Altering the Way Job Information is Presented to Increase Citizenship Performance

by

Carter Schock

A Thesis Submitted to the

Graduate Faculty of Middle Tennessee State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of Masters of Psychology.

Middle Tennessee State University

August 2015

Thesis Committee:
Dr. Mark Frame, Chair
Dr. Michael Hein, Member
Dr. Richard Moffett III, Critical Reader

ABSTRACT

Presenting job information via competency models is an increasingly popular practice in organizations today. Campion et al. (2011) suggest that using competency models to describe the behaviors employees engage in at work can be tied to many positive organizational outcomes. One potential outcome is increased Citizenship Performance, or behavior that shapes the social context in which work occurs (Borman, 2004; Organ, 1997). Despite its potential advantages, the practice of competency modeling has far outpaced research (Stone, Webster & Schoonover, 2013). Building off of research by Fritsch (2014), this study empirically tested the notion that when presented with work samples, people will display higher amounts of Citizenship Performance when presented with competency-based job descriptions than when presented with traditional task-based job descriptions. Results indicated that type of job information does not affect Citizenship Performance while people are engaged in job-related tasks. However, in this study archival work sample data that was collected for another purpose (Fritsch, 2014) was successfully re-coded to study Citizenship Performance. This may be a useful application for practitioners, and implications are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Effective job performance is relevant to almost every conceivable job. Campbell (1990) defined job performance as those behaviors that contribute to organizational goals. Historically, the study of job performance has focused on task performance behaviors. These are behaviors that contribute to the completion of the technical aspects of a job listed in a job description (Campbell, 1990). In the past few decades, a distinctly different aspect of job performance has received attention; Citizenship Performance (Coleman & Borman, 2000). Citizenship Performance (CP) is behavior that does not directly contribute to task performance but supports the social or psychological setting in which task performance takes place (Borman, 2004; Organ, 1997).

CP has many ties to organizational effectiveness, including increased production quality and quantity (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997) and increased customer satisfaction ratings in service settings (Walz & Niehoff, 1996). CP has also been shown to influence manager ratings of employee performance just as strongly as task performance (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff et al., 2009; Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994).

The question now becomes how organizations can increase CP. One possible way is through the use of competency-based job information, often incorporated in a competency model. Competency models typically differ from traditional job descriptions in that they focus on the behaviors that the worker must engage in to be successful rather than the tasks that collectively identify the work (Sanchez & Levine, 2009; Stevens, 2013). Competency models provide broad brush strokes that convey the message that one's role in the organization is larger than simply performing tasks (Campion et al.,

2011; Jiao, Richards & Hackett, 2013). However, competency models face a number of criticisms, such as the level of rigor that goes into creating them, the lack of an accepted definition of what a "competency" is, and lack of research demonstrating that they have intended effects on HR functions (Campion et al., 2011; Schippmann et al., 2000; Stone, Webster & Schoonover, 2013). Despite these criticisms, competency models possess a clear strength in that they are often more closely tied to the vision and goals of an organization than traditional job descriptions (Campion et al., 2011; Sanchez & Levine, 2009; Schippmann et al., 2000).

This focus on linking behavior to organizational goals is thought to increase CP (Purvanova, Bono, and Dzieweczynski, 2006; Sanchez & Levine, 2009). Furthermore, competency models have the potential to increase objective and perceived measurements of Hackman and Oldham's (1975) task characteristics. This is important because objective and perceived task characteristics are strong predictors of CP (Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990; Mayfield, 2013; Podsakoff, MacKenize, & Bommer, 1996; Purvanova et al., 2006).

The present study will empirically test the notion that competency-based job information will increase CP. Using an experimental method, CP will be compared between task-based and competency-based conditions in a work sample. The history and conceptualization of CP, its links to organizational effectiveness, and similarities and differences with task performance will be discussed. Similarly, the conceptualization of competency models will be reviewed, as will it's benefits and drawbacks. Ties to organizational effectiveness, both empirical and conceptual, will be discussed. Finally, the parameters of the study will be defined and the methodology will be explained.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Citizenship Performance

The Concept of Citizenship Performance

Coleman and Borman (2000) use the term CP to encapsulate the concepts of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Prosocial Organizational Behavior, Model of Soldier Effectiveness, and Contextual Performance. These constructs share much conceptual and practical similarity, and are discussed in more detail below. In stride with Organ's (1997) call for parsimony among these concepts, the present study adopts Coleman and Borman's (2000) use of one term, Citizenship Performance, to refer to the entire domain.

Coleman and Borman (2000) synthesized the CP domain into 27 distinct behaviors. Members of SIOP who were classified as I/O practitioners sorted these 27 behaviors into distinct categories. The researchers conducted factor analysis, cluster analysis, and multi-dimensional scaling of these categories that resulted in a three-dimensional model of CP: (a) interpersonal support, (b) organizational support, and (c) job/task conscientiousness. Borman et al. (2001) further refined this model using approximately 2,300 CP behaviors from studies conducted by Personnel Decisions Research Institute. These behaviors were classified using Coleman and Borman's (2000) taxonomy and themes that arose during classification were used to modify the taxonomy. The resulting model contains three dimensions: (a) personal support (e.g. helping others by suggesting ways to improve), (b) organizational support (e.g. staying loyal to the organization during hard times), and (c) conscientiousness initiative (e.g. working hard despite obstacles; Borman et al., 2001; Borman, 2004). This model, along with exemplars

for each dimension, will be used as a guide for classifying CP in the present study and is

displayed in Table 1.

Table 1.

Citizenship Performance Dimensions

Personal Support

Helping others by offering suggestions, teaching them useful knowledge or skills, directly performing some of their tasks to help out, and providing emotional support for their personal problems

Cooperating with others by accepting suggestions, informing them of events they should know about, and putting team objectives ahead of personal interests

Showing consideration, courtesy, and tact in relations with others, as well as motivating and showing confidence in them

Organizational Support

Representing the organization favorably by defending and promoting it, as well as expressing satisfaction and showing loyalty by staying with the organization despite temporary hardships

Supporting the organization's mission and objectives, complying with reasonable organizational rules and procedures, and suggesting improvements

Conscientious Initiative

Persisting with extra effort despite difficult conditions

Taking the initiative to do all that is necessary to accomplish objectives even if not normally a part of own duties, and finding additional productive work to perform when own duties are completed

Developing own knowledge and skills by taking advantage of opportunities within the organization and outside the organization, using own time and resources, when necessary

---

Adapted from Borman et al., 2001

The concept of CP evolved from the work of early business thinker Chester Barnard, who suggested organization members must cooperate and share information in order to facilitate work processes (1938). Social psychologist Daniel Katz (Katz, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1966) further stressed that helping and cooperating behaviors improve organizational performance and that there is a distinction between "innovative and spontaneous behaviors" and task performance. Subsequently, research on CP branched into 3 streams of research that generated 3 different concepts: Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Prosocial Organizational Behavior (POB), and the model of soldier effectiveness.

The concept that has gained the most notoriety in the CP domain is OCB. Smith, Organ and Near (1983) coined the term and defined it as behavior that goes beyond one's prescribed role in order to help others in the organization or support the organization itself, and serves to strengthen the social context in which work occurs. OCB initially consisted of two dimensions: altruism (helping specific coworkers) and generalized compliance (general acts of conscientiousness towards the organization). These researchers described OCB as a way of managing the interdependent relationships between coworkers, which results in a higher collective output. Brief and Motowidlo (1986) cultivated a similar concept entitled Prosocial Organizational Behavior (POB), which focuses on behavior that promotes the welfare of individual employees, groups, or organizations. Borman, Motowidlo, Rose and Hanser (1987) created a model of soldier effectiveness for the United States Army in which teamwork, determination, and allegiance to the organization combine with technical knowledge to create effective performance.

Organ (1988) further refined the definition of OCB by suggesting that it is most effective at promoting organizational effectiveness in aggregate and consists of five dimensions: altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue. Organ (1988) also insisted that OCBs are not formally rewarded by the organization through such things as pay increases. However, the requirement that OCB not be rewarded was later removed in response to research that suggested that many managers consider OCB when appraising employee performance (Campbell, 1990; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Organ's (1997) final definition of OCB is "performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place" (p.95).

Borman and Motowidlo (1993) condensed and integrated the concepts of POB, OCB, and soldier effectiveness into the concept of Contextual Performance. They defined this as performance that "shapes the organizational, social, and psychological context that serves as a critical catalyst for task activities and processes" (p.71). They created a five-dimension taxonomy of Contextual Performance based on previous POB, OCB, and soldier effectiveness research:

1. Persisting with enthusiasm and extra effort as necessary to complete own task activities successfully.
2. Volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of own job.
3. Helping and cooperating with others.
4. Following organizational rules and procedures.
5. Endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives.

Relationships to Organizational Effectiveness

While task performance varies for different jobs, CP dimensions are likely consistent across many jobs and organizations (Borman, 2004; Borman, et al., 2001). Mentoring a less experienced employee, expending extra effort to ensure a job is performed well, and going out of one's way to keep others informed are examples of citizenship behavior (Borman, 2004). It is generally agreed that job performance is the combination of in-role behavior and CP (Campbell, 1990).

In a meta-analysis of 206 independent samples, Podsakoff et al. (2009) found that OCB was strongly related to supervisor ratings of performance, ($r = .49$). This relationship was virtually the same for OCBs aimed at individuals ($r = .46$) and the organization ($r = .46$). Furthermore, they found that task performance had roughly the same relationship with performance ratings ($r = .46$). Motowidlo and Van Scooter (1994) found similar relationships between task performance and overall performance ($r = .43$) and CP and overall performance ($r = .41$). Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994) found that helping behavior, civic virtue, and sportsmanship, dimensions from Organ's (1988) taxonomy, all independently influenced managerial evaluations of performance for insurance agents. In aggregate, they explained 48% of the variance in managerial evaluations of performance. These results suggest that managers rely on OCB at least as much as task performance when assessing overall job performance of their employees.

CP has been linked to many facets of organizational effectiveness. The collective effect of helping behavior, civic virtue, and sportsmanship accounted for 17% of the variance in unit-level performance (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). Civic virtue and sportsmanship were positively related to unit performance, though helping behavior was

negatively related. This suggests that though some CP is valued by the organization, it does not always contribute to objective performance. A likely cause is that the more helping behavior an employee displays, the less they can engage in task-related performance behaviors.

A study of paper mill crews found that helping behavior alone accounted for 17% of the variance in product quality and 26% of the variance in product quantity (Podsakoff et al., 1997). In a sample of restaurants, helping behavior and sportsmanship explained 43% of the variance in product waste, civic virtue explained 37% of the variance in customer complaints, and helping behavior accounted for 39% of customer satisfaction ratings (Walz & Niehoff, 1996). Taken together, these results indicate that CP affects both organizational effectiveness and behaviors that reduce cost. With strong evidence that increased CP can impact the bottom line, the question now becomes how organizations can foster CP.

Predictors of Citizenship Performance

Conscientiousness is one of the most robust predictors of job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Meta-analytic findings suggest that Conscientiousness also predicts CP, $r = .24$ (Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001). Lepine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) found that factors such as affective commitment ($r_c = .32$), job satisfaction, ($r_c = .28$), and procedural justice ($r_c = .23$) are also related to CP. Organizational factors such as trust ($r_c = .27$; Colquitt, Scott, & LePine, 2007) and perceived organizational support (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) predict CP as well. Leader-member exchange quality has been shown to predict CP, $r_c = .32$ (LePine et al., 2002), and $r_c = .37$, (Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007).

In a meta-analysis of CP predictors, Organ and Ryan (1995) found dispositional measures (i.e. personality) to be weak predictors of CP, with the exception of Conscientiousness, which was moderately related. Job satisfaction and affective commitment also explained moderate amounts of CP. Additionally, job satisfaction and affective commitment were found to have a greater effect on CP than in-role performance. This implies that they way in which employees see their work environment has a greater impact on CP than individual differences. This has implications for the ways in which jobs are designed or described to maximize job satisfaction or affective commitment.

Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) also conducted a review of the literature concerning predictors of Organ's (1988) OCB dimensions. Their review found that individual characteristics such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment tended to predict dimensions such as helping behavior and organizational support. Role ambiguity and role conflict were negatively related to helping behavior, courtesy, and sportsmanship. The only organizational characteristic that had a noteworthy relationship with any OCB dimensions was group cohesion. Leadership behaviors, such as transformational leadership and articulating a vision, were related to all dimensions and had stronger relationships than individual characteristics or organizational characteristics. The same was true for task characteristics, such as feedback and satisfying work. Additionally, the amount of routine in a task was negatively related to all CP dimensions.

A great deal of research suggests that characteristics of the job affect the amount of CP displayed at work. In a meta-analytic study, Jiao et al. (2013) found that role breadth is a strong predictor of OCB, $r = .43$. Role breadth is defined as the degree to which employees view CP behaviors as a part of their job responsibilities (Jiao et al.,

2013). It should be noted that this relationship is stronger than that for organizational, personality, task, and affective factors. Results of a meta-analysis conducted by Podsakoff et al. (1996) suggest that task characteristics, such as task feedback and intrinsically satisfying work, are the most robust predictors of CP.

Farh et al. (1990) examined the effects of job satisfaction, leadership behaviors, and Hackman and Oldham's (1975) task characteristics on the CP behaviors of Compliance and Altruism. Their results suggest that task characteristics (particularly autonomy) and perceptions of fair leadership are stronger predictors of CP than job satisfaction. Mayfield (2013) examined the relationship between the task characteristics of autonomy, task identity, and skill variety (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) and various facets of CP. He found that when controlling for job satisfaction and organizational commitment, autonomy accounted for 2% of total helping behaviors. Task identity added an additional 3% to the prediction of helping behavior and civic virtue and 2% to taking initiative when controlling for the same variables. It is important to note that a 2% or 3% increase in task performance would be considered substantial and very beneficial in most organizations. It is likely that such an increase in helping behavior or civic virtue has similar benefits to an organization. In another vein, Mayfield (2013) found that skill variety accounted for 10% of the variance in initiative behaviors when controlling for organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and salary. This may be because roles with a high degree of skill variety require employees to proactively apply their skills to a wider array of situations (Mayfield, 2013). At any rate, task characteristics appear to predict CP over and above affective feelings and individual characteristics.

Previous research indicates that task characteristics are the most consistent predictors of CP. Purvanova et al. (2006) investigated the relationship between employee perceptions of task characteristics and CP. They found that job satisfaction ($\beta = .10$), Hackman and Oldham's (1975) objective job characteristics (measured via an assigned complexity score; $\beta = .15$), and transformational leadership ($\beta = .16$) were related to CP when regressed in the same model, $R^2 = .24$. A second model that contained perceived job characteristics, as measured by an averaged score on a shortened version of the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS; Hackman & Oldham, 1975), also predicted CP ($\beta = .11$, overall $R^2 = .24$). In addition, perceived job characteristics rendered the other factors insignificant. This indicates two things. First, perceived job characteristics have a greater bearing on CP than satisfaction or transformational leadership. Second, perceptions of job characteristics such as autonomy and task identity impact CP more than the degree to which these characteristics actually exist.

Competency Models

A Broader Picture of Job Information

Task characteristics are the strongest predictors of CP. Additionally, perceptions of task characteristics are just as predictive of CP, if not more so (Purvanova et al., 2006). This is good news for an organization attempting to alter the amount of CP that its employees engage in. Factors such as personality are not malleable and attempts to change leadership behaviors are labor intensive, costly, and their effectiveness is difficult to measure. However, task characteristics are objective factors that can be altered through job design, and changing how employees view their jobs can alter perceptions of task characteristics.

One way to manipulate perceptions of the job is through the presentation of job information. Unfortunately, very little research has investigated the relationship between the presentation of job information and CP behavior. Purvanova et al. (2006) suggest that CP can be increased through a strong linkage between the job and the overall purpose and strategy of the organization. In line with their findings on role breadth and CP, Jiao et al. (2013) suggest that organizations attempting to increase CP should implement HR practices that communicate broad role expectations.

What are Competency Models?

An increasingly popular means of conveying job information is the use of competency-based job information. A competency is a piece of knowledge, a skill, an ability, or another characteristic that is associated with effectiveness on a job or effectiveness as a member of an organization (Campion et al., 2011; Mirabile, 1997; Parry, 1996; Schippmann et al., 2000). Competencies are related to job performance and

are measurable against valid criteria of that performance (Parry, 1996; Schippman et al., 2000). They identify important and meaningful facets of behavior in the workplace and provide a means of measuring those facets (Bartram, 2005). Ford, Campbell, Campbell, Knapp, and Walker (2000) differentiate between core competencies, or those that reflect the needs of the organization as a whole, and job-specific competencies that pertain to a particular job.

Competencies are often arranged into a model that contains five to twelve competencies, is graphically represented, and pertains to a specific job or family of jobs (Campion et al., 2011). Campion et al. (2011) suggest that each competency in the model include: A) a name, B) a definition of what that competency means in terms of behavior and a clear statement of why those behaviors are useful to the job, C) a break down of different levels of proficiency in the competency, and D) behavioral indicators of each level of proficiency. Behavioral indicators remain similar across levels of proficiency but increase in complexity and scope.

Competency models are increasingly prevalent in the world of talent management. In a survey of 292 organizations, 75% were found to use competencies to drive selection, promotion, and training and development (Cook & Bernthal, 1998). Another survey of 130 executives in large firms found that 75% had used competency models for at least two years (Rathbar-Daniels, Erickson, & Dalik, (2001). Additionally, large talent management firms such as PeopleFluent and Saville Holdsworth Limited (SHL) use competencies as the framework for their talent management solutions. PeopleFluent claims that their competency model solutions are used by 80% of Fortune 100 companies

(PeopleFluent, 2014). Competency-based job information has clearly become just as commonplace as task-based information, if not more so.

Job Information in the 21st Century

The focus on behaviors instead of tasks stems from changes in the type of work performed in industrialized countries. As technology and industrialization spread, production jobs increasingly move to low wage countries and developed countries begin performing more knowledge work (Lawler, 1994). With knowledge work comes more ambiguous responsibilities on the part of the employee. The hierarchy that once dominated organizations has given way to increased autonomy on the part of the worker (Lawler, 1994). Employees are expected to take the initiative to do what needs to be done instead of constantly being directed by management (Lawler, 1994). Factors such as leading and deciding, persuading and influencing, empathy, and critical thinking are larger factors in successful job performance than filling a pre-defined role. With work that requires the manipulation of knowledge, information, and social skills, a task-based approach, such as traditional job descriptions, may not be the most comprehensive way to communicate job information. A competitive advantage for organizations attempting to thrive in the ever-globalizing marketplace is the ability to see employees as more than workers with sets of responsibilities cemented in fixed job descriptions. Rather, an advantage lies in viewing employees as human resources that contribute to the overall effectiveness of the organization (Lawler, 1994). As discussed in the following section, communicating job information via competency models facilitates this competitive advantage.

Differences from Traditional Job Analysis

A task force created by the Society of Industrial Organizational Psychology (SIOP) determined that traditional job analysis is typically more task-focused while competency modeling is more concerned with aligning performance to organizational goals (Schippmann et al., 2000). In fact, the creation of a competency model typically begins by consulting key executives about the organization's vision and goals for the future (Campion et al., 2011). This often results in competency models showing a stronger linkage to organizational changes and strategy than traditional job analysis (Rodriguez, Patel, Bright, Gregory, & Gowing, 2002). In turn, this aids in executive buy-in (Campion et al., 2011). Additionally, narrow job descriptions resulting from job analysis are often counterproductive to the constant change that modern organizations face, whereas competencies define broad skills that increase employees' flexibility and speed and prepare them for rapid changes in the workplace (Kochanski, 1997; Lawler, 1994).

The SIOP Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures (2003) echo this view. The Principles indicate that organizations existing in dynamic environments or are internally dynamic may benefit from using competency models to create or support selection procedures (2003).

Benefits and Uses

Competency models have the potential to better align behavior at work with the overall strategy of the organization (Campion, 2011; Sanchez & Levine, 2009; Schippmann et al., 2000). Well-constructed competencies provide behavioral indicators

of performance at different levels of proficiency (Campion et al., 2011). This allows for

the differentiation of low, average, and high performance (Campion et al., 2011; Mirabile,

1997; Parry, 1996). HR departments can use this information to identify what behaviors

lead to high performance and develop employees with those behaviors in mind (Campion

et al., 2011). In fact, Professionals in HR and Industrial/Organizational Psychology report

that competency models are more commonly used for training and development than

traditional job analysis (Schippman et al., 2000).

Additionally, employees can use this information as a roadmap for self-

development (Derven, 2008). Because of the additive nature of the behavioral indicators

across levels of proficiency, they can easily be incorporated into rating scales for

structured interviews, performance appraisals, etc. The multiple purposes served by

competency models help HR departments select, train, evaluate, and promote employees

based on the same criteria (Campion et al., 2011).

Research that identifies specific links between competency models and

organizational outcomes is lacking. However, some research indicates that competency

models do capture important aspects of job performance. Tian, Miao, Xu, and Yang

(2009) found that combined supervisor and peer ratings of competencies were very

strongly related to combined supervisor and peer ratings of leadership performance for

new military officers. Officers received competency ratings shortly before graduating

from a military academy and received leadership performance ratings two years ($r = 0.673$,

$p < 0.01$) and four years ($r = 0.473$, $p < 0.01$) after assuming military leadership roles.

Furthermore, leadership performance was significantly different for those with high

competency ratings versus those with average competency ratings (Tian et al., 2009).

These findings do not answer the question of if competency models have any incremental validity over job descriptions in eliciting job performance. However, they do suggest that competency-based job information, when properly synthesized, is in fact related to job performance. Findings also suggest that competency models can distinguish between superior and average performers, which is an alleged strength over job analysis (Campion et al., 2011). Furthermore, the Tian et al. (2009) finding that competency ratings at completion of training (graduation) are related to performance years afterwards has implications for training and development. Competency ratings may be useful in determining if trainees move on to more advanced training or receive remedial training, as is sometimes done in the military.

One study suggested that organizations that use competency models reap unique benefits over those that do not (Cook & Bernthal, 1998). Out of the 292 organizations surveyed, 91% reported that their processes for selecting and designing training initiatives were enhanced when these initiatives were supported by competency models. Only 48% reported such enhancement when training initiatives were not supported by competency models. Additionally, organizations that supported a larger number of HR systems with competencies were more likely to report that competencies improved the overall effectiveness of the organization. This provides evidence that a common competency language can unify HR systems and increase the overall effectiveness of the organization (Campion et al., 2011).

Competency Models and Citizenship Performance

Though hard evidence is in short supply, competency models have the potential to increase many aspects of organizational effectiveness. CP is likely one of these aspects.

Competency models should elicit CP for several reasons. For one, many of the behaviors outlined in a competency model apply to the context in which work occurs (Sanchez & Levine, 2009) and emphasize knowledge, skills and abilities (e.g. communication and teamwork) that facilitate but do not directly contribute to task performance. Second, they satisfy Purvanova et al.'s (2006) call for a connection between the job and vision of the organization in order to increase CP. Third, they convey broad role expectations, which Jiao et al. (2013) assert increases CP.

Additionally, competency models often explicitly detail aspects of CP. Southwest Airlines emphasizes "freedom" in its competency models, or the ability to learn, grow, make a difference, and innovate (Sanchez & Levine, 2009). Not only do these behaviors resemble those in Borman et al.'s taxonomy, they are critical to the organization's brand. In a similar example, Federal Express emphasizes the competency of "discretionary effort" (e.g. generating novel ideas, solving problems; Jiao et al. 2013), which bears resemblance to the CP dimension of Conscientious Initiative (Borman et al., 2001).

Core competences, such as those used by Southwest Airlines and Federal Express, are systemic to the organization and do not fluctuate much across different jobs in the organization. As Borman et al. (2001) suggest, CP dimensions are also likely to remain consistent across an organization. Thus, core competencies that apply to the organization as a whole may predict CP better than job descriptions that drill down into each specific job and have little in common amongst themselves.

Recall that a primary strength of competency models is their linkage of individual behaviors to organizational goals (Campion et al., 2011; Sanchez & Levine, 2009; Schippmann et al., 2000). Also recall that task characteristics, specifically autonomy, task

identity, and skill variety, are strong predictors of CP (Farh, et al., 1990; Mayfield, 2013; Podsakoff et al., 1996). Perceived task characteristics are just as robust predictors if not more so (Purvanova et al., 2006). Competency models provide clear examples of behaviors that are inherent in a particular job and lead to attainment of personal and organizational objectives (Campion et al., 2011). Thus competency models have the potential to increase the degree to which employees know what behaviors they must exhibit to succeed (autonomy), see their work as a complete unit instead of a cut-away of a larger task (task identity), and use a variety of knowledge, skills or abilities to achieve their work goals (skill variety). If these task characteristics are increased, CP will be increased (Farh, et al., 1990; Mayfield, 2013; Podsakoff et al., 1996; Purvanova et al., 2006).

Unfortunately, very little research has been conducted to draw a direct link between competency models and CP. However, Redmond (2013) found that perceived strategic relevance and perceived fairness of rewards coming from behaviors detailed in competency models were related to CP, but mediated by social exchange relationships. This implies that when competency models are seen as strategically relevant and employees are rewarded fairly for adhering to them, a social exchange is created in which the employee is more likely to engage in CP.

Controversy

There is much controversy concerning the utility of competency models as tools for presenting job information. Unfortunately, the practice of competency modeling has not yet reached the level of sophistication required to clearly identify what is and is not a

competency (Stone et al., 2013). Many organizations that use competency models report that they do not measure their impact on HR functions (Rathbar-Daniels et al., 2001).

The amount of rigor that goes into developing the actual content of competency models is of concern as well. A SIOP task force determined traditional job analysis is a more rigorous process than competency modeling and that the only real advantage of competency modeling is a closer relationship to the vision and strategy of the organization (Schippmann et al., 2000). The lack of rigor in developing competencies makes it more susceptible to legal challenges than traditional job analysis when used for selection and related applications (Campion et al., 2011; Schippmann et al., 2000).

Present Study and Hypotheses

This study investigated the extent to which people exhibit different levels of

Citizenship Performance behaviors when presented with Competency-based job

information versus Task-based job information. The proposed study adds to the

competency modeling literature by investigating a practical use for competency models

within organizations. Furthermore, as indicated by Stone et al. (2013), the consequences

of replacing task-based job information with competency-based job information are

virtually unknown. The hypotheses for this study were:

H1: Overall, when completing work-samples, participants presented with
Competency-based job information will display more **overall Citizenship Performance**
behaviors than when they are presented with Task-based job information.

H2a: Overall, participants completing work-samples with Competency-
based job information will display more **personal support** behaviors than when
they are presented with Task-based job information.

H2b: Overall, participants completing work-samples with Competency-
based job information will display more **organizational support** behaviors than
when they are presented with Task-based job information.

` *H2c*: Overall, participants completing work-samples with Competency-based job
information will display more **conscientious initiative** behaviors than when they are
presented with Task-based information

CHAPTER III: METHODS

Participants and Data Collection

The in-basket data used for the proposed study was collected as part of a large-scale research project (Fritsch, 2014). A total of 164 students participated in the study for undergraduate course credit. Responses that demonstrated a clear lack of effort, blank responses, and responses from participants under 18 were removed. The final sample size used in the analysis was 122. Participants were recruited using the SONA registration system and completed in-baskets electronically in a computer lab setting. Qualtrics software was used to host the in-baskets and record responses. A research assistant supervised the lab to ensure participants worked independently. Demographic characteristics of the sample such as age, sex, and work experience can be seen in Table 2. The majority of the participants were women and most of them were between 18 and 24 years old.

Table 2.

Participant Demographics

Variable	
Gender	
Male	38
Female	84
Age	
18-24	110
25-34	10
35-44	2
Ethnicity	
White	72
Hispanic or Latino	9
Black or African American	36
Asian / Pacific Islander	3
Other	2
English as Native Language	
Yes	110
No	12
Full Time Employment	
Less than 1 year	66
More than 1 year	49
Student status	
Freshman	59
Sophomore	26
Junior	23
Senior	13

Measures

In-baskets

Presentation of job information (job description versus competency model) was manipulated using in-baskets. In-baskets were created using two jobs set in two fictitious companies: Hiring Specialist for Kraftestle, Inc. and Training Specialist for Nisyota, Inc. Items were open-ended and addressed issues such as process improvement, legal/ethical issues, and strategic decision-making. Participants were instructed to respond via email, phone call, or voicemail.

Job Information Conditions

A job description and competency model was created for each position. As stated before, each participant completed two in-baskets. Half of participants were randomly assigned to each company. A Latin Square design was used to assign participants to conditions. Within each company, half of the participants were randomly assigned to be presented with the competency model first, and half with the job description first. After completing the first in-basket, participants completed a second in-basket using the other condition. Thus, there are four levels to this variable, displayed in Table 3.

Table 3.

Conditions of the Variable Job Information Conditions

Condition	In-basket 1	In-basket 2
A	Kraftestle Task	Nisyota Competency
B	Kraftestle Competency	Nisyota Task
C	Nisyota Task	Kraftestle Competency
D	Nisyota Competency	Kraftestle Task

Citizenship Performance Ratings

As noted earlier, the raw data collected by Fritsch (2014) was used in the present study. The qualitative data provided by participants was coded and scored by a new team of researchers to assess Citizenship Performance in the four conditions. A five-point behaviorally anchored rating scale (BARS) was created to assess the Citizenship Performance (CP) of in-basket responses for both the Kraftestle and Nisyota in-baskets. The BARS was designed to assess the effectiveness of responses to each issue within the in-basket items. Rating options ranged from "1," indicating very ineffective CP, to "5," indicating very effective CP. Many responses addressed task performance aspects of the issue but not citizenship performance. An option of "0" was used for such responses. A response of "99" indicated no action at all on the issue.

The anchors for each issue were matched to a dimension of CP from the taxonomy created by Borman et al. (2001). For example, Item 06A of the Kraftestle in-basket addresses the CP dimension of personal support. In the Borman et al. (2001) taxonomy, this includes behavior such as "teaching them (others) useful knowledge or skills" and "showing consideration, courtesy, and tact in relations with others." These behaviors were synthesized to create the in-basket rating item: "responds in a tactful and considerate way when Bobbie asks him/her to do something unethical and explains the ethical dilemma of the situation." Anchors were created to reflect the range of behaviors (ranging from very effective to very ineffective) one may exhibit in response to that issue. Some items from the original data (Fritsch, 2014) did not lend themselves to CP, and thus were not included in the BARS for this study. The BARS for Kraftestle and Nisyota can be seen in Appendices B and C, respectively.

Revisions to the BARS were made using feedback from the expert raters that participated in the Fritsch (2014) study. Their feedback was solicited because of their prior training in the use of a BARS and familiarity with responses to this particular in-basket exercise. Reviewers were asked to rate five raw in-basket responses using the BARS and provide wording and formatting edits. Ratings and edits were made individually and then discussed as a group. Ratings were almost unanimous across all items and both companies. Ratings helped to identify items that were not relevant to the study (i.e. all "0" or "99"). Edits helped to clarify the wording of items and to ensure that each exemplar behavior accurately reflected its respective level of CP (i.e. very effective).

Frame of Reference Training

Three graduate students and three undergraduate students provided CP ratings for in-basket responses. Raters were trained to use the BARS to score in-baskets using the frame of reference (FOR) method. FOR involves aligning the way raters perceive responses in the context of the situation and ensuring raters use the rating scale in the same way (Schleicher, Day, Mayes, & Riggio, 2002). In the first rater meeting, the researcher provided a conceptual description of the concept of CP and its dimensions according to the Borman et al. (2001) model. Also during the first meeting, three exemplar in-basket responses (chosen by the researcher) were rated individually by each rater and then discussed until consensus was reached.

A sample of twelve in-baskets (four for each team) was used to further conduct FOR training. Raters scored each in-basket individually and then reconvened to discuss and calibrate ratings. Raters provided edits to the BARS, noting issues such as confusing

anchors, anchors that overlapped with each other, and anchors that did not fully capture the range of participant responses.

Rating Process

In a manner similar to Fritsch (2014), the raters were divided into three teams of two (Teams A, B, and C) to rate the remaining in-baskets. Each team was randomly assigned one third of the in-basket responses. Raters provided ratings independently and then discussed them to reach consensus. Initially, a third rater provided independent ratings for responses in which the two primary raters disagreed in order to provide a third-party perspective during consensus discussions. However, during the first round of consensus meetings, it was determined that these third-party ratings did not assist in the discussion, and the third rater was no longer used. All raters remained blind to the condition of responses.

While consensus ratings were used for the analyses, inter-rater reliability estimates were calculated for each team. Pre-consensus meeting coefficient alpha values ranged from .51 to .94 for Team A with an average of .74. Alphas ranged from .03 to .95 for Team B with and average of .72. Values ranged from .11 to .94 for Team C with an average of .67. Table 4 displays coefficient alpha values for all in-basket items.

Table 4.

Chronbach's Alpha Values for Inter-rater Reliability

In-Basket Item	Team A	Team B	Team C
Kraftestle Item 02A - Organizational Support	.70	.88	.82
Kraftestle Item 02B - Organizational Support	.77	.43	.94
Kraftestle Item 03A - Personal Support	.84	.90	.83
Kraftestle Item 03B - Organizational Support	.94	.57	.76
Kraftestle Item 04A - Personal Support	.69	.57	.26
Kraftestle Item 04B - Organizational Support	.72	.89	.73
Kraftestle Item 05 - Personal Support	.85	.84	.72
Krafteslte Item 06A - Personal Support	.79	.95	.86
Kraftestle Item 06B - Organizational Support	.74	.69	.80
Kraftestle Item 07 - Conscientious Initiative	.86	.93	.91
Nisyota Item 02 - Personal Support	.58	.76	.79
Nisyota Item 03A - Personal Support	.51	.76	.11
Nisyota Item 03B - Conscientious Initiative	.80	.79	.54
Nisyota Item 04A - Personal Support	.83	.03	.43
Nisyota Item 04B - Conscientious Initiative	.74	.89	.76
Nisyota Item 06 - Organizational Support	.61	.79	.55
Nisyota Item 07A - Organizational Support	.75	.89	.72
Nisyota Item 07B - Personal Support	.52	.47	.56

CHAPTER IV: ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Data Cleaning and Coding

Values of 0 and 99 were coded as missing values in the SPSS data file. The

pattern of missing data for each in-basket item was evaluated using Little's MCAR test to

determine if missing data was related to other variables in the data set, e.g. age or gender.

Little's MCAR test was non-significant for both Kraftestle and Nisyota responses (p

$= .974$ and $p = .960$, respectively), indicating the pattern of missing data was completely

unpredictable and thus not problematic.

An overall (i.e., mean) Kraftestle and Nisyota score was calculated for each

participant using the consensus ratings for the Kraftestle and Nisyota in-basket items.

Mean scores were also calculated for each CP dimension within Kraftestle and Nisyota

and within the Task and Competency conditions. Internal consistency was slightly less

than ideal ($\alpha = .66$) for the overall Nisyota and Kraftestle scores. Internal consistency was

not assessed for the dimension-level scales as many of these scales contained three items

or less. Descriptive statistics for these variables can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5.

Descriptive Statistics of Dependent Variables

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Overall	Kraftestle	2.94	0.56	1.67	4.43
	Nisyota	3.19	0.47	1.75	4.29
	Task	3.05	0.50	1.75	4.43
	Competency	3.08	0.56	1.67	4.33
Kraftestle	Personal Support	3.17	0.65	1.33	5.00
	Organizational Support	2.84	0.80	1.00	5.00
	Conscientious Initiative	2.19	1.12	1.00	5.00
Nisyota	Personal Support	3.33	0.52	1.50	4.50
	Organizational Support	3.19	0.85	1.00	5.00
	Conscientious Initiative	2.78	0.70	1.00	5.00
Task	Personal Support	3.22	0.58	1.50	4.67
	Organizational Support	2.99	0.83	1.00	5.00
	Conscientious Initiative	2.48	0.87	1.00	5.00
Competency	Personal Support	3.27	0.61	1.33	5.00
	Organizational Support	3.02	0.85	1.00	5.00
	Conscientious Initiative	2.55	1.03	1.00	5.00

Tests of Hypotheses

To test the first hypothesis that o*verall citizenship performance would be greater when participants were presented with competency-based job information*, a repeated measures ANOVA was conducted between overall Kraftestle and overall Nisyota scores. No significant difference was found between the two conditions, Wilk's $\Lambda = .998$, $F (1, 117) = .228$, $p = .634$. Therefore, the first hypothesis was not supported.

Repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to test hypotheses 2a, 2b, and 2c, that *personal support, organizational support, and conscientious initiative behaviors would be greater when participants were presented with competency-based job information.* CP did not differ for any of the CP dimensions between the task and competency conditions, Wilk's $\Lambda = .998$, $F (1, 60) = .133$, $p = .717$. Therefore hypotheses 2a, 2b and 2c were not supported.

To test for the presence of a company effect (i.e. differences in CP performance between Kraftestle and Nisyota), a repeated measures ANOVA was conducted with overall Kraftestle and overall Nisyota scores. This analysis found that overall CP ratings for Nisyota were significantly higher than overall CP performance for Kraftestle, Wilks' $\Lambda = .849$, $F (1, 117) = 20.737$, $p < .001$.

Differences Among CP Dimensions

Significant difference were identified among the CP dimensions (personal support, organizational support, and conscientiousness initiative) using repeated measures ANOVA, Wilk's $\Lambda = .366$, $F (2, 59) = 51.005$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .634$. Pairwise comparisons indicated personal support was higher than organizational support and conscientious initiative and organizational support was higher than conscientious initiative.

As with overall CP scores, company had an overall effect on dimension-level CP scores, Wilk's $\Lambda = .820$, $F(1, 60) = 13.180$, $p = .001$. Paired samples t tests with an adjusted alpha of .0167 were conducted to explore the relationships among the CP dimensions by company. No significant difference was found for personal support, $t(116) = 2.157$, $p = .033$. However, organizational support and conscientious initiative were significantly higher for Nisyota than Kraftestle, $t(102) = 3.798$, $p < .001$, and $t(66) = 3.265$, $p = .002$, respectively.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

Overall Findings

This study was an additional step in a line of research that sought to determine the substantive, job performance impact that might be gleaned from utilizing competency-based job information (as opposed to the traditional task-based job information). This endeavor extends the work by Fritsch (2014), in which differences in job performance were assessed between work sample participants who used task-based and competency-based job descriptions to complete in-baskets. While Fritsch (2014) failed to find significant differences in different aspects of job performance between task-based and competency-based job information, the current study focused on the relatively understudied facet of job performance known as Citizenship Performance.

As with Fritsch (2014), the present study did not find significant differences between Citizenship Performance ratings when participants were presented with competency-based and task-based job descriptions. This may indicate that overall Citizenship Performance is not affected by the way in which job information is presented. In the absence of differences in overall CP, differences in each dimension of CP (personal support, organizational support, and conscientious initiative) were assessed. The hypotheses that each dimension would be higher for the competency-based job information condition were not supported. In terms of demonstrating the impact of competency-based job information, the results of the present study are discouraging.

The competency model literature is in desperate need of strong links between competency modeling and measureable organizational outcomes. One objective of this study was to fill this void by providing evidence that competency models serve an

important purpose, increasing Citizenship Performance, in real organizations. Results suggested that competency models do not serve this purpose, but the information gained is still valuable. Competency models have the potential to serve many purposes, such as aligning individual behavior with an organization's strategy (Campion et al., 2011), underscoring what KSAs employees need to develop to be successful (Derven, 2008), and allowing for greater flexibility in employees' roles (Kochanski, 1997; Lawler, 1994). However, increasing CP does not appear to be a benefit of competency models over task-based job descriptions.

An underlying assumption of this study was that the relationship between job information and CP is mediated by role breadth and task characteristics. As noted earlier, role breadth is a strong predictor of CP (Jiao et al., 2013) and competency-based job information should inherently provide a broader description of a given job (Campion et al., 2011; Jiao et al., 2013) and task characteristics (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) are strongly related to CP (Farh et al., 1990; Mayfield, 2013; Podsakoff et al., 1996). One aim of the present study was to demonstrate that employees who were given competency-based job information would have a greater degree of role-breadth, a more explicit understanding of what behaviors lead to success in the given position (including CP behaviors), and higher perceived task characteristics (e.g. task identity and autonomy). In combination, these factors were hypothesized to result in higher CP, but this hypothesis was not supported.

Due to the archival nature of the data, role breadth and task characteristics factors were not measureable. It may be the case that competency models do not actually increase role breadth and task characteristics. It could also be that the fictional

competency models designed for this study were not sufficient to draw out CP behaviors from participants. Many competency models contain a break down of different levels of proficiency for each competency and behavioral indicators of each level (Campion et al., 2011), which was not present in the models designed for this study. Another recommendation by Campion et al. (2011) is that in addition to a definition of each competency, a statement of why it is important to the job should be included. This statement of purpose was not included in the models used for this study.

The presence of a company effect indicated that overall CP, organizational support, and conscientious initiative were higher for Nisyota than for Kraftestle. This indicates that something about the Nisyota in-basket drew out more CP behaviors than the Kraftestle in-basket. One potential explanation for this finding is the nature of the positions created for each in-basket. In the Nisyota in-basket, the participant assumes the role of training specialist. In the Kraftestle in-basket, the same participant is placed in the role of a hiring specialist. The slightly more technical nature of the role of training specialist could cause an increase in conscientious initiative and organizational support. Similarly, the stimuli (e-mails, memos, messages, etc.) in the Nisyota in-basket tended to be issues that have longer-lasting effects, required more follow-through to implement, and required more continuous improvement than the more proximal hiring related issues presented in the Kraftestle in-basket.

Though the hypotheses of this study were not supported, one key aspect of our findings is potentially useful to organizations that wish to assess the degree to which CP behaviors might be present in their current employees. Specifically, based upon the results of the present study, it could be possible to "reverse engineer" a means of

assessing CP using archival performance or selection information related to job

performance. This study used archival responses to in-baskets that were collected for the

Fritsch (2014) study that assessed job performance, not CP. These responses were

recoded to generate ratings of CP, which was not the original purpose of the responses.

Evidence exists that, using the BARS created for this study, valid ratings of CP

were generated. Apart from the construct-valid approach to creating the BARS,

dimension-level ratings differed significantly from each other. Additionally, overall

ratings and dimension-level ratings differed between Nisyota and Kraftestle,

demonstrating differentiation between the two companies. Lastly, the internal consistency

of the BARS ($\alpha = .66$ for both) was not ideal, but was close to the commonly

accepted .70 threshold required for a scale to be considered reliable. This reliability could

easily be improved as an organization uses such a tool over time.

It is not uncommon for organizations to have archival work sample data. Work

sample data is often collected for purposes such as selection for open positions or

promotions. The successful use of the BARS in this study suggests that organizations can

recode past work sample data to obtain information about the level of CP in their

organization. The convergent validity of such measures of Citizenship Performance can

be assessed by correlating work sample response scores with existing paper and pencil

measures of CP.

Limitations and Future Research

A limitation of this study is the archival nature of the data. Using this data, role

breadth and perceptions of task characteristics, which are thought to mediate the

relationship between job information and CP, could not be measured. The lack of

significant findings between job information conditions may be because the presentation

of job information does not actually influence task characteristics or role breadth. Future

research should explore differences in perceived task characteristics or role breadth

among job information conditions. These factors are related to a host of desirable

outcomes other than CP, such as job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). This

provides many ways in which competency models may prove useful to organizations.

As noted in Fritsch (2014), the sample utilized for this study consisted mainly of

college students with little to no work experience. Students received course credit for

participating, but no additional incentives existed for performing well on the tasks

presented in the in-baskets. This is particularly problematic when studying Citizenship

Performance, as this construct is concerned with going "above and beyond," helping

others, etc. A sample that incorporates participants with more work experience, or one

that provides additional incentives to do well, may yield different results.

Another limitation of this study lies in the reliability of the measures. As noted

previously, the internal consistency of the overall Kraftestle and Nisyota scores ($\alpha = .66$)

could be improved. More reliable overall measures might have led to different results.

Additionally, inter-rater reliability for Nisyota items was less than ideal, especially for

Team C (mean $\alpha = .56$). Though the ratings used in the actual analyses reflected the

consensus of the two raters, poor inter-rater reliability suggests that raters frequently

disagreed on initial ratings. This may suggest that raters compromised a great deal in the

consensus meetings in order to reach an agreement. A more structured or more intensive

frame of reference training may improve rater agreement in future research.

Conclusions

The use of competency models to provide employees with job-related information is an increasingly common practice in organizations. Many believe using competency models provides value that is not found in traditional, task-based job descriptions (Campion et al., 2011; Sanchez & Levine, 2009). However, many researchers and practitioners are skeptical of these claims, and point out the legitimate concern of a lack of research demonstrating competency models serve their intended purposes (Stone et al., 2013; Schippmann et al., 2000). Building on the work of Fritsch (2014), this study sought to find evidence that competency-based job descriptions increase Citizenship Performance, and therefore serve a valuable purpose in organizations.

Results of the study indicated that Citizenship Performance is not influenced by presenting participants with competency-based versus task-based job descriptions. Coupled with the results from Fritsch (2014), increases in job performance may not be a benefit that competency models bring to organizations. Additional research is needed to tie competency models with desirable organizational outcomes.

REFERENCES

Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard
University Press.

Bartram, D. (2005). The great eight competencies: A criterion-centric approach to
validation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 1185-1203.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job
performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44,* 1-26.

Borman, W. C. (2004). The concept of organizational citizenship. *Current Directions in
Psychological Science, 13*, 238-241. doi:10.2307/20182965

Borman, W. C., Buck, D. E., Hanson, M. A., Motowidlo, S. J., Stark, S., & Drasgow, F.
(2001). An examination of the comparative reliability, validity, and accuracy of
performance ratings made using computerized adaptive rating scales. *Journal of
Applied Psychology, 86*, 965-973. doi:10.1037//002I-9010.86.5.965

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.

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., Motowidlo, S. J., Rose, S. R., & Hanser, L. M. (1987). *Development of a model of soldier effectiveness* (Technical Report No. 741). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. Retrieved from: http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?&verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA 191625

Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *The Academy of Management Review, 11*, 710-725.

Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 687-732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Campion, M., Fink, A., Ruggeberg, B., Carr, L., Phillips, G., & Odman, R. (2011). Doing competencies well: Best practices in competency modeling. *Personnel Psychology, 64,* 225-262.

Coleman, V., & Borman, W. C. (2000). Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. *Human Resource Management Review, 10,* 25-44.

Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 909-927. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.909

Cook, K. W., & Bernthal, P. (1998). *Job/role competency practices survey report.* Bridgeville, PA: DDI.

Derven, M. (2008). Lessons learned: Using competency models to target training needs. *Training and Development, 62,* 68-73.

Farh, J. L., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management, 76*, 705-721.

Ford, L., Campbell, R., Campbell, J., Knapp, D., & Walker, C. (2000). 21st century soldiers and noncommissioned officers: Critical predictors of performance (Technical Report 1102). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Fritsch, A. (2014). *Competency-based job information & job performance* (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle Tennessee State Univeristy, Murfreesboro, Tennessee.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*, 159-170.

Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P (2007). Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 269-277. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.269

Jiao, C., Richards, D. A., & Hackett, R. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and role breadth: A meta-analytic and cross-cultural analysis. *Human Resource Management, 52*, 697-714.

Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science, 9,* 131-146.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations.* New York: Wiley.

Kochanski, J. (1997). Competency-based management. *Training and Development, 51*, 41-44.

Lawler, E. (1994). From job-based to competency-based organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*, 3-15. doi:10.1002/job.4030150103

Lepine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 52-65. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.52

Mayfield, C. (2013). Promoting organizational citizenship behavior through job design: Job characteristics versus job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Disciplines, 11*, 36-64.

Mirabile, R. J. (1997). Everything you wanted to know about competency modeling. *Training and Development, 51,* 73-77.

Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 475-480.

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., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 46*, 775-802. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995

Parry, S. (1996). The quest for competencies. *Training, 33,* 48-54.

PeopleFluent. (2014). About PeopleFluent. Retrieved from

http://www.peoplefluent.com/company/about-us (accessed 11 November 2014).

Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual

and organizational level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A

meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 122-141.

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). Organizational citizenship behaviors and

sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research, 31,* 351-363.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenize, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Meta-analysis of the

relationships between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job

attitudes, role perceptions, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81,* 380-

399.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000).

Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and

empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management, 26*,

513-563.

Purvanova, R. K., Bono, J. E., & Dzieweczynski, J. (2006). Transformational leadership,

job characteristics, and organizational citizenship performance. *Human Performance,

19,* 1-22.

Rathbar-Daniels, D., Erickson, M. & Dalik, A. (2001). Here to stay: Taking competencies

to the next level. *Worldatwork Journal, First qtr,* 70-77.

Redmond, E. (2013). Competency models at work: The value of perceived relevance and fair rewards for employee outcomes. *Human Resource Management, 52*, 771-792. doi: 10.1002/hrm.21560

Rhoades, L. & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 698-714. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.698

Rodriguez, D., Patel, R., Bright, A., Gregory, D., & Gowing, M. K. (2002). Developing competency models to promote integrated human resource practices. *Human Resource Management, 41,* 309-324. doi: 10.1002/hrm.10043

Sanchez, J. I., & Levine, E. D. (2009). What is (or should be) the difference between competency modeling and traditional job analysis? *Human Resource Management Review, 19*, 53-63.

Schippmann, J., Ash, R., Battista, M., Carr, L., Eyde, L., Hesketh, B., …Sanchez, J. (2000). The practice of competency modeling. *Personnel Psychology, 53,* 703-740.

Schleicher, D. J., Day, D. V., Mayes, B. T., & Riggio, R. E. (2002). A new frame for frame-of-reference training: Enhancing the construct validity of assessment centers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 735-746. doi:10.1037/0021- 9010.87.4.735

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organization citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68,* 653-663.

Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. (2003). *Principles for the validation and use of personnel selection procedures* (4th ed.). Bowling Green, OH: Author.

Stevens, G. (2013). A critical review of the science and practice of competency modeling.

   Human Resource Development Review, 12, 186-107. doi:

   10.1177/1534484312456690

Stone, T., Webster, D., & Schoonover, S. (2013). What do we know about competency

   modeling? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 21,* 334-338.

Tian, J., Miao, D., Xu, Y., & Yang, Y. (2009). The leadership competency modeling of

   military academy cadets. *Social Behavior and Personality, 37,* 525-538.

Walz, S. M., & Niehoff, B. P. (1996). Organizational citizenship behaviors and their

   effect on organizational effectiveness in limited-menu restaurants. *Academy of

   Management Best Papers Proceedings, USA,* 307-311.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

IRB Approval

IRB
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Office of Research Compliance,
010A Sam Ingram Building,
2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd
Murfreesboro, TN 37129

EXEMPT APPROVAL NOTICE

6/4/2015

Investigator(s): Carter Schock
Department: Psychology
Investigator(s) Email: cs4v@mtmail.mtsu.edu
Protocol Title: "Altering the Way Job Information is Presented to Increase Citizenship Performance"
Protocol ID: 15-330

Dear Investigator(s),

The MTSU Institutional Review Board, or a representative of the IRB, has reviewed the research proposal identified above and this study has been designated to be EXEMPT. The exemption is pursuant to 45 CFR 46.101(b) **(2) Educational Tests, Surveys, Interviews, or Observations**

The following changes to this protocol must be reported prior to implementation:
- Addition of new subject population or exclusion of currently approved demographics
- Addition/removal of investigators
- Addition of new procedures
- Other changes that may make this study to be no longer be considered exempt

The following changes do not have to be reported:
- Editorial/administrative revisions to the consent of other study documents
- Changes to the number of subjects from the original proposal

All research materials must be retained by the PI or the faculty advisor (if the PI is a student) for at least three (3) years after study completion. Subsequently, the researcher may destroy the data in a manner that maintains confidentiality and anonymity. IRB reserves the right to modify, change or cancel the terms of this letter without prior notice. Be advised that IRB also reserves the right to inspect or audit your records if needed.

Sincerely,

Institutional Review Board
Middle Tennessee State University

NOTE: All necessary forms can be obtained from www.mtsu.edu/irb.

APPENDIX B

Kraftestle BARS

Kraftestle

Item, Issue and Competency	(5) Very Effective	(4) Effective	(3) Acceptable	(2) Ineffective	(1) Very Ineffective	(0) No CP	(99) No action
Item: 02A Issue: Defends the organization's rules/values when Jan suggests lying about Mitchell's terms of employment CP Dimension: Organizational Support	Replies to Jan stating that it is against the organization's rules or values to lie about Mitchell's termination AND that he/she trusts the organization's selection system.	Replies to Jan stating that it is against the organization's rules or values to lie about Mitchell's termination OR that he/she trusts the organization's selection system.	Replies to Jan stating that Mitchell cannot be terminated but does not provide an explanation.	Replies to Jan stating that Mitchell can be terminated for some reason besides "temporary terms."	Replies to Jan stating that Mitchell can be terminated due to "temporary terms."	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.
Item: 02B Issue: Defends the organization's use of selection procedures when Jan suggests eliminating them. CP Dimension: Organizational Support	Replies to Jan stating that the procedures add value to the organization AND that he/she supports the organization's use of the procedures.	Replies to Jan stating that the procedures add value to the organization OR that he/she supports the organization's use of the procedures.	Replies to Jan stating that the selection procedures should be retained because "those are the rules."	Replies to Jan agreeing that the procedures are a burden and should be examined OR should be eliminated.	Replies to Jan agreeing that the procedures are a burden AND should be eliminated.	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.
Item: 03A suggestions to Wanda as to how to track the number of applicants and how long the application process takes; motivates her for suggesting a good idea; CP Dimension: Personal Support	Does **ALL** of the following: • Commends Wanda for suggesting application metrics should be obtained. • Explains how or why collecting such metrics is important. • Provides suggestions for how to obtain them.	Does **TWO** of the following: • Commends Wanda for suggesting application metrics should be obtained. • Explains how or why collecting such metrics is important. • Provides suggestions for how to obtain them.	Does **ONE** of the following: • Commends Wanda for suggesting application metrics should be obtained. • Explains how or why collecting such metrics is important. • Provides suggestions for how to obtain them.	Does **ONE** of the following: • Dismisses Wanda's suggestion in a rude or unprofessional way •States that application metrics do not need to be obtained	Dismisses Wanda's suggestion in a rude or unprofessional way **AND** does one of the following: • States that application metrics do not need to be obtained • Does not provide suggestions for how to obtain them.	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.

Item							
Item: 03B Kraftestle's commitment to ethical laws, standards and policies when Wanda suggests a change in selection procedures that is unlawful; explains to Wanda CP Dimension: Organizational Support	Explains to Wanda in detail why interviewing applicants between the ages of 30 and 45 would be unlawful *AND* is against Kraftestle's values.	Explains to Wanda briefly why interviewing applicants between the ages of 30 and 45 would be unlawful *AND* is against Kraftestle's values.	Explains to Wanda briefly why interviewing applicants between the ages of 30 and 45 would be unlawful *OR* is against Kraftestle's values.	Tells Wanda that the change cannot be made but does not provide an explanation *OR* provides an explanation that does not involve law or Kraftestle's values.	Tells Wanda that the change cannot be made *AND* provides an explanation that does not involve law or Kraftestle's values.	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.
Item: 04A Issue: Provides emotional support to Grant and helps Grant by offering suggestions and performing some of his tasks to help out. CP Dimension: Personal Support	Replies to Grant empathizing with Grant's stress *AND* acknowledging the urgency of the situation *AND* Provides a viable means of letting the applicants know in time.	Replies to Grant empathizing with Grant's stress *OR* acknowledging the urgency of the situation *AND* Provides a viable means of letting the applicants know in time.	Replies to Grant providing a viable means of letting the applicants know in time.	Replies to Grant indicating that this is "not my job" *OR* reprimands Grant in an unconstructive way.	Replies to Grant indicating that this is "not my job" *AND* reprimands Grant in an unconstructive way.	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.
Item: 04B Issue: Identifies that the process of mailing applicant offer letters is inefficient and provides improvement recommendations; follows through on recommendations to assist in implementation. CP Dimension: Organizational Support	Replies to Grant acknowledging that the process is inefficient *AND* provides alternative methods for the future *AND* takes necessary steps to ensure alternative methods are implemented (e.g. emails Alex Bloom concerning changing the policy).	Replies to Grant acknowledging that the process is inefficient OR provides alternative methods for the future *AND* takes necessary steps to ensure alternative methods are implemented.	Replies to Grant acknowledging that the process is inefficient *OR* provides alternative methods for the future but does not take steps to ensure alternative methods are implemented.	Replies to Grant stating that mailing offer letters is company policy and should not or cannot be changed.	Replies to Grant stating that mailing offer letters is the ideal way to communicate job offers.	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.
Item: 05 Issue: Assists Terry in the process of writing interview questions and instructs him on the legal/ethical issues created by the questions; encourages Terry CP Dimension: Personal Support	Does **ALL** of the following: • Encourages Terry by pointing out his contribution to the interview process •Explains the legal/ethical problems with questions three and five • Provides lawful alternatives to questions three and five.	Does **TWO** of the following: • Encourages Terry by pointing out his contribution to the interview process •Explains the legal/ethical problems with questions three and five • Provides lawful alternatives to questions three and five.	Does **ONE** of the following: • Encourages Terry by pointing out his contribution to the interview process •Explains the legal/ethical problems with questions three and five • Provides lawful alternatives to questions three and five.	Does **ONE** of the following: • Reprimands Terry for creating questions with legal/ethical issues •Does not provide suggestions to help Terry	Does **BOTH** of the following: • Reprimands Terry for creating questions with legal/ethical issues •Does not provide suggestions to help Terry	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.

Item: 06A Issue: Responds in a tactful and considerate way when Bobbie asks him/her to do something unethical and explains the ethical dilemma of the situation. CP Dimension: Personal Support	Tells Bobbie in a polite way that he/she cannot send the interview notes *AND* explains why it would be unethical/breaks terms of confidentiality.	Tells Bobbie in a polite way that he/she cannot send the interview notes *OR* explains why it would be unethical/breaks terms of confidentiality.	Tells Bobbie that he/she cannot send the interview notes but does not explain why *OR* simply states it is against the rules.	Tells Bobbie in a rude way that he/she cannot send the interview notes.	Tells Bobbie in an extremely rude way that he/she cannot send the interview notes *OR* agrees to send the interview notes.	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.
Item: 06B Issue: Supports and defends Kraftestle's value of being cost effective (business acumen) by identifying the inefficiency in Bobbie's plan to bring in 30 people for interviews and a tour and suggesting improvements. CP Dimension: Organizational Support	Replies to Bobbie with *all* of the following: • States that the plan is not cost effective • Explains that being cost effective is a Kraftestle value • Provides a suggestion that makes the plan more cost effective	Replies to Bobbie with *2* of the following: • States that the plan is not cost effective • Explains that being cost effective is a Kraftestle value • Provides a suggestion that makes the plan more cost effective	Replies to Bobbie with *1* of the following: • States that the plan is not cost effective • Explains that being cost effective is a Kraftestle value • Provides a suggestion that makes the plan more cost effective	Replies to Bobbie with *1* of the following: • Approves the lab tour and interviews for 30 people • Indicates that the budget is not an issue	Replies to Bobbie with *2* of the following: • Approves the lab tour and interviews for 30 people • Indicates that the budget is not an issue	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.
Item: 07 pressed for time, persists with extra effort by creating an informational paragraph about Kraftestle to be used in the maintenance interviews. CP Dimension: Conscientious Initiative	Replies to Bela agreeing that company information should be shared in interviews AND submits a detailed paragraph that includes information about Kraftestle culture, structure or product.	Replies to Bela submitting a detailed paragraph that includes information about Kraftestle culture, structure or product.	Replies to Bela submitting a brief paragraph that includes information about Kraftestle culture, structure or products.	Replies to Bela stating that he/she will submit a paragraph with Kraftestle information later.	Delegates that task to someone else or to Bela *OR* states that company information is not needed in the interviews.	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.

APPENDIX C

Nisyota BARS

Nisyota

Item, Issue and Competency	(5) Very Effective	(4) Effective	(3) Acceptable	(2) Ineffective	(1) Very Ineffective	(0) No CP	(99) No action
Item: 02 Issue: Responds to Hans' curt email in a polite way and expresses an understanding of the time-sensitive situation. CP Dimension: Personal Support	Does all of the following: • Sends Hans a polite message • Expresses an understanding of the urgency of the issue • Apologizes for the delay	Does 2 of the following: • Sends Hans a polite message • Expresses an understanding of the urgency of the issue • Apologizes for the delay	Does 1 of the following: • Sends Hans a polite message • Expresses an understanding of the urgency of the issue • Apologizes for the delay	Does none of the following: • Sends Hans a polite message • Expresses an understanding of the urgency of the issue • Apologizes for the delay	Sends Hans a rude email about the training.	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.
Item: 03A Issue: Accepts Joey's suggestions that increased training may help the packing department with the machine and that Nice may serve as a model for training. Helps Joey by offering further suggestions. CP Dimension: Personal Support	Replies to Joey expressing agreement that training may be the solution *AND* uses Joey's statement about Nice to suggest a solution to the issue.	Replies to Joey expressing agreement that training may be the solution *AND* suggests that Nice may be a resource to help solve the problem.	Does one of the following: • Expresses agreement with Joey that increased training may help • Suggests that Nice may serve as a resource for the problem • Uses Joey's statement about Nice to suggest a solution to the issue.	Replies to Joey disagreeing that training would help *OR* states that fact that the machine is from Nice is irrelevant.	Replies to Joey disagreeing that training would help *AND* states that fact that the machine is from Nice is irrelevant.	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.
Item: 03B Issue: Takes initiative to do all that is necessary to resolve the packaging department's issue and persists in doing so despite being pressed for time. CP Dimension: Conscientious Initiative.	Replies to Joey stating that he/she will create a training program for the packaging machine *AND* that he/she will work directly with Nice to design the program *AND* asks questions about training needs or previous training.	Replies to Joey stating that he/she will create a training program for the packaging machine *AND* that he/she will work directly with Nice to design the program *OR* asks Joey questions about training needs or previous training.	Replies to Joey stating that he/she will create a training program for the packaging machine.	Replies to Joey stating that Joey should contact Nice to get information about the machine.	Replies to Joey stating that Joey should look through the documentation that came with the machine for solutions	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.

Item: 04A Issue: Helps Hanna by offering suggestions on how to resolve the conflict between George and the rest of the department and empathizes with George's situation. CP Dimension: Personal Support	Replies to Hanna providing 2 suggestions as to how the situation with George may be resolved AND demonstrates empathy with George' situation (coming from another country).	Replies to Hanna providing a suggestion as to how the situation with George may be resolved AND demonstrates empathy with George' situation (coming from another country).	Replies to Hanna providing a suggestion as to how the situation with George may be resolved OR demonstrates empathy with George' situation (coming from another country).	Replies to Hanna stating the he/she has no suggestions as to how to resolve the conflict OR states that George must conform to the mainstream culture.	Replies to Hanna stating the he/she has no suggestions as to how to resolve the conflict AND states that George must conform to the mainstream culture.	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.
Item: 04B Issue: Takes initiative to resolve the situation by discussing the issue directly with George and creating a culturally-based training program. CP Dimension: Conscientious Initiative	Replies to Hanna with all of the following: • Offers to speak to George directly concerning the issue. • Indicates that he/she is creating a training program to address cultural issues. • Indicates that diversity and inclusion is a key value of Nisyota.	Replies to Hanna with 2 of the following: • Offers to speak to George directly concerning the issue. • Indicates that he/she is creating a training program to address cultural issues. • Indicates that diversity and inclusion is a key value of Nisyota.	Replies to Hanna with 1 of the following: • Offers to speak to George directly concerning the issue. • Indicates that he/she is creating a training program to address cultural issues. • Indicates that diversity and inclusion is a key value of Nisyota.	Replies to Hanna with 1 of the following: • Hanna must resolve the issue herself. • Interpersonal issues are unavoidable in the workplace. • There is nothing that can be done to resolve the situation.	Replies to Hanna with 2 of the following: • Hanna must resolve the issue herself. • Interpersonal issues are unavoidable in the workplace. • There is nothing that can be done to resolve the situation.	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.
Item: 06 Offers a way to improve the organization and promote its value of global presence by acting on Melvin's suggestion to include the entire product line in online sales training. CP Dimension: Organizational Support	Replies to Melvin stating that he/she plans to take the lead on adjusting the training to include the entire product line because Nisyota is a global company.	Asks Melvin to adjust the online training to include the entire product line because Nisyota is a global company.	Replies to Melvin stating the he/she plans to investigate including the entire product line OR agrees with the need to include the entire product line.	Replies to Melvin encouraging the use of the online training developed by Jamie as it is.	Replies to Melvin dismissing Melvin's suggestion that the training should be adjusted to include the entire product line.	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.

Item: 07A Issue: Represents the organization favorably by promoting the fact that culturally biased behavior is unacceptable at Nisyota and showing pride or satisfaction in the organization. CP Dimension: Organizational Support	Replies to Hong stating all of the following: • Culturally biased behavior is unacceptable • Nisyota prides itself on its diversity and inclusiveness • He/she personally enjoys being a part of Nisyota	Replies to Hong stating 2 of the following: • Culturally biased behavior is unacceptable • Nisyota prides itself on its diversity and inclusiveness • He/she personally enjoys being a part of Nisyota	Replies to Hong stating 1 of the following: • Culturally biased behavior is unacceptable • Nisyota prides itself on its diversity and inclusiveness • He/she personally enjoys being a part of Nisyota	Replies to Hong stating that cultural clashes at work are unavoidable.	Replies to Hong stating that he must assimilate into the existing culture.	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.
Item: 07B Issue: Provides emotional support for Hong's personal problems and show confidence in him as a member of Nisyota. CP Dimension: Personal Support	Replies to Hong with all of the following: • Empathizes with Hong's situation. • Suggests actions that Hong may take to feel less like an outsider. • Tells Hong is a valued member of Nisyota.	Replies to Hong with 2 of the following: • Empathizes with Hong's situation. • Suggests actions that Hong may take to fell less like an outsider. • Tells Hong is a valued member of Nisyota.	Replies to Hong with 1 of the following: • Empathizes with Hong's situation. • Suggests actions that Hong may take to fell less like an outsider. • Tells Hong is a valued member of Nisyota.	Replies to Hong stating that he/she has no suggestions *OR* that Hong should contact someone else about the issue (e.g. Jan Lima, HR Mgr.)	Tells Hong to "deal with it" *OR* that this is not an issue to be discussed at work.	Sends a response that incorporates task performance but does not incorporate CP.	Did not send a message or sent a message about an unrelated topic.