

THE FREQUENCY OF FEEDBACK WHEN AFFECTIVITY IS INVOLVED

Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies of

Angelo State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

by

MEGAN M. DUNCAN

May 2015

Major: Industrial/Organizational Psychology

## Dedication

To Jewells, Lillie, and Nathaniel:

Thank you for all your patience and understanding during this process. Every day you inspire me to be a better person. Without you, I'm lost. You are my beacon.

## Acknowledgements

To the wonderful faculty at Angelo State University in the Industrial organizational Psychology Department:

Thank you for allowing me to vent my concerns and frustrations during this journey. You kept me grounded and focused on the task at hand. Your encouragements meant the world to me.

To Toni and Karl Kincer:

Thank you for inspiring and showing me that all things are possible through hard work and dedication.

## Abstract

In this study, the role of feedback frequency and negative affectivity relating to self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and job performance was examined. In total, 148 participant responses were collected via internet survey. Using regression analysis, no support was found for feedback frequency predicting self-efficacy, job satisfaction, or perceptions of job performance. Support was found for affectivity negatively predicting self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and perceptions of job performance. These findings are consistent with previous affectivity research. An exploratory regression analysis was conducted to test if an interaction term composed of negative affectivity and feedback frequency predicted the dependent measures, but these analyses were not significant. Limitations of the current study and implications for future research are discussed.

## Table of Contents

Perceptions of Feedback Frequency.....	2
Self-efficacy.....	2
Job Satisfaction .....	5
Job Performance Perceptions.....	7
Affectivity.....	10
Self-efficacy.....	10
Job Satisfaction .....	11
Job Performance Perceptions.....	13
Method .....	16
Participants.....	16
Measures.....	16
Procedure.....	18
Results.....	19
Practical Implications.....	24
Limitations.....	25
Future Directions.....	26

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>TABLE 1:</b> Mean, Standard Deviation, and Zero Order Correlation.....	18
<b>TABLE 2:</b> Exploratory Analysis of Negative Affectivity and Feedback Frequency Predicting Self-Efficacy, Job Satisfaction, and Perceptions of Job Performance.....	20

## THE FREQUENCY OF FEEDBACK WHEN AFFECTIVITY IS INVOLVED

Interest in feedback has gained popularity in the workforce with employers using various types of instruments to gather performance information and to distribute it in a useful manner to their employees. Midlevel managers and some upper level managers are uninformed about the importance of viable feedback. The goal of the present study is to further research on the frequency with which feedback is given. Another goal is to examine affectivity in the workforce. This study examined employee perceptions of feedback frequency and how these perceptions of feedback frequency predicted self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and job performance. Furthermore, affectivity was examined in the same aforementioned manner.

## Perceptions of Feedback Frequency

Feedback is the actual information received concerning a task; it indicates how well an individual achieved his or her objective (Nadler, 1979; Rosen, Levy, & Hall, 2006). Feedback is communicated through various media such as performance evaluations and appraisals. Perceptions about the usefulness of feedback are determined by how credible the actual feedback is to employees (Rosen et al., 2006). Credible feedback may determine how well the employees respond and alter their behavior (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995; Steelman, Levy & Snell, 2004). The frequency with which the employee receives useful feedback may improve job performance. However, research in this particular subfield of feedback is limited (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). It may be useful for organizations to increase the amount of performance feedback given in a calendar year to improve job performance and to motivate employees. Feedback is beneficial to the employee and the organization. It allows each party to determine if they want to continue to pursue their relationship. Frequent feedback can be used to detect if there are job self-efficacy deficiencies, and organizational and job dissatisfaction issues. Moreover, frequent feedback can boost the employees' perspective on their job performance as well as give the employee an objective perspective on their performance. The self-efficacy of the employee will set the tone for how the job is performed.

***Self-efficacy.*** Self-efficacy is the belief one has in his or her own ability to accomplish specific tasks or goals (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 2005). Self-efficacy is believed to influence whether a person will accept the feedback given to them (Karl,



O'Leary-Kelly, & Marticchio, 1993). Furthermore, self-efficacy is a part of the self-esteem domain. Self-esteem is the global view of an individual's worth and value whereas self-efficacy is specific to the ability to perform distinct tasks, and research has determined that self-esteem influences one's belief in their capabilities (Bandura, 2007). Nease, Mudgett, and Quinones (1999) found that individuals with high self-efficacy were more likely to dismiss negative feedback about their performance and more likely to increase their performance efforts to accomplish their tasks. Additionally, individuals with high self-efficacy were more skeptical of the feedback credibility when the comments were continuously unfavorable (Nease et al., 1999). Interestingly, individuals with low self-efficacy were less likely to modify their behavior (Karl et al., 1993). Furthermore, Brown (2010) found that individuals high in self-esteem were less likely to experience distress from receiving negative feedback.

Since self-efficacy is a part of the self-esteem domain, it stands to reason that high self-esteem is similar to high self-efficacy. As such, the finding in Brown (2010) is consistent with the idea that high self-efficacy is also good for dealing with negative feedback. Karl et al. (1993) suggested that employees with low self-efficacy be given encouragement prior to any training program and evaluation to promote positive change in behavior. Giving employees frequent and useful feedback that can be directly incorporated into their job duties may result in higher self-efficacy. The level of self-efficacy an individual has can potentially affect how well they accept the feedback that is given to them.

Self-efficacy can thwart the motivational efforts of employees who do not have strong beliefs in their abilities to perform job tasks (Latham, 2012). Someone who does not believe

that he or she can accomplish a task will not put forth the energy needed to try. Frequent feedback and setting minor goals for these employees will allow them to improve performance. Goal setting theories suggest that having realistic goals improves self-efficacy through positive feedback that leads to positive change in performance (Latham, 2012). Frequent feedback given on a regular basis could aid in the improvement of employees who are underperforming. The employee and the supervisor need to set goals and the feedback needs to be clear, specific, and frequent to increase self-efficacy and performance. Additionally, the relationship between self-efficacy and goal setting is positive when goals are set by supervisor or if they are self-set, and self-efficacy will likely improve as predicted by goal setting theory if goals are specific and feedback is frequent and consistent (Latham, 2012).

Another important factor to consider is goal commitment. Employees with decreased self-efficacy will set goals but will find excuses not to actively pursue or commit to achieving the goal (Latham, 2012). Frequent feedback can help alleviate stress associated with goal commitment by the supervisor being in constant communication with the employee and being abreast of the situation. Motivation is important to self-efficacy and frequent feedback because it is an impetus propelling the employee to strive for intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Additionally, goal commitment can be maintained if the individual believes that the goal is meaningful and if they have the desire to attain the goal. Motivation research states that individuals who view the goal as significant achieve higher performance than individuals who perceive the goals to be insignificant (Latham, 2012). Relevant timely feedback can help

guide to individual in determining if the goal is significant enough to warrant improvement and demonstrate if the individual has the self-efficacy to achieve the goal.

Moreover, Morin and Latham (2000) found that there is a positive relationship between supervisor performance and self-efficacy (as cited by Latham, 2012). Specifically, as employee performance improves so does the supervisor's, which indirectly motivates the supervisor and the employee to continuously work more efficiently. This indicates that there is positive feedback transpiring between the supervisor and employee. It provides incentives for both parties to give frequent feedback to keep improving performance, and it subsequently increases self-efficacy. Feedback and goal regulation research shows that when employees receive negative feedback when attaining their goals they make adjustments in their performance that ensures failure in achieving that goal (Ilies & Judge, 2005). This is why frequent feedback communication is important in the relationship between supervisor and employee. Frequent feedback is needed to assuage employees' negative feelings about their performance and offer another alternative for reaching their goal. Based on the above, the following is predicted:

*Hypothesis 1:* Perceptions of feedback frequency will positively predict self-efficacy such that higher feedback frequency will predict higher self-efficacy.

***Job Satisfaction.*** Job satisfaction is the employee's comprehensive attitude about the job (Jex & Britt, 2008; Latham, 2012). Job satisfaction is central for ensuring that employees will remain with the organization and continue to perform adequately (Jex & Britt, 2008). When supervisors give positive feedback to employees, job satisfaction increases (Srivastava

& Rangarajan, 2008). Moreover, negative feedback has no effect on job satisfaction, whereas positive feedback increases satisfaction and motivation (Jaworski & Kohil, 1991). Frequent feedback can create a positive work environment for employees. Interestingly, research shows that career satisfaction and organizational commitment increases in the presence of a learning environment within the organization (Joo & Parks, 2010). With frequent feedback from the organization, employees will have a better understanding of where their skills and abilities are and where improvements can be made. Employees are more likely to be satisfied with the organization when the organization takes time to ensure that its employees are properly trained and that mistakes are acceptable. Additionally, when constructive feedback is given in an organization where employees perceive advancement opportunities, job satisfaction increases (Sommer & Kulkarni, 2012). Feedback that is timely and recurrent should also yield an increase in organizational and job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is necessary for allowing certain employees to weed themselves out of the organization and for retaining strong capable employees. Consistent feedback from employees on job satisfaction is a conduit for an open dialog between the organization and the employees. Scanlan and Still (2013) examined the wellbeing of occupational therapists working in the mental health industry. The researchers found that employees who felt stressed and exhausted were more likely to have higher rates of withdrawal from the organization and experience burnout (Scanlan & Still, 2013). Additionally, employees within the same organization who were internally job searching also experienced higher rates of withdrawal intentions (Scanlan & Still, 2013).

Higher rates of employee satisfaction are beneficial for the organization and the employees. Satisfaction reduces employee turnover and saves the organization financially. Improving job satisfaction and limiting the amount of distress the employees experience create an atmosphere of positivity in the workplace. Interestingly, Kim and Wright (2007) reported a connection between work stressors and exhaustion that influences job satisfaction negatively. Employees who perceive their workload to be distressing were more inclined to ruminate on the concept of voluntary turnover (Kim & Wright, 2007). Frequent feedback could aid in eliminating this issue because the employee and the supervisor will be in constant communication about job performance.

Furthermore, employees' inflated perceptions of their own job performance can lead to deleterious effects on job satisfaction. For example, Van Emmerik, Bakker, and Euwema (2008) reported that constables who perceived their job performance to be above average found negative feedback to be unwelcome and experienced higher rates of job dissatisfaction. Thus, frequent feedback will enhance job satisfaction because employees can integrate feedback information to make appropriate changes in their performance to be successful in the job. Based on the above, the following is predicted:

*Hypothesis 2:* Perceptions of feedback frequency will positively predict job satisfaction such that higher frequency feedback will predict higher job satisfaction.

***Job Performance Perceptions.*** Job performance as defined by Campbell (1990, 1994) is composed of the behaviors individuals display while working to fulfill the

organization's objectives (as cited by Jex & Britt, 2008). Research on the relationship between feedback and job performance varies; the position of this study is that feedback frequency will relate to respondent perceptions of performance. Task performance research has shown that lower performers significantly improve their performance when feedback is positive (Murthy & Schafer, 2011). When it comes to effort and time spent performing job tasks, employees tend to do tasks that will give them more descriptive feedback (Northcraft, Schmidt, & Ashford, 2011). Additionally, employees are aware of those salient tasks and have higher investments in completing the tasks to receive that specific feedback.

Research indicates that negative feedback will enhance future performance, however, if the feedback is too harsh it can hinder performance (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). Negative feedback delivered in a negative manner can actually contribute to interpersonal problems (Baron, 1988). Additionally, these interpersonal problems will be displayed in behaviors such as avoidance and lack of teamwork (Baron, 1988). Offering employees the opportunity to periodically receive feedback could prevent employees' feelings from being hurt and give the supervisor experience with being tactful at delivering negative feedback. When feedback is specific and perceived as helpful it is generally accepted and job performance improves (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). Feedback frequency research is scarce in this area. Previous studies highlight that frequency with which the feedback is given is crucial for ensuring that the recipients heed the advice. Integrating feedback that is useful during performance appraisals or in informal feedback situations will reduce ambiguity in terms of how well the employee is performing. Different subfields of feedback have yielded positive results in the

task performance domain (Murthy & Schafer, 2011). However, this study is focused on the frequency at which feedback is given to influence performance. Additionally, the frequency which feedback and performance appraisal are given should improve job performance. Based on the above the following is predicted:

*Hypothesis 3:* Perceptions of feedback frequency will positively predict job performance such that higher frequency feedback will predict higher self-rated job performance.

## Affectivity

Affectivity is a personality trait that remains stable throughout one's lifetime. There are two domains of affectivity: positive affectivity (PA) and negative affectivity (NA) (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Individuals high in negative affectivity (NA) are those who perceive the world more negatively in a global sense than individuals low in NA. In other words, high NA individuals perceive themselves and others more negatively (Walker, Van, Jaarsveld, & Skarlicki, 2014; Lam, Yik & Schaubreock, 2002). Conversely, PA is characterized by a sanguine disposition. These individuals tend to view the world as more positive. Affectivity is a baseline personality trait, which means that an individual high on either spectrum can still experience positive and negative feelings. Their general disposition is either pessimistic or optimistic, depending on where they fall on the affectivity spectrum.

Walker et al. (2014) expanded upon NA research by studying incivility in employees and consumers in the customer service industry. They found that individuals high in NA were more likely to reciprocate rudeness to customers and coworkers than employees low in NA. Lam et al. (2002) found that over time employees low in NA were more likely to respond positively to feedback that resulted in measurable rewards than employees high in NA. High NA employees temporarily responded favorably to positive feedback and rewards but reverted back to their original baseline NA state (Lam et al., 2002), indicating that NA is a fixed characteristic.

**Self-efficacy.** According to Lee and Ko (2010) positive affectivity and self-efficacy are significantly correlated. Research in the health field revealed that nurses high in PA showed



more job self-efficacy and performed job tasks better and these findings indicated that PA improved the organizations' effectiveness in patient care (Lee & Ko, 2010). Prosocial behaviors are also linked to PA. Hartog and Belschak (2012) found that high self-efficacy promoted prosocial behaviors such that employees went beyond their duties to help coworkers and the organization. PA will relate to higher perceptions of self-efficacy because high PA individuals have a general positive outlook on themselves. NA will relate to lower perceptions of self-efficacy due to fact that high NA individuals view the world and themselves more pessimistically. Based on the above the following is predicted:

*Hypothesis 4:* Affectivity will negatively predict self-efficacy such that high negative affectivity will relate to lower self-efficacy.

**Job Satisfaction.** Personality traits like affectivity relate to how individuals perceive the world (Gilford, 2007). Turnover intentions are indicators of job satisfaction or the lack thereof. Dissatisfied employees who are high in PA will voluntarily leave jobs more frequently than employees high in NA (Judge, 1993). This indicates that individuals high in PA are experiencing cognitive dissonance and removing themselves from their current position within the organization will relieve the dissonance.

Additionally, individuals high in PA proactively seek positive change (Duffy, Ganster, & Shaw, 1998). PA is also linked to job satisfaction when opportunities for growth are possible in the individual's future (Bowling, Hendricks & Wagner, 2008). Interestingly, PA and NA research revealed no difference in satisfaction when considering compensation (Bowling et al., 2008). Duffy et al. (1998) found that professors with longer tenure who were

high in PA were more likely to experience discontent with dissatisfying jobs positions. Moreover, they were also more likely to make changes within their position such as asking for increased compensation for alleviating their discontentment (Duffy et al. 1998). This illuminates the fact that people high in PA are not satisfied or content in being jobs or careers that are negative and distressing.

Job satisfaction and affectivity research has shown that individuals high in PA were more likely to have increased job satisfaction, stronger commitment to the organization and lower turnover intentions (Cropanzano, James, & Konovsky, 1993). Moreover, employees who were high in PA and who perceived organizational support were less likely to contemplate turnover when controversy arose within the organization (Chun, Wong, & Tjosvold, 2007). Those employees were satisfied and content with the organization as a whole and had faith that the organization would make the best decision to resolve the controversy. However, employees high in NA who perceived that there was no opportunity to grow within the organization and/or perceived that they were in the wrong job position experienced higher rates of dissatisfaction in the job and within the organization (Johnson & Johnson, 2000). Interestingly, employees high in NA were more likely to perceive more injustices within the organization and to be less satisfied overall in their job positions (Irving, Coleman, & Bobovel, 2005).

NA is linked to job stressors (Mak & Mueller, 2000). Individuals high in NA are more likely to engage in counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) and work incivility when they experience job stress which leads to dissatisfaction (Penney & Spector, 2005). NA

is correlated with role ambiguity and work overload (Ng & Sorensen, 2009). This may be because people high in NA tend to perceive the world in a negative way rather than from a more optimistic perspective. The stress of the job may induce poor interpersonal skills that cause conflict among coworkers and feeds back into the notion of being generally dissatisfied with the job itself. Mak and Mueller (2000) found that when employees high in PA experience job insecurities they experienced more vocational and psychological stress whereas individuals high in NA experience more interpersonal and physical strains due to job insecurities. Based on this research the following is predicted:

*Hypothesis 5:* Affectivity will negatively predict job satisfaction such that high negative affectivity will relate to lower job satisfaction.

**Job Performance Perceptions.** Job performance is essential for any successful organization. Kaplan and Bradley (2009) conducted a meta-analysis on job performance in relation to PA and NA; they found that PA and NA predict job performance. They confirmed that NA positively related to CWBs (Kaplan & Bradley, 2009). Bouckennooghe, Raja, and Butt (2013) examined job performance and satisfaction in relation to PA and NA and found that satisfaction was a moderator of the relationship between job performance and employee retention. Interestingly, they found that employees high in NA were more likely to attempt to reach higher performance levels when they experience low job satisfaction (Bouckennooghe et al., 2013). Furthermore, for employees high in PA there was a positive relationship between job performance and low satisfaction, and no relationship between satisfaction and performance when satisfaction was high (Bouckennooghe et al., 2013).

Research concerning prosocial behaviors and prosocial personality overlaps with research concerning affectivity. Individuals high in PA frequently engage in organizational citizen behaviors (OCB, also known as prosocial behaviors). Bakker, Tims, and Derks (2012) affirmed that people with proactive personalities who engage in prosocial behaviors are more likely to create job tasks when their official job duties were complete. In other words, these individuals created job tasks during down time after job demands were met (Bakker et al., 2012). Moreover, research has found that proactive personality is also related to job performance and that job autonomy is moderated by job performance and proactive personality (Fuller, Hester, & Cox, 2010).

Research indicates that people with proactive personalities create job opportunities for themselves that allow them to flourish through social networking, which they make through their extra role activities (Thompson, 2005). Their job performance and their OCBs enable them to branch out of their job demands and take on other roles and responsibilities that were not available to them initially. Additionally, Bergeron, Schroeder, and Martinez (2014) found that employees who engage in proactive behaviors also work more hours a week. Bergeron et al. (2014) explained that the employees viewed their job roles more broadly and that engaging in proactive behaviors was essentially a function of their duties that they enjoyed doing. Fu and Deshpande (2014) found a direct relationship between organizational commitment and job performance. Based on this research the following is predicted:

*Hypothesis 6:* Affectivity will negatively predict job performance such that high negative affectivity will relate to lower perceptions job performance.

## Method

**Participants.** The present study surveyed 152 participants (89 females (58.55%) and 63 males (41.45%)). The criterion for the current study was that participants had to be currently employed and must have received performance evaluations at this job. Four participants were excluded from the study because they did not meet the criteria for participation. The excluded participants did not receive performance evaluations of any kind. The age range of participants was between 45 and 60 years. Participants varied considerably in their employment backgrounds as well. Participants were recruited through various media. Some participants were initially contacted directly through email via personal or professional connections and these individuals were asked to forward the email to other potential participants who may be interested in taking part in the survey. These participants did not receive any incentives for their participation. Other participants were recruited through social media websites such as Facebook. Additionally, undergraduate introduction to psychology students were also recruited to participate in the study. These students were employed and received participation credit for taking part in the study. Furthermore, some participants were recruited through Survey Monkey and were compensated \$4 US for partaking in the survey.

**Measures.** Complete versions of the instrument used in this study are located in Appendix A.

*Self-efficacy.* Self-efficacy was measured using a general domain scale (Love, Bahner, Jones, & Nilsson, 2007). The scale was modified to align with the study by specifically focusing the statements of self-efficacy about job performance. An example of a

question on this scale was “how confident are you at meeting the challenges of your job position?” Responses utilized a 5-point continuous scale (1 = “not at all confident” to 5 = “very confident”). Five items were used to form this scale. Love , Bahner , Jones, and Nilsson (2007) found strong internal reliability evidence for their scale( $\alpha = .93$ ).

*Positive/negative affectivity.* Positive and negative affectivity were measured using the Positive Affect and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clarke, & Tellegen, 1988). Respondents were presented with a list of words and asked to rate to what extent the respondent has felt that way in the past. Respondents reported their level of agreement with each item on a 5-point continuous scale (1 = “Slightly or not at all” to 5 = “very much”), For example, the words ‘excited’ and ‘proud’ represented positive affect and the words ‘distressed’ and ‘hostile’ were indicative of negative affect. Twenty statement responses were used to form this scale. Watson, Clarke, and Tellegen (1988) found strong internal reliability evidence for their scale ( $\alpha = .88$ ).

*Job satisfaction.* Job satisfaction was measured using the Satisfaction With Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). The items were modified by focusing on career satisfaction instead of general life satisfaction. Respondents reported their level of agreement with each item on a 5-point continuous scale (1 = “Strongly disagree” to 5 = “strongly agree”). An example item reads: “In most ways, my job is close to my ideal career.” Four items were used to form this scale. Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985) did not report internal reliability estimates in their paper, they did provide external validation estimates in the form of correlations with other similar scales.

*Employee performance self-perceptions.* This variable was measured using a three-item scale first published in Diaz, Bergman, and Miner (2014). Respondents reported their level of agreement with each item on a 5-point continuous scale (1 = “Strongly disagree” to 5 = “strongly agree”). An example item reads: “I am performing well in my job.” There were three items used to form this scale. Diaz, Bergman, and Miner (2014) reported that the internal reliability for this scale was acceptable ( $\alpha = .81$ ).

**Procedure.** Participants were given a self-report questionnaire on Survey Monkey. Participants were asked to recall the most recent time they received feedback concerning their job performance from their supervisor and to recall that feedback. Once the survey was completed, a debriefing statement appeared on the screen thanking them for their time and explaining the study.



## Results

Table 1 reports the means, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the variables in the study. Cronbach's alpha for these variables indicated suitable internal reliability. As seen in Table 1, feedback frequency was not significantly correlated with any other study variable. Negative affectivity was negatively correlated with self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and performance perceptions. Likewise, self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and performance perceptions were all significantly and positively correlated to each other.

**Table 1.**  
Mean, Standard Deviation and Zero-order Correlation for Study Variables.

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5
1. Feedback Frequency	3.07	1.180	--				
2. Negative Affectivity	1.83	.687	.075	(.879)			
3. Self-Efficacy	4.55	.489	.110	-.298*	(.817)		
4. Job Satisfaction	3.31	.853	.005	-.276*	.299*	(.737)	
5. Job Performance	3.88	.696	.121	-.232*	.537*	.268*	(.688)

Note: *M* is mean, *SD* is standard deviation, \* $p < .01$ , Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients appear in parentheses on the diagonal.

### *Hypotheses H1 – H3*

Hypothesis 1 stated that perceptions of feedback frequency would predict higher self-efficacy. Regression analysis indicated that feedback frequency was not related to self-efficacy ( $\beta = .11, p > .05$ ). Hypothesis 2 stated that perceptions of feedback frequency would predict higher job satisfaction. The regression analysis revealed that there was no significant relationship between perceptions of feedback frequency and higher job satisfaction ( $\beta = -.01, p > .05$ ). Finally, Hypothesis 3 stated that perceptions of feedback frequency would predict

higher self-rated job performance ratings. The relationship was not significant ( $\beta = -.12, p > .05$ ). Therefore, all three of these predicted relationships were not supported by the data.

#### *Hypotheses H4 – H6*

Hypothesis 4 stated that affectivity would negatively predict self-efficacy. Scores on the PANAS were scaled so that high values indicated strong negative affectivity for these analyses. The regression analysis revealed a significant relationship between affectivity and self-efficacy ( $\beta = -.30, p < .01, R^2 = .09$ ). High negative affectivity was related to lower self-efficacy. Hypothesis 5 predicted a relationship between negative affectivity and job satisfaction. The regression analysis revealed support for this prediction ( $\beta = -.28, p < .01, R^2 = .08$ ). High negative affectivity was related to lower job satisfaction. Hypothesis 6 predicted that negative affectivity and would relate to lower self-reported job performance. This relationship was significant ( $\beta = -.23, p < .01, R^2 = .05$ ). Employees with high negative affectivity scores provided lower self-rating of job performance. Negative affectivity related to all three dependent measures.

#### *Post-Hoc Exploratory Analyses*

An exploratory regression analysis was conducted to see if an interaction term composed of affectivity and feedback frequency would predict the three dependent measures. To construct the interaction term, affectivity and feedback frequency were mean-centered and the term was created by multiplying mean-centered scores for each participant on the affectivity and feedback frequency variables. The interaction term did not add significant incremental variance to the prediction of the three dependent variables (see Table 2).

**Table 2.**  
Regression for the Exploratory Analysis of Negative Affectivity and Feedback Frequency  
Predicting Self-Efficacy, Job Satisfaction, and Perceptions of Job Performance.

	<u>Self-Efficacy</u>			<u>Job Satisfaction</u>			<u>Job Performance</u>		
	<i>b</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>
Constant	4.801		.000	3.954		.000	4.094		.000
Negative Affectivity	-.227	-.318	.000	-.346	-.276	.001	-.255	-.249	.003
Feedback Frequency	.053	.128	.111	.012	.016	.845	.083	.139	.089
Negative Affectivity X Feedback Frequency	.046	.072	.374	.059	.052	.529	.040	.043	.598
$R^2$	.110			.079			.075		

Note: *b* is the unstandardized regression coefficient,  $\beta$  is the standardized regression coefficient, *p* is P value.

## **Discussion**

The present study investigated the relationship between feedback frequency and self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and job performance. Further, the study explored positive and negative affectivity in comparison to self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and job performance. The results of the study showed that feedback frequency was not a significant predictor of self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and job performance in this study. However, negative affectivity did relate significantly to self-efficacy, decreased job satisfaction, and lower perceptions of job performance as predicted. This study is innovative for examining feedback frequency from their supervisors and how it relates to outcomes. This study highlights the need for more research in the field of feedback. Additionally, communication skills can be improved between the employer and the employees with more constant and consistent feedback.

Motivation research has shown that timely positive feedback improves performance and goal attainment (Latham, 2012). The same should be said about timely and frequent feedback about job performance; however, the current study did not support this notion. Participative goal setting theory suggests that goals should be set with the employee and the manager, so that both agree upon which behaviors need to improve to attain the set goals (Latham, 2012). This should lead to goal commitment and then achievement. It could be that performance appraisal feedback is too retrospective and that the appraiser cannot adequately recall the employees' behaviors. However, if appraisals were given more than twice a year, there could be a significant relationship between job self-efficacy, satisfaction, and performance. Informal timely feedback may give employees more confidence in their

abilities to perform their job tasks, which could increase their self-efficacy and bolster their job satisfaction and enhance perception of performance. Frequent feedback does not mean that the employees are being evaluated every week but that feedback is given more than biannually. Formal appraisals are beneficial for various reasons. However, limited infrequent feedback is counterproductive for developing employees. Jawahar (2006) stated that when employees are in agreement with the organization's appraisal system that job satisfaction increases. Retaining strong, capable, and satisfied employees benefits the organization as a whole.

The result of affectivity did build on past research in the field. In the study, a negative relationship between NA and self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and perceptions of job performance was found. Additionally, the results of the study suggest that individuals high in NA will experience lower job self-efficacy to some degree compared to their counterparts who are high in PA.

This study supports previous NA research in the domain of job satisfaction. Research shows that employees high in NA experience stressors differently from PAs and that could explain why incivility and CWBs are rated higher among people high in negative affectivity (Penney & Spector, 2005). If employees are not satisfied with the organization or their specific job roles, then deviating from job tasks to find other activities to pass the time while at work might seem like a reasonable thing to do since the employees do not want to be there. Bakker et al., (2012) said that individuals high in PA are more likely to find enrichment activities when their work is complete or during slow periods. It is only natural that high NA

employees who are dissatisfied and underperforming would do the opposite to pass the time. High PA employees proactively seek to change their dissatisfying positions (Duffy et al, 1998) whereas high NA employees will remain in a turbulent environment until they are asked to leave (Judge, 1993). It is important for organizations to remember that these personality traits are persistent.

**Practical Implications.** Employees and supervisors can benefit from this study by understanding that negative affectivity is a personality disposition that is a stable trait and dissatisfaction is going to be more prevalent with these employees. Supervisors need to be aware that personality dispositions are persistent and are not easily changed. High NA individuals can be satisfied in the workforce but their level of satisfaction is not going to be presented in the same way or at the same level as employees high in positive affectivity.

Employees high in positive affectivity are more likely to report more positive job performance perceptions compared to their negative affectivity counterparts. Individuals high in negative affectivity may actually be reporting more honestly due to their general disposition about life. Additionally, employees high in positive affectivity will more likely engage in proactive work behaviors. Moreover, these employees have higher self-efficacy and are better candidates for participating in collaborative goal setting. These employees will also be more inclined to stay committed to their goals.

Performance appraisals are essential for establishing how well the employee is doing his or her job. Frequent developmental feedback is useful for nurturing well-rounded employees. Evolved employees ultimately increase the organization's standing in the

industry, which means that the company can compete on various levels in the marketplace. Developed employees know how to perform their jobs adequately and work efficiently to complete tasks. Ensuring accurate frequent feedback on employees' performance will illuminate their strengths and deficiencies. These deficiencies can be molded into strengths with developmental training and the strengths can be increased by enrichment. Ultimately, the organization will benefit from having developed employees who are identified through frequent feedback.

**Limitations.** A number of limitations existed in this study. One limitation was recruiting participants who actually received formal performance appraisals. Some volunteers were turned away because they did not receive any type of formal performance feedback. Often, the organizations did not give formal feedback to their employees. The employees did receive informal feedback infrequently. Another limitation to the study was the retrospective self-report of job performance. Participants may not have accurately remembered receiving performance feedback especially if the feedback was given more than six months ago. Additionally, participants may have only remembered the positive feedback that they received from their supervisors and not the negative aspects. In general, people have a tendency to dismiss the negative and remember positive information that fits into their personal identities.

Each aspect of the study relied on self-report. As a result, common method variance could be an issue. Future work should include outside reports of performance and perhaps the inclusion of peer ratings of employee affectivity. Participants could have tried to make

themselves appear better than what they really were. Participants could have tried to select the answer choices that were more socially desirable rather than answering truthfully. Another limitation for this study that it was a cross sectional self-report study that only captured one specific period. More information could have been obtained if the study captured at least two or three different periods of time. Furthermore, self-report cross sectional designs do not allow for the inference of causality. There is no way of knowing if affectivity is causing increased rates of self-efficacy. The data are only correlational and it must be interpreted that way.

**Future Directions.** Future research should examine the relationship between frequency feedback and perceptions of job performance. Research in this area is advantageous for employers wanting to increase their overall profits by having employees perform at their optimal level. Clear and concise information about when and how frequent to give feedback to employees will benefit the entire workforce. It is possible that giving excessively frequent feedback will have the same effect as not having enough feedback in the sense that the employee cognitively withdraw from doing their job. Another research opportunity is to examine the relationship between frequency feedback and motivation theory in high pressure and stressful occupations. This may yield significant information on motivating employees who feel overworked and under pressure to perform. Another research opportunity is to extend affectivity dispositional research in the area of self-efficacy. Research in this domain is scarce and information concerning human behavior and personality could be further explored.



This study extended feedback research in the subfield of frequency. The results indicated that feedback frequency could not predict self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and perception of job performance. However, this study did expound upon affectivity. This study demonstrated that positive affectivity predicts increase self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and higher rates of job performance perceptions and the opposite is true for negative affectivity.

## References

- Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert, R. M. (2005). *Social psychology* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Bakker, A., Tims, M., & Derks, D. (2012). Proactive personality and performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. *Human Relations, 65*(10), 1359-1378.  
doi:10.1177/0018726712453471
- Bandura, A. (2007). Social cognitive theory. In S. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, (730-734). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412952651.n280>
- Baron, R. A. (1988). Negative effects of destructive criticism: impact on conflict, self-efficacy, and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*(2), 199-207.
- Bergeron, D. Schroeder, T., & Martinez, H. (2014). Proactive personality at work: Seeing more to do more and doing more?. *Journal of Business & Psychology, 29*(1), 71-86.  
doi: 10.1007/s10869-013-9298-5
- Bouckenooghe, D., Raja, U., & Butt, A. (2013). Combined effects of positive and negative affectivity and job satisfaction on performance and turnover intentions. *Journal of Psychology, 147*(2), 105-123. doi:10.1080/00223980.2012.678411
- Bowling, N., Hendricks, E., & Wagner, S. (2008). Positive and negative affectivity and facet satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business & Psychology, 23*(3/4), 115-125.  
doi: 10.1007/s 10869-008-9082-0

- Brown, J. D. (2010). High self-esteem buffers negative feedback: Once more with feeling. *Cognition & Emotion, 24*(8), 1389-1404. doi:10.1080/02699930903504405
- Chun, H., Wong, A., & Tjosvold, D. (2007). Turnover intention and performance in China: The role of positive affectivity, Chinese values, perceived organizational support and constructive controversy. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 80*(4), 735-751.
- Consiglio, C., Borgogni, L., Alessandri, G., & Schaufeli W. B. (2013). Does self-efficacy matter for burnout and sickness absenteeism? The mediating role of demands and resources at the individual and team levels. *Work & Stress, 27*(1), 22-42.  
doi:10.1080/02678373.2013.769325
- Cropanzano, R., James, K., & Konovsky, M. A. (1993). Dispositional affectivity as a predictor of work attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 4*(6), 595-606. doi:10.1002/job.4030140609
- Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2012). When does transformational leadership enhance employee proactive behavior? The role of autonomy and role breadth self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(1), 194-202. doi: 10.1037/a0024903
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*(1), 71-75. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4901\_13
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Shaw, J. D. (1998). Positive affectivity and negative outcomes: The role of tenure and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(6), 950-959. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.83.6.950

- Fu, W., & Deshpande, S. (2014). The impact of caring climate, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment on job performance of employees in China's insurance company. *Journal of Business Ethics, 124*(2), 339-349. doi: 10.1007/s10551-013-1876-y
- Fuller Jr., J. B., Hester, K., & Cox, S. S. (2010). Proactive personality and job performance: Exploring job autonomy as a moderator. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 22*(1), 35-51.
- Illies, R., & Judge, T. A. (2005). Goal regulation across time: The effects of feedback and affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(3), 453-467. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.453
- Irving, P. G., Coleman, D. F., & Bobovel, D. R. (2005). The moderating effect of negative affectivity in the procedural justice job satisfaction relation. *Canadian Journal Of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement, 37*(1), 20-32. doi: 10.1037/h0087242.
- Jawahar, I. (2006). Correlates of satisfaction with performance appraisal feedback. *Journal of Labor Research, 27*(2), 213-236.
- Jaworski, B. J., & Kohl, A. K. (1991). Supervisory feedback: Alternative types and their impact on salespeople's performance and satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research (JMR), 28*(2), 190-201.
- Jex, S. M., & Britt, T. W. (2008). *Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach (2<sup>nd</sup> edition)*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

- Johnson, G. J. & Johnson, W. R. (2000). Perceived overqualification, positive and negative affectivity, and satisfaction with work. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, *15*(2). 167-184.
- Joo, B. & Parks, S. (2010). Career satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention: The effect of goal orientation, organizational learning culture and developmental feedback. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, *31*(6), 482-500. doi: 10.1108/01437731011069999
- Judge, T. A. (1993). Does affective disposition moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and voluntary turnover? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*(3), 395-401.
- Kaplan, S. Bradley, J.C., Luchman. J.N., & Haynes, D. (2009). On the role of positive and negative affectivity in job performance: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(1), 162-176. doi: 10.1037/a0013115
- Karl, K. A., O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., & Martocchio, J. J. (1993). The impact of feedback and self-efficacy on performance in training. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *14*, 379-394. doi:10.1002/job.4030140409
- Kim, S., & Wright, B. E. (2007). IT employee work exhaustion: Toward an integrated model of antecedents and consequences. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *27*(147). doi:10.1177/0734371X06290775

- Kraimer, M. L., Wayne, S. J., Liden, R.C. & Sparrowe, R. T. (2005). The role of job security in understanding the relationship between employee's perceptions of temporary workers and employees performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(2), 389-398. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.3
- Lam, S. K., Yik, M. M., & Schaubroeck, J. (2002). Responses to formal performance appraisal feedback: The role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 192-201. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.192
- Latham, G. P. (2012). *Work motivation: History, theory, research and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lee, T., & Ko, Y. (2010). Effects of self-efficacy, affectivity and collective efficacy on nursing performance of hospital nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 66*(4), 839-848. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2009.05244.x
- Love, K. M., Bahner, A. D., Jones, L. N., & Nilsson, J. E. (2007). An investigation of early research experience and research self-efficacy. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 38*(3), 314-320 doi:10.1037/0735-7028.38.3.314
- Madera, J. M., Dawson, M., Neal, J. A., & Busch, K. (2013). Breaking a communication barrier: The effects of visual aids in food preparation on job attitudes and performance. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 37*(2), 262-280. doi:10.1177/1096348012436376

- Mak, A. S., & Mueller, J. (2000). Job insecurity, coping resources and personality dispositions in occupational strain. *Work & Stress, 14(4)*, 312-328. doi: 10.1080/026783700122462
- Maynard, D.C., & Parfyonova, N. M. (2013). Perceived overqualification and withdrawal behaviours: Examining the roles of job attitudes and work values. *Journal of Occupational And Organizational Psychology, 86(3)*, 435-455. doi: 10.1111/joop.12006
- Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Murthy, U. S., & Schafer, B. A. (2011). The effects of relative performance information and framed information systems feedback on performance in production task. *Journal of Informational Systems, 25(1)*, 159-184. doi: 10.2308/jis.2011.25.1.159
- Nadler, D. A. (1979). The effects of feedback on task group behavior: A review of the experimental research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 23(3)*, 309-338. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(79)90001-1
- Nease, A. A., Mudgett, B. O., & Quiñones, M. A. (1999). Relationships among feedback sign, self-efficacy, and acceptance of performance feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84(5)*, 806-814. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.84.5.806
- Ng, T. H., & Sorensen, K. L., (2009). Dispositional affectivity and work-related outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39(6)*, 1255-1287. doi: 10.1111/j.1550-1816.2009.00481.x

- Northcraft, G. B., Schmidt, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2011). Feedback and the rationing of time and effort among competing tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(5), 1076-1086. doi: 10.1037/a0023221
- O'Shea, D., Monaghan, S., & Ritchie, T.(2014) Early career attitudes and satisfaction during a recession. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 29*(3), 226-245. doi: 10.1108/JMP-02-2013-0061
- Patrick, J., Smy, V., Tombs, M., & Shelton, K. (2012). Being in one's chosen job determines pre-training attitudes and training outcomes. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 85*(2), 245-257. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02027.x
- Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2005). Job stress, incivility and counterproductive work behavior (CWB): the moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(7), 777-796. doi:10.1002/job. 336.
- Ricketta, M. (2008). The causal relation between job attitudes and performance: A meta-analysis of panel studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(2), 472-481. doi: 10/1037/0021-9010.93.2.472
- Rosen, C. C., Levy, P. E., & Hall, R. J. (2006). Placing perceptions of politics in the context of the feedback environment, employee attitudes, and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 211-220. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.211
- Scanlan, J., & Still, M. (2013). Job satisfaction, burnout and turnover intention in occupational therapists working in mental health, *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal, 60*(5), 310-318. doi:10.1111/1440-1630.12067



- Sommer, K. L., & Kulkarni, M., (2012). Does constructive performance feedback improve citizenship intentions and job satisfaction? The roles of perceived opportunities for advancement, respect, and mood. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 23(2), 177-201. doi: 10.1002/hrdq.21132
- Srivastava, R., & Rangarajan, D. (2008). Understanding the salespeople's "feedback-satisfaction" linkage: what role does job perceptions play?. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 23(3), 151-160. doi: 10.1108/0885862081418
- Thompson, J. A. (2005). Proactive personality and job performance: A social capital perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 1011-1017. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.1011
- Van Emmerik, I. H., Bakker, A. B., & Euwema, M.C. (2008). What happens after the developmental assessments center? Employees' reactions to unfavorable performance feedback. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(5), 513-527.
- Walker, D. D., van Jaarsveld, D. D., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2014). Exploring the effects of individual customer incivility encounters on employee incivility: The moderating roles of entity (in)civility and negative affectivity. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 99(1), 151-161. doi:10.1037/a0034350
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.54.6.1063

Zhu, D., Norman, I. J., & While, A. E. (2013). Nurses' self-efficacy and practices relating to weight management of adult patients: a path analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition & Physical Activity*, *10*(1), 131-153. doi: 10.1186/1479-5868-10-

## Appendix A

Measurement scales used for the current study.

**Self-Efficacy: Love, Bahner, Jones, & Nilsson (2007).**

**How confident are you in your overall job ability to:**

- 1- Not confident at all*
- 2- Somewhat unconfident*
- 3- Neutral*
- 4- Somewhat confident*
- 5- Very confident*

---

Completing significant job tasks?  
 Perform well under pressure?  
 Meet the challenges of your job position?  
 Communicate effectively with coworkers, supervisor (ect)?  
 Have what it takes to perform well in this position?

---

**Performance Perception: Diaz, Bergman, and Miner (2014).**

**Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your job position during the last 6 months.**

- 1- Strongly Disagree*
- 2- Disagree*
- 3- Neither Agree nor Disagree*
- 4- Agree*
- 5- Strongly Agree*

---

I am performing well in my job.  
 I really need to improve my performance in my job position.  
 I am not performing as well as other workers in my same position.

---

**Satisfaction With Life (Modified): Diener, Emmons, Larson & Griffin (1985).**

**Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your job during the last 6 months.**

- 1- Strongly Disagree*
- 2- Disagree*
- 3- Neither Agree nor Disagree*
- 4- Agree*
- 5- Strongly Agree*

---

In most ways, my job is close to my ideally career.  
 I am satisfied with my job performance.  
 If I could work in another position, I would.  
 I often think about quitting this job.

---

**Appendix A (continued).**  
Measurement scales used for the current study.

**Positive Affect and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) by Watson, Clarke, and Tellegen (1988).**

**This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and indicate to what extent you have generally felt this way in the last 6 months.**

- 
- 1- Slightly or not at all*
  - 2- A little*
  - 3- Moderately*
  - 4- Quite a bit*
  - 5- Very much*
- 

Interested	Distressed
Excited	Upset
Strong	Guilty
Enthusiastic	Scared
Proud	Hostile
Alert	Irritable
Inspired	Ashamed
Determined	Embarrassed
Attentive	Jittery
Active	Afraid

---