the work task. The material may include documents (e.g., books, reports) and tools (e.g., lending a pen or laptop). The employee may also provide materials that the recipient turns into a finished product or service. For example, if an employee is trying to print a report but their printer has run out of paper, a coworker may take some paper from their own printer and give it to the employee.</p> <p>However, if the coworker shows the employee how to order more paper, this action does not count as Materials. This is because this action does not involve the helper directly providing a material, which is essential for the help to be considered as Materials.</p>



Table 3

*Item-Sort Task Results for Knowledge Items*

Knowledge items	Frequency of assignment		
	TH	ES	PWG
Demonstrated the steps involved in completing my task correctly	<b>86</b>	5	6
Taught me ways to fulfill my task obligations	<b>81</b>	13	3
Gave me tips for ensuring that my work complied with rules and regulations	<b>79</b>	11	7
Suggested a safer way to complete my task	<b>82</b>	10	5
Told me information that is necessary to fulfill my task responsibilities	<b>83</b>	8	6
Shared information so that I do not fail to complete my task	<b>81</b>	8	8
Clarified why following a certain procedure prevents me from producing low-quality work	<b>76</b>	17	4
Described the steps that I should take to complete my task-relevant duties	<b>87</b>	5	5
Told me what to do to make sure that my work complied with rules and regulations	<b>81</b>	12	4
Explained why following a certain procedure is important for fulfilling my task obligations	<b>82</b>	6	9
Walked me through the necessary steps for fulfilling my task-relevant duties	<b>84</b>	6	7
Told me the meaning of terms and concepts that were necessary for completing my task correctly	<b>82</b>	10	5
Recommended a procedure that I should follow to avoid failing to complete my task	<b>84</b>	7	6
Shared facts that were necessary for completing my task safely	<b>75</b>	10	12
Showed me what I should do to complete my task correctly	<b>88</b>	6	3
Demonstrated ways to accomplish my task	<b>87</b>	7	3
Taught me ways to finish my task in a short amount of time	<b>84</b>	9	4
Provided recommendations for performing my task successfully	<b>81</b>	8	8
Suggested a faster way to complete my task	<b>80</b>	8	9
Told me information that was necessary to make a lot of progress on my task	<b>78</b>	10	9
Shared information that I needed to perform my task in the ideal way	<b>77</b>	12	8
Clarified why following a certain procedure allows me to complete my task successfully	<b>77</b>	10	10
Described steps that I could take to maximize my productivity at work	<b>82</b>	10	5
Told me what to do to get a lot of work done	<b>76</b>	14	7
Explained why following a procedure was important for accomplishing many of my tasks	<b>77</b>	8	12
Walked me through the steps to do my task in the best possible way	<b>86</b>	9	2
Told me the meaning of terms and concepts that were necessary for achieving success on my task	<b>78</b>	15	4
Provided me with tips for getting a lot of tasks completed in a short amount of time	<b>75</b>	13	9
Shared facts that were necessary for accomplishing my task quickly	<b>79</b>	9	9
Showed me what to do to complete my task in the ideal way	<b>88</b>	6	3

*Note.* Boldface indicates substantively valid ( $p < .05$ ). TH = task-related help; ES = emotional support; PWG = positive workplace gossip.

Table 4

*Item-Sort Task Results for Labor Items*

Labor items	Frequency of assignment		
	TH	ES	PWG
Worked with me to prevent me from producing low-quality work	<b>86</b>	7	4
Worked with me to fulfill my task obligations	<b>87</b>	10	0
Completed part of my task to prevent me from failing to finish my work	<b>89</b>	5	3
Provided an extra hand with completing my task-relevant duties	<b>86</b>	9	2
Took over part of my project to prevent me from failing to complete it	<b>89</b>	5	3
Did part of my task so that I fulfill my task-relevant duties	<b>91</b>	3	3
Took on some of my responsibilities so that I fulfill my task obligations	<b>91</b>	2	4
Worked on parts of my task so that I complete the task correctly	<b>89</b>	5	3
Redid part of my task so that my work was completed correctly	<b>90</b>	4	3
Revised part of my work to make sure that it complied with rules and regulations	<b>87</b>	3	7
Took some of the workload off my shoulders to prevent me from failing to complete my task	<b>90</b>	5	2
Temporarily took on my task so that I fulfill my task-relevant duties	<b>92</b>	1	4
Lent me a hand with ensuring that my work complied with rules and regulations	<b>88</b>	5	4
Lent me a hand with fulfilling my task responsibilities	<b>90</b>	3	4
Worked with me to ensure that I completed my task safely	<b>90</b>	5	2
Worked with me so that I complete a lot of work	<b>88</b>	8	1
Worked with me to finish a lot of my work in a short amount of time	<b>90</b>	5	2
Completed part of my task so that my work was high-quality	<b>90</b>	3	4
Provided an extra hand with completing my task quickly	<b>87</b>	5	5
Took over part of my project so that I accomplish many tasks	<b>91</b>	2	4
Did part of my task so that I make a lot of progress on my work	<b>93</b>	2	2
Took on some of my task responsibilities so that I maximize my productivity	<b>92</b>	3	2
Worked on part of my task so that I accomplish high-quality work	<b>90</b>	4	3
Redid part of my task so that my work was high-quality	<b>93</b>	2	2
Revised part of my work so that I finish my work successfully	<b>88</b>	3	6
Took some of the workload off my shoulders so that I accomplish many tasks	<b>85</b>	8	4
Temporarily took on my task so that I accomplish many of my other tasks	<b>88</b>	7	2
Lent me a hand with completing a lot of my work	<b>87</b>	6	4
Worked on my project so that I accomplish many tasks	<b>89</b>	5	3
Finished part of my task so that I produce the best possible work	<b>91</b>	2	4

*Note.* Boldface indicates substantively valid ( $p < .05$ ). TH = task-related help; ES = emotional support; PWG = positive workplace gossip.

Table 5

*Item-Sort Task Results for Material Items*

Material items	Frequency of assignment		
	TH	ES	PWG
Let me borrow their supplies so that I perform my task safely	<b>90</b>	4	3
Shared their tools with me so that I perform my task correctly	<b>88</b>	4	5
Gave me supplies that were necessary for fulfilling my task obligations	<b>89</b>	5	3
Brought me things that were necessary for completing my task-relevant duties	<b>88</b>	6	3
Shared items that I needed to perform my task in a safe way	<b>86</b>	6	5
Handed me materials so that I complete my task correctly	<b>92</b>	3	2
Shared their personal property with me so that I do not fail to complete my task	<b>87</b>	8	2
Lent me their personal property so that I fulfill my task responsibilities	<b>84</b>	8	5
Lent me supplies to prevent me from failing to perform my task	<b>88</b>	6	3
Provided supplies that were necessary for performing my task-relevant duties	<b>91</b>	4	2
Gave me items that were necessary for completing my task correctly	<b>91</b>	5	1
Gave me materials to ensure that my work complied with rules and regulations	<b>89</b>	6	2
Let me use their supplies so that I finish my task correctly	<b>91</b>	3	3
Passed me items that I needed to fulfill my work obligations	<b>89</b>	5	3
Sent me materials that I needed to avoid producing low-quality work	<b>89</b>	3	4
Let me borrow their supplies so that I complete a lot of my tasks	<b>91</b>	1	5
Shared their tools with me to ensure that my work was high-quality	<b>85</b>	10	2
Gave me supplies that allowed me to make a lot of progress on my work	<b>91</b>	5	1
Brought me things that I needed to maximize my productivity	<b>86</b>	4	7
Shared items with me so that I get a lot of work done in a short amount of time	<b>88</b>	7	2
Handed me materials that allowed me to make a lot of progress on my work	<b>91</b>	5	1
Shared their personal property with me so that I produce the best possible work	<b>80</b>	10	7
Lent me their personal property so that I complete a lot of work	<b>86</b>	10	1
Lent me supplies so that I make a lot of progress on my task	<b>86</b>	8	3
Provided me with supplies so that I accomplish many tasks	<b>91</b>	3	3
Gave me items that I needed to achieve success on my task	<b>90</b>	3	4
Gave me materials that allowed me to make a lot of progress on my work	<b>85</b>	7	5
Let me use their supplies so that I finish a great deal of work	<b>86</b>	6	5
Passed me items so that I complete my task quickly	<b>90</b>	4	3
Sent me materials that I needed to accomplish high-quality work	<b>88</b>	5	4

*Note.* Boldface indicates substantively valid ( $p < .05$ ). TH = task-related help; ES = emotional support; PWG = positive workplace gossip.

Table 6

*Loadings of Retained Items From EFA*

Items	M	K	L
Provided supplies that were necessary for performing my task-relevant duties	<b>0.90</b>	-0.05	-0.01
Gave me items that were necessary for completing my task correctly	<b>0.89</b>	-0.04	-0.04
Handed me materials that allowed me to make a lot of progress on my work	<b>0.83</b>	0.00	0.04
Sent me materials that I needed to accomplish high-quality work	<b>0.82</b>	0.05	-0.03
Brought me things that I needed to maximize my productivity	<b>0.78</b>	0.01	0.09
Shared items that I needed to perform my task in a safe way	<b>0.74</b>	0.09	0.01
Showed me what I should do to complete my task correctly	-0.01	<b>0.86</b>	-0.05
Walked me through the steps to do my task in the best possible way	0.03	<b>0.85</b>	0.02
Described the steps that I should take to complete my task-relevant duties	-0.03	<b>0.82</b>	0.00
Told me the meaning of terms and concepts that were necessary for achieving success on my task	0.01	<b>0.81</b>	0.02
Recommended a procedure that I should follow to avoid failing to complete my task	0.00	<b>0.80</b>	0.03
Explained why following a procedure was important for accomplishing many of my tasks	0.05	<b>0.79</b>	0.01
Provided an extra hand with completing my task quickly	0.02	-0.06	<b>0.85</b>
Took some of the workload off my shoulders to prevent me from failing to complete my task	-0.01	-0.05	<b>0.84</b>
Lent me a hand with completing a lot of my work	0.05	-0.05	<b>0.84</b>
Lent me a hand with fulfilling my task responsibilities	-0.02	0.02	<b>0.83</b>
Completed part of my task so that my work was high-quality	-0.02	0.08	<b>0.80</b>
Took over part of my project to prevent me from failing to complete it	0.02	0.11	<b>0.67</b>

*Note.* Boldface indicates the highest factor loading for each item. M = materials; K = knowledge; L = labor.

Table 7

*Interfactor Correlations and Reliabilities from Study 3 (EFA)*

Task-Related Help	Labor	Knowledge	Materials
Labor	(.92)		
Knowledge	.50	(.93)	
Materials	.59	.54	(.93)

*Note.* Alpha reliabilities are presented in parentheses.

Table 8

*Factor Loadings of Final Scale Items From CFA (Study 4)*

Items	Factor Loading
Knowledge items	
Described the steps that I should take to complete my task-relevant duties	.86
Recommended a procedure that I should follow to avoid failing to complete my task	.84
Showed me what I should do to complete my task correctly	.83
Explained why following a procedure was important for accomplishing many of my tasks	.80
Walked me through the steps to do my task in the best possible way	.87
Told me the meaning of terms and concepts that were necessary for achieving success on my task	.77
Labor items	
Took some of the workload off my shoulders to prevent me from failing to complete my task	.81
Took over part of my project to prevent me from failing to complete it	.67
Lent me a hand with fulfilling my task responsibilities	.85
Completed part of my task so that my work was high-quality	.77
Provided an extra hand with completing my task quickly	.72
Lent me a hand with completing a lot of my work	.88
Material items	
Shared items that I needed to perform my task in a safe way	.73
Provided supplies that were necessary for performing my task-relevant duties	.82
Gave me items that were necessary for completing my task correctly	.88
Brought me things that I needed to maximize my productivity	.79
Handed me materials that allowed me to make a lot of progress on my work	.86
Sent me materials that I needed to accomplish high-quality work	.75

*Note.* N = 935. All factor loadings are significant at  $p < .001$ .

Table 9

*Validity Analyses from Study 4 (CFA)*

Factor	AVE	MSV	CR
Labor	.62	.29	.93
Knowledge	.69	.29	.91
Materials	.65	.22	.92

*Note.* AVE = Average Variance Extracted; MSV = Maximum Shared Variance; CR = composite reliability.

Table 10

*Interfactor Correlations and Reliabilities from Study 4 (CFA)*

Factor	Labor	Knowledge	Materials
Labor	(.90)		
Knowledge	.54	(.93)	
Materials	.47	.45	(.92)

*Note.* Cronbach's alpha reliabilities are presented in parentheses on the diagonal.



Table 11

*Descriptive Statistics, Correlations and Alpha Reliabilities For All Variables in Nomological Network Study (Study 5)*

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. Materials	2.92	0.99	(.92)																	
2. Knowledge	2.53	0.97	.44**	(.93)																
3. Labor	2.49	0.84	.43**	.55**	(.90)															
4. Supplication	1.53	0.79	.12**	.28**	.25**	(.93)														
5. DHS	2.25	0.79	.20**	.34**	.36**	.42**	(.88)													
6. AHS	4.04	0.63	.13**	.10*	.10*	-.21**	.03	(.85)												
7. SRTP	4.40	0.55	-.09*	-.20**	-.21**	-.49**	-.38**	.31**	(.86)											
8. NBACH	2.59	0.57	-.02	.01	-.06	.32**	.02	-.30**	-.21**	(.88)										
9. Initiated Interdepe.	3.38	0.99	.13**	-.06	.08	.02	-.03	-.04	.07	.07	(.83)									
10. Received Interdepe.	3.63	0.94	.19**	.05	.16**	.01	.02	.12**	.02	-.06	.43**	(.85)								
11. Coworker Support	3.60	0.93	.11**	.08	.14**	-.17**	-.06	.31**	.22**	-.52**	.04	.10*	(.91)							
12. Emotional Support	2.17	0.85	.18**	.20**	.29**	.18**	.14**	.17**	-.08	-.15**	.06	.07	.43**	(.89)						
13. SNA	3.30	0.76	.08*	-.06	.01	-.18**	-.09*	.15**	.22**	-.32**	.01	-.07	.46**	.15**	(.80)					
14. SNR	3.42	0.94	.12**	.03	.19**	-.17**	-.01	.30**	.18**	-.46**	.05	.12**	.72**	.43**	.50**	(.91)				
15. SNC	4.23	0.61	.03	-.18**	-.08	-.33**	-.36**	.18**	.57**	-.09*	.17**	.09*	.26**	.09*	.32**	.27**	(.88)			
16. OCB-I	4.78	1.04	.17**	.11**	.22**	-.10*	-.06	.30**	.22**	-.22**	.12**	.15**	.40**	.42**	.20**	.32**	.44**	(.88)		
17. OCB-O	4.32	1.30	.19**	.06	.15**	-.02	-.05	.17**	.14**	-.19**	.18**	.17**	.45**	.34**	.46**	.32**	.49**	.53**	(.92)	
18. OCB Received	3.12	0.84	.23**	.28**	.37**	.02	.13**	.31**	.04	-.42**	.02	.12**	.69**	.49**	.33**	.14**	.60**	.52**	.45**	(.90)

*Note.* N = 590. Cronbach's alpha reliabilities are presented in parentheses on the diagonal. DHS = Dependency-oriented help seeking tendency; AHS = Autonomy-oriented help seeking tendency; SRTP = Self-reported task performance; NBACH = Negative beliefs about accepting coworker help; Initiated Interdepe. = Initiated interdependence; Received Interdepe. = Received interdependence; SNA = Satisfaction of the need for autonomy; SNR = satisfaction of the need for relatedness; SNC = Satisfaction of the need for competence; OCB-I = Individual-directed organizational citizenship behaviors; and OCB-O = Organization-directed organizational citizenship behaviors.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 12

*Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Alpha Reliabilities for Receipt of Task-Related help and NBACH Variables From Nomological Network Study (Study 5)*

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Materials	2.92	0.99	(.92)							
2. Knowledge	2.53	0.97	.44**	(.93)						
3. Labor	2.49	0.84	.43**	.55**	(.90)					
4. Diminished Image Beliefs	3.13	0.85	.04	.14**	.01	(.85)				
5. Reciprocity Obligation Beliefs	2.16	0.88	.05	.07	.05	.30**	(.88)			
6. Self-Reliant Beliefs	3.44	0.86	-.12**	-.13**	-.22**	.40**	.31**	(.85)		
7. Coworker Mistrust Beliefs	1.88	0.95	.08*	.07	.10*	.25**	.59**	.23**	(.91)	
8. Coworker Incompetence Beliefs	2.13	0.76	-.15**	-.20**	-.16**	.01	.27**	.24**	.37**	(.76)

*Note.* N = 590.

Table 13

*Bivariate and Semi-Partial Correlations From Nomological Network Study (Study 5)*

Variable	Materials ( <i>r</i> )	Knowledge ( <i>r</i> )	Labor ( <i>r</i> )	OCB Received ( <i>r</i> )	OCB Received ( <i>sr</i> )
Materials					.21**
Knowledge	.44**				.31**
Labor	.43**	.55**			.38**
OCB Received	.23**	.28**	.37**		
Coworker Support	.11**	.08	.14**	.69**	
Supplication	.12**	.28**	.25**	.02	.19**
Dependency-Oriented Help Seeking	.20**	.34**	.36**	.13**	.23**
Autonomy-Oriented Help Seeking	.13**	.10*	.10*	.31**	.13**
Self-Reported Task Performance	-.90*	-.20**	-.21**	.04	-.15**
NBACH (Composite)	-.02	.01	-.06	-.42**	-.07*
Diminished Image Beliefs	.04	.14**	.01	-.12**	-.01
Reciprocity Obligation Beliefs	.05	.07	.05	-.26**	-.01
Self-Reliant Beliefs	-.12**	-.13**	-.22**	-.26**	-.15**
Coworker Mistrust Beliefs	.08*	.07	.10*	-.34**	.040
Coworker Incompetence Beliefs	-.15**	-.20**	-.16**	-.43**	-.15**
Initiated Interdependence	.13**	-.06	.08	.02	-.01
Received interdependence	.19**	.05	.16**	.12**	.08
Emotional Support	.18**	.20**	.29**	.49**	.26**
Satisfaction of Need for Autonomy	.08*	-.06	.01	.33**	.02
Satisfaction of Need for Relatedness	.12**	.03	.19**	.60**	.14**
Satisfaction of Need for Competence	.03	-.18**	-.08	.14**	-.05
OCB-I	.17**	.11**	.22**	.52**	.34**
OCB-O	.19**	.06	.15**	.45**	.19**

*Note:* The last column presents the semi-partial correlations, controlling for coworker support in OCB received. *r* = bivariate correlation; *sr* = semi-partial correlation; OCB-I = Individual-directed organizational citizenship behaviors; and OCB-O = Organization-directed organizational citizenship behaviors.