

To cite this:

Richard, J. E., Plimmer, G., Fam, K.-S., & Campbell, C. (2015). Publishing success of marketing academics: Antecedents and outcomes. *European Journal of Marketing*, 49(1/2), 123 - 145.
doi: 10.1108/EJM-06-2013-0311

Publishing success of marketing academics: Antecedents and outcomes

James Richard, Geoff Plimmer, Kim Fam, & Charles Campbell

Purpose: The purpose of this paper is to explore the relationship between positive incentives (perceived organisational support) and negative incentives (publish or perish), on both academic publication productivity and marketing academics' quality of life. While publish or perish pressure is a common technique to improve academics' performance, it's punishment orientation may be poorly suited to the uncertain, creative work that research entails and be harmful to academics' life satisfaction and other wellbeing variables. In particular, it may interfere with family commitments, and harm the careers of academic women. While perceived organisational support may be effective in encouraging research outputs and be positive for wellbeing it may be insufficient as a motivator in the increasingly competitive and pressured world of academia. These issues are important for individual academics, for schools wishing to attract good staff, and the wider marketing discipline wanting to ensure high productivity and quality of life amongst its members.

Design/methodology/approach: A conceptual model was developed and empirically tested using self-report survey data from 1,005 academics across five continents. AMOS SEM was used to analyse the data.

Findings: The findings indicate that the most important determinants of publishing success and improved well-being of academics is organisational support rather than a "publish-or-perish" culture.

Research limitations/implications: The use of a self-report survey may have an impact (and potential bias) on the perceived importance and career effect of a "publish-or-perish" culture.

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (<http://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited

However, current levels of the publish-or-perish culture appear to have become harmful, even for top academic publishers. Additional longitudinal data collection is proposed.

Practical implications: The challenge to develop tertiary systems that support and facilitate world-leading research environments, may reside more in organisational support, both perceived and real, rather than a continuation (or adoption) of a publish-or-perish environment. There are personal costs, in the form of health concerns and work-family conflict, associated with academic success, more so for women than men.

Originality/value: This study is the first to empirically demonstrate the influence and importance of “publish-or-perish” and “perceived organisational support” management approaches on marketing academic publishing performance and academic well-being.

Keywords: Marketing, Academic Success, Research work, Higher education, work-life balance, publish-or-perish

Article Classification: Research paper

Publishing success of marketing academics: Antecedents and outcomes

Research, scholarship and publication are central to the work of marketing academics in higher education. Marketing academics are expected to do research, publish and disseminate their research to students, practitioners and the general public. As well as providing financial benefit, publishing research contributes to the 'wider' purposes of the marketing academy to produce new knowledge (Boice & Ferdinand, 1984; Mittal, Feick, & Murshed, 2008).

However, even academics with the necessary research and writing skills can struggle to publish as often as they would like (MacLeod, Steckley, & Murray, 2012). The environment in which research is produced is important to the careers of individual academics, development of school (department and/or faculty) brands (i.e., specific expertise, or as good places to work), and those wanting to reflect about the dynamic and unpredictable nature of incentives to perform and publish.

The extant literature with respect to marketing research, academic output and its impact, has focused on approaches to ranking journals (Richard, Fam, Plimmer, & Gerschewski, 2012; Steward & Lewis, 2010), criticisms of ranking methods (Hofacker, Gleim, & Lawson, 2009; Svensson, 2010), comparison of ranking results (Chan, Lai, & Liano, 2012; Rosenstreich & Wooliscroft, 2012), ethnocentrism in journals (Svensson & Wood, 2007), and publishing performance of individuals and institutions (Polonsky & Carlson, 2011). However, few published studies have investigated what influences marketing academics' publishing success and the effect of these factors on well-being

In his editorial on assessing academic quality in marketing and the UK Research Excellence Framework, Lee (2011) raises significant and fundamental questions regarding academic success; Why do academics do the work they do? Is the work of academics high enough quality? If not, why not? More importantly how could the work and output of marketing academics be improved? The challenge may well be "...to develop a system which supports and facilitates our continuing progress..." (p. 483).

The current study takes a cross disciplinary approach, drawing from the marketing, applied psychology, human resources, and management literatures, to address how the work of marketing academics could be improved by examining two antecedents influencing publishing success, and the impact of publishing success on academics well-being. Toward

this end two alternative management systems for production: 1) perceived organisational support - an approach essentially modelled on social exchange, and 2) publish or perish pressure – a more traditional incentive based and punishment oriented approach are examined from the marketing academic perspective.

Like other knowledge work sectors, recent decades have witnessed a rising pressure to perform in academia. This pattern is global, and has spread from the United States which began emphasising research as the determinant of quality in the 1960s (Augier, March, & Sullivan, 2005). Since then, the performance management of research outputs at national, organisational and individual levels has spread throughout the Anglo countries, and to Europe, Asia and other jurisdictions (Auranen & Nieminen, 2010). How organisations respond to these pressures internally appear critical to market success. Universities, like other organisations, have responded by accentuating incentives through publish-or-perish pressure, and increased support for core staff (Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, & Boudreau, 2000). At the organisational and individual levels, however, a new set of issues is arising. Although a substantial amount of research has taken place regarding scientometrics in marketing and the social sciences, few studies within the marketing domain have considered the motivation for academics to produce new knowledge and the impact of organisational approaches on individual academic success and well-being (e.g., Muzumdar, 2012; Saunders & Wong, 2011).

How to maximise performance (e.g., creating new knowledge) from core employees (e.g., marketing academics) presents a classic marketing management dilemma. It is not clear whether to use pressure, which is essentially a fear-based approach; or to use a more 'positive' communal social exchange based approach. Debates about hard and soft approaches have deep philosophical origins, playing out in both marketing and human resource management literatures. Yet these two approaches have profound consequences on employee wellbeing and performance (Merriman & Deckop, 2007). Advocates of pressure emphasise an economic exchange through employee incentives and consequences; in which tangible rewards are closely contingent on tangible effort (Glassman, Glassman, Champagne, & Zugelder, 2010). In contrast, advocates of a social exchange approach seek to motivate employees and raise performance through what is essentially a trust relationship based on reciprocation across a broad span of both rewards and worker contributions, that are often less

tangible, less time bound and less contingent. Worker perceptions about how much employing organisations support them either enhance or undermine this social exchange (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). This performance management dilemma is a particular salient issue for universities and academics as both face increasing competition for status, funds and jobs.

Traditional incentive based approaches, such as pay for performance, are often effective but can be very harmful if implemented incorrectly. Punishment, and its threat (such as job loss) seem particularly powerful in shaping behaviour but in quite different ways to how rewards work. People narrow the span of what they do in order to escape punishment, even though some jobs, such as that of being an academic, are best done with a broad span of behaviour. In contrast, more recent motivational approaches, such as perceived organisational support (POS) can create a sense of reciprocal obligation within workers, and also be beneficial to worker wellbeing (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). They may, however, not be as potent as traditional incentives. These two approaches – one focussed on incentives in an economic exchange, the other focussed on cognitions in a social exchange, are not mutually exclusive, but they do stand in tension with each other. Both represent different management ideologies.

The need for balance may be most salient for knowledge workers, where observing performance is difficult, discretionary effort is important, and interdependence on others is high (Edgar & Geare, 2012). Their production is often highly customised, and while such workers can control their effort, their outputs are often long term and more stochastic. Such workforces are also commonly global, mobile and demanding. Arguably, knowledge workers provide particular motivational challenges. As well as traditional rewards, they expect workplaces that promote well-being, family friendliness, health, status, and other things that make up a good life (Taylor, 2006). Academia represents an interesting case in the tension between the two motivational theories of incentives (pressure-based) and social exchange, and the diverse rewards that knowledge workers seek.

This paper investigates three questions. The first question concerns whether an incentive system focussed on potential losses as well as gains, as the publish-or-perish system is, lowers or raises performance. Should marketing academics be incentivised for publishing in top tier journals? For this, the evidence is mixed. Loss framed incentive schemes can be

effective in raising performance, apparently because of sunk costs and threats to adapted lifestyle (Glassman, et al., 2010). The job insecurity literature, which implicitly focuses on fear and pressure, is mixed although such insecurity tends to be portrayed as a hindrance to effective job performance (Staufenbiel & König, 2010). It can, however, be a performance enhancing challenge and a spur to extra effort. Some research suggests that job loss can be simultaneously a hindrance and challenger to performance, with varying effects on different types of performance outcomes (Byron, Khazanchi, & Nazarian, 2010). For instance, it is unclear whether individual academics are actually more productive, or whether most productivity gains have occurred by forcing non-publishing academics out, increasing authorship numbers per paper, or doing safe but not very useful research (Saunders & Wong, 2011; van Dalen & Henkens, 2012).

A second question concerns whether publish-or-perish pressure is potentially harmful to marketing academics' wellbeing, in particular life satisfaction, depressive symptoms and health concerns (Miller, Taylor, & Bedeian, 2011). A third question concerns whether alternative publishing performance mechanisms, in particular management of perceived organisational support might be more effective than traditional incentives. Both the high performance and perceived organisational support literatures have recognised social exchange, identity, skills and resources as pathways to productivity (Boxall & Macky, 2009).

These issues are particularly prescient when other life roles, such as being a parent can start to weigh. This role clash weighs particularly on women (Rothausen-Vange, Marler, & Wright, 2005). This paper develops a general model of antecedents and outcomes of marketing academic publication performance and explores the best mix of support and pressure to improve research productivity, by reporting on a global survey of academics in marketing, and the impact of organisational factors ('publish-or-perish pressure' and 'perceived organisational support') associated with individual performance, wellbeing and a positive work –family environment.

Conceptual model and hypotheses

Publish or perish (PP)

The culture of “publish-or-perish” recently became the focus of serious scholarly attention presumably in response to its growth in intensity (Miller, et al., 2011). Between 1988 and

2008 the number of published management academics doubled, as business lecturers sought to join the prestige markets of the publishing game (Certo, Sirmon, & Brymer, 2010). The top-tier publication space, however, grew more slowly, which intensified competition for top journal spaces. The average time for academics to write five articles in top-tier journals consequently almost doubled from five to nine-and-a-half years (Certo, et al.). This may explain why, given that publication in top-tier journals is a prerequisite for academic advancement, pressure to publish predicts stress and professional burnout. Publication stress appears to have grown in the last thirty or so years (Miller, et al., 2011).

While the publish-or-perish literature establishes that stress is a significant outcome of the pressure to publish, it does not satisfactorily resolve whether this might undermine publication performance and success; with publication success being defined as publishing research in top journals (e.g., Top tier, A, or A* ranked). While relatively few studies have examined the effects of stress on “organizationally relevant” employee behaviours, these studies typically link occupational stress and strain to poor employee performance, satisfaction, job involvement, organisational commitment and low creativity (Byron, et al., 2010; Jex & Crossley, 2005).

Alternatively, pressure might be beneficial to publication performance, and insufficient pressure to perform can cause apathy in workers, making them less productive (Moorhead and Griffin, 1995). In fact, the incentives created by publish-or-perish has arguably been ‘too successful’, and encouraged academics to place quantity ahead of quality and to produce work that has the highest chances of being published rather than what is useful (Miller, et al., 2011). Therefore publication success may be defined through quantity or quality of publications. The number of individuals publishing in top-tier management journals increased by more than 50 per cent between 1988 and 2008, and the promise of promotion and financial reward spurred publication output (Certo, et al., 2010). Publication performance, for this study, is therefore defined as the individual’s publication summary; the portfolio of publications over a specific period of time. Based on these counter-arguments about the harmful versus the beneficial effects of stress, we therefore present two alternative hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1a: High publish-or-perish (PP) pressure will be associated with less

marketing academic publication performance (PS).

*Hypothesis 1b: High publish-or-perish (PP) pressure will be associated with **more** marketing academic publication performance (PS).*

Perceived organisational support (POS)

While placing pressure on staff is one motivating technique, perceived organisational support provides an alternative means to improve productivity, and may also improve staff wellbeing (Andreassi & Thompson, 2008). Perceived organisational support hinges on social exchange and psychological contract theories, whereby workers reciprocate perceived deliberate support from the organisation (Rousseau & Parks, 1993). It has reasonable links to both task and extra role performance, particularly when jobs have high autonomy, such as those of academics. The support can be real as well as perceived and directly useful to performance. An example of practical support is formal and informal training and development, which improves employee skill as well as indicating that the employee is valued by the employer (Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997).

The link between perceived organisational support (POS) and employee performance is consistently positive (Andreassi & Thompson, 2008). POS is also associated with lower absenteeism, intentions to quit, and commitment to the organisation (Dikkers, den Dulk, Geurts, & Peper, 2005). Given the above, we suggest:

Hypothesis 2: High perceived organisational support (POS) will be associated with higher marketing academic publication performance (PS).

Health and well-being

Although academics commonly report publication stress, the effect on physical health and psychological well-being is under-researched, yet well acknowledged (Miller, et al., 2011). The occupational stress literature however, has found an unequivocal link between occupational stress and physical and psychological health concerns (Mullen, Kelley, & Kelloway, 2008). It can also undermine cognitive functioning and is associated with severe depressive disorders (Wang & Patten, 2001).

A job demand – control model, which links workload and conflicting psychological demands with their degrees of decision authority and skill utilisation would suggest that the combination of publication pressure, growing competition for space in top journals, and

uncertainty over outcomes would place academics at risk of poor health outcomes (Certo, et al., 2010). While academics arguably have considerable latitude in terms of decision authority and skill use in their approach to researching and writing top-tier journal articles, their published outputs are likely to be constrained and unpredictable. The effort-reward imbalance model of stress may be particularly salient to academics as it is applicable, in part, to individuals “involved in highly competitive career development” and where rewards consist of money, esteem, and status control (Siegrist, 1996, p. 31). According to the model, sustained, heavy effort in exchange for insufficient rewards results in chronic emotional distress and subsequent psychological and physical health concerns (Tsutsumi & Kawakami, 2004). Given the above, we predict:

Hypothesis 3: Publication performance (PS), will reduce marketing academic a) depressive symptoms (DS) and b) physical health concerns (HC).

Many academics struggle to meet the demands of both parenthood and a successful career. Academia’s work pressure is a significant cause of work-related stress in both men and women, and is a particular culprit in generating work-family conflict, alienating workers from their families and reducing their “work-family enrichment” (Beauregard, 2006). Such illustrations inform the literature’s “rational model”, which predicts work-family conflict resulting from incompatible time demands between domains. For academics, a job-strain model might also apply, whereby role demands and perceptions of control at work cause work-to-family interference. Indeed, work stress can “spill over” into the home and strain family relationships (Demerouti, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2005). Given the above, we suggest:

Hypothesis 4a: Publication performance (PS) will decrease marketing academic work-family conflict (WFC).

POS may also help address problems between work and family. The quality of the work-family interface can be helped by practical and emotional support from employers. Practical family-friendly policies include flexible work times, “telecommuting”, onsite childcare, support resource and referral programmes (Kossek & Van Dyne, 2008). Yet many workers worry that their prospects for promotion will suffer if they do not put the needs of the organisation first, despite the formal offering of support programmes by employers (O'Driscoll et al., 2003). Perceptions that the organisation demands long hours are the

strongest antecedents to work-family conflict (WFC), even when controlling for the number of hours actually worked (Beauregard, 2006). A family-friendly culture consists of perceptions that organisational time demands are constrained, with few negative career consequences from choosing work-life balance, and acknowledged managerial support of work-family balance (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002). Employees who perceive a family-friendly work culture experience positive spill over from work to family life (Thompson & Prottas, 2005). Publication performance could also affect family-work conflict (FWC) through work demands (or work support), depending on the prevalent antecedents, whereby family pressures intrude into work. Therefore:

Hypothesis 4b: Publication performance (PS), mediated by WFC, will decrease marketing academic family-work conflict (FWC).

Perceived organisational support can also improve physical and psychological health, and been positively linked to life satisfaction (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Prottas, 2002). Social support provided at work, and family-friendly workplace cultures, have been shown to benefit workers' physical health and psychological well-being (Bond, et al., 2002). The absence of POS or the focus on a publish or perish (PP) culture could be associated with aversive psychological reactions, while the presence of POS should improve life satisfaction (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Given this, we expect to verify:

Hypothesis 5: Perceived organisational support (POS) will positively influence marketing academic life satisfaction (LS) through publication performance (PS).

Academics do receive benefits from publication. As well as tangible rewards such as promotion and grants (RE), there are also psychological rewards that include life satisfaction (LS), and self-esteem (SE). The growth of publish-or-perish pressure in recent years may, however, have focussed attention on tangible as well as self-esteem rewards. We therefore suggest:

Hypothesis 6a: Marketing academic publication performance (PS) will positively influence rewards (RE).

Hypothesis 6b: Marketing academic publication performance (PS), mediated by RE, will positively influence marketing academic self-esteem (SE).

Female academics may experience particular work family conflict because of stronger dual expectations. Research results are, however, mixed with some studies indicating that social change has made gender issues redundant, and others showing it is still highly salient. Some early studies found no gender differences in the antecedents or outcomes of work-to-family or family-to-work interference, and that men and women experienced similar intensities of work-family conflict (Miller, et al., 2011). However, another study found no impact of motherhood on scholarly productivity (Cole & Zuckerman, 1987).

In contrast, other, and more generally recent research has found that work-family conflict still falls heavily on women. The gendered division of labour in the home, whereby female academics report higher childcare and family obligations than do their male counterparts, may explain this difference (Rothausen-Vange, et al., 2005). Another explanation is that more academic men than women have at-home partners to handle greater shares of housework and childcare (Jacobs & Winslow, 2004). Thus, we suggest:

Hypothesis 7a: Female marketing academics will demonstrate more family-work conflict (FWC).

Hypothesis 7b: Female marketing academics will demonstrate less publication performance (PS).

In addition, to these formal hypotheses, since PS is the tangible output manifested by the environment (PP and/or POS) the expectation is that the health and well-being factors will be significantly influenced by both PP and POS mediated through PS, refer to Figure 1

Insert Figure 1 here

Method

Sampling

This study developed a sampling frame of academics by scanning marketing, tourism, and international business departmental web sites of universities across the five continents. Potential respondents were identified from Shanghai Jiao Tong University Ranking 2010 List, Times Supplement University Ranking 2010 List (excluding academics listed on the

Shanghai Jiao Tong List), ANZMAC Conference Directory of Academics, and a further 300 universities located in South Africa, Asia/South Pacific, Australia, New Zealand, USA, Middle East, South America and Europe that were not present on any of the above lists. Respondents included academics from all levels (lecturers, senior lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors, professors, and chair professors).

An email, which included a brief introduction and a link to the Qualtrics online survey, was sent to all potential participants. Two weeks following the initial email invitation, a follow-up email was sent.

Response rate

Of the 3,714 respondents contacted by email, 825 returned out-of office auto-generated messages, 982 had “undeliverable” e-mails (e.g., invalid e-mail addresses), and 87 others declined to participate. In total 1,820 usable responses were collected giving an overall response rate of 49.0%. Following data cleaning and verification (815 respondents were discarded since they did not provide a list of journals they had published in over the specified period to evaluate); the final sample size was 1,005 cases (27.1%). The respondents were full-time academics from the marketing, tourism or international business disciplines.

Respondent analysis

A number of marketing departments around the world consider tourism marketing and international business as marketing sub-domains. The majority of respondents (92.6%) reported themselves under marketing while there were 18 tourism marketing respondents (2.6%) and 33 international business respondents (4.8%). Overall, the respondents report they are active in marketing academia and publish in journals across the three areas. The largest group of respondents, as indicated in Table 1, were aged 35 to 44 (22%), with 10% between the ages of 25 to 34, with a large number (45.3%) of respondents indicating they had published in at least one of the top six journals during the 2006 to 2011 reporting period. There were 471 males (46.9%) and 210 females (20.9%), 324 respondents did not report their gender, of the total 34.4% of the respondents were well established in their academic career (aged 45 to 64).

=====

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (<http://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited

Insert Table 1 here

The majority of respondents were from the United States of America (31.7%), followed by the United Kingdom (9.4%), Australia (7.9%), Canada (4.3%) and New Zealand (3.7%).

Table 2 shows the reported distribution of publications across categories.

Insert Table 2 here

Measures

The unit of analysis is the individual. Except where otherwise noted, all measures consisted of five-point Likert-type scales, anchored with 1 (Strongly disagree) and 5 (Strongly agree). See Appendix A for details of the final items and constructs used in the study. Publish-or-perish (PP) pressure was measured with a new two item five-point Likert-type scale ($\alpha = .868$). Perceived organisational support (POS) was measured with the eight item scale recommended by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986). Academic self-esteem (SE) was measured with three items ($\alpha = .830$). Academic reward (RE) was measured as a new two item scale ($\alpha = .684$).

Work-family conflict (WFC) and family-work conflict (FWC) were measured using the Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian (1996) five item scales, with higher scores indicating increased conflict. The Diener et al. (1985) five-item satisfaction with life (LS) scale was adopted for this study, with high scores indicating satisfaction with life. Depressive symptoms was measured with four items from the depressive symptoms subscale of the General Well-being Schedule using six-point Likert-type scales (Fazio, 1977). A low score (< 3.0) indicates symptoms of depression, $\alpha = .886$. Health concerns (HC) were also measured with two six-point Likert-type scales adapted from that schedule ($\alpha = .782$), low scores (< 3.0) indicate few health concerns.

A publishing performance (PS) measure was calculated by having participants list up to ten journals they had published in over the 2006 to 2011 period. The survey question asked: Which Journals have you published in since 2006? Points were then calculated based on the respondent's stated publication record using the following rating scale: A* journal 7 points;

A journal 5 points; B journal 3 points; C journal 1 point. The journal categories (A*, A, B and C) are based on existing published rankings (e.g., Australian Business Deans Council, 2010). The rating calculation (e.g., 7 points for A* journals, etc.) was adapted from the New Zealand Government's performance-based research fund (PBRF) rating scale, which is in turn heavily influenced by the UK and Australian systems (Tertiary Education Commission, 2005).

Other demographic factors (control factors) included country (regional factors), gender, discipline (e.g., marketing, tourism or IB), career progression, academic focus (e.g., teaching, research, or service), years employed, and family structure (e.g., children, marital status).

Results

To investigate and validate the constructs, confirmatory factor analysis, exploratory factor analysis and reliability analysis was conducted. Figure 1 depicts how the variables are conceptually related. In this model, self-esteem (SE) and publishing reward (RE) are outcomes from publishing success (PS). Whereas publishing success (PS) is influenced by the organisations' publish-or-perish orientation (PP) and perceived organisational support (POS) and all three factors influence the work life balance.

Measurement model

Results from the measurement model demonstrated acceptable convergent validity; construct factor loadings were greater than 0.70 and loaded on the appropriate constructs, the average variance extracted (AVE) exceeded 0.50 and construct reliability (CR) exceeded 0.60, see Appendix A. In addition, the square roots of the AVEs are greater than the corresponding construct correlations, demonstrating acceptable discriminate validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981), see Table 3 for details. The goodness of fit statistics were also satisfactory, RMSEA = .035, CFI = .98, TLI = .97 and NFI = .96 (Bagozzi & Yi, 2012).

=====
Insert Table 3 here
=====

Structural model (hypothesis testing)

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (<http://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited

The results from our structural equation modelling are provided in Table 4 below. All cases with missing data were excluded and outliers were deleted from the sample to provide the final sample (n = 699). The model demonstrates acceptable fit statistics, with RMSEA = .044, SRMR = .062, CFI = .96, TLI = .95, and NFI = .93.

Insert Table 4 here

The model results illustrated in Figure 2 accounts for a large amount of the variance found in depressive symptoms (65%), life satisfaction (55%), publishing performance (34%) and work-family conflict (27%). The model accounts for a lesser amount of variance in self-esteem (20%), health concerns (13%), family-work conflict (22%) and rewards (2%).

Direct effects

The SEM results support H_{1a}; the publish-or-perish environment directly and negatively affects publication performance ($\beta = -0.396, p < .001$), H₂ also finds support from the results; organisational support directly and positively affects publication performance ($\beta = 0.432, p < .001$). Publication performance significantly and positively affects¹ depressive symptoms (H3a; $\beta = -0.806, p < .001$), health concerns (H3b; $\beta = -0.363, p < .001$), work – family conflict (H4a; $\beta = -0.521, p < .001$), life satisfaction (H5; $\beta = 0.741, p < .001$), and rewards (H6a; $\beta = 0.156, p = .020$). Rewards have a positive and direct impact on self-esteem (H6b; $\beta = 0.447, p < .001$), while work – family conflict has a direct positive impact on family – work conflict (H4b; $\beta = 0.466, p < .001$).

Insert Figure 2 here

Indirect effects, PS fully mediates PP and POS

Examining the indirect effects from SEM bootstrapping indicates that POS and PP not only significantly affect PS, but also significantly affect well-being and life satisfaction through

¹ Note: Since DS, HC and WFC items measure the level of depression, health concerns and conflict, negative coefficients indicates lower levels of depression, health concerns and conflict (e.g., a positive effect).

PS, see Table 5. In particular, increases in publish-or-perish culture (PP) increases depressive symptoms (DS; $\beta = 0.319, p = .001$), health concerns (HC; $\beta = 0.143, p = .001$), and work – family conflict (WFC; $\beta = 0.206, p = .001$) through PS. PP also significantly increases FWC through PS and WFC ($\beta = 0.096, p = .001$). Life satisfaction attitudes (LS; $\beta = -0.293, p = .001$), and rewards (RE; $\beta = -0.062, p = .003$) are both significantly negatively influenced by increases in PP. PP also significantly negatively effects self-esteem through PS and RE ($\beta = -0.028, p = .003$).

On the other hand, organisational support (POS) significantly improves depressive symptoms (DS; $\beta = -0.348, p = .001$), health concerns (HC; $\beta = -0.156, p = .001$), work – family conflict (WFC; $\beta = -0.225, p = .001$), life satisfaction (LS; $\beta = 0.320, p = .001$), and rewards (RE; $\beta = 0.067, p = .003$) through PS. In addition POS reduces FWC through PS and WFC ($\beta = -0.105, p = .001$), while increasing SE through PS and RE ($\beta = 0.030, p = .003$).

=====
Insert Table 5 here
=====

In order to determine if the model is fully mediated through PS, an alternative model, with direct paths from PP, POS and PS to DS, HC, WFC, FWC, and LS was tested. Although the Goodness of Fit statistics were acceptable (RMSEA = .044, SRMR = .059, CFI = .96, TLI = .96, and NFI = .94), none of the direct path coefficients from PP and POS to the outcomes were significant. This result supports the more parsimonious PS fully mediated model, see Appendix B for details.

Effect of high and low publication success

The significant total effects of publishing success (PS) supports the direct effects noted above. To test whether the negative PP influence on publishing success results are unduly influenced by poor performing academics, the data was separated into two groups, 1) those who stated they had published in A ranked journals (Hi, $n = 500$) and, 2) those who had not published in A ranked journals (Lo, $n = 199$). An independent samples t test was used to compare the publish-or-perish scores reported by respondents in the “Hi” group ($n=500$) to the scores reported by respondents in the “Lo” group ($n=199$). There were no significant differences in PP scores between the two groups, “Hi” group ($\bar{x} = 3.39, SD = 1.15$) and “Lo”

group ($\bar{x} = 3.49$, $SD = 1.14$), $t(697) = -0.95$, $p = .345$. To estimate the effect of PP on Hi and Lo publication groups, two linear regressions were performed. PP accounted for a significant 1.5% of the variability in publication performance for the Hi publication group, $R^2 = .015$, adjusted $R^2 = .013$, $F(1, 498) = 7.79$, $p = .005$, $\beta = -0.124$. However, PP accounted for a non-significant 0.08% of the variability in publication performance for the Lo publication group, $R^2 = .008$, adjusted $R^2 = .003$, $F(1, 497) = 1.63$, $p = .203$, $\beta = -0.091$. These results indicate that the PP environment has a more negative influence on the high publication performers, than low publication performers.

Further data explorations sought to identify whether a curvilinear relationship existed in the relationship between pressure to publish and publishing success. No curvilinear relationship was found.

Demographic (control) factors

Overall, demographic factors, including country (regional factors), gender, discipline (e.g., marketing, tourism or IB), career progression, academic focus (e.g., teaching, research, service), years employed, and family structure did not produce any significant effect on the general model. However, there were gender group differences.

Gender effect

Since having children appears particularly detrimental to female academic careers and women academics may experience more family – work conflict because of stronger dual expectations (Hunter & Leahey, 2010), two independent t tests were performed.

Since equal variances could not be assumed Welch's t tests were used. The first t test was used to compare family – work conflict reported by female participants ($n = 195$) to family – work conflict reported by male participants ($n = 450$)². The t test was statistically significant, with females reporting 0.45 more conflict ($\bar{x} = 3.63$, $SD = 0.94$) than male participants ($\bar{x} = 3.18$, $SD = 1.10$), $t(426.08) = 5.31$, $p < .001$. This result supports H7a. The second independent t test was used to compare publication performance reported by female participants ($n = 195$) to publication performance reported by male participants ($n = 450$).

² Note: Only 195 of the 210 females, and 450 of the 471 males provided responses to these work – family conflict questions.

This *t* test was also statistically significant, with females reporting 2.98 less in publication performance ($\bar{x} = 7.20$, $SD = 6.00$) than male participants ($\bar{x} = 10.18$, $SD = 8.01$), $t(484.36) = -5.21$, $p < .001$. This result supports H7b.

Discussion

This paper explored the best mix of support and incentives to influence marketing academic publication performance. The findings in this article suggest that marketing academics and educational managers wishing to raise the performance and improve the well-being of academics should look more closely at organisational support rather than additional pressure. As well as being harmful to general academic well-being, the publish-or-perish (PP) approach appears harmful to the productivity of both high and low performing academics. These patterns are consistent across different national university systems. In this study, perceived organisational support (POS) has a strong positive relationship with publishing performance. POS may be particularly salient for knowledge workers, such as academics, because of the self-directed nature of much academic work, and the uncertain relationship between effort and outcome. This supports H1a rather than the counter hypothesis H1b, see Table 6.

=====
Insert Table 6 here
=====

There are several possible explanations why publish-or-perish pressure is associated with reduced publication success. Both the job demand stress and role strain models help explain this result (Häusser, Mojzisch, Niesel, & Schulz-Hardt, 2010). In particular the relationships between PP and depressive symptoms ($\beta = 0.319$) and life satisfaction ($\beta = -0.293$) showed the strongest negative influence (by increasing DS) and provides support for the job demand argument. The role strain argument (between work and family obligations) is also supported by the strong positive relationship between PP and the work family conflict variables ($\beta = 0.206$); as PP increases work-family conflict increases.

PP pressure increases work family conflict, depressive symptoms, and health concerns while decreasing life satisfaction, rewards and self-esteem through PS. Both the job demand stress and role strain explanations are compatible with these results. An important policy and

managerial consideration from these results is the strong negative impact of a publish-or-perish culture on depressive symptoms compared to the positive influence of organisational support.

The finding that women experience more work-family conflict than men, and publish less, indicates that gender inequity appears global and persistent in marketing academia. Women academics may experience particular work family conflict because of stronger dual expectations. This is consistent with other recent research that has found that gender issues are persistent and serious in academia. Female academics report higher childcare and family obligations than do their male counterparts, and more academic men than women have at-home partners to handle greater shares of housework and childcare (Rothausen-Vange, et al., 2005). Possibly, the rise in pressure to publish over the last decade or so has accentuated gender issues that were previously hard to detect.

Although managerial techniques such as publish or perish pressure may have been effective in raising productivity in early stages of university managerialism, it's early gains appear to have declined, and led to some perverse outcomes such as high publication rates but declining research impact (Butler, 2003). Prior research has criticised various side-effects of the publish-or-perish culture, but the assumption that it drives successful publications has typically gone unchallenged. In a sense, publish-or-perish culture has certainly stimulated a surge of academic output over recent decades, and by this measure has arguably accomplished its mission. The publish-or-perish ethos embedded in system wide productivity improvements may have come from picking low hanging fruit. Subsequent use of publish-or-perish pressure appears to have become counterproductive for individual level gains. Findings in this paper point to the need to look at new approaches.

Basic antecedents of perceived organisational support include fair procedures, supervisor support, fair rewards and job conditions (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Consequences of POS include a strong positive effect on job satisfaction and commitment, and a modest positive relationship with employee task performance. In addition, POS appears to have a particular relationship to extra role performance – “actions favourable to the organisation that go beyond assigned responsibilities” (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002, p. 702; Riggle, Edmondson, & Hansen, 2009). POS may be particularly important for fostering the collegial

behaviours that characterise high performing university departments (Edgar & Geare, 2010). Such behaviours include discussing research problems, assisting colleagues with drafts, and sharing common values that drive members to work willingly towards common goals. In contrast, in low performing academic departments staff feel isolated and norms are unclear.

The indirect effects analysis from bootstrapping found significant relationships between both POS and PP on all of the health and well-being indicators. Overall, the analysis indicates that POS significantly reduces work family conflict through publishing success (PS). POS also indirectly decreases depressive symptoms, health concerns and positively influences life satisfaction rewards and self-esteem. As sustained stress tends to reduce performance over time, current management practices may have harmful long term effects on productivity (Jex & Crossley, 2005).

Although the results indicate that publication performance positively affects marketing academic's well-being and life satisfaction, the influence of PP and POS are significantly different. Perceived organisational support significantly decreases work-family conflict and subsequently family-work conflict, whereas publish-or-perish increases both work-family conflict and family-work conflict.

High performance is associated with a mix of tangible and intangible rewards that include academic self-esteem, rewards and life satisfaction. However, publication performance based on a publish-or-perish culture results in personal cost, despite the wide range of rewards associated with it. Finding no significant difference between country effects (as a control factor) is of particular interest and warrants additional future study.

Limitations and future research

As in most cross sectional studies, this study has some limitations, specifically difficulty in inferring causation and the potential for response bias given the self-selection nature of the survey and the use of SEM for analysis. The use of cross-sectional design and influence of self-selection bias, due to self-report survey data, may be evident in the results, since only those with relatively good publication results may have responded. However, the distribution of publication categories reported (see Table 2), although tending toward the high side appears normally distributed, with a number of respondents reporting publications in C categories (or less). Finding more objective measures of publication success would be

beneficial. The potential for endogeneity and the influence of additional factors, not addressed in the model may be of consequence. Our research plan is to continue to conduct similar surveys every three years to build a more comprehensive model based on longitudinal data to analyse.

Further research could explore more fine-grained attempts to raise productivity through POS in order to raise both task and extra role performance. It is unclear which aspects of POS are most important, and whether its effectiveness may be extended beyond social exchange by providing more useful resources. Further research could also explore more closely the incentive management inherent in publish-or-perish pressure, which is viewed as punitive, and framed more as potential losses than gains. The behavioural psychology literature indicates that appropriate framing can effectively raise performance (Glassman, et al., 2010). Other research, however, has found that fear of loss or punishment can be particularly harmful in organisations because it inhibits divergent thinking, risk taking and innovation. Academic research may be particularly vulnerable to the negative effects of punishment or threats of loss because it involves long-term projects of uncertain outputs and outcomes. In these situations forcing a tight contingency between publishing and reward may be poorly aligned with the uncertain, drawn out, challenging and novel nature of research. In such persistence-demanding situations organisational support, and other ‘soft’ management approaches appear a better alternative. It may be because they fit better with the intrinsic motivation and learning goals needed for the “deep learning” that good research entails (Rosenstreich & Wooliscroft, 2012). This approach might also help ensure that published research is useful rather than a result of gaming. Soft approaches might also mitigate work family pressures and job strains, which are important for both the sustained effort that research involves, and equity.

The study has successfully developed and validated a general model that can be used to investigate the effects of antecedents and outcomes of academic publication performance.

Conclusion

Although universities administrations have seen some improvement in publication productivity in the last ten years, current levels of publish-or-perish performance management appear to have become harmful, even for top academic publishers. The loss,

rather than gain orientation of publish-or-perish may be one area for change. The challenge, as Lee (2011) concludes; to develop tertiary systems that support and facilitate a world-leading research environment, may reside more in organisational support, both perceived and real, rather than a continuation (or adoption) of a publish-or-perish environment. Indeed, the existing carrot or stick approach is harmful to academic staff, arguably their families, and are unfair to women.

Appendix

=====
Insert Appendix A here
=====

=====
Insert Appendix B here
=====

References

- Anderson, S., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 28(6), 787-810.
- Andreassi, J. K., & Thompson, C. A. (2008). Work-family culture: Current research and future directions. In K. Korabik, D. S. Lero & D. L. Whitehead (Eds.), *Handbook of work-family integration: Research, theory, and best practices* (pp. 331-351). London, UK: Academic Press.
- Augier, M., March, J. G., & Sullivan, B. N. (2005). Notes on the evolution of a research community: Organization studies in anglophone North America, 1945-2000. *Organization Science*, 16(1), 85-95.
- Auranen, O., & Nieminen, M. (2010). University research funding and publication performance - An international comparison. *Research Policy*, 39(6), 822-834.
- Australian Business Deans Council. (2010). ABDC Journal List 2010 Retrieved 5 March, 2014, from www.abdc.edu.au/download.php?id=461294,245,1
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (2012). Specification, evaluation, and interpretation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 40(1), 8-34.

- Beauregard, A. T. (2006). *Organizational work-home culture and employee well-being: Direct or indirect links?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Atlanta, GA.
- Boice, R., & Ferdinand, J. (1984). Why academicians don't write. *The Journal of Higher Education, 55*(5), 567-582. doi: 10.2307/1981822
- Bond, J. T., Thompson, C., Galinsky, E., & Prottas, D. (2002). Highlights of the national study of the changing workforce: Executive summary (pp. 4). New York, NY: Families and Work Institute.
- Boxall, P., & Macky, K. (2009). Research and theory on high performance work systems: progressing the high involvement stream. *Human Resource Management Journal, 19*(1), 3-23.
- Butler, L. (2003). Explaining Australia's increased share of ISI publications—the effects of a funding formula based on publication counts. *Research Policy, 32*(1), 143-155.
- Byron, K., Khazanchi, S., & Nazarian, D. (2010). The relationship between stressors and creativity: A meta-analysis examining competing theoretical models. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(1), 201-212.
- Cavanaugh, M. A., Boswell, W. R., Roehling, M. V., & Boudreau, J. W. (2000). An empirical examination of self-reported work stress among US managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(1), 65.
- Certo, S. T., Sirmon, D. G., & Brymer, R. A. (2010). Competition and scholarly productivity in management: Investigating changes in scholarship from 1988 to 2008. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 9*(4), 591-606.
- Chan, K. C., Lai, P., & Liano, K. (2012). A threshold citation analysis in marketing research. *European Journal of Marketing, 46*(1/2), 134-156. doi: 10.1108/03090561211189211
- Cole, J. R., & Zuckerman, H. (1987). Marriage, motherhood, and research performance in science. *Scientific American, 255*(2), 119-125.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2005). Spillover and crossover of exhaustion and life satisfaction among dual-earner parents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*(2), 266-289.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*(1), 71-75.
- Dijkers, J. S. E., den Dulk, L., Geurts, S. A. E., & Peper, A. B. (2005). Work-nonwork culture, utilization of work-nonwork arrangements, and employee-related outcomes in two Dutch organizations. In S. A. Y. Poelmans (Ed.), *Work and family: An international research perspective* (pp. 147-172). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Edgar, F., & Geare, A. (2010). Characteristics of high-and low-performing university departments as assessed by the New Zealand performance based research funding (PBRF) exercise. *Australian Accounting Review*, 20(1), 55-63.
- Edgar, F., & Geare, A. (2012). *An examination of the characteristics and environs of knowledge workers*. Paper presented at the Human research Institute of New Zealand Research Forum, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.
- Fazio, A. F. (1977). *A concurrent validation study of the NCHS General Well-Being Schedule*: DIANE Publishing.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50.
- Glassman, M., Glassman, A., Champagne, P. J., & Zugelder, M. T. (2010). Evaluating pay-for-performance systems: Critical issues for implementation. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 42(4), 231-238.
- Häusser, J. A., Mojzisch, A., Niesel, M., & Schulz-Hardt, S. (2010). Ten years on: A review of recent research on the Job Demand–Control (-Support) model and psychological well-being. *Work & Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health & Organisations*, 24(1), 1-35.
- Hofacker, C. F., Gleim, M. R., & Lawson, S. J. (2009). Revealed reader preference for marketing journals. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 37(2), 238-247. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11747-008-0124-y>
- Hunter, L. A., & Leahey, E. (2010). Parenting and research productivity: New evidence and methods. *Social Studies of Science*, 40(3), 433-451.
- Jacobs, J. A., & Winslow, S. E. (2004). The academic life course, time pressures and gender inequality. *Community, Work & Family*, 7(2), 143-161. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1366880042000245443>
- Jex, S. M., & Crossley, C. D. (2005). Organizational consequences. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway & M. R. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of work stress* (pp. 575-599). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Kossek, E. E., & Van Dyne, L. (2008). Face-time matters: A cross-level model of how work-life flexibility influences work performance of individuals and groups. In K. Korabik, D. S. Lero & D. L. Whitehead (Eds.), *Handbook of work-family integration: Research, theory, and best practices* (pp. 305-330). London, UK: Academic Press.
- Lee, N. (2011). Reflections on assessing academic quality in marketing, and the UK REF.

- MacLeod, I., Steckley, L., & Murray, R. (2012). Time is not enough: promoting strategic engagement with writing for publication. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(6), 641-654.
- Merriman, K. K., & Deckop, J. R. (2007). Loss aversion and variable pay: a motivational perspective. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(6), 1026-1041.
- Miller, A. N., Taylor, S. G., & Bedeian, A. G. (2011). Publish or perish: Academic life as management faculty live it. *Career Development International*, 16(5), 422-445. doi: 10.1108/13620431111167751
- Mittal, V., Feick, L., & Murshed, F. (2008). Publish and prosper: The financial impact of publishing by marketing faculty. *Marketing Science*, 27(3), 430-442.
- Mullen, J., Kelley, E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2008). Health and well-being outcomes of the work-family interface. In K. Korabik, D. S. Lero & D. L. Whitehead (Eds.), *Handbook of work-family Integration: Research, theory, and best practices* (1st ed., pp. 191-214). London, UK: Academic.
- Muzumdar, P. (2012). Dilemma of journal ranking: Perplexity regarding research quality. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 16(4), 87-100.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 400-410.
- O'Driscoll, M. P., Poelmans, S., Spector, P. E., Kalliath, T., Allen, T. D., Cooper, C. L., et al. (2003). Family-responsive interventions, perceived organizational and supervisor support, work-family conflict, and psychological strain. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 10(4), 326-344.
- Polonsky, M., & Carlson, L. (2011). Exploring links between publishing performance in different levels of marketing journals. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 23(1), 7-22. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13555851111099961>
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714.
- Richard, J. E., Fam, K.-S., Plimmer, G., & Gerschewski, S. (2012). An update of the *Vox Populi* approach to academic journal rankings: 2011 in review. *Asia Journal of Business Research*, 2(1), 1-18.
- Riggle, R. J., Edmondson, D. R., & Hansen, J. D. (2009). A meta-analysis of the relationship between perceived organizational support and job outcomes: 20 years of research. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(10), 1027-1030.

- Rosenstreich, D., & Wooliscroft, B. (2012). Assessing international journal impact: the case of marketing. *European Business Review*, 24(1), 58-87. doi: 10.1108/09555341211191553
- Rothausen-Vange, T. J., Marler, J. H., & Wright, P. M. (2005). Research productivity, gender, family, and tenure in organization science careers. *Sex Roles*, 53(9/10), 727-738.
- Rousseau, D. M., & Parks, J. M. (1993). The contracts of individuals and organizations. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 1-43). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Saunders, J., & Wong, V. (2011). Manoeuvring towards research decline: The RAE and the decline of Britain's international research standing. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(4), 484-512. doi: 10.1108/03090561111111307
- Siegrist, J. (1996). Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1(1), 27-41. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.1.1.27
- Staufenbiel, T., & König, C. J. (2010). A model for the effects of job insecurity on performance, turnover intention, and absenteeism. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(1), 101-117.
- Steward, M. D., & Lewis, B. R. (2010). A comprehensive analysis of marketing journal rankings. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 32(1), 75-92.
- Svensson, G. (2010). SSCI and its impact factors: a "prisoner's dilemma"? *European Journal of Marketing*, 44(1-2), 23-33. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03090561011008583>
- Svensson, G., & Wood, G. (2007). Ethnocentricity in academic marketing journals: A study of authors, reviewers, editorial boards and editors. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 25(3), 252-270. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02634500710747770>
- Taylor, J. (2006). Managing the unmanageable: the management of research in research-intensive universities. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 18(2), 9.
- Tertiary Education Commission. (2005). *Performance-Based Research Fund: Guidelines 2006*. Wellington, NZ: Crown Copyright, Retrieved from <http://www.tec.govt.nz/Documents/Publications/pbrf-guidelines-2006.pdf>.
- Thompson, C. A., & Prottas, D. J. (2005). Relationships among organizational family support, job autonomy, perceived control, and employee well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(4), 100-118. doi: 10.1016/s0149-2063(00)00067-2
- Tsutsumi, A., & Kawakami, N. (2004). A review of empirical studies on the model of effort-reward imbalance at work: reducing occupational stress by implementing a new theory. *Social Science & Medicine*, 59(11), 2335-2359.

- van Dalen, H. P., & Henkens, K. (2012). Intended and unintended consequences of a publish-or-perish culture: A worldwide survey. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63(7), 1282-1293. doi: 10.1002/asi.22636.
- Wang, J., & Patten, S. B. (2001). Perceived work stress and major depression in the Canadian employed population, 20–49 years old. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(4), 283-289. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.6.4.283
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 82-111.