

AN EYE FOR AN EYE AND THE DARK SIDE OF MENTORING:  
AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL  
JUSTICE AND NEGATIVE MENTORING

by

JULIA BABETTE SAUER

(Under the Direction of Lillian T. Eby)

ABSTRACT

The objective of this dissertation is to examine the joint effect of mentor personality and justice perceptions on protégé perceptions of negative mentoring. Theories on displaced aggression and trickle-down models are employed. Results show that mentor perceptions of distributive and procedural justice do not predict protégé perceptions of distancing or manipulative behavior. Furthermore, mentor conscientiousness, agreeableness, and neuroticism do not moderate the relationships between mentor justice perceptions and protégé perceptions of negative mentoring. Multi-level modeling was employed to analyze the data.

INDEX WORDS: Negative Mentoring, Organizational Justice, Personality, Trickle-Down Model

AN EYE FOR AN EYE AND THE DARK SIDE OF MENTORING:  
AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL  
JUSTICE AND NEGATIVE MENTORING

by

JULIA BABETTE SAUER

B.S., The University of Georgia, 2009

M.S., The University of Georgia, 2012

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GA

2014

© 2014

Julia Babette Sauer

All Rights Reserved

AN EYE FOR AN EYE AND THE DARK SIDE OF MENTORING:  
AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL  
JUSTICE AND NEGATIVE MENTORING

by

JULIA BABETTE SAUER

Major Professor: Lillian T. Eby

Committee: Nathan T. Carter  
Brian J. Hoffman

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
May 2014

## DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my family, especially my mother, Gertrud Sauer, and my sister, Andrea Sauer. Without their love, support, and encouragement, I would not be where I am today. I would like to specifically thank my mother for encouraging me to set out into the world at only 16 years of age and to support me in every way she could, even if this meant personal sacrifices. If it was not for what she has taught me and instilled in me, I would not have pursued this degree.

I would also like to dedicate this dissertation to two important role models in my life, Jutta Unkel and Pamela Greenway. Unknowingly to Jutta, she set the foundations to my education by introducing me to the field of Industrial-Organizational Psychology. Pam taught me many valuable life lessons and through her generous support enabled me to start my education in the United States. I would also like to thank Dr. Sean Baldwin, my peer mentor. As an undergraduate student, Sean opened my eyes to the possibilities of graduate school. I strongly believe that if it was not for his support, I would not have ended up staying in the United States and pursued a Ph.D. here.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my major professor, Dr. Lillian T. Eby for her wisdom, support, encouragement, and guidance throughout the years and particularly during the dissertation process. Lillian, you are a true mentor, and I have learned so much from you!

I would also like to thank Dr. Nathan T. Cater for teaching me about MLM, for supporting me, and for answering my countless questions. I appreciate you being there for me throughout this process and encouraging me to go this statistical route.

Furthermore, I would like to thank Dr. Brian J. Hoffman for his guidance and support during the past few years and on this dissertation. I appreciate you always having an open ear to any topic I would bring to you.

I would also like to thank Dr. Tanja Laschober for her statistical guidance, her support, and her friendship throughout the years.

Finally, I would like to thank my best friend and support system while in graduate school, Dr. Stefanie Beck. Without you, graduate school would not have been the same. I thank you for your friendship and everything you have done for me. I am so happy that we met here and that we went through graduate school together. Finally, I would also like to thank Melissa Mitchel for her support, encouragement, friendship, countless laughs, and talks during this dissertation process.

This study was supported by Award Numbers R01 DA019460 from the National Institutes on Drug Abuse awarded to Lillian T. Eby. The content is solely the

responsibility of the author and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institute on Drug Abuse or the National Institutes of Health.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
CHAPTER	
1 Introduction.....	1
2 Theoretical Background and Hypotheses .....	6
Negative Mentoring .....	6
Antecedents of Negative Mentoring .....	8
Organizational Justice.....	10
Main Effects of Justice on Negative Mentoring .....	12
The Moderating Role of Supervisory Mentor Personality.....	16
3 Method .....	21
Participants and Procedure.....	21
Supervisory Mentoring Measures .....	21
Protégé Measures .....	23
Control Variables .....	24
4 Results.....	26
Descriptive Statistics.....	26
Confirmatory Factor Analyses .....	26
Examination of Clustering Effects.....	28

Exploratory Analyses .....	33
5 Discussion .....	35
6 Implications for Theory and Practice.....	31
7 Limitations .....	42
8 Conclusion .....	44
REFERENCES .....	45

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations, and Reliabilities.....	65
Table 2: Parameter Estimates for the Five Models Examining the Relationship between Mentor Justice Perceptions and Personality and Protégé Perceptions of Manipulative Behavior.....	66
Table 3: Parameter Estimates for the Five Models Examining the Relationship between Mentor Justice Perceptions and Personality and Protégé Perceptions of Distancing Behavior.....	67

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

A growing number of studies have examined the relationship between employees' justice perceptions and attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. This research has also examined revenge and other types of retaliation, including aggressive behavior (e.g., Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2001; Bies & Tripp, 1995; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Tripp, Bies, & Aquino, 2002). However, only recently, researchers have begun to explore how supervisors' justice perceptions are related to subordinates' perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors (Ambrose, Schminke, & Mayer, 2013). Such research is needed because supervisors play an important role in employees' day-to-day activities and may influence their attitudes and behaviors (Ambrose et al., 2013).

In order to examine the cross-over effects of supervisor justice perceptions on subordinate outcomes, researchers have focused on "trickle-down" models, which are used to empirically examine the effect(s) of perceptions of one member of an organization, such as a supervisor, on other members in the organization, such as subordinates (Aryee, Chen, Sun, & Debrah, 2007). For example, Tepper, Duffy, Henle, and Lambert (2006) found that supervisor procedural justice perceptions are negatively related to subordinate perceptions of abusive supervision, a specific type of workplace deviance.

Negative mentoring represents another type of workplace deviance (Ghosh, Dierkes, & Falletta, 2011). In fact, Tepper (2007) notes that negative mentoring and

abusive supervision are similar in regards to the downward directionality of the two types of behaviors, the non-involvement of physical violence, and their definition in regards to intended outcomes. On a behavioral level, manipulative behavior shares a great deal of overlap with abusive supervision in terms of the protégé/subordinate experiencing deception, sabotage of his or her career, and tyrannical behavior on part of the mentor/supervisor (Eby, Butts, Lockwood, & Simon, 2004). Thus, the two constructs are similar in that both entail active, willful negative behavior directed at a protégé/subordinate. Distancing behavior and abusive supervision share similarities as well; specifically, the non-verbal aspects of abusive supervision (e.g., withholding information, or giving someone the silent treatment; Aryee et al., 2007) are consistent with the behavioral manifestation of distancing behavior (e.g., intentional exclusion, neglect; Eby, McManus, Simon, & Russell, 2000).

Despite their similarities, there are important differences as well, which become apparent when considering the supervisor-subordinate or mentor-protégé relationships, respectively. For example, in a typical supervisor-subordinate relationship, the supervisor is more task-oriented and focused on the subordinate's current job performance. By contrast, a supervisory mentor is committed to the long-term development of the protégé and is more invested in the protégé's career success (Pan, Sun, & Chow, 2011; Thomas & Lankau, 2009). It is also assumed that a mentor truly cares for the protégé's development beyond regular role requirements (Booth, 1996; Eby, Rhodes, & Allen, 2007). Thus, the supervisory mentoring relationship functions at a deeper personal level, such that the connection between a protégé and a supervisory mentor may go beyond those established in a strict supervision relationship (Booth, 1996). Furthermore, a mentoring relationship

is characterized by the protégé being able to trust and confide in the mentor. This may not be the case in a regular supervisor-subordinate relationship. Thus, violations of trust due to negative mentoring may be substantially different than in a supervisory relationship without mentoring.

While abusive supervision and negative mentoring share some similarities, they represent different constructs. This dissertation will therefore draw on Tepper et al.'s (2006) study and extend it into the domain of mentoring in the following ways: First, similar to when supervisors feel unjustly treated, supervisory mentors who experience injustice may also engage in deviance as a means to retaliate. This retaliation is likely not going to be directed at the mentor's own supervisor due to the existing power imbalance and the possibility of negative retribution. Drawing on theories of trickle-down models (Masterson, 2001) as well as theories of displaced aggression (Dollard, Miller, Doob, Mowrer, & Sears, 1939), this dissertation argues that when supervisory mentors experience injustice, they might engage in negative mentoring, thus displacing their aggression against a convenient target (Cropanzano & Prehar, 2001).

Second, this dissertation also extends Tepper et al.'s (2006) research by examining supervisory mentor perceptions of both procedural and distributive justice. Prior research found that distributive justice and retaliatory behavior are related, such that as employee perceptions of distributive justice increase so does employee theft (Greenberg, 1990). However, to date, this has not been examined in the context of a trickle-down model involving supervisory mentors and protégés. This study will address this gap by examining mentor perceptions of both distributive and procedural justice in relation to protégé perceptions of negative mentoring.

A final extension is the current study's examination of supervisory mentor personality as a moderator of the justice perception-negative mentoring relationship. Because personality influences both individual behavior and interpersonal interactions, scholars have suggested that it likely plays a role in the effectiveness of mentoring relationships (Allen et al., 2009; Turban & Lee, 2007). Interestingly, few researchers have incorporated personality into the study of mentoring (Allen et al., 2009) and even fewer studies that have examined personality in the context of negative mentoring (e.g., Allen et al., 2009; Kim & Choi, 2011). The current dissertation builds on and extends research from the protégé perspective by examining several Big Five personality characteristics of the supervisory mentor that may attenuate or exacerbate the association between mentor justice perceptions and protégé reports of negative mentoring. In doing so, this study answers the call in the literature to examine personality in the context of mentoring. It also contributes to building mentoring theory because examining the interactional effect of mentor personality and mentor perceptions of justice allows us to better understand the phenomenon of negative mentoring.

This dissertation makes several important contributions to the workplace deviance, trickle-down, and mentoring literatures. First, with the exception of research on abusive supervision, prior research has commonly focused on subordinates' negative workplace behaviors (Hoel, Rayner, & Cooper, 1999). This dissertation will add to the literature by examining negative mentoring as a different type of workplace deviance, as expressed by a supervisory mentor. Prior research has also neglected to focus on cross-over effects in the mentoring literature and typically examined mentoring from an individual-level perspective, such as examining the relationship between protégé

perceptions of negative mentoring and protégé outcomes (e.g., Burk & Eby, 2010; Ghosh et al., 2011). This dissertation will examine inter-individual relationships and thus integrate and extend the concept of trickle-down models into the mentoring literature.

Second, examining organizational justice as a potential antecedent of negative mentoring is important. As Kim and Choi (2011, p. 92) note, “negative aspects are more likely to be noticeable in formal than in informal mentoring relationships because the formality and mode of contact required in formal mentoring can limit the development of trust and emotional closeness in the relationship” (Chao, 2009; Karkoulian, Halawi, & McCarthy, 2008; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Tourigny & Pulich, 2005). As such, in formal mentoring relationships, mentors might engage in negative mentoring as their emotional connection with their protégé is limited. Further, protégés cannot as easily remove themselves from supervisory mentoring relationships. Therefore, examining supervisory reactions to organizational justice in relation to protégé perceptions of negative mentoring is particularly important in formal relationships.

Third, Tepper and Almeda (2012) stress the importance of examining workplace hostility longitudinally and within dyads. They argue that individual contributions to negative relationships may fluctuate temporally within dyads. This may be because mentors require both motive and opportunity to engage in negative mentoring. For example, a supervisory mentor can only take credit for a protégé’s work after the protégé has been successful. This argues for the importance of longitudinal research, using in-tact supervisory mentor-protégé dyads, which has not been the subject of prior empirical research (Allen, Eby, O'Brien, & Lentz, 2008).

## CHAPTER 2

### THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

#### **Negative Mentoring**

Workplace mentoring involves the relationship between a more senior, more experienced person, the mentor, and a more junior, less experienced person, the protégé (Kram, 1985). Past mentoring research has more commonly examined the positive aspects of mentoring (Simon & Eby, 2003), which focuses on the mentor fostering personal and professional development in the protégé (Kram, 1985). Notwithstanding the documented benefits of mentoring for protégés (e.g., Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004; Eby et al., 2013; Kammeyer-Mueller & Judge, 2008), effect sizes tend to be relatively small (Eby et al., 2013). This is not terribly surprising because similar to other interpersonal relationships, mentoring might be subject to disappointment, difficulties, and interpersonal dysfunctions at times (Duck, 1981; Marshall, 1994; Simon & Eby, 2003). More specifically, Kram (1985) indicates that sometimes mentoring relationships that start out positively change and become dissatisfying and destructive over time.

In addition to relationships changing over time, mentoring relationships may also be characterized by both positive and negative experiences simultaneously. For example, Eby et al. (2004) suggest that a mentor may provide a protégé with exposure and visibility within an organization while simultaneously engaging in negative mentoring by taking credit for the protégé's accomplishments. Only focusing on the positive aspects of mentoring might therefore oversimplify the complex nature of a mentoring relationship

(Eby & Allen, 2002; Wood & Duck, 1995). Recent research has begun to systematically investigate this “dark side” of mentoring (Scandura, 1998), which has been termed negative mentoring (Eby et al., 2000).

Negative mentoring is conceptualized as “specific incidents that occur between mentors and protégés, mentors’ characteristic manner of interacting with protégés, or mentors’ characteristics that limit their ability to effectively provide guidance to protégés” (Eby et al., 2000, p. 3). Perceptions of negative mentoring are conceptually distinct from positive mentoring experiences, and, thus, negative mentoring does not simply reflect the absence of positive experiences (Eby et al., 2004). Eby et al. (2000) empirically identified five dimensions comprised of 15 specific types of negative mentoring experiences as perceived by the protégé.

When a mentor engages in *manipulative behavior*, the mentor utilizes his or her position power over the protégé. The mentor may also use the protégé for personal gains by engaging in tyranny, credit-taking, or sabotage. *Distancing behavior* takes place when the mentor pays little or no attention to the protégé and his or her personal and/or career-development. The mentor may be self-absorbed or neglectful. *Lack of mentor expertise* describes situations in which the mentor lacks the technical or interpersonal skills necessary for successful mentoring. *Match within the dyad* refers to the extent to which the mentor and the protégé are compatible in regards to values, personality, and work-style. The final dimension is called *general dysfunctionality*, which includes problems which the mentor may experience that could negatively impact the mentoring relationship, such as personal issues (Eby et al., 2000).

Empirical research on negative mentoring is somewhat limited and focuses primarily on potential outcomes for protégés, such as decreased learning, lower job satisfaction, decreased career-related and psychosocial support received, as well as greater depressed mood and stress, higher levels of psychological job withdrawal, and increased turnover intentions (Burk & Eby, 2010; Eby et al., 2004; Eby & Allen, 2002). However, it is also important to examine the circumstances in which negative mentoring may occur (Eby et al., 2000), as negative mentoring relationships can be costly (Scandura, 1998). Because very few studies have examined potential antecedents of negative mentoring (Hamlin & Sage, 2011; Kim & Choi), this study helps to address this gap in the literature.

In this dissertation, I will only focus on distancing and manipulative behavior as two types of negative mentoring behavior. These behaviors represent the protégés' perceptions of intentional, calculated actions or conduct directed against them via sabotage, deception, credit-taking, or neglect by the mentor (Simon & Eby, 2003). Lack of mentor expertise, match within the dyad, and general dysfunctionality cannot be conceptualized as behavior per se, as these encompass situations in which there is either a misfit between the parties, the mentor lacks expertise, or the mentor exhibits personal problems. As such, they are not behaviors that the mentor can actively choose to engage in but rather are factors that the mentor might not have control over.

### **Antecedents of Negative Mentoring**

Scholars have drawn on the workplace deviance literature (e.g., Robinson & Bennett, 1995) to explain negative mentoring and noted that it can be conceptualized as a type of workplace deviance, “defined as voluntary employee behavior that violates

organizational norms and threatens the well-being of coworkers and the employing organization” (Ghosh et al., 2011, p. 23). For example, aspects of negative mentoring behavior, such as inappropriate delegation, tyranny, credit taking, or sabotage exhibit distinct similarities with exploitative or authoritarian behaviors, which are commonly described as deviant workplace behaviors (Ghosh et al., 2011). Moreover, Neuman and Baron’s (1998) three-factor model of workplace aggression indicates that aggression may vary from relatively minor acts of obstructionism, such as failing to return a phone call, to expressions of hostility, such as belittling someone’s opinion, to more serious overt aggression, such as physical attacks. Consistent with this idea, Simon and Eby (2003) found that negative mentoring can range from minor to more severe behavior. This suggests that the antecedents of negative mentoring may be similar to those of workplace deviance and aggression.

Prior research finds that perceived organizational justice is one of the most consistent predictors of counterproductive work behavior, such as organizational retaliatory behavior (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), organizational-motivated aggression (O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996), workplace aggression (Neuman & Baron, 1998), workplace deviance (Bennett & Robinson, 2000), and anti-social behavior (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997). Similarly, research on abusive supervision finds that supervisors’ perceptions of injustice are related to subordinates’ perceptions of abusive supervision (Tepper et al., 2006). Because negative mentoring can be conceptualized as a type of workplace deviance (Ghosh et al., 2011) and because organizational justice is a common predictor of workplace deviance (Flaherty & Moss, 2007), it is plausible that when a supervisory mentor feels unjustly treated, he or she may engage in a range of negative

mentoring behaviors toward a protégé. In the section that follows, I will outline the rationale for expecting supervisory mentors' perceptions of organizational justice to predict protégés' reports of negative mentoring.

### **Organizational Justice**

Organizational justice refers to the appraisal of unfairness and mistreatment in organizations (Greenberg, 1987). It is comprised of three types of subjective perceptions, namely (a) perceptions regarding fairness of how organizational outcomes are distributed or allocated, (b) perceptions regarding fairness that focus on the procedures utilized to allocate or distribute such outcomes, and (c) perceptions regarding the interpersonal treatment individuals receive when said procedures are delivered. These types of justice are referred to as distributive (Adams, 1965; Homans, 1961; Leventhal, 1976), procedural (Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975), and interactional justice (Bies & Moag, 1986), respectively. Importantly, they are positively related, yet distinct constructs (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

Organizational justice research finds that perceptions of fairness predict favorable employee attitudes and behavior, such as, organizational commitment, organizational support, organizational citizenship behavior, work performance, and trust in management (e.g., Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Konovsky & Freeman, 2000). On the other hand, unjust treatment may elicit feelings of frustration (Rafferty, Restubog, & Jimmieson, 2010), anger, or resentment, which likely result in a desire for retribution in order to punish those deemed responsible (Sheppard, Lewicki, & Minton, 1992; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Prior research shows that distributive and procedural justice perceptions are associated with counterproductive

work behavior, conflict with others, and negative emotions (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

**Distributive justice.** In order to determine whether the *outcomes* one receives from social exchange relationships with others are perceived as fair (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997), individuals compare their perceived contributions relative to the outcomes they have received. This ratio is then compared to some referent person or standard. If a discrepancy exists between the outcome they have received and the perceived contributions provided, individuals may feel treated unfairly. As a result, they may then choose to retaliate against the organization to make the ratio between the outcome they received and their input less negative from their perspective (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

**Procedural justice.** When those who are affected by organizational decisions have the opportunity to influence those decisions (Thibaut & Walker, 1975), and when they are treated with neutrality, trustworthiness, and respect during the allocation process (Tyler, 1989), the *decision-making processes* involved are said to be procedurally just (Tepper et al., 2006). When this is not the case, procedural injustice may lead to resentment and create a desire to retaliate against those whom they blame as the source for their experienced injustice (Bies & Tripp, 1995; Folger, 1993; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Tepper et al., 2006). In addition, some research suggests that procedural injustice creates negative emotional states, which might be vented against individuals who are considered to be convenient targets (e.g., due to their lower status; Cropanzano & Prehar, 2001; Fitness, 2000; Glomb, 2002; Weiss, Suckow, & Cropanzano, 1999).

**Interactional justice.** The *quality of interpersonal treatment* individuals receive during the implementation of procedures consists of both interpersonal and informational justice (Greenberg, 1990; Greenberg, 1993). Interpersonal justice refers to the degree to which individuals are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authority figures or third parties involved in executing organizational procedures. Informational justice, on the other hand, deals with explanations and information why procedures were implemented or why outcomes were distributed in a certain manner (Colquitt et al., 2001). Therefore, the *quality of interactions* with those who make decisions also affects whether or not individuals perceive fair treatment at work.

Bies and Moag (1986) propose with their agent-system model that interpersonal and informational justice are more powerful predictors of agent-referenced outcomes (directed towards supervisors or bosses) than of system-referenced outcomes (directed towards the organization overall). Research has supported this model and found that interactional justice is related to behaviors towards the source of the perceived injustice, such as citizenship behavior directed at one's supervisor (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000). Because interactional justice is better suited in predicting supervisor-referenced outcomes, it will not be examined as a potential antecedent in this study, as the focus of this study is on potential antecedents of negative mentoring as experienced by the protégé, and not on outcomes related to the mentor's supervisor.

### **Main Effects of Justice on Negative Mentoring**

The revenge and retaliation literature suggests that individuals who experience mistreatment seek revenge, and it has been shown that procedural and distributive justice are related to a wide range of retaliatory behavior (e.g., Aquino et al., 2011; Bies &

Tripp, 1995; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Tripp et al., 2002). According to Folger and Cropanzano (1998), when individuals experience injustice, they seek to identify the party accountable for their perceived injustice. Once identified, that person is the target of an individual's reactions. However, workplace deviance in response to unfair treatment can lead to disciplinary responses including written reprimands, demotion, reduction of work responsibilities, transfer, or termination (Tepper et al., 2009).

Therefore, in some situations the person experiencing injustice may find it advantageous to maintain a relationship with a high-status offender, such as a supervisor (Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2006; Lawler & Yoon, 1993). Thus, when supervisors feel unjustly treated by their higher-level supervisor, they may "likely be inhibited from seeking revenge because the offender is well positioned for counter-revenge" (Aquino et al., 2001, p. 654).

Power-dependence theory (Emerson, 1972) is useful to further explain this reluctance. The theory states that an individual's dependence is inversely related to his or her own power. When an individual is in a relationship that is characterized by power imbalance, he or she is dependent on the other person for valued resources. This power dependence constrains one's response options in response to perceived injustice (Molm, 1988; Tepper et al., 2009). Based on Gouldner's (1960) negative norm of reciprocity, supervisory mentors who experience injustice from their own supervisor may want to engage in retaliatory behavior as a means to return their frustration about this perceived injustice and restore equity. However, their dependence and lack of power over their own supervisors may constrain their ability to direct behavior at the perceived source of injustice (Tepper et al., 2009).

The power difference between the supervisory mentor and the protégé places the mentor in a unique position to displace his or her frustration with the organization or his or her supervisor by taking it out on the protégé (Eby et al., 2000). This notion is in line with displaced aggression theory (Dollard et al., 1939), which states that individuals who experience a strong provocation and who cannot engage in retaliation due to a power difference may behave aggressively towards an innocent other (Bies & Tripp, 2003). This reflects “the displacement of the aggressive inclination toward the initial provocateur” (Miller, Pedersen, Earleywine, & Pollock, 2003, p. 75).

Additionally, trickle-down models are based on the notion that the experiences of an individual at one level of the organization influence not only his or her perceptions of the organization but also his or her behavior towards others in the organization (Ambrose et al., 2013). For example, when individuals perceive their organization to be treating them fairly, they may respond by engaging in positive behavior directed towards others, which in turn may translate into further positive behavior towards others on the part of those who have previously been treated positively (Ambrose et al., 2013). On the other hand, in response to organizational injustice and in a “kick the dog” fashion (Hoobler & Brass, 2006; Restubog, Scott, & Zagenczyk, 2011), supervisors may take out their frustration due to injustice on those over whom they have power over, their subordinates (Hoobler & Brass, 2006). In a similar vein, a supervisory mentor’s frustration may trickle down to lower levels and be taken out on protégés.

Several studies have empirically examined the trickle-down effect in the justice literature (e.g., Masterson, 2001; Tepper & Taylor, 2003). Most trickle-down research has focused on the link between supervisors’ perceptions of a construct and subordinates’

perceptions of the same construct. An example of such research is provided by Mawritz, Mayer, Hoobler, Wayne, and Marinova (2012) who find that abusive manager behavior is positively related to abusive supervisor behavior, which in turn positively predicts workgroup interpersonal deviance. Other researchers have extended their focus and examined trickle-down effects across different constructs as well. For example, Wayne, Hoobler, Marinova, and Johnson (2008) examined the trickle-down effects of abusive behavior across three hierarchical positions (manager, supervisor, employee). One of their findings was that manager abusive supervision is positively related to supervisor turnover intentions, and supervisor abusive supervision is positively related to employee turnover intentions. Thus abusive supervision trickles down to influence employee attitudes.

Taking all these points into consideration, I therefore hypothesize:

*Hypothesis 1: Mentor perceptions of (a) distributive justice and (b) procedural justice are negatively related to protégé perceptions of mentor manipulative behavior.*

Homans (1961) and Skarlicki and Folger (1997) note that when individuals in lower power positions experience injustice, attempts to restore equity are likely carried out in an indirect manner by engaging in more covert acts of retaliation. This behavior may likely go unnoticed or if observed would be less likely to be considered as retaliatory behavior and thus punished by the organization. Therefore, distancing behavior could be considered another plausible response to mentors experiencing distributive or procedural injustice. Rather than overtly retaliating, withdrawing from protégés by seeming to be more concerned with their own career or not showing interest in developing their

protégés can be conceptualized as a covert and less discretionary act of retaliation. As such, I hypothesize the following:

*Hypothesis 2: Mentor perceptions of (a) distributive justice and (b) procedural justice are negatively related to protégé perceptions of mentor distancing behavior.*

### **The Moderating Role of Supervisory Mentor Personality**

Personality theorists such as Allport (1937) argue that individuals are predisposed to engage in certain behavior and that such predispositions are relative stable over time (Skarlicki, Folger, & Tesluk, 1999). This is consistent with a growing body of research documenting the relationship between personality and workplace deviance (e.g., Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, & Barrick, 2004). Personality is also implicated in understanding responses to unfairness because justice perceptions may be influenced by characteristics of the perceiver (Brockner, 1988; Folger & Skarlicki, 1998; O'Leary-Kelly et al., 1996; Skarlicki et al., 1999).

Although main effects of personality on workplace deviance and justice may be important to consider, an opposing position is presented by cognitive social theorists (Mischel, 1973, 2007) who emphasizes the need to examine the interaction between situational and personal factors. According to this interactional perspective (e.g., Mischel, 2007; Shoda & Mischel, 1993), personality alone cannot be used to explain all instances of workplace deviance. Rather, it is important to examine how personality interacts with situational factors (Hattrup & Jackson, 1996; House, Shane, & Herold, 1996) to influence behavior.

The argument is that personality determines how individuals perceive and interpret certain situations, and the interaction between personality and the situation itself will in turn influence how individuals respond (Henle, 2005). Colbert et al. (2004) argue that “employees are likely to demonstrate deviant behavior in response to negative perceptions of the work situation *only if such behavior is consistent with their personality traits*” (p. 599, emphasis added). Robinson & Bennett (1995) make a similar argument and note that the extent to which a provocation may result in deviance is dependent on constraints or controls that could inhibit deviance. In a similar vein, perceptions of injustice could also lead to deviant behavior, such as negative mentoring, when such negative behavior is consistent with an individual’s personality traits. In support of this, Henle and Gross (2013) point out that organizational justice is a commonly examined situational variable in their review of interactional studies of workplace deviance. For example, Flaherty and Moss (2007) find that distributive justice is more strongly related to deviance when individuals are also low in agreeableness.

Henle and Gross (2013) also suggest that conscientiousness is the strongest predictor of workplace deviance, followed by emotional stability and agreeableness, and that openness to experience and extraversion are likely to have the weakest relationship with deviant behavior. Reviews of the relationship between personality factors and counterproductive work behaviors support this pattern of effects (e.g., Cullen & Sackett, 2003; Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt, 2003). Although I am not examining the direct effect of personality on negative mentoring, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism are the most conceptually meaningful moderators of the relationship between

mentor injustice perceptions and protégé perceptions of negative mentoring. In this dissertation, I will therefore only examine these personality traits as moderators.

**Conscientiousness.** According to Ones and Viswesvaran (1996) theory of conscientiousness at work, conscientious individuals tend to show greater productivity, go beyond role requirements, and, most importantly for this dissertation, avoid counterproductive work behaviors. Additionally, conscientious individuals tend to be achievement-oriented, are dependable, responsible, and more dutiful (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Tepper, Duffy, & Shaw, 2001). They also tend to think carefully about their actions before engaging in them and adhere to their morale obligations, responsibilities, and ethical principles (Costa & McCrae, 1989; Goldberg, 1990). Those who score lower on measures of conscientiousness tend to be impulsive, passive-aggressive, and maladaptive (Costa, Zonderman, & McCrae, 1991; Costa, McCrae, & Dye, 1991).

Therefore, when feeling unjustly treated, mentors lower on conscientiousness may be more likely to engage in manipulative behavior due to their impulsive nature. Likewise, when faced with injustice, less conscientious mentors may be more likely to engage in distancing behavior due to stronger passive-aggressive tendencies. On the other hand, those higher on conscientiousness might be less inclined to engage in negative mentoring behavior when they feel unfairly treated because this may go against their tendencies to act dependably and adhere to role obligations. Rather than engaging in negative mentoring behavior when feeling unjustly treated, higher-conscientious individuals might use other strategies to deal with their perceived injustice in order to maintain their self-image of being dependable and responsible.

*Hypothesis 3: Mentor conscientiousness moderates the relationship between mentor organizational justice perceptions with protégé perceptions of negative mentoring. Specifically, under conditions of greater mentor conscientiousness, the negative relationship between mentor organizational justice perceptions and protégé perceptions of negative mentoring will be weaker.*

**Agreeableness.** Agreeableness refers to the extent to which an individual is trusting, cares about others, is easy to get along with, and pleasant to be around (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997). Individuals who score lower on a measure of agreeableness are said to be antagonistic, self-centered, manipulative, argumentative, hostile, vengeful, inconsiderate, insulting, and they are less concerned about engaging in behaviors that might result in conflict (Colbert et al., 2004; Costa, McCrae, & Dembroski, 1989; Goldberg, 1990). On the other hand, individuals who score higher on measures of agreeableness tend to be cooperative, sympathetic, trusting, altruistic, and sensitive to the needs of others (Costa & McCrae, 1989; Goldberg, 1990). They also tend to be reluctant to express anger or engage in aggressive behavior when experiencing a conflict situation (Costa & McCrae, 1989; Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, & Hair, 1996).

Based on these characteristics, individuals lower on agreeableness might be more likely to engage in negative mentoring when feeling unjustly treated because they are less concerned about the potential interpersonal conflicts that might result from engaging in negative mentoring. By contrast, due to their cooperative, altruistic, and sensitive nature, individuals higher on agreeableness might be less likely to engage in negative mentoring when experiencing injustice. Their motivation to avoid conflict and their general

tendency to be non-aggressive should make it less likely to sabotage protégés when feeling unjustly treated.

*Hypothesis 4: Mentor agreeableness moderates the relationship between mentor organizational justice perceptions with protégé perceptions of negative mentoring. Specifically, under conditions of greater mentor agreeableness, the negative relationship between mentor organizational justice perceptions and protégé perceptions of negative mentoring will be weaker.*

**Neuroticism.** Individuals lower on neuroticism tend to be calm, free from troubling emotions, and self-assured (Turban & Lee, 2007). In contrast, individuals higher on neuroticism tend to experience difficulties in dealing with problems and show heightened reactions to stressful events (Bolger & Zuckerman, 1995; Ferguson, 2001). When a mentor experiences injustice, which may be considered a stressful event, it seems plausible that mentors higher on neuroticism also experience difficulties in dealing with their perceived injustice and show heightened reactions, such as engaging in negative mentoring. Furthermore, individuals higher on neuroticism tend to be depressed, insecure, fearful, and anxious, and highly anxious individuals also tend to have dysfunctional thought processes (Colbert et al., 2004). Therefore, when mentors higher on neuroticism experience injustice, their distorted thought processes and insecurity may influence the extent to which mentors engage in negative mentoring when experiencing injustice. In other words, mentor neuroticism may exacerbate the relationship between mentor injustice perceptions and protégé perceptions of negative mentoring. I therefore hypothesize:

*Hypothesis 5: Mentor neuroticism moderates the relationship between mentor organizational justice perceptions with protégé perceptions of negative mentoring. Specifically, under conditions of greater mentor neuroticism, the negative relationship between mentor organizational justice perceptions and protégé perceptions of negative mentoring will be stronger.*

## CHAPTER 3

### METHOD

#### **Participants and Procedure**

In order to address methodological limitations associated with cross-sectional data (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986), this dissertation employs a longitudinal design. Two waves of data (1 year apart) were collected from both counselors ( $N = 372$ ) and their clinical supervisors ( $N = 156$ ), working in 26 substance use disorder (SUD) treatment facilities across the United States. Female counselors made up 66.2% of the sample and female clinical supervisors 65.6%. The average age was about 45 years for counselors and 48 years for clinical supervisors. Of the counselors, 64.2% were Caucasian, 18.7% were African American, 14.0% were Hispanic, 0.6% were Asian, 1.6% were multi-racial, and 0.9% indicated "Other." Of the supervisors, 76.2% were Caucasian, 11.2% were African American, 5.4% were Hispanic, 0.3% were Asian, 4.6% were multi-racial, and 2.3% indicated "Other." The modal education level was some graduate school experience (53.0% for counselors, 73.9% for clinical supervisors). Participants were provided with a paper and pencil survey during regular business hours. They were informed about the purpose of the study and provided informed consent to participate. The response rate was 88% for supervisors at Time 1, and 73% for counselors at Time 2.

#### **Supervisory Mentoring Measures**

Procedural justice was measured with a six-item scale by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) at Time 1. The validity of this scale has previously been established (Abu Elanain,

2009). Wording was slightly adjusted for collection purposes in the SUD field. Example items are “To make job decisions, center management collects accurate and complete information,” and “Job decisions are made by center management in an unbiased manner.” Distributive justice was assessed with a five-item scale by Moorman (1991). Moorman (1991) conducted a confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) of this scale and demonstrated its validity. Example items are “I am fairly rewarded considering my responsibilities,” and “I am fairly rewarded for the work I have done well.” Supervisory mentors indicated their level of agreement with both scales on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Coefficient alpha is .87 for procedural justice scale and .96 for the distributive justice scale.

In order to capture mentor personality, Saucier’s (1994) mini-markers were employed. This measure captures the extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and intellectual/imaginative traits of the Big Five model. For the purpose of this dissertation, only agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism constructs are utilized. Supervisory mentors were presented with eight adjectives per given construct (e.g., “sympathetic” for agreeableness, “efficient” for conscientiousness, and “jealous” for neuroticism) and were asked to describe how they see themselves at the present time, not how they wished to be in the future. Participants indicated the extent to which each adjective describes them accurately, using a five-point Likert scale (1 = extremely inaccurate to 5 = extremely accurate) at Time 1. Coefficients alpha are .78 for agreeableness, .79 for conscientiousness, and .70 for neuroticism. This measure has been found to be a valid measure of personality (Palmer & Loveland, 2004).

Because negative affect and counterproductive behavior have been consistently linked to the variables in this study (e.g., Barsky & Kaplan, 2007; Dalal, 2005), they were examined as part of an exploratory analysis. Mentor negative affect was measured with a scale by Watson, Clark, and Tellegen (1988), consisting of ten items. Tellegen, Watson, and Clark (1999) found that negative affect is independent from positive affect and that it constitutes a valid scale. Respondents utilized a five-point Likert scale (1 = almost never to 5 = almost always) and indicated how often, on a daily basis, they felt a certain way. Example items are, “upset”, “scared”, and “hostile.” Coefficient alpha for this scale is .86.

Mentor counterproductive work behavior directed at the organization was measured with a scale by Spector et al. (2005). Mentors indicated how often they have engaged in certain behavior (1 = never to 5 = every day), such as “purposely damaged a piece of equipment or property,” or “took home supplies without permission.” The CWB-O scale consists of twenty items, and coefficient alpha is .81. Spector et al. (2005) have demonstrated the validity of this scale.

### **Protégé Measures**

Distancing behavior and manipulative behavior were measured with Eby et al.’s (2004) negative mentoring scale at Time 2. Distancing behavior was assessed with four items, such as “My clinical supervisors seems to have ‘more important things to do’ than to meet with me,” or “My clinical supervisor is more concerned about his/herself than helping me develop professionally.” The manipulative behavior scale consists of four items as well. Example items are “My clinical supervisor has deliberately misled me,” and “My clinical supervisor has undermined my performance on tasks or assignments.”

For both scales, protégés provided ratings on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Coefficients alpha for these scales are .90 for distancing behavior and .88 for manipulative behavior. Eby et al. (2004) provided evidence of the construct validity of the negative mentoring scales.

### **Control Variables**

Possible control variables at Time 1 were considered. Drawing on research on abusive supervision may be helpful to determine which potential controls to include, as these variables might also be theoretically meaningful in explaining variance in negative mentoring. Prior research on aggressive behaviors and abusive supervision has commonly examined gender as a control variable (Burton & Hoobler, 2011). This is because men tend to be more aggressive under most neutral situations (Bettencourt & Miller, 1996) and are more likely to engage in abusive supervision when compared to women (Tepper et al., 2006).

Another potential control variable that was examined is mentor age. Research on workplace aggression demonstrates that younger adults (in their late teens to mid-twenties) engage more frequently in workplace aggression than older adults (Baron, Neuman, & Geddes, 1999). Therefore, older mentors might be less likely to engage in negative mentoring.

In line with research examining the relationship between organizational justice and abusive supervision (Tepper et al., 2006), the amount of time spent in a mentoring relationship was also considered as a potential control. This variable might be important to consider, as prior research has found that the length of time a subordinate has spent in a relationship might influence his or her ratings of abusive supervision; that is,

subordinate ratings might be more lenient during a “honeymoon phase” or harsher later on in the relationship when individuals are more critical and watchful (Hoobler & Brass, 2006). In a similar vein, protégés may alter their ratings depending on the amount of time spent in the mentoring relationship. This notion is supported by Kram (1985) who suggests that relational problems might be more likely to occur later in the mentoring relationship.

In order to determine which control variables to retain for the analysis, bivariate correlations between each control variable and the dependent variables, distancing and manipulative behavior, were examined, respectively (Neter, Wasserman, & Kutner, 1985). None of the potential control variables were significantly related to the dependent variables. Therefore, no control variables were included in subsequent analyses.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

#### **Descriptive Statistics**

Variable means, standard deviations, intercorrelations, and coefficients alpha are reported in Table 1. Consistent with previous research, distributive and procedural justice are positively related ( $r = .30, p < .05$ ; e.g., Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). Furthermore, agreeableness and conscientiousness are positively related ( $r = .25, p < .05$ ), and neuroticism is negatively related with these two personality traits ( $r = -.53, p < .05$  for agreeableness;  $r = -.31, p < .05$  for conscientiousness). This is consistent with prior research (for a review, see John & Srivastava, 1999). Finally, consistent with Eby et al. (2004), distancing behavior and manipulative behavior are positively related ( $r = .77, p < .05$ ).

#### **Confirmatory Factor Analyses**

To demonstrate the factor structure of the scales employed, confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were conducted. For mentor justice, a two-factor model was employed, and for mentor personality, a three-factor model was utilized. Additionally, using the protégé variables, a two-factor CFA was conducted to demonstrate the factor structure of distancing and manipulative behavior.

When conducting CFAs, a partial or total disaggregation approach may be employed (Bandalos & Finney, 2001). In a partial disaggregation approach, the average of a subset of items from a given scale is utilized to form parcels that are used as manifest

indicators (Williams & O'Boyle, 2008). There are several advantages of using parcels (for a review, see Bandalos & Finney, 2001). For example, parcels generally exhibit higher reliabilities than single items (Coffman & MacCallum, 2005). In addition, Little, Cunningham, Shahar, and Widaman (2002) note that “compared with item-level data, models based on parceled data (a) are more parsimonious (i.e., have fewer estimated parameters both locally in defining a construct and globally in representing an entire model), (b) have fewer chances for residuals to be correlated or dual loadings to emerge (both because fewer indicators are used and because unique variances are smaller), and (c) lead to reductions in various sources of sampling error” (p.155). Finally, Thompson and Melancon (1996) argue that using parcels will result in better model fit than using items as indicators.

In a total disaggregation approach, individual items are used as manifest indicators. A total disaggregation approach allows for a more detailed level of analysis; however, due to the increased number of parameter estimates, it also creates higher levels of random error and typically yields poorer model fit (Bagozzi & Heatherton, 1994; Eby et al., 2004). In order to determine which approach to utilize, the item to subject ratio should be examined. It is recommended that parcels are created when the item to subject ratio is too low to obtain stable factor solutions (Bandalos & Finney, 2001), and that the ideal ratio is 10:1 (Nunnally, 1978).

In this dissertation, the item to subject ratio is 7:1 for mentor personality, 14:1 for mentor justice perceptions, and 47:1 for protégé perceptions of negative mentoring. Thus, the subject to item ratio for mentor personality falls below the acceptable ratio. Therefore, three parcels were created for each personality construct, following the

guidelines of Bagozzi and Heatherton (1994). It was specified that each personality parcel would load on its appropriate latent factor. The mentor personality three-factor model provided good fit to the data ( $\chi^2=37.79$ ,  $p<.00$ ; CFI =.97, TLI =.95, RMSEA = .07 [90% CI = .017, .103], SRMR =.05), thus supporting the model and demonstrating the expected factor structure.

For mentor justice perceptions and protégé perception of negative mentoring, a total disaggregation approach was employed in each respective model, as the subject to item ratios for both constructs are above the recommended ratio. Therefore, in both CFA models, items were used as manifest indicators. Both the two-factor mentor justice model ( $\chi^2=89.52$ ,  $p<.00$ ; CFI =.96, TLI =.95, RMSEA = .09 [90% CI = .061, .112], SRMR =.06) and the two-factor protégé negative mentoring model ( $\chi^2=43.69$ ,  $p<.00$ ; CFI =.98, TLI =.97, RMSEA = .10 [90% CI = .058, .133], SRMR =.04) provided acceptable fit, confirming the expected factor structure of the models.

### **Examination of Clustering Effects**

Additionally, because several protégés report to the same supervisory mentor, intraclass correlations (ICCs) were calculated and the design effect was examined. ICCs provide a measure of homogeneity of individuals within a group or cluster and represent the proportion of variance in an outcome variable that is accounted for by the clusters (Kline, 2005). Although there is no golden rule for ICC cut-off values, a commonly used rule of thumb is that an ICC greater than .10 “may be sufficient to result in appreciable bias in standard errors if multilevel statistical techniques are not used” (Kline, 2005, p. 344). By using ICCs, the design effect can be calculated, which allows one to determine

whether clustering in the data would threaten to distort the results (Kish, 1965). It is defined as

$$1 + (\text{average cluster size} - 1) * \text{ICC}. \quad (1)$$

No clustering effect is present when the ratio is equal to one. However, if the ratio is greater than 1, standard statistical formulas underestimate the sampling variance, thus increasing the chances of making a Type-I error (Hox, 1998).

In the current study, the average cluster size (number of protégés per mentor) was 2.39. Following the method of Singer (1998), ICCs were calculated, using SPSS. For distancing behavior, the ICC was .12 (design effect = 1.16), and for manipulative behavior, the ICC was .21 (design effect = 1.29). Because this provided evidence that the data is non-independent, a multi-level model approach was used to analyze the data and to test the hypotheses (Bliese & Hanges, 2004).

As described in Hayes (2006), a progression of models was tested for each negative mentoring variable, respectively. In order to test these models, the intercepts were set as random, whereas the coefficients for the justice variables and the coefficients for the personality variables were set as fixed. Setting the intercepts as random underlies the assumption that the intercepts on distancing or manipulative behavior may vary across mentor groups (where each group refers to one mentor and his or her respective protégés). Furthermore, it is assumed that the relationship between the mentor variables and negative mentoring is the same across all groups; therefore, their coefficients are set as fixed. Because both random and fixed components were utilized, mixed effects models were tested. As estimation method, maximum likelihood estimation was used, and all independent and moderator variables were grand-mean centered by subtracting the

sample mean from each case's score on the respective variable. Grand-mean centering should be used when the focus of a research question is on a level-1 variable or on an interaction (Heck & Thomas, 2000). Moreover, it is common to transform the predictor variables in such a way, as this allows for meaningful interpretation of the parameters (Hayes, 2006).

In order to test the hypotheses, several models were created where parameters were progressively added. The new model in which parameters were added was always compared to the prior model (without the added parameters) by conducting a  $\chi^2$  likelihood ratio test. For this test, the difference of model deviance was examined by subtracting the  $-2 \times \log$  likelihood ( $-2LL$ ) of the new model from the prior one. Because the difference in deviance has a  $\chi^2$  distribution with degrees of freedom that are equal to the difference in the amount of parameters between the models compared, a  $\chi^2$  calculator could be utilized to determine significance (Carson & Beeson, 2013; Hayes, 2006). Results of all models are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

In order to determine whether mentors differ from one another in regards to the amount of negative mentoring they are perceived to engage in by their protégés, models were created in which only the random intercepts were included, following the guidelines of Hayes (2006). In the first set of intercept models (Model 1A and 1B), the intercepts were set as fixed (contrary to later model testing) to serve as a point of comparison (in the following, models ending with an A refer to models in which the dependent variable is manipulative behavior, whereas models ending with a B refer to models in which the dependent variable is distancing behavior.).

Next, random intercept models (Model 2A, 2B) were created, in which the intercepts were set as random. These latter models are used to estimate the extent to which mentors differ in manipulative or distancing behavior across groups. Both Model 2A ( $\gamma_0 = 2.12, p < .05$ ) and Model 2B yield ( $\gamma_0 = 2.45, p < .05$ ) significant results for the intercept, indicating that mentors receive a mean rating of 2.12 on manipulative behavior and 2.45 on distancing behavior. In order to compare the fixed intercept to the random intercept models,  $\chi^2$  likelihood ratio tests were conducted between the fixed and random intercept models. Results indicate that mentors differ in the amount of negative mentoring they are perceived to engage in by protégés (manipulative behavior:  $\chi^2(1) = 12.15, p < .05$ ; distancing behavior:  $\chi^2(1) = 3.01, p < .05$ ). In order to account for the variation found, the fixed predictors (Model 3A, 3B), fixed moderators (Model 4A, 4B), and fixed interaction terms (Model 5A, 5B) were added in subsequent model analyses.

For Model 3A, the model in which only the random intercept and the fixed justice variables are included, the estimates of procedural justice ( $\gamma_1 = .05, p > .05$ ) and distributive justice ( $\gamma_2 = .03, p > .05$ ) are non-significant. This can be interpreted as two mentors who differ in one unit in their distributive and procedural justice perceptions do not significantly differ in the amount of manipulative behavior protégés perceive them to engage in. In other words, mentor justice perceptions do not significantly predict protégé perceptions of manipulative behavior. Although the main effect terms are not significant, interestingly, the  $\chi^2$  likelihood ratio test between this model and the random intercept model yields  $\chi^2(2) = 50.93 (p < .05)$ . As such, Model 3A provides better fit than the random intercept model (Model 2A), indicating that the relationship between mentor justice perception and protégé perceptions of manipulative behavior differs across

groups. Taken together, although there is significant variance across groups, the relationship between mentor justice perceptions and protégé perceptions of manipulative behavior is not significant. Hypotheses 1A and 1B are not supported.

Similarly, for Model 3B, the estimates of procedural justice ( $\gamma_1 = .05, p > .05$ ) and distributive justice ( $\gamma_2 = .03, p > .05$ ) are non-significant. The  $\chi^2$  likelihood ratio test between this model and the random intercept model (Model 2B) yields  $\chi^2(2) = 62.10$  ( $p < .05$ ), indicating that Model 3B provides better fit than the random intercept model. Therefore, the relationship between mentor justice perceptions and protégé perceptions of distancing behavior is not significant, despite there being significant variance across groups. Hypotheses 2A and 2B are not supported.

When examining Models 4A and 4B, in which all three personality variables were added to the previous models, results show that none of the personality variables significantly predict manipulative behavior (conscientiousness:  $\gamma_3 = -.10, p > .05$ ; agreeableness:  $\gamma_4 = -.04, p > .05$ ; neuroticism:  $\gamma_5 = -.04, p > .05$ ) or distancing behavior (conscientiousness:  $\gamma_3 = -.13, p > .05$ ; agreeableness:  $\gamma_4 = -.07, p > .05$ ; neuroticism:  $\gamma_5 = -.13, p > .05$ ). Conducting the  $\chi^2$  likelihood ratio test yields that Model 4A provides better model fit than Models 3A ( $\chi^2(3) = 36.69; p < .05$ ) and Model 4B provides better fit than Model 3B ( $\chi^2(3) = 38.94; p < .05$ ). This indicates that when including the personality variables in the models, the significant variances across groups remain.

Finally, interaction terms were created between the procedural justice (PJ), distributive justice (DJ), and the personality variables of conscientiousness (C), agreeableness (A), and neuroticism (N): PJxC, PJxA, PJxN, DJxC, DJxA, DJxN. They were added to Models 5A and 5B. However, no significant results were found for the

interaction term estimates in Model 5A (PJxC:  $\gamma_6 = -.14$ ;  $p > .05$ ; PJxA:  $\gamma_7 = .02$ ;  $p > .05$ ; PJxN:  $\gamma_8 = .15$ ;  $p > .05$ ; DJxC:  $\gamma_9 = -.04$ ;  $p > .05$ ; DJxA:  $\gamma_{10} = .27$ ;  $p > .05$ ; DJxN:  $\gamma_{11} = .01$ ;  $p > .05$ ) or in Model 5B (PJxC:  $\gamma_6 = -.12$ ;  $p > .05$ ; PJxA:  $\gamma_7 = -.01$ ;  $p > .05$ ; PJxN:  $\gamma_8 = .13$ ;  $p > .05$ ; DJxC:  $\gamma_9 = .02$ ;  $p > .05$ ; DJxA:  $\gamma_{10} = .27$ ;  $p > .05$ ; DJxN:  $\gamma_{11} = .06$ ;  $p > .05$ ). When comparing these models to the prior models without the interaction terms (Model 4A and 4B),  $\chi^2(6) = 4.95$ ;  $p > .05$  for the manipulative behavior models and  $\chi^2(6) = 4.64$ ;  $p > .05$  for the distributive behavior models. Therefore, Models 4A and 4B actually provided better model fit than the models including the interaction terms. Conclusively, mentor personality does not moderate the relationship between mentor justice perceptions and protégé perceptions of negative mentoring, and this relationship also does not vary across groups. Hypotheses 3, 4, and 5 were therefore not supported.

Because the analyzed models are complex, and in order to examine the possibility of collinearity affecting the results, the analyses were also conducted with less complex models, in which each personality variable, as well as each justice variable was included separately. In other words, models were tested with both justice components and each personality variable included separately, as well as models where each justice component was included separately with (a) personality variables included individually and (b) with all three personality variables together. The pattern of non-significant results remained unchanged.

### **Exploratory Analyses**

Because the non-significant findings are contrary to the proposed hypotheses, additional correlational analyses were conducted in order to examine whether mentor justice perceptions are related to some other type of retaliatory behavior, such as

engaging in counterproductive work behavior as reported by the mentor. In doing so, it can be examined whether supervisory mentors might retaliate directly against the organization when feeling unjustly treated rather than displacing their aggression onto protégés. This is consistent with prior research which has found that procedural and distributive justice perceptions are positively related to CWB (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001). Results show that only mentor perceptions of distributive justice are significantly negatively related to mentor counterproductive work behavior ( $r = -.34, p < .05$ ). Mentor perceptions of procedural justice are not significantly related to CWB.

Furthermore, in order to examine the potential of omitted variables and an alternative model, the relationship between mentor negative affect and mentor justice perceptions as well as protégé perceptions of negative mentoring was examined. Researchers have suggested that individuals higher on negative affect tend to perceive their work environment to be more unfair and hostile, thus engaging in stronger reactions towards acts of unfairness (Barsky & Kaplan, 2007). It was found that mentor negative affect was negatively related to procedural and distributive justice ( $r = -.12, p < .05$ ;  $r = -.23, p < .05$ , respectively), but it was not related to distancing and manipulative behavior ( $r = .02, p > .05$ ;  $r = .11, p > .05$ , respectively). All correlational results are presented in Table 1.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine the joint effects of mentor personality and justice perceptions on protégé perceptions of negative mentoring. No support was found for the proposed hypotheses despite sufficient theoretical rationale.

One possible explanation for these surprising findings might be that rather than measuring the presence of negative mentoring, this study may have examined the absence of negative mentoring, as indicated by the relatively low means on the negative mentoring scales. However, the means in this dissertation are actually slightly higher (DB:  $M = 2.46$ ,  $SD = .95$ ; MB:  $M = 2.15$ ,  $SD = .88$ ) than those reported by Eby et al. (2004; DB:  $M = 2.0$ ,  $SD = .68$ ; MB:  $M = 1.7$ ,  $SD = .65$ ). Future research might examine the hypothesized relationships in a context in which protégés rate their mentors higher on negative mentoring to examine if this would result in differential findings.

Another potential explanation for the null effects might have to do with the context in which the data were collected. The sample in this dissertation consists of clinical supervisors and their counselors in the SUD field, and it differs from samples used in previous research on justice and deviant behavior. For example, Tepper et al.'s (2006) study employed a military sample of National Guard members and their supervisors. In the military, supervisors may be constrained by the military structure as to how they can engage in deviant behavior when feeling unjustly treated. More specifically, it may be much more difficult to retaliate against the military as a whole or

against someone higher in the hierarchy than against a subordinate when feeling unjustly treated. Furthermore, the position power between a military member and his or her supervisors may be different from that in a supervisory mentor-protégé relationship in the SUD field. Supervisory mentors may take on a more developmental or supportive role (Pan et al., 2011; Thomas & Lankau, 2009) than an appraisal and disciplinary role, such as in the military. The absence of a clear power differential may explain why supervisory mentors do not engage in negative mentoring when feeling unjustly treated.

Furthermore, in line with the context in which this data was collected, SUD facilities are often small organizations with few employees, as compared to large Fortune 500 companies. Engaging in deviant behavior and getting away with it may be much harder in smaller organizations than in larger ones, where this type of behavior may be less noticeable. Therefore, it is possible that in this particular context, supervisory mentors may not engage in negative mentoring when feeling unjustly treated due to the potential repercussion when getting caught. However, because research has shown that perceptions of injustice are related to retaliatory behavior (e.g., Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), it begs the question as to whether supervisory mentors might engage in some other type of deviant behavior when feeling unjustly treated.

For example, previous meta-analytic research has examined the relationship between organizational justice and CWB (Dalal, 2005). Consistent with this line of research, an exploratory analysis was conducted, examining the correlational relationship of mentor justice and CWB. Results show that only distributive justice is related to CWB, while procedural justice is not. Therefore, when supervisory mentors perceive the distribution of outcomes to be unfair, they are also likely to retaliate by engaging in CWB

against their organization. However, if procedures are perceived to be unfair, this is not the case. As such, engaging in CWB may represent an outlet to restore the ratio between the amount of effort provided by supervisory mentors and the perceived equity of outcomes received. Although very tentative, these findings provide some support that supervisory mentors engage in retaliatory behavior against their organization when feeling unjustly treated but through different means. Future research should carefully examine which type(s) of retaliatory behavior supervisory mentors might engage in under conditions of injustice.

Moreover, this dissertation employed a very rigorous design, using longitudinal data as well as dyadic data. Some previous research findings that support significant relationships between justice perceptions and workplace deviance utilized non-dyadic, cross-sectional data (e.g., Aquino, Lewis, & Bradfield, 1999; Fox et al., 2001; Henle, 2005). Such significant findings might however be the result of common method variance. That is, when the relationship between justice perceptions and workplace deviance is measured with the same method (i.e. subordinate ratings only), the relationship between the variables may be inflated (Spector, 2006). Because common method variance is a pervasive problem in research, as it biases empirical conclusions (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003), future studies should carefully investigate the potential of common method variance and take precautions to mitigate it.

Finally, negative affect was included in a correlational analysis as a potential omitted variable. Researchers have suggested that individuals higher on negative affect tend to have a negative world view and perceive their environment to be more hostile and unfair (Barsky & Kaplan, 2007). These perceptions may lead to individuals engaging in

stronger reactions following injustice (Barsky & Kaplan, 2007), which may include negative mentoring. This would suggest that protégé perceptions of negative mentoring are not driven by mentor perceptions of justice but rather by the mentor's own general negative affect. In this dissertation, mentor negative affect is related to mentor justice perceptions but not to protégé perceptions of negative mentoring. This implies that although mentors who tend to perceive things negatively also tend to report lower justice perceptions, mentor negative affect is unrelated to negative mentoring aimed at protégés.

## CHAPTER 6

### IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY AND PRACTICE

Despite the fact that this dissertation did not provide support for the study predictions, it still allows for a better understanding of the phenomenon of negative mentoring. Studies examining antecedents of negative mentoring are lacking. Therefore, this dissertation provided insights as to what is not an antecedent of negative mentoring, namely, supervisory mentor perceptions of distributive and procedural justice.

Although there were no significant effects at the individual level, there may be group-level effects operating in these data. In order to assess whether there was agreement among protégés about the extent to which they experience distancing and manipulative behavior on the part of their respective mentors, interrater agreement among protégés was assessed via  $r_{WG(J)}$ . This statistic is used when a single target, such as a mentor, is rated by multiple raters, such as protégés, on  $J$  essentially parallel items (LeBreton & Senter, 2008). In examining  $r_{WG(J)}$ , both uniform (un) and slightly skewed (ss) null response distributions were used (to account for the potential tendency of protégés to either be particularly lenient or harsh in their ratings). The results are based on a sample of  $N = 88$ , which represents 56.41% of the sample. The reduction in sample size is due to the fact that some mentors have only one protégé who reports to them. These cases were excluded from the analyses. For manipulative behavior, the mean  $r_{WG(J)_{un}} = .94$  and the mean  $r_{WG(J)_{ss}} = .86$ . For distancing behavior, the mean  $r_{WG(J)_{un}} = .91$  and the mean  $r_{WG(J)_{ss}} = .88$ . These results indicate that there is relatively high within-

group agreement among protégés about mentors' negative mentoring behavior, as an  $r_{WG(J)}$  of 1.00 would indicate perfect agreement (LeBreton & Senter, 2007).

The results of these post-hoc analyses have important implications for mentoring theory. More specifically, the results of the  $r_{WG(J)}$  analyses indicate that protégé ratings of negative mentoring are similar within a mentor-protégé group, but they are different across groups. This suggests that, from a protégé perspective, mentors seem to treat their protégés similarly across the board rather than favoring some protégés while engaging in negative mentoring towards others. This finding is particularly interesting when considering leader-member-exchange theory, which proposes that supervisors have unique relationships with each of their members and that these relationships differ in quality (Graen & Scandura, 1987). The results of this dissertation suggest that when it comes to negative mentoring, supervisory mentors do not engage in differential treatment toward their protégés. Because the mentor acts similarly to all of his or her protégés, this may imply that negative mentoring may manifest within the mentor as a characteristic way of responding to individuals rather than a relational dynamic occurring within a particular mentor-protégé dyad.

A final theoretical implication has to do with the fact that prior research has neglected to focus on dyadic effects in the context of negative mentoring and commonly studied negative mentoring from an inter-individual perspective by examining protégé perceptions of negative mentoring and their relationship to other protégé-level variables (e.g., Burk & Eby, 2010; Ghosh et al., 2011). The null findings indicate that mentor justice perceptions do not trickle down to protégés and influence their perception of

negative mentoring. Therefore, no support was found for trickle-down models of justice in the context of negative mentoring.

In regards to practical implications, these findings are good news for organization, as they imply that supervisory mentors who feel unjustly treated do not “kick the dog” and take out their frustration on subordinate protégés. However, organizations should still do everything in their power to make every employee feel justly treated, as justice perceptions are related to other types of deviant behavior (Dalal, 2005). For example, the exploratory analysis found a significant negative relationship between supervisory mentor perceptions of justice and self-reports of CWB.

## CHAPTER 7

### LIMITATIONS

As with any study, this dissertation has several limitations. First, I did not measure supervisory mentor perceptions of interactional justice, as interactional justice has been found to be a more powerful predictor of outcomes directed at supervisors or bosses (Bies & Moag, 1986), not subordinates. However, including interactional justice in the model would allow for a more comprehensive examination of all facets of justice and their relationship to negative mentoring. Future research should therefore include all types of justice to examine whether supervisory mentors who experience interactional injustice might retaliate against their supervisors directly, rather than taking out their frustrations on others and thus displacing their aggression.

Another limitation has to do with the operationalization of negative mentoring. Tepper et al. (2006) argue that when abusive supervision is measured with subordinate self-reports, it is assumed that there is an agreement between the self-reported perceptions of abusive supervision and the actual exposure. However, some subordinates may underreport the level of abusive supervision they are experiencing due to their potential reluctance of admitting that they are victimized. Similarly, in this dissertation, negative mentoring was measured using protégé self-reports, and protégés may also be reluctant to admit that their mentor engages in negative mentoring, as this would (in a sense) place them in a victimized position. Future research should not only collect protégé ratings of negative mentoring, but also data from different sources, such as

mentor self-report ratings, co-worker ratings, as well as observational reports and archival data. This would provide a more well-rounded assessment of negative mentoring.

Furthermore, this data was collected from supervisory mentors and protégés in the substance abuse treatment field. As such, the findings may be idiosyncratic to this population and not generalizable to other occupations. More specifically, as argued above, it is possible that the findings would be different in larger organizations, where deviant behavior might be more likely to go unnoticed. Therefore, future studies should examine negative mentoring in larger organizations where mentors are engaged in mentoring relationships with several protégés to determine if differential effects exist.

Additionally, although employing a rigorous design by utilizing longitudinal data is often recommended and encouraged in organizational research, it is possible that the time interval to collect the mentor and protégé data of this dissertation was too large to find any significant effects (Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2010). More specifically, the effect of being exposed to injustice may have disappeared by the time negative mentoring was measured, or other events may have taken place that would have influenced the extent to which injustice would have had an effect (Taris & Kompier, 2014). As such, one year might be too long of a time period, and future research should examine smaller time intervals, such as three or six months. This would not only ensure a rigorous design, but it would also allow for the examination of more proximal effects.

Finally, in order to determine whether the non-significant findings are truly a result of no relationships in the sample utilized or whether they are due to a lack of statistical power, I conducted a power analysis (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). A

reasonable  $R^2$  to be expected for the main-effects-only model would be .05 and .10 for the model including the interaction terms. According to Jaccard, Turrisi, and Wan (1990), with these effect sizes, a sample size of 143 is needed in order to achieve a power level of .80. When increasing  $R^2$  to .10 for the main effects model and to .15 for the model interaction terms, a sample size of 135 is needed. Because the sample employed in this dissertation consists of 156 mentors, a lack of power was not the cause of the non-significant findings, and the sample was large enough. In other words, the non-significant findings are truly a result of no relationships and power was not a limitation.

## CHAPTER 8

### CONCLUSION

Although research on justice and workplace deviance has been growing (e.g., Aquino et al., 2001; Bies & Tripp, 1995; Tripp et al., 2002), no studies have examined the interactional relationship between mentor justice perceptions and personality in the context of negative mentoring. This study answered this call and found that mentor distributive and procedural justice perceptions do not predict protégé perceptions of distancing and manipulative behavior and that the mentor personality does not act as a moderator. Although contradictory to the proposed hypotheses, the null findings of this dissertation “make meaningful contributions to our literature and serve as important examples of ‘null’ results to inform our science” (Landis, James, Lance, Pierce, & Rogelberg, in press). More specifically, they are good news for organizations by indicating that mentors do not “kick the dog” and take out their frustration on their protégés when feeling unjustly treated.

## REFERENCES

- Abu Elanain, H. M. (2009). Job characteristics, work attitudes and behaviors in a non-western context. *Journal of Management Development, 28*, 457-477. doi: 10.1108/02621710910955985.
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 267-299). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., O'Brien, K. E., & Lentz, E. (2008). The state of mentoring research: A qualitative review of current research methods and future research implications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73*, 343-357. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2007.08.004.
- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 127-136. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.127.
- Allen, T. D., Johnson, H.-A. M., Xu, X., Biga, A., Rodopman, O. B., & Ottinot, R. C. (2009). Mentoring and protégé narcissistic entitlement. *Journal of Career Development, 35*, 385-405. doi: 10.1177/0894845308327735.
- Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Holt.
- Ambrose, M. L., Schminke, M., & Mayer, D. M. (2013). Trickle-down effects of supervisor perceptions of interactional justice: A moderated mediation approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*, 678-689. doi: 10.1037/a0032080.
- Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U., & Bradfield, M. (1999). Justice constructs, negative

- affectivity, and employee deviance: A proposed model and empirical. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 1073-1091. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199912)20:7%3C1073::AID-JOB943%3E3.0.CO;2-7.
- Aquino, K., Tripp, T. M., & Bies, R. J. (2001). How employees respond to personal offense: the effects of blame attribution, victim status, and offender status on revenge and reconciliation in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 52-59. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.1.52.
- Aquino, K., Tripp, T. M., & Bies, R. J. (2006). Getting even or moving on? Power, procedural justice, and types of offense as predictors of revenge, forgiveness, reconciliation, and avoidance in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 653-668. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.653.
- Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L.-Y., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 191-201. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.191.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Heatherton, T. F. (1994). A general approach to representing multifaceted personality constructs: Application to state self-esteem. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 1, 35-67. doi: 10.1080/10705519409539961.
- Bandalos, D. L., & Finney, S. J. (2001). *Item parceling issues in structural equation modeling* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Baron, R. A., Neuman, J. H., & Geddes, D. (1999). Social and personal determinants of workplace aggression: Evidence for the impact of perceived injustice and the Type A Behavior Pattern. *Aggressive Behavior*, 25, 281-296. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1999)25:4<281::AID-AB4>3.3.CO;2-A.

- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1-26. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x.
- Barsky, A., & Kaplan, S. A. (2007). If you feel bad, it's unfair: A quantitative synthesis of affect and organizational justice perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 286-295. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.286.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 349-360. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.85.3.349.
- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 410-424. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.410.
- Bettencourt, B. A., & Miller, N. (1996). Gender differences in aggression as a function of provocation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 119*, 422-447. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.119.3.422.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations, 1*, 43-55.
- Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (1995). The use and abuse of power: Justice as social control. In R. S. Cropanzano, & K. M. Kacmar (Eds.), *Organizational politics, justice, and support: Managing social climate at work* (pp. 131-145). Westport, CT: Quorum Books
- Bliese, P. D., & Hanges, P. J. (2004). Being both too liberal and too conservative: The perils of treating grouped data as though they were independent. *Organizational*

*Research Methods*, 7, 400-417. doi: 10.1177/1094428104268542.

Bolger, N., & Zuckerman, A. (1995). A framework for studying personality in the stress process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 890-902. doi:

10.1037/0022-3514.69.5.890.

Booth, R. (1996). Mentor or manager: What is the difference? A case study in supervisory mentoring. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17(3), 31-36.

Brockner, J. (1988). *Self-esteem at work: Research, theory, and practice*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.

Burk, H. G., & Eby, L. T. (2010). What keeps people in mentoring relationships when bad things happen? A field study from the protégé's perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77, 437-446. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2010.05.011.

Burton, J. P., & Hoobler, J. M. (2011). Aggressive reactions to abusive supervision: The role of interactional justice and narcissism. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 52, 389-398. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2011.00886.x.

Carson, R. J., & Beeson, C. (2013). Crossing language barriers: Using crossed random effects modelling in psycholinguistics research. *Tutorials Quant Meth Psych*, 9(1), 25-41.

Chao, G. T. (2009). Formal mentoring: Lessons learned from past practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 40, 314-320. doi: 10.1037/a0012658.

Coffman, D. L., & MacCallum, R. C. (2005). Using parcels to convert path analysis models into latent variable models. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 40, 235-259. doi: 10.1207/s15327906mbr4002\_4.

- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *86*, 278-321. doi: 10.1006/obhd.2001.2958.
- Colbert, A. E., Mount, M. K., Harter, J. K., Witt, L. A., & Barrick, M. R. (2004). Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 599-609. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.599.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 425-445. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425
- Costa, P., McCrae, R. R., & Dembroski, T. M. (1989). Agreeableness versus antagonism: Explication of a potential risk factor for CHD. In A. Siegman & T. M. Dembroski (Eds.), *In search of coronary-prone behavior* (pp. 41-63). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., Zonderman, A. B., & McCrae, R. R. (1991). Personality, defense, coping, and adaptation in older adulthood. In E. M. Cummings, A. L. Greene & K. H. Karraker (Eds.), *Life-span developmental psychology: Perspectives on stress and coping* (pp. 277-293). Hillsdale, NJ England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1989). *Neo PI/FFI manual supplement*. Odessa, FL:

Psychological Assessment Resources.

- Costa, P. T., McCrae, R. R., & Dye, D. A. (1991). Facet scales for agreeableness and conscientiousness: A revision of the NEO Personality Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*, 887-898. doi: 10.1016/0191-8869(91)90177-d.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 12*, 317-372.
- Cropanzano, R., & Prehar, C. A. (2001). Emerging justice concerns in an era of changing psychological contracts. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice* (Vol. 2, pp. 245-269). Mahwah, NJ US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Cullen, M. J., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Personality and counterproductive workplace behavior. In M. R. Barick & A. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Personality and work: Reconsidering the role of personality in organizations* (pp. 150-182). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 1241-1255. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241.
- Dollard, J., Miller, N. E., Doob, L. W., Mowrer, O. H., & Sears, R. R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Duck, S. (1981). Toward a research map for the study of relationship breakdown. *Personal Relationships, 3*, 1-29.
- Eby, L., Butts, M., Lockwood, A., & Simon, S. A. (2004). Protégés negative mentoring

- experiences: Construct development and nomological validation. *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 411-447. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.tb02496.x.
- Eby, L. T., & Allen, T. D. (2002). Further investigation of protégés' negative mentoring experiences. *Group & Organization Management*, 27, 456-479. doi: 10.1177/1059601102238357.
- Eby, L. T., McManus, S. E., Simon, S. A., & Russell, J. E. A. (2000). The protégé's perspective regarding negative mentoring experiences: The development of a taxonomy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 57, 1-21. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1999.1726.
- Eby, L. T., Rhodes, J. E., & Allen, T. D. (2007). Definition and evolution of mentoring. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 7-20). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Eby, L. T. d. T., Allen, T. D., Hoffman, B. J., Baranik, L. E., Sauer, J. B., Baldwin, S., . . . Evans, S. C. (2013). An interdisciplinary meta-analysis of the potential antecedents, correlates, and consequences of protégé perceptions of mentoring. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139, 441-476. doi: 10.1037/a0029279.
- Emerson, R. (1972). Exchange theory, part I: A psychological basis for social exchange. Part II: Exchange relations and networks. *Sociological Theories in Progress*, 2, 38-87.
- Ferguson, E. (2001). Personality and coping traits: A joint factor analysis. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 6, 311-325. doi: 10.1348/135910701169232.
- Fitness, J. (2000). Anger in the workplace: An emotion script approach to anger episodes between workers and their superiors, co-workers and subordinates. *Journal of*

*Organizational Behavior*, 21, 147-162. doi: 10.1002/(sici)1099-1379(200003)21:2<147::aid-job35>3.0.co;2-t.

Flaherty, S., & Moss, S. A. (2007). The impact of personality and team context on the relationship between workplace injustice and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 2549-2575. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00270.x.

Folger, R. (1993). Reactions to mistreatment at work. In J. K. Murnighan (Ed.), *Social Psychology in Organizations: Advances in Theory and Research* (pp. 161-183). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Folger, R., & Skarlicki, D. (1998). A popcorn model of workplace violence. In R. W. Griffin, A. O'Leary-Kelly, & J. Collins (Eds.), *Dysfunctional behavior in organizations: Nonviolent dysfunctional behaviors* (pp. 43-82). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Folger, R. G., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management* (Vol. 7). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 291-309. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.2001.1803.

Ghosh, R., Dierkes, S., & Falletta, S. (2011). Incivility spiral in mentoring relationships: Reconceptualizing negative mentoring as deviant workplace behavior. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13, 22-39. doi: 10.1177/1523422311410639.

Giacalone, R. A., & Greenberg, J. E. (1997). *Antisocial behavior in organization*.

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Glomb, T. M. (2002). Workplace anger and aggression: Informing conceptual models with data from specific encounters. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7, 20-36. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.7.1.20.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative 'description of personality': The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1216-1229. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1216.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178. doi: 10.2307/2092623.
- Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9, 175-208.
- Graziano, W. G., & Eisenberg, N. (1997). Agreeableness: A dimension of personality. In R. Hogan, J. A. Johnson & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 795-824). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Graziano, W. G., Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Hair, E. C. (1996). Perceiving interpersonal conflict and reacting to it: The case for agreeableness. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 70, 820-835. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.70.4.820.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 9-22. doi: 10.5465/amr.1987.4306437.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 561-568. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.75.5.561.
- Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes

- of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hamlin, R. G., & Sage, L. (2011). Behavioural criteria of perceived mentoring effectiveness: An empirical study of effective and ineffective mentor and mentee behaviour within formal mentoring relationships. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, *35*, 752-778. doi: 10.1108/03090591111168311.
- Hatrup, K., & Jackson, S. (1996). Learning about individual differences by taking situations seriously. In K. R. Murphy (Ed.), *Individual Differences and Behavior in Organizations*, (pp. 507-547). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hayes, A. F. (2006). A primer on multilevel modeling. *Human Communication Research*, *32*, 385-410. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2006.00281.x.
- Heck, R. H., & Thomas, S. L. (2000). *An Introduction to Multilevel Modeling Techniques*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Henle, C. A. (2005). Predicting workplace deviance from the interaction between organizational justice and personality. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *17*, 247-263.
- Henle, C. A., & Gross, M. A. (2013). Born to be deviant? An examination of the relationship between workplace deviance and employee personality. In S. M. Elias (Ed.), *Deviant and criminal behavior in the workplace* (pp. 50-76). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Hoel, H., Rayner, C., & Cooper, C. L. (1999). Workplace bullying. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 14, pp. 195-229). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

- Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. Oxford, England: Harcourt, Brace.
- Hoobler, J. M., & Brass, D. J. (2006). Abusive supervision and family undermining as displaced aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 1125-1133. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1125.
- House, R. J., Shane, S. A., & Herold, D. M. (1996). Rumors of the death of dispositional research are vastly exaggerated. *Academy of Management Review, 21*, 203-224. doi: 10.5465/amr.1996.9602161570.
- Hox, J.J. (1998). Multilevel modeling: When and why. In I. Balderjahn, R. Mather, & M. Shader (Eds.), *Classification, data analysis, and data highways* (pp. 147–154). New York: Springer.
- Jaccard, J., Turrisi, R., & Wan, C. K. (1990). *Interaction effects in multiple regression*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., & Judge, T. A. (2008). A quantitative review of mentoring research: Test of a model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72*, 269-283. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2007.09.006.
- Karkoulian, S., Halawi, L. A., & McCarthy, R. V. (2008). Knowledge management formal and informal mentoring: An empirical investigation in Lebanese banks. *Learning Organization, 15*, 409-420. doi: 10.1108/09696470810898384.
- Kim, M. J., & Choi, K. (2011). Formal mentors' distancing and manipulative behaviors:

An empirical study on their antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Business and Policy Research*, 6, 91-103.

Kish, L. (1965). *Survey sampling*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York, NY: Guilford press.

Konovsky, M. A., & Freeman, A. B. (2000). Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26, 489-511. doi: 10.1177/014920630002600306.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work*. Boston, MA: Scott- Foresman.

Landis, R. S., James, L. R., Lance, C. E., Pierce, C. A., & Rogelberg, S. G. (in press).

When is nothing something? Editorial for the null results special issue of Journal of Business and Psychology. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1-5. doi: doi:10.1007/s10869-014-9347-8.

Lawler, E. J., & Yoon, J. (1993). Power and the emergence of commitment behavior in negotiated exchange. *American Sociological Review*, 58, 465-481. doi: 10.2307/2096071.

LeBreton, J. M., & Senter, J. L. (2008). Answers to 20 questions about interrater reliability and interrater agreement. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11, 815-852. doi: doi:10.1177/1094428106296642.

Leventhal, G. S. (1976). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 9, 91-131. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60059-3.

Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the

- study of fairness in social relationships. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Little, T. D., Cunningham, W. A., Shahar, G., & Widaman, K. F. (2002). To parcel or not to parcel: Exploring the question, weighing the merits. *Structural Equation Modeling, 9*, 151-173. doi: 10.1207/S15328007SEM0902\_1.
- Marshall, L. L. (1994). Physical and psychological abuse. In W. R. Cupach & B. H. Spitzberg (Eds.), *The dark side of interpersonal communication* (pp. 281-311). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Masterson, S. S. (2001). A trickle-down model of organizational justice: Relating employees' and customers' perceptions of and reactions to fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 594-604. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.594.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 738-748. doi: 10.2307/1556364.
- Mawritz, M. B., Mayer, D. M., Hoobler, J. M., Wayne, S. J., & Marinova, S. V. (2012). A trickle-down model of abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology, 65*, 325-357. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2012.01246.x.
- Miller, N., Pedersen, W. C., Earleywine, M., & Pollock, V. E. (2003). A theoretical model of triggered displaced aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 7*, 75-97. doi: 10.1207/S15327957PSPR0701\_5.
- Mischel, W. (1973). Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of

- personality. *Psychological Review*, 80, 252-283. doi: 10.1037/h0035002.
- Mischel, W. (2007). Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. In Y. Shoda, D. Cervone & G. Downey (Eds.), *Persons in context: Building a science of the individual* (pp. 278-326). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Molm, L. D. (1988). The structure and use of power: A comparison of reward and punishment power. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 51, 108-122. doi: 10.2307/2786834.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.76.6.845.
- Neter, J., Wasserman, W., & Kutner, M. H. (1985). *Applied linear statistical models: Regression, analysis of variance, and experimental designs*. Homewood, IL: R. D. Irwin
- Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (1998). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets. *Journal of Management*, 24, 391-419. doi: 10.1016/S0149-2063(99)80066-X.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556. doi: 10.2307/256591.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework. *The Academy of Management Review*, 21, 225-

253. doi: 10.2307/258635.

- Ones, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (1996). *A theory of conscientiousness at work*. Paper presented at the 11th annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.
- Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C., & Schmidt, F. L. (2003). Personality and absenteeism: A meta-analysis of integrity tests. *European Journal of Personality, 17*, 19-38. doi: 10.1002/per.487.
- Palmer, J. K., & Loveland, J. M. (2004). Further investigation of the psychometric properties of Saucier's Big Five "Mini-Markers": Evidence for criterion and construct validity. *Individual Differences Research, 2*, 231-238.
- Pan, W., Sun, L.-Y., & Chow, I. H. S. (2011). The impact of supervisory mentoring on personal learning and career outcomes: The dual moderating effect of self-efficacy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 78*, 264-273. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2010.05.001.
- Ployhart, R. E., & Vandenberg, R. J. (2010). Longitudinal research: The theory, design, and analysis of change. *Journal of Management, 36*, 94-120. doi: 10.1177/0149206309352110.
- 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. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management, 12*, 531-544. doi:

10.1177/014920638601200408.

Rafferty, A. E., Restubog, S. L. D., & Jimmieson, N. L. (2010). Losing sleep: Examining the cascading effects of supervisors' experience of injustice on subordinates' psychological health. *Work and Stress, 24*, 36-55. doi:

10.1080/02678371003715135.

Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. L. (1999). Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 529-550. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.84.4.529.

Restubog, S. L. D., Scott, K. L., & Zagencyk, T. J. (2011). When distress hits home: The role of contextual factors and psychological distress in predicting employees' responses to abusive supervision. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 713-729.

doi: 10.1037/a0021593.

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 555-572.

doi: 10.2307/256693.

Saucier, G. (1994). Mini-markers: A brief version of Goldberg's unipolar Big-Five markers. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 63*, 506-516. doi:

10.1207/s15327752jpa6303\_8.

Scandura, T. A. (1998). Dysfunctional mentoring relationships and outcomes. *Journal of Management, 24*, 449-467. doi: 10.1016/S0149-2063(99)80068-3.

Sheppard, B. H., Lewicki, R. J., & Minton, J. W. (1992). *Organizational justice: The search for fairness in the workplace*. New York, NY: Lexington Books/Macmillan.

- Shoda, Y., & Mischel, W. (1993). Cognitive social approach to dispositional inferences: What if the perceiver is a cognitive social theorist? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 574-585. doi: 10.1177/0146167293195009.
- Simon, S. A., & Eby, L. T. (2003). A typology of negative mentoring experiences: A multidimensional scaling study. *Human Relations, 56*, 1083-1106. doi: 10.1177/0018726703569003.
- Singer, J. D. (1998). Using SAS PROC MIXED to fit multilevel models, hierarchical models, and individual growth models. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, 23*, 323-355. doi: 10.2307/1165280.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 434-443. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.82.3.434.
- Skarlicki, D. P., Folger, R., & Tesluk, P. (1999). Personality as a moderator in the relationship between fairness and retaliation. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*, 100-108. doi: 10.2307/256877.
- Spector, P., Fox, S., Penney, L., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2005). Development of the counterproductive work behavior checklist (CWB-C). *Unpublished paper, University of South Florida, Tampa.*
- Spector, P. E. (2006). Method variance in organizational research truth or urban legend? *Organizational Research Methods, 9*, 221-232. doi: 10.1177/1094428105284955.
- Taris, T. W., & Kompier, M. A. (2014). Cause and effect: Optimizing the designs of longitudinal studies in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress, 28*, 1-8. doi: 10.1080/02678373.2014.878494.

- Tellegen, A., Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1999). On the dimensional and hierarchical structure of affect. *Psychological Science, 10*, 297-303. doi: 10.1111/1467-9280.00157.
- Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 33*, 261-289. doi: 10.1177/0149206307300812.
- Tepper, B. J., & Almeda, M. (2012). Negative exchanges with supervisors. In L. T. d. T. Eby & T. D. Allen (Eds.), *Personal relationships: The effect on employee attitudes, behavior, and well-being* (pp. 67-93). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., Breaux, D. M., Geider, S., Hu, C., & Hua, W. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 109*, 156-167. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.03.004.
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Henle, C. A., & Lambert, L. S. (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology, 59*, 101-123. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00725.x.
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinates' resistance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 974-983. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.5.974.
- Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C. (2003). Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*, 97-105. doi: 10.2307/30040679.

- Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Thomas, C. H., & Lankau, M. J. (2009). Preventing burnout: The effects of LMX and mentoring on socialization, role stress, and burnout. *Human Resource Management, 48*, 417-432. doi: 10.1002/hrm.20288.
- Thompson, B., & Melancon, J. (1996). *Using item "Testlest"/"Parcels" in confirmatory factor analysis: An example using the PPSDQ-78*. (ERIC Document No. ED 404 349).
- Tourigny, L., & Pulich, M. (2005). A critical examination of formal and informal mentoring among nurses. *Health Care Manager, 24*, 68-76. doi: 10.1097/00126450-200501000-00011.
- Tripp, T. M., Bies, R. J., & Aquino, K. (2002). Poetic justice or petty jealousy? The aesthetics of revenge. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 89*, 966-984. doi: 10.1016/S0749-5978(02)00038-9.
- Turban, D. B., & Lee, F. K. (2007). The role of personality in mentoring relationships. In B. R. Ragins & K. E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 21-50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tyler, T. R. (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: A test of the group-value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 830-838. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.57.5.830.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 1063-1070. doi: 10.1037//0022-

3514.54.6.1063.

- Wayne, S. J., Hoobler, J., Marinova, S. V., & Johnson, M. M. (2008). Abusive behavior: Trickle-down effects beyond the dyad. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, 1-6. doi: 10.5465/ambpp.2008.33622318.
- Weiss, H. M., Suckow, K., & Cropanzano, R. (1999). Effects of justice conditions on discrete emotions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 786-794. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.84.5.786.
- Williams, L. J., & O'Boyle, E. H. (2008). Measurement models for linking latent variables and indicators: A review of human resource management research using parcels. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18, 233-242. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2008.07.002.
- Wood, J. T., & Duck, S. (1995). Off the beaten track: New shores for relationship research. In J. T. Wood & S. Duck (Eds.), *Under-studied relationships: Off the beaten track*, (pp. 1-22). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Table 1

*Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations, and Reliabilities*

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Correlations									
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
1. Procedural Justice <sup>a</sup>	3.19	.76	(.87)									
2. Distributive Justice <sup>a</sup>	3.07	1.15	.30*	(.96)								
3. Agreeableness <sup>a</sup>	4.39	.46	.14*	.22*	(.78)							
4. Conscientiousness <sup>a</sup>	4.18	.57	-.04	.29*	.25*	(.79)						
5. Neuroticism <sup>a</sup>	2.14	.61	-.14*	-.18*	-.53*	-.31*	(.70)					
6. Distancing Behavior <sup>b</sup>	2.46	.95	.05	.04	-.01	-.06	-.05	(.90)				
7. Manipulative Behavior <sup>b</sup>	2.15	.88	.05	.03	-.03	-.06	.01	.77*	(.88)			
8. Negative Affect <sup>a</sup>	1.88	.54	-.12*	-.23*	-.42*	-.24*	.62*	.02	.11	(.86)		
9. CWB <sup>a</sup>	1.33	.24	-.09	-.34*	-.16*	-.15*	.24*	.04	.05	.35*	(.81)	

*Note.* *N* ranges from 298 to 350 for all variables due to missing data.

<sup>a</sup> mentor ratings; <sup>b</sup> protégé ratings.

Reliability coefficients appear in parentheses.

\**p* < .05.

Table 2

*Parameter Estimates for the Five Models Examining the Relationship between Mentor Justice Perceptions and Personality and Protégé Perceptions of Manipulative Behavior*

		Model 1A	Model 2A	Model 3A	Model 4A	Model 5A
Fixed components						
Intercept	$\gamma_0$	2.15**	2.12**	2.11**	2.11**	2.10**
Procedural Justice	$\gamma_1$			0.05	0.03	0.06
Distributive Justice	$\gamma_2$			0.03	0.03	0.03
Agreeableness	$\gamma_3$				-0.04	-0.03
Conscientiousness	$\gamma_4$				-0.10	-0.10
Neuroticism	$\gamma_5$				-0.04	-0.03
PJxA	$\gamma_6$					0.02
PJxC	$\gamma_7$					-0.14
PJxN	$\gamma_8$					0.15
DJxA	$\gamma_9$					0.27
DJxC	$\gamma_{10}$					-0.04
DJxN	$\gamma_{11}$					0.01
Random components						
Intercept variance	$\tau_0$		0.16*	0.16**	0.14**	0.11**
Error variance	$\sigma^2$	0.78**	0.62**	0.63*	0.63*	0.64
Model fit						
Model deviance (-2LL)		859.80	847.65	796.72	760.03	755.08
Model $\Delta \chi^2$			12.15**	50.93**	36.69**	4.95
$\Delta df$			1	2	3	6

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .001$ .

Table 3

*Parameter Estimates for the Five Models Examining the Relationship between Mentor Justice Perceptions and Personality and Protégé Perceptions of Distancing Behavior*

		Model 1B	Model 2B	Model 3B	Model 4B	Model 5B
Fixed components						
Intercept	$\gamma_0$	2.46**	2.45**	2.44**	2.43**	2.41**
Procedural Justice	$\gamma_1$			0.05	0.04	0.07
Distributive Justice	$\gamma_2$			0.03	0.03	0.04
Agreeableness	$\gamma_3$				-0.07	-0.07
Conscientiousness	$\gamma_4$				-0.13	-0.12
Neuroticism	$\gamma_5$				-0.13	-0.13
PJxA	$\gamma_6$					-0.01
PJxC	$\gamma_7$					-0.12
PJxN	$\gamma_8$					0.13
DJxA	$\gamma_9$					0.27
DJxC	$\gamma_{10}$					0.02
DJxN	$\gamma_{11}$					0.06
Random components						
Intercept variance	$\tau_0$		0.11	0.10	0.08	0.06
Error variance	$\sigma^2$	0.91**	0.81**	0.80**	0.79**	0.80**
Model fit						
Model deviance (-2LL)		909.67	906.66	844.56	805.62	800.98
Model $\Delta \chi^2$			3.01**	62.10**	38.94**	4.64
$\Delta df$			1	2	3	6

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .001$ .