



**FLOURISHING VIA WORKPLACE RELATIONSHIPS: MOVING
BEYOND INSTRUMENTAL SUPPORT**

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Journal</i>
Manuscript ID:	AMJ-2014-0506.R2
Manuscript Type:	Revision
Keywords:	Attitudes, cognitions, and affect (General) < Attitudes, Cognitions, and Affect < Organizational Behavior < Topic Areas, Social exchange theory < Theoretical Perspectives, Mood and emotions < Attitudes, Cognitions, and Affect < Organizational Behavior < Topic Areas
Abstract:	In a series of qualitative and quantitative studies, we developed a model of the functions of positive work relationships, with an explicit focus on the role that these relationships play in employee flourishing. Stories that employees told about positive relationships at work revealed that relationships serve a broad range of functions, including the traditionally-studied functions of task assistance, career advancement, and emotional support, as well as less studied functions of personal growth, friendship, and the opportunity to give to others. Building on this taxonomy, we validated a scale – the Relationship Functions Inventory – and developed theory suggesting differential linkages between the relationship functions and outcomes indicative of employee flourishing. Results revealed unique associations between functions and outcomes, such that task assistance was most strongly associated with job satisfaction, giving to others was most strongly associated with meaningful work, friendship was most strongly associated with positive emotions at work, and personal growth was most strongly associated with life satisfaction. Our results suggest that work relationships play a key role in promoting employee flourishing, and that examining the differential effects of a taxonomy of relationship functions brings precision to our understand of how relationships impact individual flourishing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Flourishing via Workplace Relationships: Moving Beyond Instrumental Support

Amy E. Colbert
University of Iowa
E-mail: amy-colbert@uiowa.edu

Joyce E. Bono
University of Florida
E-mail: joyce.bono@warrington.ufl.edu

Radostina K. Purvanova
Drake University
E-mail: ina.purvanova@drake.edu

ABSTRACT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

In a series of qualitative and quantitative studies, we developed a model of the functions of positive work relationships, with an explicit focus on the role that these relationships play in employee flourishing. Stories that employees told about positive relationships at work revealed that relationships serve a broad range of functions, including the traditionally-studied functions of task assistance, career advancement, and emotional support, as well as less studied functions of personal growth, friendship, and the opportunity to give to others. Building on this taxonomy, we validated a scale – the Relationship Functions Inventory – and developed theory suggesting differential linkages between the relationship functions and outcomes indicative of employee flourishing. Results revealed unique associations between functions and outcomes, such that task assistance was most strongly associated with job satisfaction, giving to others was most strongly associated with meaningful work, friendship was most strongly associated with positive emotions at work, and personal growth was most strongly associated with life satisfaction. Our results suggest that work relationships play a key role in promoting employee flourishing, and that examining the differential effects of a taxonomy of relationship functions brings precision to our understand of how relationships impact individual flourishing.

FLOURISHING VIA WORKPLACE RELATIONSHIPS:
MOVING BEYOND INSTRUMENTAL SUPPORT

A growing body of literature highlights the importance of positive interpersonal relationships at work (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003; Ragins & Dutton, 2007). As organizations become flatter and increasingly utilize teams to accomplish tasks, work has become more interdependent and relationships are a more important part of the work context (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; Grant & Parker, 2009). Much research has been done on specific types of work relationships, such as mentoring relationships (e.g., Kram, 1985) and leader-follower relationships (e.g., Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Recently, scholars have called for a more complete understanding of work relationships in organizational life with a focus on positive, high-quality work relationships (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003), defined by Ragins and Dutton as “a reoccurring connection between two people that takes place within the context of work . . . and is experienced as mutually beneficial” (2007: 9).

Although many characteristics exemplify positive workplace relationships, central to their definition are the beneficial functions they serve (Rousseau & Ling, 2007). To extend theory about positive work relationships, a more complete understanding of the functions they serve, or the direct benefits they provide, is needed. The social support and mentoring literatures provide a starting point, highlighting the benefits of receiving task and emotional support and career development through interpersonal connections (Kram, 1985; Stroebe & Stroebe, 1996). These literatures view relationships through a social exchange lens (e.g., Blau, 1964); relationship partners exchange resources that are useful in some way, such as money, advice, or support. A key focus of this literature is on how resources help individuals cope with adversity (Feeney & Collins, 2014; Stroebe & Stroebe, 1996). However, recent relationship theory (Feeney

1
2
3 & Collins, 2014) suggests that relationships also help people actively pursue opportunities for
4 growth and development. Consistent with this theory, recent writings by relationship scholars
5 observe that work relationships can be a “source of enrichment, vitality, and learning that helps
6 individuals, groups, and organizations grow, thrive, and flourish” (Ragins & Dutton, 2007: 3)
7 and can provide “an affirming and heady mix of supports and supplies” (Rousseau & Ling, 2007:
8 373). Thus, relationships may provide more than task assistance, career advancement, and
9 emotional support, which have been the focus of existing research on work relationships (Ragins
10 & Cotton, 1999; Stroebe & Stroebe, 1996). Examining work relationships through theoretical
11 lenses of growth and development (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003) may reveal that they provide
12 resources that directly support personal growth and development. Further, a view of relationships
13 that shifts the focus from coping with adversity to supporting growth and development suggests
14 that individuals may become less concerned about gathering and conserving resources (Hobfoll,
15 1989). In this context, relationships may provide individuals with an opportunity to *give* to others
16 (Brown, Nesse, Vinokur, & Smith, 2003; Grant, 2007).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Support for taking a broader and more integrated view of workplace relationships is also
37 suggested by changes in the way employees blend work and personal lives. According to *Forbes*,
38 “professionals have to blend what they do personally and professionally in order to make both
39 work” (Schwabel, 2014). As boundaries between work and nonwork identities become blurred
40 (Ramarajan & Reid, 2013), work relationships are not only sources of instrumental work-
41 relevant support (e.g., task assistance and career advice); they may also be a source of resources
42 with implications beyond the work domain, such as personal growth and friendship (Dutton &
43 Heaphy, 2003; Niven, Holman, & Totterdell, 2012). Because both theory and the changing
44 nature of work point to a broader view of workplace relationships, our primary purpose is to
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 broaden and deepen understanding of the role that positive workplace relationships play in
4 employees' lives, by examining the functions they serve and the impact that these functions have
5
6 on individuals.
7
8

9
10 This research makes several important contributions. First, we extend understanding of
11 workplace relationships by developing a comprehensive taxonomy of the full range of functions
12 they serve. We analyzed critical incident descriptions of good workplace relationships, and found
13 that the functions described were consistent with emerging theory that suggests that relationships
14 promote growth and development and have implications beyond the workplace. In addition to the
15 functions of task assistance, career advancement, and emotional support, work relationships also
16 provided personal growth, friendship, and the opportunity to give to others, showing that work
17 relationships provide more than instrumental, work-related resources. Second, we established
18 differential predictive validity for the expanded taxonomy of relationship functions. Adding
19 relationship functions such as personal growth, friendship, and giving to others not only provides
20 a more comprehensive understanding of the functions served by good work relationships, but
21 also helps us to understand how relationships support outcomes indicative of employee
22 flourishing. While traditionally-studied relationship functions may be associated with general job
23 attitudes, our expanded taxonomy of relationship functions may help solve the puzzle of how
24 work relationships also directly support flourishing, allowing employees to achieve the highest
25 levels of functioning and psychosocial health (Keyes, 2007). As such, we developed and tested
26 theory linking relationship functions to flourishing-consistent outcomes such as finding meaning
27 in work, experiencing positive emotions, and ultimately finding satisfaction in life (Keyes,
28 2007). This analysis showed that work relationships play a key role in promoting growth and
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 development not only through the specific functions that they serve, but also through the
4
5 flourishing outcomes they engender.
6
7

8 Third, we demonstrated the relative impact of each relationship function by studying
9
10 them together. Doing so brings precision to the relationship literature, allowing us to determine
11
12 the unique contributions of relationship functions that have often been studied in isolation.
13
14 Finally, we make a practical contribution to the relationships literature by introducing and
15
16 validating a brief, but comprehensive, scale designed to measure the full range of work-relevant
17
18 relationship functions. Together our theoretical and empirical work represents an important step
19
20 in providing a broader view of the types of resources that positive work relationships can
21
22 generate and transmit efficiently (Rousseau & Ling, 2007). Moreover, by focusing on outcomes
23
24 that represent flourishing and well-being, we present a more integrated picture of the role that
25
26 workplace relationships can play in employees' lives.
27
28
29
30

31 **STUDY 1: IDENTIFYING AND MEASURING RELATIONSHIP FUNCTIONS**

32
33
34 Despite the centrality of relationships in our work lives, we still have much to learn about
35
36 the ways in which relationships are formed and maintained, the processes by which they develop
37
38 and change, and the mechanisms by which they impact outcomes. Answering these types of
39
40 research questions requires a clear understanding of the characteristics of good work
41
42 relationships. Past research has focused on the overall quality of interpersonal interactions; the
43
44 degree of trust, respect, loyalty, and felt mutuality that characterizes good work relationships
45
46 (Ferris, Liden, Munyon, Summers, Basik, & Buckley, 2009; Ragins & Dutton, 2007, Stephens,
47
48 Heaphy, & Dutton, 2012); and the structural features of good relationships (Dutton & Heaphy,
49
50 2003; Stephens et al., 2012). While these elements clearly distinguish good work relationships
51
52 from bad ones, positive work relationships are specifically defined as being mutually beneficial
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and generative (Ragins & Dutton, 2007). In addition to satisfying a fundamental need to belong
4
5 (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), relationships produce resources including energy, self-knowledge,
6
7 and support that fuel growth and development and facilitate the exchange of resources (Ragins &
8
9 Dutton, 2007; Rousseau & Ling, 2007). These descriptions of positive work relationships
10
11 suggest that they may be characterized and differentiated by the resources that they provide and
12
13 the functions that they serve. Consistent with functionalist theorizing in psychology (e.g., Cantor,
14
15 1994; Snyder, 1993), we suggest that the functions served by good work relationships, rather
16
17 than their mere existence, best predicts ultimate outcomes.
18
19
20
21

22 Work has changed considerably since task and emotional support were identified as the
23
24 primary functions of relationships. Technology has blurred lines between work and other life
25
26 domains (e.g., Barley, Meyerson, & Grodal, 2011). Additionally, work is increasingly seen as a
27
28 source of meaning, growth, and energy (Ragins & Dutton, 2007). Given the expanded role of
29
30 work in many people's lives and the increasingly relational nature of the workplace, we argue
31
32 that positive work relationships today serve a wider range of functions than those identified by
33
34 previous research. Recent theory on the functions served by relationships supports this view. In
35
36 their theory on thriving through relationships, Feeney and Collins (2014) observed that previous
37
38 research has focused on how relationships help individuals cope with adversities while ignoring
39
40 the role of relationships in helping individuals actively pursue opportunities for growth and
41
42 development in the absence of adversity. Feeney and Collins's theory on thriving through
43
44 relationships is rooted in attachment theory (Bowlby, 1988), which proposes that relationships
45
46 may serve as a safe haven in times of stress as well as a secure base that promotes growth and
47
48 development. Thus, work relationships may serve functions related to opportunities for personal
49
50 growth and development and provide resources that extend beyond the workplace, in addition to
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the more traditionally studied functions of task assistance, emotional support, and career
4 advancement.
5
6

7
8 Given that theoretical developments and the changing nature of work suggest that work
9 relationships may serve a broader range of functions than previously identified, we collected
10 critical incidents to inductively gain a broader understanding of the functions served by positive
11 work relationships. This methodology can be useful in building theory, in defining a conceptual
12 domain, and in the development of measures because it provides a systematic way of collecting
13 and analyzing the experiences of many individuals (Flanagan, 1954). By comparing lived
14 experiences to existing theory and research (e.g., mentoring: Kram, 1985; social support: Cohen,
15 Mermelstein, Kamarck, & Hoberman, 1985; meaningful connections: Kahn, 2007), new insights
16 can be gained. This initial qualitative work was inductive, with the purpose of developing a more
17 complete taxonomy of relationship functions, which was then used to develop and test theory
18 positing differential links between relationship functions and outcomes indicative of employee
19 flourishing in Study 2.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Phase 1: Understanding Functions of Positive Work Relationships**

37
38 *Method.* We used an online survey to elicit descriptions of good workplace relationships.
39 Participants were 287 individuals, including MBA students (11%), human service workers (9%),
40 employed adults drawn from the Mechanical Turk research participants database (20%), and
41 employed undergraduate students (60%). Participants worked in various industries, including
42 education, government, retail, banking, informational technology, health care, human services,
43 and manufacturing. They were 62% female, and their relationship partners were 58% female.
44
45 Our participants were drawn from all working-age groups (60% <25, 9% 26-30, 15% 31-40,
46 9% 41-50, 6% > 50). Moreover, the number of stories we collected is quite large for qualitative
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 research, resulting in more than 25 stories per age category, except for the over 50 category,
4
5 where we obtained 17 stories. The age range of the partners in the relationships described was
6
7 also broad (39% < 25, 17% 26-30, 21% 31-40, 16% 41-50, 6% > 50; 1% did not report this
8
9 information).

10
11
12 Participants described relationships with peers (52%), bosses (39%), and direct reports
13
14 (9%). We asked respondents to think about a good work relationship they had currently or in the
15
16 recent past. They responded to open-ended questions designed to gather general information
17
18 about the relationship, to elicit specific stories that captured the essence of the relationship, and
19
20 to assess why the relationship was seen as a good one. In the first group surveyed, respondents
21
22 discussed the benefits they received from their relationships; hence, we revised the questions
23
24 slightly to include a prompt specifically focused on benefits (see Appendix A).
25
26
27
28

29
30 Two authors coded 20 randomly chosen stories to identify relationship functions. Using
31
32 Atlas.ti (2005), each author independently identified functions reflected in the critical incidents
33
34 and extracted text describing the functions. This resulted in two independent lists of functions.
35
36 The lists were compared and differences in labels and categorization schemes were resolved by
37
38 re-examining the data together and referencing the existing literature. With this initial list of
39
40 functions as a starting point, the same authors coded 20 different incidents to determine whether
41
42 additional functions would emerge. Revisions were discussed to achieve consensus on a final list
43
44 of six relationship functions (see Table 1).
45
46
47

48
49 A codebook was developed, which included a description of the content domain for each
50
51 function, content excluded from that function, and examples and quotations from the data. Teams
52
53 of six undergraduate psychology students were trained to use the codebook to identify functions
54
55 present in the relationship descriptions. Coders assessed the extent to which each of the six
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 functions was present, using a four-point scale (0 = *the relationship does not serve this function*;
4
5 3 = *the relationship strongly serves this function*). Coders were instructed to exclude incidents
6
7 that did not describe a dyadic work relationship, resulting in 283 coded stories. We computed
8
9 intraclass correlations (Bartko, 1976; James, 1982; Table 2). ICC(1) values, which indicate the
10
11 percent of variance in ratings attributable to the incident, ranged from .38 to .61, and ICC(2)
12
13 values, which estimate the reliability of the aggregated ratings, ranged from .79 to .90. Thus,
14
15 ratings were aggregated across raters.
16
17
18
19

20 **Results.** Table 1 lists the six functions with illustrative quotations. Table 2 presents
21
22 descriptive statistics and correlations. Two functions described specific types of instrumental
23
24 support - task assistance (i.e., helped me get my work done) and career advancement (i.e., helped
25
26 me to advance my career by providing career-related resources). Respondents also described
27
28 their relationships as providing emotional support (i.e., helped me cope with stress by listening to
29
30 my problems and responding in a supportive way). These functions are consistent with important
31
32 functions of work relationships identified in previous research (Kram, 1985; Stroebe & Stroebe,
33
34 1996).
35
36
37
38

39 We also identified three functions that are less prevalent in the literature on workplace
40
41 relationships: personal growth (i.e., helped me grow and develop by challenging and supporting
42
43 me), friendship (i.e., spent time with me outside of work; was a companion), and giving to others
44
45 (i.e., provided me with an opportunity to assist or support others). Friendship was the most
46
47 frequently observed function in our data (mean = 1.30), whereas personal growth was the least
48
49 observed (mean = .24). Correlations between functions were generally low, indicating that
50
51 coders were able to distinguish between the functions, and that employees varied in the functions
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 they received from good work relationships. Moderate co-occurrence was found for personal
4
5 growth and career growth ($r = .33$); all other correlations between functions were less than .25.
6
7

8 ***Brief discussion.*** Our analysis of critical incidents identified six functions served by good
9
10 work relationships. Consistent with the literature on social support (Stroebe & Stroebe, 1996),
11
12 positive work relationships provided both task assistance and emotional support. Moreover, as
13
14 suggested by the mentoring literature (Kram, 1985; Ragins & Cotton, 1999), positive work
15
16 relationships also provided the advice and sponsorship integral to career advancement. Our data
17
18 verify the continued importance of these instrumental functions in today's workplace. But, they
19
20 also suggest that work relationships serve functions that are not prevalent in the existing
21
22 relationships literature.
23
24
25

26
27 First, work relationships served as a source of personal growth. Respondents described
28
29 relationship partners who helped them grow and develop by challenging them, supporting them,
30
31 or serving as role models of who they might become. The personal growth function is consistent
32
33 with Dutton and Heaphy's (2003) suggestion that work relationships should be viewed through
34
35 identity and growth lenses because relationships shape both our work and personal identities.
36
37 This function is also consistent with Feeney and Collins (2014) call for more attention to the
38
39 ways in which relationships promote opportunities for growth and development in addition to the
40
41 ways they provide support during times of stress.
42
43
44
45

46 Second, our data revealed that work relationships are an important source of friendship
47
48 and companionship. Respondents described people they enjoyed being around, who they could
49
50 share anything with, and who they spent time with outside of work. Developing friendships at
51
52 work is consistent with the increasingly blurred boundary between work and life (Ramarajan &
53
54 Reid, 2013). Friendship ties, also referred to as expressive ties (Balkundi & Harrison, 2006),
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 have been studied in the social network literature as characteristic of interpersonal relationships
4 (e.g., Niven et al., 2012); however, we know less about the relative impact of friendship at work,
5
6 especially when studied alongside traditional relationship functions, such as task assistance and
7
8 emotional support.
9
10

11
12 In addition to benefits received by employees, we also identified giving to others as a
13
14 unique function of high quality work relationships. Participants described mentoring others to
15
16 help them grow and develop, and supporting others through difficult times. This is an important
17
18 finding because most research on coworker relationships focuses on benefits received, despite
19
20 evidence that providing support to others may have even greater benefits than receiving it
21
22 (Brown et al., 2003), and that giving to beneficiaries of work also benefits employees (Grant,
23
24 2007, 2008). Given the traditional focus on relationships as a resource for coping with adversity,
25
26 it is not surprising that giving to others has not been highlighted as a primary function of work
27
28 relationships in previous research. In times of adversity, employees are likely to conserve scarce
29
30 resources, reducing their focus on giving to others (Hobfoll, 1989). However, when theoretical
31
32 attention shifts to understanding relationships in times of abundance and growth, giving to others
33
34 is more likely to emerge as a function of work relationships. Our results suggest that giving to
35
36 coworkers is an important function of good work relationships, one that has not been studied
37
38 alongside traditional functions associated with getting benefits from a relationship (Chiaburu &
39
40 Harrison, 2008).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Phase 2: Item Generation**

49
50 *Method.* The next step in our research was to develop a scale to measure the six
51
52 relationship functions. We developed a pool of 55 items, with 7 to 11 items for each function. To
53
54 assess content validity and clarity, we used item assignment procedures (Anderson & Wilson,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1997). Seven graduate psychology students were given the items along with a list of the
4
5 relationship functions and their definitions. They were asked to assign each item to one of six
6
7 functions. They were also asked to rate each item's clarity ("The item is clearly written"), fit
8
9 with the assigned function ("The item fits the category I assigned it to well"), and overlap with
10
11 other functions ("This item overlaps with other functions") using a 5-point scale (1 = *strongly*
12
13 *disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). In cases of overlap, the second function that fit an item was listed.
14
15
16

17
18 **Results.** Using data from these procedures, we developed a scale with three items for
19
20 each function. We selected items that met four criteria: 1) they were assigned to the correct
21
22 function by at least six of the seven raters, 2) they received average scores on clarity and fit of at
23
24 least 4.0, and 3) they had an average overlap score of 3.0 or lower. In cases where more than
25
26 three items met the criteria, we selected items that best matched the construct definition. The 18
27
28 items of the Relationship Function Inventory (RFI) and the data used to select them are presented
29
30 in Appendix B.
31
32

33 34 **Phase 3: Scale Development and Validation**

35
36 In Phase 3, we examined the factor structure of the RFI. We expected the RFI to assess
37
38 six distinct relationship functions, but we also expected the functions would be moderately
39
40 correlated. Relationships characterized by high levels of trust, respect, or closeness may serve
41
42 multiple functions, resulting in co-occurrence of functions (Rousseau & Ling, 2007). Further,
43
44 based on principles of social exchange (Blau, 1964), individuals who are the beneficiaries of
45
46 work relationships that provide task assistance, career advancement, emotional support,
47
48 friendship, or personal growth are likely to reciprocate by giving to others.
49
50
51

52
53 In Phase 3, we also examined the association between the RFI and related variables
54
55 (Hinkin, 1995). Because relationships at work play an important role in shaping overall job
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 satisfaction, we assessed the criterion-related validity of the relationship functions. According to
4
5 seminal theories of job satisfaction, (e.g., Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), employees are more
6
7 satisfied with their jobs when they receive resources they expect. Because five of the six
8
9 relationship functions assess resources that employees may find beneficial (e.g., task assistance,
10
11 career advancement, emotional support, friendship, personal growth), we expected them to be
12
13 positively related to job satisfaction. Moreover, the literature on prosocial behavior suggests that
14
15 people also have a need to help others (Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005). Empirical
16
17 research in the context of non-work relationships has shown that providing social support may
18
19 have even greater benefits than receiving it (Brown et al., 2003). Therefore, we expect that the
20
21 opportunity to give to coworkers will also be associated with job satisfaction.
22
23
24
25
26

27 We further assessed validity by examining the incremental contribution of the
28
29 relationship functions after controlling for coworker satisfaction. Smith et al. (1969) identified
30
31 satisfaction with coworkers as one of five key facets of job satisfaction. We expected coworker
32
33 satisfaction to be positively correlated with at least some of the functions we identified, but we
34
35 also expected that the relationship functions are distinct from coworker satisfaction in that they
36
37 assess specific resources provided by work relationships rather than a general evaluation of
38
39 coworkers. Thus, we expected that the relationship functions explain incremental variance in job
40
41 satisfaction, after controlling for satisfaction with coworkers.
42
43
44

45
46 *Hypothesis 1a: The six relationship functions are positively associated with job*
47
48 *satisfaction.*
49

50
51 *Hypothesis 1b: The six relationship functions explain unique incremental variance in job*
52
53 *satisfaction, after controlling for the effects of coworker satisfaction.*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Method.** We surveyed 177 part-time and full-time MBA students at two Midwestern
4
5 universities, one large public and one small private. Of the 177 participants, 38% were 30 or
6
7 younger, 44% were 31-40, 15% were 41-50, and 3% were over 50 years old; 63% were male. Of
8
9 participants who reported organizational tenure, 13% had been with their organizations for less
10
11 than one year, 18% between 1-2 years, 32% between 3-5 years, and 37% over 5 years.
12
13

14
15 To measure relationship functions, we used the 18-item RFI (3 items per function,
16
17 averaged to form a scale for each function). Participants reported the extent to which their
18
19 current relationships with all of their coworkers provided the benefits listed in the relationship
20
21 function items, using a 5-point response scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*).
22
23 Coworkers were defined as “anyone you work with who is not your direct supervisor.” We
24
25 assessed the internal consistency reliability of each subscale using coefficient alpha (task
26
27 assistance: $\alpha = .82$; career advancement: $\alpha = .87$; emotional support: $\alpha = .86$; friendship: $\alpha = .86$;
28
29 personal growth: $\alpha = .84$; giving to others: $\alpha = .88$).
30
31
32
33

34 Job satisfaction was measured with 5 items from the Brayfield-Rothe scale (Brayfield &
35
36 Rothe, 1951; Judge, Bono, & Locke, 2000). Sample items are “Most days, I am enthusiastic
37
38 about my work” and “I consider my job to be rather unpleasant” (reversed), rated on the same
39
40 scale used for the RFI. Items were averaged to create an overall score for each participant ($\alpha =$
41
42
43
44
45 .75).

46 Satisfaction with coworkers was measured with the well-validated 18-item Job
47
48 Descriptive Index–Coworker scale (Roznowski, 1989), which uses a 3-point rating scale (0 = no,
49
50 the item does not describe my coworkers, 1 = ?, I cannot decide, and 3 = yes, the item describes
51
52 my coworkers; e.g., Hanish, 1992). Sample descriptors are “stimulating,” “boring,” and “talk too
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 much.” Item scores were averaged to form an overall coworker satisfaction score for each
4
5
6 participant ($\alpha = .86$).
7

8 **Results.** We used exploratory factor analysis (i.e., principal axis factoring with an oblique
9
10 rotation [promax]; Conway & Huffcutt, 2003) to determine the number of factors underlying the
11
12 18-item RFI. Exploratory factor analysis supported a six-factor solution; all items had a single
13
14 factor loading over .60 and no cross loading greater than .20 (see Table 3).¹
15
16

17
18 Descriptive statistics and correlations are reported in Table 4. Task assistance (mean =
19
20 3.92) and giving to others (mean = 3.91) were reported most frequently with career advancement
21
22 (mean = 3.29) reported least frequently. Correlations between functions were low to moderate,
23
24 and the pattern was consistent with plausible theoretical links between the functions. For
25
26
27 example, the instrumental functions of task assistance and career advancement were correlated
28
29
30
31

32
33 ¹ Although the RFI was used to assess functions served by relationships with all
34
35 coworkers in the studies reported in this paper, to further establish the robustness of the RFI, we
36
37 collected additional data in two new samples—a sample of 252 members of a large nonprofit
38
39 agency in the Midwest United States and a sample of 76 employed students enrolled in a senior-
40
41 level undergraduate class in a large university in the Midwest United States. In these samples, we
42
43 asked respondents to first think of a specific individual at work with whom they have a good
44
45 work relationship, and then to indicate whether that individual is their boss, their peer, or their
46
47 subordinate. Participants completed the RFI with that particular target in mind. Hence, we had an
48
49 opportunity to compare the factor structure of the RFI in different instruction conditions –
50
51 thinking of coworkers in general (Study 2 sample), thinking of a specific coworker (137
52
53 participants from new samples), and thinking of a specific supervisor (148 participants from new
54
55 samples). We used multi-group confirmatory factor analysis to test measurement invariance of
56
57 the factor structures in these three situations (co-workers in general, a specific co-worker, a
58
59 specific boss). First, to test for configural invariance, we ran an unconstrained model, allowing
60
free estimation of the factor structure in each sample. Model fit was good ($\chi^2_{\text{unconstrained (360)}} =$
 $590.94, p < .00$; CFI = .98, SRMR = .06, RMSEA = .06), providing initial evidence that the three
groups are configurally equivalent. Next, to further ensure that item loadings are equivalent
across groups, we tested for metric equivalence. We constrained the model, forcing the same
factor structure to fit to the data in each of the three samples. That also yielded a good model fit
($\chi^2_{\text{constrained (384)}} = 621.73, p < .00$; CFI = .98, SRMR = .06, RMSEA = .06). Finally, we verified
measurement invariance by the chi-square difference test, which was non-significant ($\chi^2_{\text{difference}}$
 $(24) = 30.74, p = .16$).

1
2
3 .44, the socio-emotional functions of friendship and emotional support were correlated .49, and
4
5 the growth functions of career advancement and personal growth were correlated .42.
6
7

8 To provide preliminary criterion-related and discriminant validity evidence, we examined
9
10 correlations between the relationship functions, coworker satisfaction, and overall job
11
12 satisfaction (see Table 4). Correlations with coworker satisfaction ranged from .46 for career
13
14 advancement to .10 for giving to others (average $r = .30$). Correlations with overall job
15
16 satisfaction were slightly smaller (average $r = .24$), with moderate and statistically significant
17
18 correlations for task assistance ($r = .31$), career advancement ($r = .35$), personal growth ($r = .26$),
19
20 and giving to others ($r = .39$); emotional support and friendship were not significantly associated
21
22 with job satisfaction.
23
24
25
26

27 To further demonstrate the distinctiveness of the relationship functions from coworker
28
29 satisfaction, we used hierarchical regression (see Table 5). First, we regressed job satisfaction on
30
31 coworker satisfaction and then entered the six relationship functions in a second step. We then
32
33 repeated this regression but reversed the order of entry; relationship functions were entered first
34
35 with coworker satisfaction added in Step 2. Coworker satisfaction explained 7% of the variance
36
37 in job satisfaction when it was entered first, but did not explain significant incremental variance
38
39 when entered in step 2 ($\Delta R^2 = .01$). When relationship functions were entered first, they
40
41 explained 24% of the variance in job satisfaction. They also explained 18% of the variance in job
42
43 satisfaction, after controlling for coworker satisfaction. Thus, Hypotheses 1a and 1b were
44
45 supported.² Although four of the six functions (task assistance, career advancement, personal
46
47 growth, and giving to others) were significantly correlated with job satisfaction, regression
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 ² A reviewer raised the issue that the comparison of the RFI and JDI-Coworker Satisfaction might be impacted by
55 the fact that our outcome—job satisfaction—and the RFI are measured on a 5-point scale, whereas JDI-Coworker
56 satisfaction is measured on a 3-point scale. Hence, we repeated these analyses using JDI-work satisfaction, which is
57 measured on a 3-point scale, as the outcome variable. Results mirrored those reported in Table 5, providing further
58 evidence that the relationship functions are distinct from broad satisfaction with coworkers.
59
60

1
2
3 results showed that when the functions were considered together, only giving to others ($\beta = .28$)
4
5 and career advancement ($\beta = .24$) were significantly related to job satisfaction.
6
7

8 **Brief discussion.** In Phase 3, we provided evidence that the 18-item RFI assesses six
9
10 distinct, but related functions. As a set, these functions explained unique variance in job
11
12 satisfaction, even after controlling for coworker satisfaction. This suggests that the relationship
13
14 functions are not simply an alternative way of evaluating overall relationship quality. Rather,
15
16 they assess resources and benefits that come from good relationships, that can be used to satisfy
17
18 employee needs, and that positively impact employees' evaluations of their jobs.
19
20

21
22 Of the six relationship functions, the opportunity to give to others was most strongly
23
24 related to job satisfaction. This corroborates insights from our critical incidents that good work
25
26 relationships not only provide valuable resources, but also fulfill the need to give to others. This
27
28 may be because giving to others creates a sense of mutuality (Stephens et al., 2012), which
29
30 strengthens positive relationships. Career advancement was also significantly related to job
31
32 satisfaction. This finding suggests that relationships with colleagues play an important role in
33
34 promoting employee growth and development. Although career advancement was the most
35
36 infrequently experienced function (mean = 3.29), employees lucky enough to have coworkers
37
38 who supported their climb up the career ladder were more satisfied with their jobs.
39
40
41
42

43
44 It is important to note that the role of career advancement in job satisfaction may be
45
46 heightened in this sample of MBA students, many of whom are pursuing the MBA specifically
47
48 for the purpose of career advancement; they may value this relationship function more highly
49
50 during their present career stage. For this reason, in Study 2 we used a diverse sample of working
51
52 adults drawn from a wide range of industries to further explore the nomological net of the
53
54 relationship functions. Additionally, we address another central purpose of this research, which
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 was to theorize and test a unique pattern of relationships between the relationship functions and
4 specific outcomes, bringing precision to the relationships literature. Specifically, we examined
5 how relationships promote employee flourishing. As such, one of the key contributions of our
6 expanded taxonomy of relationship functions is that the newly-identified functions provide
7 unique insight into how relationships engender outcomes such as meaningfulness, positive
8 emotions, and life satisfaction.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **STUDY 2: RELATIONSHIP FUNCTIONS AND EMPLOYEE FLOURISHING**

18
19
20 The primary purpose of Study 2 was to examine the unique effects of the six relationship
21 functions on outcomes indicative of employee flourishing (Keyes, 2007). Most research on work
22 relationships has examined the association between broad measures of relationship quality and
23 general employee attitudes (e.g., Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006), but
24 it is also important to examine differential associations between specific relationship functions
25 and a wider range of outcomes. Whereas some broad outcomes, such as job satisfaction, may be
26 associated with multiple relationship functions, other outcomes may be uniquely associated with
27 only one, or a small subset, of the functions. By developing theory about which functions are
28 most strongly associated with each specific flourishing outcome, we extend the literature on
29 work relationships, adding precision to our understanding of the ways that workplace
30 relationships affect employees. This approach also allows us to compare the potential benefits of
31 lesser-studied functions (personal growth, friendship, and giving to others) in the context of the
32 more traditionally-studied functions (task assistance, career advancement, and emotional
33 support).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Traditionally-studied functions, such as task assistance, career advancement, and
54 emotional support, may predict basic job satisfaction, but the functions of personal growth,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 friendship, and giving to others are likely to be especially relevant in predicting outcomes that
4 capture employee flourishing. Employee flourishing occurs when employees experience high
5 levels of well-being and are fully functioning (Keyes, 2007). In his research on flourishing and
6 mental health, Keyes (2005) identified a number of indicators of flourishing, including positive
7 emotions and positive psychological functioning. Given the expanded conceptualization of
8 positive work relationships that we developed in Study 1, we suggest that positive workplace
9 relationships are indirect and distal predictors of employee flourishing via the functions they
10 serve (see Figure 1). It seems likely that relationship functions are not only associated with
11 higher levels of job satisfaction, but also support employee functioning at its highest levels.
12 Hence, we develop theory to suggest that personal growth, friendship, and giving to others
13 predict outcomes indicative of positive emotions at work and positive psychological functioning
14 (e.g., work meaningfulness, life satisfaction), providing evidence that functions that are
15 consistent with a growth and development perspective ultimately lead to outcomes associated
16 with individual flourishing. Finally, Study 2 provides additional validity evidence for the RFI, by
17 confirming its factor structure in a diverse sample of working adults.

18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 **Theoretical Development**

40
41 *Meaningful work.* When people are at peak levels of functioning or flourishing, they see
42 their lives as meaningful and valuable, finding purpose in life (Keyes, 2007). Of the six
43 relationship functions, we expect that the opportunity to give to others is most strongly
44 associated with employees' perceptions that work is meaningful. Meaningful work is "work
45 experienced as particularly significant and holding more positive meaning for individuals"
46 (Rosso, Dekas, & Wrzesniewski, 2010: 95). Judgments of meaningfulness are shaped by the
47 extent to which work is consistent with one's values and identities (Pratt & Ashforth, 2003;
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Rosso et al., 2010). When work is consistent with employees' identities, it becomes an
4
5 opportunity to live out cherished values and enact an authentic self (Kernis & Goldman, 2006).
6
7 However, perceptions of meaningfulness are not solely based on individual fulfillment. Work
8
9 may also be perceived as meaningful when it is accomplished in the context of a valued group.
10
11 When work is done as a part of a group or organization, identification with the group and a sense
12
13 of belonging also contributes to perceptions of meaningfulness (Pratt & Ashforth, 2003; Rosso et
14
15 al., 2010).
16
17
18

19
20 Although a great deal of research has investigated the factors that shape perceptions of
21
22 meaningfulness at work, we know little about the role of dyadic interpersonal relationships
23
24 (Rosso et al., 2010). Recent research suggests that connections with beneficiaries of one's work
25
26 are motivating because they highlight the prosocial impact that work can have on others (Grant,
27
28 2007, 2008). This research has focused on beneficiaries of one's work as a source of
29
30 meaningfulness, but giving to coworkers may also reinforce perceptions of meaningfulness.
31
32
33 When describing the experience of giving to others in their critical incidents, respondents noted
34
35 their pride in the impact that they had on coworkers. For example, one respondent observed, "I
36
37 enjoyed helping her make difficult decisions, and felt privileged to help her grow professionally
38
39 and personally." Similarly, Grant, Dutton, and Rosso (2008) found that formal employee support
40
41 programs may be associated with stronger affective organizational commitment because they
42
43 provide employees with the opportunity to assist coworkers, which reinforces their identity as
44
45 caring people. Building on this research, we propose that informal opportunities to give to
46
47 coworkers through interpersonal relationships will increase perceptions of meaningfulness.
48
49
50
51

52
53 Conversely, we do not expect functions associated with gaining benefits to affect
54
55 perceptions that work is meaningful. It is possible that receiving resources such as task
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 assistance, career advice, or emotional support may help employees achieve goals at work.

4
5 However, receiving these resources may also indicate to employees that they need help in
6
7
8 overcoming challenges and meeting work goals, thus posing a threat to self-esteem (Deelstra,
9
10 Peeters, Schaufeli, Stroebe, Zijlstra, & van Doornen, 2003). This is problematic because self-
11
12 esteem has been posited to be a necessary foundation for meaningful work (Rosso et al., 2010).
13
14 For these reasons, we expect giving to others will be the relationship function that is most
15
16 strongly associated with perceptions of meaningfulness at work.
17
18

19
20 *Hypothesis 2: Giving to others is positively related to perceptions of meaningful work.*

21
22 **Positive emotions at work.** Positive emotions are another important component of
23
24 flourishing (Keyes, 2007). In the broader social psychological literature, the link between social
25
26 relationships and positive emotions is well documented (e.g., Berscheid & Reis, 1998). Clark and
27
28 Watson (1988) found that socializing is more commonly associated with positive affect than any
29
30 other life activity. Argyle even went so far as to state that “social relationships have a powerful
31
32 effect on happiness and other aspects of well-being, and are perhaps its greatest single cause”
33
34 (2001: 71). Theoretically, the link between social relationships and positive emotions can be
35
36 explained in several ways. As we have argued throughout this paper, social relationships provide
37
38 resources, which may contribute to the happiness and well-being of the recipient. However, even
39
40 when relationships do not provide direct resources, they may satisfy human’s enduring need to
41
42 belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Both resources provided by work relationships and
43
44 satisfaction of the need to belong may lead to positive emotions at work.
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Despite the prevalence of evidence linking social relationships with positive affect,
52
53 happiness, and well-being, the mere existence of social relationships and frequency of contact
54
55 with others are not strong correlates of positive affect and subjective well-being (Lucas &
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Dyrenforth, 2006). Instead, close relationships that satisfy the need to belong are more likely to
4 contribute to happiness (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Such relationships are characterized by
5 frequent and affectively pleasant interactions that are based on concern for each other's welfare
6 (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Intimacy theory also suggests that high quality relationships – those
7 in which partners feel close and connected, have the ability to reveal central aspects of the self to
8 each other, and perceive that partners are responsive – are more likely to engender positive
9 emotions (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Specifically, Reis, Sheldon, Gable, Roscoe, and Ryan (2000)
10 found that feelings of relatedness associated with positive affect came from feeling understood
11 and appreciated, talking about something meaningful, or sharing fun activities.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 Given the evidence that certain types of relationships are more likely to be associated
26 with positive emotions, we propose that two of our six relationship functions will engender
27 positive emotions at work. First, friendship represents the type of close relationship that has
28 previously been associated with positive affect (Thoits, 2011). When work relationships develop
29 into friendships, partners are more likely to be willing to reveal central aspects of the self and are
30 more likely to perceive that partners are responsive. Friendships go beyond typical coworker
31 relationships, with partners being more likely to spend time outside of work and exhibit active
32 care toward one another. Further, friends are likely to share fun activities together. Because of
33 this, friendships are often pleasant, providing an important source of positive emotions at work
34 (Lucas & Dyrenforth, 2006). When talking about relationships that had developed into
35 friendships, participants in our critical incidents study noted that they were able to “get to know
36 each other outside of the work environment,” and described the relationship partner as someone
37 “you can share anything with.”
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Second, when studied together with other relationship functions, we also propose that giving to others is likely to be associated with positive emotions at work. It is relationships in which individuals both receive resources and also have the chance to give back that are most likely to engender positive emotions, because of their mutuality (Ragins & Dutton, 2007; Stephens et al., 2012). Further, giving to others may allow individuals to satisfy a need and validate their identities as caring people (Grant et al., 2008), which may also lead to the experience of positive emotions. Given this, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 3: Friendship (a) and giving to others (b) are positively related to positive emotions at work.

Life satisfaction. Another important component of human flourishing is experiencing satisfaction with one's life (Keyes, 2007). Because work is an important domain in many people's lives (Judge & Watanabe, 1993), being satisfied at work contributes to satisfaction in life. Thus, relationship functions, such as task assistance, career advancement, and emotional support, may be positively related to life satisfaction because of their positive impact on job satisfaction. However, these indirect associations between relationship functions and life satisfaction are likely to be distal and weak. Relationships that provide functions easily transferred to other life domains may have stronger and more direct relationships with life satisfaction (e.g., Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). For example, personal growth may contribute not only to work but also to the development of life skills and competencies that extend outside the work domain. As one of our critical incident participants noted, work relationships can provide insights into family or religious issues in addition to building work competencies. These non-work-related areas of growth may directly impact life satisfaction. Further, friendships that begin at work may also extend outside of the work context, providing support in other life roles that

1
2
3 has a positive impact on life satisfaction. Therefore, we expect the personal growth and
4
5 friendship functions to be more strongly related to life satisfaction than work-relevant functions
6
7 such as task assistance or career development.
8
9

10
11 However, it is not only what we get from work relationships that influences life
12
13 satisfaction. The opportunity to give to others fulfills the need to help others and reinforces a
14
15 core personal identity as a caring person (Grant et al., 2008). While this may make work more
16
17 meaningful, as noted above, reinforcing core personal identities may also lead to fulfillment
18
19 outside of the work domain, which contributes directly to life satisfaction. Therefore, we propose
20
21 the following hypotheses:
22
23

24
25 *Hypothesis 4: Personal growth (a), friendship (b), and giving to others (c) are positively*
26
27 *related to life satisfaction.*
28

29 **Method**

30
31
32 ***Participants and procedures.*** Participants were drawn from the Study Response Project,
33
34 an online data collection service that links researchers with a diverse group of adult research
35
36 participants (<http://www.studyresponse.net/index.htm>). This database has been used in prior
37
38 studies (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006; Umphress, Bingham, & Mitchell, 2010), in part because it
39
40 includes workers from a wide variety of organizations and occupations. Selection criteria for
41
42 participants in this project were 300 individuals who were a) employed 32 hours per week or
43
44 more, b) married to or living with a partner who was also enrolled in Study Response, c) between
45
46 the ages of 18 and 65, and d) U.S. or Canadian residents. Focal participants received two online
47
48 surveys. The first included the relationship function items, positive affectivity, and
49
50 demographics, and the second (approximately one month later) included the outcome measures:
51
52 job satisfaction, work meaningfulness, positive emotions at work, and life satisfaction. We also
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sent an online survey to the partner about three weeks after the first focal survey and a week
4 before the second one, thus separating partner reports from those of focal participants. Partners
5 reported on focal participants' job satisfaction, work meaningfulness, and life satisfaction.
6
7 Survey links were sent directly to the intended recipient (focal participants and partners) by
8
9 Study Response staff.
10
11
12
13

14
15 Of the 267 participants who completed our first survey, 252 (94%) completed the second
16 survey. We received partner surveys from 227 partners (90%), resulting in a matched sample
17 (both participant surveys and partner survey) of 210. Data collected via anonymous Internet
18 surveys may include some degree of careless or inattentive responding, though the true
19 magnitude of the problem is hard to establish (Johnson, 2005; Meade & Craig, 2012). To address
20 this concern, we adopted a proactive approach and incorporated two instructed response items
21 into each survey. Each instructed response item told respondents to select a specific response
22 (e.g., Please select "Strongly Agree" for this item). This procedure gave us a 96% probability of
23 catching careless respondents (see formula in Meade and Craig, 2012).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Of the 210 pairs, 41 participants and 30 partners missed at least one of the instructed
37 response items, resulting in 59 pairs in which at least one person missed an instructed response.
38 It is likely that some missed instructed responses represent common measurement error, such as
39 accidentally clicking on the wrong response. Nonetheless, we took a conservative approach and
40 analyzed only data from 151 participant pairs who responded correctly to all instructed items. Of
41 the 151 participants, 53.0% were male; 24.5% were 30 years old or under, 42.4% were between
42 31 and 40 years old, 33.1% were 41 years old or older. With regard to education, 7.3% had a
43 high school degree, 15.9% had some college coursework or an associate's degree, 49.0% had a
44 bachelor's degree, and 27.8% had an advanced degree.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Measures.** We measured relationship functions with the 18-item RFI, using the same
4 instructions and response scale as in Study 1, Phase 3. As in Study 1, participants rated the extent
5 to which their current relationships with all of their coworkers provided the benefits listed in the
6 relationship function items, using a 5-point response scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly*
7 *agree*). We assessed the internal consistency reliability of each dimension using coefficient alpha
8 (task assistance: $\alpha = .72$; career advancement: $\alpha = .89$; emotional support: $\alpha = .84$; personal
9 growth: $\alpha = .87$; friendship: $\alpha = .85$; giving to others: $\alpha = .80$).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 Job satisfaction was measured with five items from the Brayfield and Rothe (1951) scale,
21 as in Study 1, and was completed by both participants and partners using a 5-point response scale
22 (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*; self : $\alpha = .83$, partner: $\alpha = .80$). Partners were
23 instructed to think about how the participant felt about his or her job. Partners' responses provide
24 an independent observer assessment of the focal participant's self-reported states and feelings,
25 and past research has shown that those assessments are accurate (Judge et al., 2000). Unless
26 otherwise noted, all subsequent scales were also included on the partners' survey.

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 Work meaningfulness was measured with the 3-item scale from the psychological
37 empowerment measure developed by Spreitzer (1995). Spreitzer reported high test-retest and
38 internal consistency reliability in two samples, as well as good convergent and discriminant
39 validity of the scale. Other research has also used the scale successfully (e.g., Liden, Wayne, &
40 Sparrowe, 2000). A sample item is: "The work I do is very important to me." A 5-point response
41 scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*; self : $\alpha = .92$, partner: $\alpha = .89$) was used.

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 To represent the full range of positive emotions that employees might experience at work,
52 we used adjectives drawn from the existing literature. We started with five mood terms drawn
53 from the Scale of Positive and Negative Experience (Diener, Wirtz, Tov, Kim-Prieto, Choi,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Oishi, et al., 2010). However, because that scale tends to focus on low to moderate arousal
4
5 positive emotions, we added four additional mood adjectives that represent “activated positive
6
7 affect” (Sonnentag & Niessen, 2008: 437). This allowed us to capture low and high arousal
8
9 positive emotions, both of which have been associated with well-being and flourishing (Diener et
10
11 al., 2010; Shirom, 2011). In all, participants responded to nine positive emotion terms:
12
13 “pleasant,” “good,” “positive,” “joyful,” “happy,” “vigorous,” “lively,” “full of pep,” and
14
15 “active.” They were instructed to think about how frequently they experienced these feelings at
16
17 work on a 5-point response scale (1 = *very rarely or never* to 5 = *very often or always*; self : $\alpha =$
18
19 .92). This scale was not included in the partner survey, as partners cannot observe participants’
20
21 emotions at work.
22
23
24
25
26

27 To measure life satisfaction, we used the 5-item Satisfaction with Life scale (Diener,
28
29 Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). Sample items are, “In most ways, my life is close to ideal”
30
31 and “The conditions of my life are excellent.” Consistent with the original scale, a 7-point
32
33 response scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*; self : $\alpha = .91$, partner: $\alpha = .92$) was
34
35 used.
36
37
38

39 Because trait positive affectivity may both facilitate the formation of good work
40
41 relationships and affect some of our outcome variables (e.g., job satisfaction; Thoresen, Kaplan,
42
43 Barsky, Warren, & deChermont, 2003) we controlled for it in our regression analysis. We
44
45 assessed trait positive affectivity using the 10-item positive affectivity scale from the PANAS
46
47 (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Respondents were instructed to indicate the extent to which
48
49 they generally felt each emotion or feeling listed (e.g., interested, excited) using a 5-point
50
51 response scale (1 = *very slightly or not at all* to 5 = *very much*; $\alpha = .91$).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Results

Means, standard deviations and intercorrelations are presented in Table 6. As expected—given that they were intended to measure the same construct—self and partner reports of job satisfaction, meaningfulness of work, and life satisfaction were highly correlated ($r = .76, .74, .73$, respectively). Therefore, the average of self and partner ratings for these dependent variables is used in all analysis. As in Study 1, the relationship functions were also correlated with each other (range $r = .43$ to $.67$). We conducted a CFA to confirm the structure of the RFI. Results indicated that the six factor structure derived in Study 1 also fit the data well in this sample ($\chi^2 = 264.63$, $df = 120$; SRMR = $.06$, CFI = $.98$, RMSEA = $.08$). Two alternative five-factor measurement models, in which conceptually similar functions were combined into a single factor, were also tested. A model with career advancement and personal growth combined into a single factor was a significantly worse fit to the data ($\Delta\chi^2 = 134.10$, $\Delta df = 1$) as was a model with a single factor for friendship and emotional support items ($\Delta\chi^2 = 170.21$, $\Delta df = 1$).

The primary purpose of this study was to provide additional evidence that the relationship functions we identified are consequential for employees, especially in terms of promoting individual flourishing. In the interest of bringing precision to relationship theory, we examined the unique associations between relationship functions and specific outcomes. Table 7 presents results of a series of regressions in which we regressed each outcome on all six relationship functions; positive affectivity was included as a control.

As in Study 1, we found that the relationship functions explained significant variance in job satisfaction even after controlling for positive affectivity; however, the individual predictors were slightly different in this sample than in Study 1. In this sample, task assistance was the only significant predictor of job satisfaction ($\beta = .31$). The relationship functions explained significant

1
2
3 variance in meaningful work. Consistent with Hypothesis 2, giving to others was the only
4
5 significant predictor of meaningful work ($\beta = .34$).
6
7

8 Hypothesis 3, which predicted that friendship and giving to others were the functions
9
10 most likely to be associated with positive emotions at work, was partially supported. Positive
11
12 emotions at work were significantly associated with friendship ($\beta = .21$), but not with giving to
13
14 others. As predicted in Hypothesis 4, life satisfaction was significantly associated with personal
15
16 growth ($\beta = .26$); however, neither friendship nor giving to others was a significant predictor of
17
18 life satisfaction.
19
20
21

22 Since our goal was to better understand unique relationships between the relationship
23
24 functions and our flourishing outcomes, we also conducted relative weights analyses to examine
25
26 the relative contribution of each function (see Table 8). Results revealed a clear pattern of
27
28 differential effects. Of the six relationship functions, the most important predictor of job
29
30 satisfaction was task assistance. Giving to others was the most important predictor of meaningful
31
32 work. Friendship was the most important predictor of positive emotions at work, and personal
33
34 growth had the strongest impact on life satisfaction. Thus, although our hypotheses were not
35
36 completely supported, clear evidence of differential outcomes of the relationship functions was
37
38 found. It is also notable that the three relationship functions that have not traditionally been
39
40 included in taxonomies of relationship functions explained the highest percentage of variance in
41
42 outcomes indicative of flourishing.
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Post hoc analyses.* Based on reviewer questions about the effects of gender and age on
49
50 our results, we conducted several post hoc analyses. First, we reran Table 7 regressions with age
51
52 and gender as controls (along with positive affectivity) and found no substantive changes in the
53
54 results. Second, we created a set of interaction terms representing the interaction between each of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the six relationship functions and gender. This block of interaction terms did not significantly
4
5 impact any of our dependent variables. Finally, we created a set of interaction terms representing
6
7 the interaction between the six relationship functions and age, which was assessed categorically:
8
9 30 and under, 31 to 40, and over 40 years of age. The block of interactions explained significant
10
11 variance in life satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = .08, p < .01$); age moderated the effects of both personal
12
13 growth ($B = .66, p < .01$) and emotional support ($B = -.46, p < .05$) on life satisfaction. As shown
14
15 in Figure 2, personal growth has a slightly negative relationship with life satisfaction for those 30
16
17 and younger; however, the relationship is increasingly positive at older ages. Conversely, the
18
19 relationship between emotional support and life satisfaction is positive for those 30 and younger,
20
21 and negative for those over 40. Although the block of interactions did not reach significance at
22
23 traditional levels for job satisfaction ($p = .14$) or positive emotions ($p = .08$), age significantly
24
25 moderated the effects of personal growth and emotional support on these outcomes as well, with
26
27 the pattern of results similar to those for life satisfaction. There were no significant age effects in
28
29 predicting meaningful work; giving to others was a significant predictor across ages.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 GENERAL DISCUSSION

37
38 Work relationships may be among our most significant relationships. These relationships
39
40 provide work-relevant resources such as task assistance, emotional support, and career
41
42 advancement, but our critical incidents showed that—consistent with theory (Feeney & Collins,
43
44 2014; Kahn, 2007; Ragins & Dutton, 2007)—good work relationships also support personal
45
46 growth, are a source of friendship, and provide the opportunity to give to others. We expected to
47
48 identify additional functions of good workplace relationships because the world of work has
49
50 changed. An increasing reliance on relational means of organizing and increasingly porous work-
51
52 life boundaries set the stage for work relationships to serve a broader range of functions than in
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the past. Further, recent theory (Feeney & Collins, 2014) suggests that relationships not only
4 help us cope with adversity, but also provide opportunities for the pursuit of growth and
5 development. Thus, we expected and found that relationships in today's workplace are likely to
6 provide more than instrumental benefits; they also support growth and development and
7 ultimately promote individual flourishing.
8
9

10
11 Our critical incidents provided direct support for an expanded taxonomy of work
12 relationship functions. Developed inductively, but consistent with theory (e.g., Dutton &
13 Heaphy, 2003; Feeney & Collins, 2014), our taxonomy of relationship functions provides
14 evidence that traditionally-studied functions including task assistance, career advancement, and
15 emotional support continue to be important in today's workplace. All of these functions are
16 positively correlated with outcomes that are indicative of employee flourishing. In fact, task
17 assistance accounts for the largest percentage of variance explained by the functions for job
18 satisfaction.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 However, our respondents also described work relationships that supported personal
35 growth, served as a source of friendship, and provided opportunities for giving to others. With
36 this expanded taxonomy of relationship functions as a foundation, we developed theory
37 predicting which relationship functions were most likely to be associated with meaningful work,
38 positive emotions at work, and life satisfaction, outcomes that are broadly representative of
39 employee flourishing. Consistent with the idea that identities are created, enacted, and revised in
40 the context of relationships (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003), we found that relationships serve the
41 function of promoting personal growth, going beyond providing advice and opportunities for the
42 development of a professional identity and extending to shaping and nurturing the individual as a
43 whole. Of the six relationship functions, personal growth explained the largest proportion of
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 variance in life satisfaction, showing that work relationships have effects that extend beyond the
4
5 work context. More research is needed to fully understand the types of relationships that are most
6
7 likely to promote personal growth and the implications of this relationship function for
8
9 organizations as well as individuals.
10
11

12 As the boundary between work and personal identities becomes less clear (Ramarajan &
13
14 Reid, 2013), work relationships also are seen as a key source of friendships. Friendship was the
15
16 most important predictor of positive emotions at work, another key indicator of employee
17
18 flourishing, even after controlling for trait positive affectivity. This suggests that having friends
19
20 at work is associated with feeling positive, happy, or pleasant beyond the dispositional factors
21
22 that influence such positive emotions. As positive emotions are a key component of employee
23
24 flourishing, having friends at work is a key driver of employee well-being. However, positive
25
26 emotions also have beneficial effects for organizations, increasing divergent thinking and
27
28 broadening thought-action repertoires (Isen, 2008; Fredrickson, 1998). Social psychological
29
30 studies of interpersonal relationships highlight the benefits of friendship, which is considered by
31
32 some as the best indicator of the closeness of a relationship (Bove & Johnson, 2001).
33
34 Additionally, social networks research has provided some insight into the role of friendship ties
35
36 in facilitating positive outcomes in the workplace (e.g., Balkundi & Harrison, 2006). However,
37
38 more research is needed to fully understand the role that work friendships play in concert with
39
40 other relationship functions to shape outcomes both inside and outside the workplace.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Having the opportunity to give to others was another function that clearly emerged from
49
50 our critical incidents. Most research on work relationships has focused on the resources
51
52 individuals *get* from their relationships (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008), though research suggests
53
54 that giving to others has far-reaching effects such as reduced mortality (Brown et al., 2003) and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 increasing motivation (Grant, 2008). Our results extend this line of research by showing that
4 when employees have the opportunity to give to coworkers at work – in the context of good
5 work relationships – benefits accrue to employees. Giving to others was the most important
6 predictor of employees' perceptions that their work is meaningful, establishing giving as a key
7 determinant of employee flourishing. It is important to note that perceptions that work is
8 meaningful also benefit organizations through increased employee motivation (Spreitzer, 1995).
9 Future research that examines how different types of giving (e.g., giving task assistance, giving
10 friendship) may differentially impact outcomes is needed to extend our understanding of this
11 important relationship function.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Our post hoc analyses revealed interesting results in that we found that personal growth is
25 most important for flourishing (life satisfaction, job satisfaction and positive emotions) for older
26 workers. The opposite trend was found for emotional support, which positively predicted job and
27 life satisfaction for younger workers, but was negatively related to these outcomes for older
28 workers. These results suggest that future research examining how the role of the relationship
29 functions change with age is needed. Moreover, given that we found some differences in the
30 relationship functions associated with job satisfaction between our MBA (study 1) and our
31 general worker (study 2) samples, the age effects we found may actually represent effects of
32 career stage. In these data, we are not able to separate out the effects of age and career stage, but
33 we encourage future research building on our findings in this area. It is also worth noting the
34 giving to others was a consistent predictor of meaningful work across age groups; this effect did
35 not differ significantly with age.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 In sum, our research advances theoretical understanding of relationships at work by
53 highlighting the breadth of functions that work relationships provide. The functions that emerged
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 from our analysis of critical incidents not only enabled us to provide a more comprehensive
4 taxonomy of relationship functions, but also specifically helped us understand how relationships
5 contribute to employee growth, well-being, and flourishing. We used this taxonomy as a
6 foundation to bring precision to the relationships literature by developing and testing theory that
7 suggests links between individual functions and specific outcomes. Our studies suggest that
8 much is lost when we focus only on the direct work-relevant benefits of workplace relationships.
9 The impact of work relationships extends well beyond job tasks, influencing employees'
10 perceptions of work meaningfulness, the emotions they experience at work, and their general life
11 satisfaction. These findings hold using self and partner ratings of outcomes and when controlling
12 for positive affectivity, which is associated both with good relationships and flourishing, as well
13 as when controlling for age and sex.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Practical Implications**

30
31 In addition to advancing theoretical understanding of work relationships, our research on
32 the functions served by good work relationships also has practical implications. Our results
33 suggest that organizations that foster the development of workplace relationships in which
34 employees have the opportunity to give and get resources from each other will benefit. Although
35 our study does not directly address this issue, it suggests that organizations may want to consider
36 workplace schedules and designs (e.g., co-location), which may impact the extent to which
37 employees develop the types of positive relationships that accrue the benefits we studied here.
38 Our results also imply that organizations with reward structures that pit employees against one
39 another, rather than nurturing cooperation, may lose out on the subtle and less directly
40 measureable benefits of high quality work relationships. Indeed, when employees develop
41 networks of positive relationships, they are more likely to share information and positive
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 emotions, benefiting individuals, teams, and the organizations for which they work (Baker &
4
5 Dutton, 2007). Finally, research in both psychology and medicine provides a growing body of
6
7 evidence that the types of flourishing outcomes we studied (meaningful work, positive emotions,
8
9 and happy lives) are associated with better health. Thus, it is plausible that when organizations
10
11 support workplace relationships that provide the benefits in our taxonomy, they may benefit not
12
13 only through employee engagement, lowered turnover, and better sharing of resources, they may
14
15 also experience reduced health care costs. Importantly, our research also shows that the focus of
16
17 relationships should not be solely on what one is getting from work relationships. The
18
19 opportunity to give to others is not merely an input into the social exchange process, but a
20
21 valuable end in itself.
22
23
24
25

26 27 **Limitations and Future Research**

28
29 This research has some limitations, which provide a springboard for future research.
30
31 First, although our data ordering is consistent with our theory and we controlled for individual
32
33 differences, we are not able to test the implied causal associations because our data are cross-
34
35 sectional. Indeed, it is plausible that there is reciprocal causality between relationship functions
36
37 and employee outcomes such as the ones we studied. For example, broaden and build theory
38
39 (Fredrickson, 1998) suggests that positive spirals may emerge, such that positive emotions may
40
41 result in the development of social resources (high quality work relationships), which then
42
43 engender more positive emotions. Future research using longitudinal panel designs is needed.
44
45
46
47

48
49 Second, to develop the taxonomy of relationship functions, we asked participants to tell
50
51 us about one positive work relationship; some participants thought of a relationship with a boss,
52
53 while others thought of a relationship with a peer or subordinate. Participants were more likely to
54
55 mention friendship, emotional support and task assistance in stories about peers, career
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 advancement in stories about supervisors, and giving to others in stories about subordinates.
4
5 Despite these trends, each of the six functions emerged across the three relationship partner
6
7 categories; hence, in Phase 3 of Study 1 and in Study 2, we focused on the functions obtained
8
9 from coworker relationships in aggregate. The moderate correlations between the functions
10
11 suggest that these functions tend to co-occur; that is, higher levels of one function are associated
12
13 with higher levels of other functions. However, we do not know whether employees tend to
14
15 experience all of the functions in the context of a single relationship, or whether it is their pattern
16
17 of high quality work relationships that matters most. We did collect additional data to show that
18
19 the RFI has a similar structure when the target is a single coworker, a set of relationships, or a
20
21 relationship with a supervisor. Nonetheless, additional research is needed to develop theory that
22
23 explains how functions served by a single work relationship impact outcomes and to empirically
24
25 determine if the outcomes of the functions served by a single work relationship differ from the
26
27 outcomes of the functions received from coworkers in general. Further, we need to know more
28
29 about whether the impact of the functions served by direct report and supervisory relationships
30
31 are similar to the impact of those functions when they are provided by coworkers. In addition, we
32
33 did not consider the extent to which work and non-work relationships serve redundant functions.
34
35 It is plausible that when non-work relationships provide functions such as friendship, personal
36
37 growth, and the opportunity to give to others, these function are less important in workplace
38
39 relationships because they are redundant. But it is also possible that obtaining these functions in
40
41 both work and other domains has additive effects.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Future research is also needed to more fully explore the nomological net around the
52
53 relationship functions. We did not explore the factors that may serve as antecedents of
54
55 relationship functions in this research, although other research on positive relationships provides
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 some insights on this. For example, trust is often cited as a characteristic of good work
4 relationships, and as Rousseau and Ling argued, “Some resources can only be produced and
5 offered in trusting relationships” (2007: 377). Drawing from theory developed by Dutton and
6 Heaphy (2003), we also predict that individuals are more likely to find friendship, personal
7 growth, and the opportunity to give to others when their relationships have higher emotional
8 carrying capacity, resilience, and openness to new ideas. In the same way that the functions
9 differentially predicted outcomes, they may have differential antecedents as well.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 Additionally, we need to know more about the mechanisms by which relationship
21 functions promote higher levels of satisfaction, more positive emotions, and perceptions of
22 meaningfulness. Our theory suggests that examining these functions through an identity lens is
23 beneficial; it is possible that the functions we identified combine to influence the ability to
24 develop and enact a positive identity at work. Kahn notes that good relationships among people
25 “enable them to feel valued and valuable, seen and witnessed, cared for and appreciated,
26 productive and engaged” (2007: 277). We need to know more about the characteristics of good
27 relationships that facilitate the development of positive identity, the conditions under which good
28 work relationships impact identity, and the processes by which good relationships promote self-
29 knowledge, self-esteem, and other nutrients of positive relationships (Dutton, Roberts, &
30 Bednar, 2010; Roberts, 2007). It is likely that in-depth interview studies will be needed to fully
31 understand the mechanisms by which good work relationships impact positive identities.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 Observational studies might also reveal additional functions served by good work relationships
53 and provide insight into the mechanisms by which they impact individuals.

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Finally, given the increasing focus on relationships characterized by abusiveness and incivility (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Tepper, 2007), future research is needed to investigate

1
2
3 the types of functions served by negative workplace relationships. It is possible that even
4
5 negative relationships serve basic functions, such as providing task assistance. Further, in the
6
7 long-term, negative work relationships may have the by-product of building skills in dealing with
8
9 difficult people, thereby providing personal growth. Examining the functions served by both
10
11 positive and negative workplace relationships is a promising direction for future research.
12
13
14

15 **Conclusion**

16
17 This research demonstrates that positive work relationships serve a more complex set of
18
19 functions than previously recognized. We show that in addition to the traditional functions of
20
21 task assistance, career advancement, and emotional support, work relationships also promote
22
23 personal growth, provide a source of friendship, and provide the opportunity to give to others. As
24
25 such, relationships not only have the potential to increase job satisfaction, but they also promote
26
27 perceptions of meaningful work, engender positive emotions at work, and support life
28
29 satisfaction; they support employee flourishing in ways that benefit both individuals and
30
31 organizations. Considered as a whole, this research advances our understanding of workplace
32
33 relationships and the functions they serve, as well as providing a practically useful tool – the
34
35 Relationship Functions Inventory – for assessment of these functions.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix A

Open-ended Questions Used to Collect Critical Incidents

We are interested in the types of relationships that people form with others at work—for example, relationships with bosses or co-workers. The purpose of this survey is for you to tell us about a good relationship that you currently have or have had in the past with someone at work. Even though we are interested in work relationships, your interactions in the relationship may have occurred either during work hours or after work.

When you complete this survey, we ask that you do NOT use real names. You can refer to the individual you are describing as "my boss/coworker" or "she/he." Please take a moment right now to think about a good relationship that you have now or have had in the past with someone at work. By relationship, we mean any association, connection or affiliation, but we want you to think about one that was particularly good.

First Round	Second Round	Prompts for Critical Incidents
X	X	Please tell us about the work relationship that came to mind. Usually the best way to get started is by simply writing about the relationship – how it got started, what it is/was like, why you consider it a good one. Please do not use names, but do provide detailed information. We would like lots of information about this relationship, so write whatever comes to mind. More is better!!
X		Please tell us a bit more about the relationship. What else would we need to know to fully understand your relationship with this person?
X	X	Now that you have provided a general sense of the relationship, we would like you to think of a specific example or episode that captures the essence of the relationship. In this section, we would like you to tell us about a specific situation or example of something that happened in the relationship. Be very specific. What was the context? What happened?
X		Please describe another specific example or episode that captures the essence of this relationship.
	X	We know that work relationships can serve many purposes and fulfill many needs. We are interested in what benefits or rewards you may have gotten from this relationship. We don't mean only concrete or tangible benefits. We are also interested in how the relationship affected you, what it contributed to your life or your career, or how it made you feel. Think about what you got out of this relationship. What functions did it serve for you? What needs did it fulfill for you?
X	X	Now, we would like to have you think about why this is/was a good relationship. What is it about this relationship that made it come to mind as a particularly good one? (Minor rewording in round two, "We would like you to describe what this relationship was like. What were the characteristics of the relationship that made it a good one?)

Appendix B

Item Statistics from the Assigning Procedure in Study 1, Phase 2

Item	Correct Assignment	Clarity Rating	Fit Rating	Overlap Rating
Task Assistance (average)	1.00	4.66	4.71	1.76
This person helps me get my work done.	1.00	4.71	4.71	1.86
This person answers questions I have about my job.	1.00	4.57	4.57	2.00
This person is always willing to give me a hand with my work.	1.00	4.71	4.86	1.43
Career Growth (average)	1.00	4.71	4.86	1.57
This person discusses my career plans with me.	1.00	4.43	4.71	1.71
This person gives me opportunities to build my career.	1.00	4.71	4.86	1.29
This person helps me identify opportunities for development that will advance my career.	1.00	5.00	5.00	1.71
Emotional Support (average)	0.95	4.28	4.76	2.24
This person helps me cope with stress.	0.86	4.14	4.86	2.71
This person allows me to vent my frustrations.	1.00	4.57	4.71	2.00
This person helps me release tension.	1.00	4.14	4.71	2.00
Friendship (average)	1.00	4.52	4.95	1.81
This person is my friend.	1.00	4.00	5.00	1.86
I spend time with this person outside of work.	1.00	4.71	4.86	1.43
My relationship with this person is more than just a work relationship	1.00	4.86	5.00	2.14
Personal Growth (average)	0.95	4.52	4.67	2.29
This person helps me grow and develop as a human being.	0.86	5.00	5.00	1.57
This person pushes me to become a better person.	1.00	4.00	4.43	2.29
This person helps me develop life skills and competencies, such as becoming a better listener or being more patient or solving problems better.	1.00	4.57	4.57	3.00
Giving to Others (average)	1.00	4.62	4.90	1.67
This relationship gives me the opportunity to assist someone else.	1.00	4.86	5.00	1.43
This relationship gives me the opportunity to mentor and support another person.	1.00	4.86	5.00	1.29
This relationship gives me the opportunity to give something back.	1.00	4.14	4.71	2.29

REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Anderson, L., & Wilson, S. 1997. Critical incident technique. In D. Whetzel & G. R. Wheaton
7
8 (Eds.), *Applied measurement methods in industrial psychology*: 89-112. Palo Alto, CA:
9
10 Davies Black Publishing.
- 11
12 Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. 1999. The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace.
13
14 *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 452– 471.
- 15
16
17 Argyle, M. 2001. *The psychology of happiness* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- 18
19
20 ATLAS/ti. 2005. Version 5.0. [Computer software] Berlin, Scientific Software Development
- 21
22
23 Baker, W., & Dutton, J. E. 2007. Enabling positive social capital in organizations. In J. E. Dutton
24
25 & B. R. Ragins (Eds.), *Exploring positive relationships at work: Building a theoretical*
26
27 *and research foundation*: 325–345. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 28
29
30 Balkundi, P., & Harrison, D. A. 2006. Ties, leaders, and time in teams: Strong inference about
31
32 network structure's effects on team viability and performance. *Academy of Management*
33
34 *Journal*, 49: 49-68.
- 35
36
37 Barley, S. R., Meyerson, D. E., & Grodal, S. 2011. E-mail as a source and symbol of stress.
38
39 *Organization Science*, 22: 887-906.
- 40
41
42 Bartko, J. J. 1976. On various intraclass correlation reliability coefficients. *Psychological*
43
44 *Bulletin*, 83: 762-765.
- 45
46
47 Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. 1995. The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal
48
49 attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117: 497-529.
- 50
51
52 Berscheid, E., & Reis, H. T. 1998. Attraction and close relationships. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T.
53
54 Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology*, 4th ed.: 193-281. New
55
56
57
58
59
60 York: McGraw-Hill.

- 1
2
3 Blau, P. M. 1964. *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
4
5
6 Bove, L. L., & Johnson, L. W. 2001. Customer relationships with service personnel: Do we
7
8 measure closeness, quality or strength? *Journal of Business Research*, 54: 189-197.
9
10
11 Bowlby, J. 1988. *A secure base*. New York: NY: Basic Books.
12
13 Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. 1951. An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied*
14
15 *Psychology*, 35: 307-311.
16
17
18 Brown, S. L., Nesse, R. M., Vinokur, A. D., & Smith, D. M. 2003. Providing social support may
19
20 be more beneficial than receiving it: Results from a prospective study of mortality.
21
22 *Psychological Science*, 14: 320-327.
23
24
25 Cantor, N. 1994. Life task problem solving: Situational affordances and personal needs.
26
27 *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20: 235-243.
28
29
30 Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. 2008. Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and
31
32 meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance.
33
34 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 1082-1103.
35
36
37 Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. 1988. Mood and the mundane: Relations between daily life events
38
39 and self-reported mood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54: 296-308.
40
41
42 Cohen, S., Mermelstein, R., Kamarck, T., & Hoberman, H. M. 1985. Measuring the functional
43
44 components of social support. In I. G. Sarason & B. R. Sarason (Eds.), *Social support:*
45
46 *Theory, research, and applications*: 73-94. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
47
48
49 Conway, J. M., & Huffcutt, A. I. 2003. A review and evaluation of exploratory factor analysis
50
51 practices in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6: 147-168.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Deelstra, J. T., Peeters, M. C. W., Schaufeli, W. B., Stroebe, W., Zijlstra, F. R. H., & van
4
5 Doornen, L. P. 2003. Receiving instrumental support at work: When help is not welcome.
6
7
8 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 324-331.
9
- 10 Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. 1985. The Satisfaction With Life Scale.
11
12 *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49: 71-75.
13
- 14 Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. 2010.
15
16 New well-being measure: Short scales to assess flourishing and positive and negative
17
18 feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, 97: 143-156.
19
- 20 Dutton, J. E., & Heaphy, E. D. 2003. The power of high-quality connections. In K. S. Cameron,
21
22 J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of*
23
24 *a new discipline*: 263-278. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
25
26
- 27 Dutton, J. E., Roberts, L. M., & Bednar, J. 2010. Pathway for positive identity construction at
28
29 work: Four types of positive identity and the building of social resources. *Academy of*
30
31 *Management Review*, 35: 265-293.
32
33
- 34 Feeney, B. C., & Collins, N. L. 2014. A new look at social support: A theoretical perspective on
35
36 thriving through relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. Advance
37
38 online publication. doi: 10.1177/1088868314544222
39
40
- 41 Ferris, G. R., Liden, R. C., Munyon, T. J., Summers, J. K., Basik, K. J., & Buckley, M. R. 2009.
42
43 Relationships at work: Toward a multidimensional conceptualization of dyadic work
44
45 relationships. *Journal of Management*, 35: 1379-1403.
46
47
48
- 49 Flanagan, J. C. 1954. The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51: 327-358.
50
- 51 Fredrickson, B. L. 1998. What good are positive emotions? *Review of General Psychology*, 2:
52
53 300-319.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. 1995. Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6: 219-247.
- Grant, A. M. 2007. Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review*, 32: 393-417.
- Grant, A. M. 2008. Does intrinsic motivation fuel the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 48-58.
- Grant, A. M., Dutton, J. E., & Rosso, B. D. 2008. Giving commitment: Employee support programs and the prosocial sensemaking process. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51: 898-918.
- Grant, A. M., & Parker, S. K. 2009. Redesigning work design theories: The rise of relational and proactive perspectives. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 3: 317-375.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. 2006. When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31: 72-92.
- Hanish, K. A. 1992. The Job Descriptive Index revisited: Questions about the question mark. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77: 377-382.
- Hinkin, T. R. 1995. A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management*, 5: 967-988.
- Hobfoll, S. E. 1989. Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44: 513-524.

- 1
2
3 Isen, A. M. 2008. Some ways in which positive affect influences decision making and problem
4 solving. In M. Lewis, J. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotions:*
5
6 548-573. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
7
8
9
10 James, L. R. 1982. Aggregation bias in estimates of perceptual agreement. *Journal of Applied*
11
12 *Psychology*, 67: 219-229.
13
14
15 Johnson, J. A. 2005. Ascertaining the validity of individual protocols from web-based
16
17 personality inventories. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 39: 103-129.
18
19
20 Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., & Locke, E. A. 2000. Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating
21
22 role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85: 237-249.
23
24
25 Judge, T. A., & Watanabe, S. 1993. Another look at the job satisfaction-life satisfaction
26
27 relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78: 939-948.
28
29
30 Kahn, W. A. 2007. Meaningful connections: Positive relationships and attachment at work. In J.
31
32 E. Dutton & B. R. Ragins (Eds.), *Exploring positive relationships at work: Building a*
33
34 *theoretical and research foundation*: 189-206. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
35
36 Associates.
37
38
39 Kernis, M. H., & Goldman, B. M. 2006. A multicomponent conceptualization of authenticity:
40
41 Theory and research. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 38: 283-357.
42
43
44 Keyes, C. L. M. 2005. Mental illness and/or mental health? Investigating axioms of the complete
45
46 state model of health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73: 539-548.
47
48
49 Keyes, C. L. M. 2007. Promoting and protecting mental health as flourishing. *American*
50
51 *Psychologist*, 62: 95-108.
52
53
54 Kram, K. E. 1985. *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life.*
55
56 Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., Sparrowe, R.T. 2000. An examination of the mediating role of
4
5 psychological empowerment on the relations between the job, interpersonal relationships,
6
7 and work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85: 407-416.
8
9
- 10 Lucas, R. E., & Dyrenforth, P. S. 2006. Does the existence of social relationships matter for
11
12 subjective well-being? In K. D. Vohs & E. J. Finkel (Eds.), *Self and relationships:*
13
14 *Connecting intrapersonal and interpersonal processes*: 254-273. New York: Guilford
15
16 Press.
17
18
- 19 Meade, A. W., & Craig, S. B. 2012. Identifying careless responses in survey data. *Psychological*
20
21 *Methods*, 17: 437-455.
22
23
- 24 Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. 2006. The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing
25
26 and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work.
27
28 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 1321-1339.
29
30
- 31 Niven, K., Holman, D., & Totterdell, P. 2012. How to win friendship and trust by influencing
32
33 people's feelings: An investigation of interpersonal affect regulation and the quality of
34
35 relationships. *Human Relations*, 65: 777-805.
36
37
- 38 Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. 2005. Prosocial behavior:
39
40 Multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56: 14.1-14.28.
41
42
- 43 Piccolo, R. F. & Colquitt, J. A. 2006. Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The
44
45 mediating role of job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49: 327-340.
46
47
- 48 Pratt, M. G., & Ashforth, B. E. 2003. Fostering meaningfulness in working and at work. In K. S.
49
50 Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship:*
51
52 *Foundations of a new discipline*: 309-327. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers,
53
54 Inc.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. L. 1999. Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of men and
4 women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,
5 84: 529-550.
6
7
8
9
- 10 Ragins, B. R., & Dutton, J. E. 2007. Positive relationships at work: An introduction and
11 invitation. In J. E. Dutton & B. R. Ragins (Eds.), *Exploring positive relationships at*
12 *work: Building a theoretical and research foundation*: 3-25. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence
13 Erlbaum Associates.
14
15
16
17
18
- 19 Ramarajan, L., & Reid, E. 2013. Shattering the myth of separate worlds: Negotiating nonwork
20 identities at work. *Academy of Management Review*, 38: 621-644.
21
22
23
- 24 Reis, H. T., Sheldon, K. M., Gable, S. L., Roscoe, J., & Ryan, R. M. 2000. Daily well-being: The
25 role of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology*
26 *Bulletin*, 26: 419-435.
27
28
29
30
- 31 Roberts, L. M. 2007. From proving to becoming: How positive relationships create a context
32 self-discovery and self-actualization. In J. E. Dutton & B. R. Ragins (Eds.), *Exploring*
33 *positive relationships at work: Building a theoretical and research foundation*: 29-45.
34 Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
35
36
37
38
39
- 40 Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. 2010. On the meaning of work: A theoretical
41 integration and review. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 30: 91-127.
42
43
44
45
- 46 Rousseau, D. M., & Ling, K. 2007. Commentary: Following the resources in positive
47 organizational relationship. In J. E. Dutton & B. R. Ragins (Eds.), *Exploring positive*
48 *relationships at work: Building a theoretical and research foundation*: 373-384.
49 Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Roznowski, M. 1989. Examination of the measurement properties of the Job Descriptive Index
4 with experimental items. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74: 805-814.
5
6
7
8 Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. 2001. On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on
9 hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52: 141-166.
10
11
12 Schwabel, D. 2014. *Work-life integration: The new norm*. Retrieved from
13 <http://www.forbes.com/sites/danschawbel/2014/01/21/work-life-integration-the-new->
14 [norm/](http://www.forbes.com/sites/danschawbel/2014/01/21/work-life-integration-the-new-).
15
16
17
18
19
20 Shirom, A. 2011. Vigor as a positive affect at work: Conceptualizing vigor, its relations with
21 related constructs, and its antecedents and consequences. *Review of General Psychology*,
22 15: 50-64.
23
24
25
26
27 Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. 1969. The measurement of satisfaction in work and
28 retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes. Rand McNally: Chicago.
29
30
31 Snyder, M. 1993. Basic research and practical problems: The promise of a “functional”
32 personality and social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19: 251-
33 264.
34
35
36
37
38
39 Sonnentag, S., & Niessen, C. 2008. Staying vigorous until work is over: The role of trait vigor,
40 day-specific work experiences and recovery. *Journal of Occupational and*
41 *Organizational Psychology*, 81: 435-458.
42
43
44
45
46 Spreitzer, G. M. 1995. Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions,
47 measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38: 1442-1465.
48
49
50
51 Stephens, J. P., Heaphy, E., & Dutton, J. E. 2012. High-quality connections. In K. S. Cameron &
52 G. M. Spreitzer (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship*:
53 385-399.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Stroebe, W., & Stroebe, M. 1996. The social psychology of social support. In E. T. Higgins & A.
4 W. Kruglanski (Eds.). *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles*: 597-621. New
5 York: Guilford Press.
6
7
8
9
10 Tepper, B. J. 2007. Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research
11 agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33: 261-289.
12
13
14
15 Thoits, P. A. 2011. Mechanisms linking social ties and support to physical and mental health.
16 *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 52: 145-161.
17
18
19
20 Thoresen, C. J., Kaplan, S. A., Barsky, A. P., Warren, C. R., & deChermont, K. 2003. The
21 affective underpinnings of job perceptions and attitudes: A meta-analytic review and
22 integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129: 914-945.
23
24
25
26
27 Umphress, E. Bingham, J.B., & Mitchell, M.C. 2010. Unethical behavior in the name of the
28 company: The moderating effect of organizational identification and positive reciprocity
29 beliefs on unethical pro-organizational behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95:
30 769-780.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. 1988. Development and validation of brief measures of
38 positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social
39 Psychology*, 54: 1063-1070.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 1

Relationship Functions

Relationship Function and Description	Example Quotations
Task Assistance - Helped me get my work done by answering questions, providing feedback, or assisting with a specific task.	<p>155: My manager helps out a lot. Not only for me, but for everyone else. She will cook if there are a lot of orders, or she will run food for the waiters. She will even get things ready for us if we cannot find the time ourselves to do it.</p> <p>703: He aided me in very technical engineering questions, and I helped him deal with interpersonal struggles with customers. Neither of us were ever afraid of asking each other a 'stupid' question. Even if we were under a deadline we would always make sure to solve the others' problem if they asked.</p>
Career Advancement - Helped me to advance my career by providing advice or access to contacts and other career-related resources.	<p>701: A good episode would be at the time when I was deliberating my future in relationship with the company. I could either stay and grow within the company, I could accept another offer, or I could go and pursue an advanced degree. Normally, I would not share this kind of issue with anyone in the company. However, I felt fairly comfortable with this particular colleague and shared my concerns and got some good advice...</p> <p>205: I've even talked to her about finding other jobs...and she's even offered to help me by using some of her own connections!</p>
Emotional Support - Helped me cope with stress by listening to my problems and responding in a supportive way.	<p>117: She made the first couple weeks seem not as stressful as I thought they would be. . . Eventually we were so close that we told each other about our struggles we were dealing with, and we relied on each other for advice and support.</p> <p>706: I've worked in stressful situations before, but nothing like what I experienced at this company. Z really helped guide me through the rough patches. She listened to me when I was frustrated and offered feedback (both constructive criticisms and supportive comments). She really helped me navigate through the minefield.</p>

Relationship Function and Description	Example Quotations
<p>Friendship – Became a friend or companion.</p>	<p>213: We started doing things together outside of work, and with another one of our coworkers that we got along with very well, who started after us. We would go out to dinner, play Bingo, and a couple of times, I went to her hometown for a weekend with her. . . It's great to have that relationship with her because we are able to vent about work and get to know each other outside of the work environment.</p> <p>701: Therefore, this work relationship extended far beyond just work - it was a much more personal one, more of like being friends that you can share anything with...</p>
<p>Personal Growth - Helped me grow and develop as a human being.</p>	<p>706: We talked a lot about everything, from work to religion to family life to anything else. She offered me new perspectives to multiple subjects. I feel that gaining those new insights helped me grow more as a person.</p> <p>712: When I sought advice, he would not give me the answers outright. He would ask me questions about my thoughts. He would have me look deeper and wider at the problem. I grew as a person in terms of my problem solving skills, my leadership ability, and my own ideas about my abilities.</p>
<p>Giving to Others - Provided me with the opportunity to assist, mentor, support, or care for the other person.</p>	<p>710: Through this relationship, I was able to help Sarah recognize her abilities and encourage her to develop those further. I enjoyed helping her make difficult decisions, and felt privileged to help her grow professionally and personally</p> <p>119: A few days later, his grandpa passed away, and immediately another coworker and I decided that we were going to go to his grandpa's funeral to be there for him. . . He was so grateful that we came. He came up and hugged us after the ceremony, and the look on his face meant more to me than anything in the world.</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Relationship Functions Coded from Critical Incidents

Function	ICC(1/2)	M	SD	TA	CA	ES	FR	PG
Task Assistance (TA)	.50/.86	0.66	0.72	1.00				
Career Advancement (CA)	.58/.89	0.38	0.67	0.04	1.00			
Emotional Support (ES)	.55/.88	0.56	0.71	-0.10	-0.08	1.00		
Friendship (FR)	.61/.90	1.30	0.94	-0.22*	-0.11	0.22*	1.00	
Personal Growth (PG)	.38/.79	0.24	0.43	-0.05	0.33*	0.08	-0.02	1.00
Giving to Others (GO)	.55/.88	0.35	0.59	0.02	-0.09	0.12*	0.07	0.06

Note. N = 283. * $p < .05$.

Table 3

Principal Axis Factor Analysis (Promax Rotation) for Relationship Function Inventory Items

Item	Factor Loadings					
	Giving to Others	Friendship	Career Advance	Emotional Support	Personal Growth	Task Assistance
My coworkers help me get my work done.	.07	.04	-.08	.02	.05	.75
My coworkers answer questions I have about my job.	-.19	-.04	.15	-.03	.07	.69
My coworkers are always willing to give me a hand with my work.	.10	-.02	.01	-.03	-.08	.89
My coworkers discuss my career plans with me.	.03	.02	.69	.16	-.10	.07
My coworkers give me opportunities to build my career.	-.01	.06	.82	-.09	.09	-.01
My coworkers help me identify opportunities for development that will advance my career.	.03	-.03	.87	.02	.00	.02
My coworkers help me cope with stress.	.07	.09	-.05	.73	.02	.06
My coworkers allow me to vent my frustrations.	-.02	-.11	.06	.86	-.03	-.03
My coworkers help me release tension.	-.05	.07	.01	.83	.06	-.04

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

My coworkers are my friends.	-04	.80	-.11	.05	.02	.15
I spend time with my coworkers outside of work.	.04	.80	.11	.01	-.05	-.15
My relationships with my coworkers are more than just work relationships.	-.04	.90	.03	-.06	.01	-.02
My coworkers help me grow and develop as a human being.	.01	.04	-.09	.05	.80	.01
My coworkers push me to become a better person.	.03	.07	.10	-.11	.78	-.01
My coworkers help me develop life skills and competencies, such as becoming a better listener or being more patient or solving problems better.	-.01	-.12	.02	.08	.78	.02
My relationships with my coworkers give me the opportunity to assist others.	.81	.11	-.04	.06	.01	.01
My relationships with my coworkers give me the opportunity to mentor and support others.	.83	-.04	.04	-.04	-.04	.03
My relationships with my coworkers give me the opportunity to give something back.	.88	-.08	.03	-.03	.06	-.06
Eigenvalue	6.46	2.32	1.61	1.37	1.37	1.10
% variance explained	35.88	12.90	8.94	7.61	7.58	6.12

Note. N = 177. Numbers in boldface indicate dominant factor loadings.

Table 4

Phase 3 Descriptive Statistics and Variable Intercorrelations

	Mean	SD	TA	CA	ES	FR	PG	GO	Cow Sat	JS
Task Assistance (TA)	3.92	.74	.82							
Career Advancement (CA)	3.29	.92	.44*	.87						
Emotional Support (ES)	3.63	.84	.34*	.40*	.86					
Friendship (FR)	3.58	.90	.17*	.35*	.49*	.86				
Personal Growth (PG)	3.56	.71	.40*	.42*	.37*	.33*	.84			
Giving to Others (GO)	3.91	.75	.36*	.36*	.26*	.19*	.38*	.88		
Coworker Satisfaction (Cow Sat)	2.13	.45	.43*	.46*	.26*	.24*	.29*	.10	.86	
Job Satisfaction (JS)	3.44	.77	.31*	.35*	.09	.02	.26*	.39*	.26*	.75

Note. N = 177. * $p < .05$. Internal consistency reliabilities (coefficient alpha) are in boldface on the diagonal.

Table 5

Phase 3 Regressing Job Satisfaction on Satisfaction with Coworkers and Relationship Functions

	DV = Job Satisfaction			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2
Coworker Satisfaction	.26*	.14		.14
Task Assistance		.08	.12	.08
Career Advancement		.19*	.24*	.19*
Emotional Support		-.09	-.09	-.09
Friendship		-.13	-.12	-.13
Personal Growth		.07	.08	.07
Giving to Others		.30*	.28*	.30*
R ² (ΔR^2)	.07*	.25* (.18*)	.24*	.25* (.01)
F (df)	12.95 _(1, 175)	8.16 _(7, 169)	8.86 _(6, 170)	8.16 _(7, 169)

Note. N = 177. * $p < .05$. Values in the table are standardized regression coefficients.

Table 6
 Study 2 Descriptive Statistics and Variable Intercorrelations

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Sex	.53	.50	--									
2. Age	2.09	.76	-.03	--								
3. Education	3.00	.90	.07	-.23	--							
4. Positive Affectivity	3.59	.72	-.11	.17	.20	.91						
5. Task Assistance	3.91	.70	.09	-.05	.22	.33	.72					
6. Career Advancement	3.17	1.07	-.03	-.15	.31	.42	.48	.89				
7. Emotional Support	3.66	.85	-.09	-.01	.23	.27	.53	.43	.84			
8. Personal Growth	3.45	.88	-.08	-.16	.25	.42	.59	.67	.60	.87		
9. Friendship	3.51	.94	.01	-.12	.14	.34	.43	.56	.53	.62	.85	
10. Giving to Others	3.81	.77	-.14	-.05	.25	.49	.46	.55	.48	.62	.56	.80
11. Job Satisfaction-Self	3.62	.84	-.11	.01	.08	.39	.45	.29	.42	.37	.31	.42
12. Job Satisfaction-Partner	3.50	.83	-.03	-.04	.00	.33	.38	.19	.23	.25	.18	.30
13. Job Satisfaction-Average	3.56	.78	-.07	-.02	.04	.38	.44	.26	.34	.33	.26	.38
14. Meaningfulness-Self	3.93	.86	.00	.15	.08	.57	.40	.44	.32	.48	.39	.59
15. Meaningfulness-Partner	3.93	.83	.01	-.01	.11	.48	.38	.42	.22	.41	.28	.50
16. Meaningfulness-Average	3.93	.79	.01	.08	.11	.57	.42	.46	.29	.48	.36	.59
17. Positive Work Emotions	3.52	.73	-.08	.11	.04	.66	.37	.44	.34	.46	.46	.43
18. Life Satisfaction-Self	5.15	1.29	-.24	-.12	.22	.47	.27	.36	.34	.45	.39	.37
19. Life Satisfaction-Partner	4.92	1.34	-.04	-.09	.20	.41	.32	.45	.26	.46	.31	.29
20. Life Satisfaction-Average	5.04	1.22	-.15	-.12	.23	.47	.32	.44	.32	.49	.38	.35

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 6
Study 2 Descriptive Statistics and Variable Intercorrelations (Cont.)

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
11. Job Satisfaction-Self	.83									
12. Job Satisfaction-Partner	.76	.80								
13. Job Satisfaction-Average	.94	.94	.89							
14. Meaningfulness-Self	.60	.59	.64	.92						
15. Meaningfulness-Partner	.49	.65	.61	.74	.89					
16. Meaningfulness-Average	.59	.67	.67	.93	.93	.93				
17. Positive Work Emotions	.68	.54	.65	.64	.50	.61	.92			
18. Life Satisfaction-Self	.58	.39	.51	.47	.42	.48	.60	.91		
19. Life Satisfaction-Partner	.50	.45	.50	.50	.52	.54	.57	.73	.92	
20. Life Satisfaction-Average	.58	.45	.55	.52	.50	.55	.63	.93	.93	.94

Note. N=151. Scale reliabilities are on the diagonal in bold. Correlations > |.17|, *p* < .05; and correlations > |.21|, *p* < .01.
Sex: 0=female, 1 = male; age: 1 = 30 or less, 2 = 31-40, 3 = 40 or more; education: 1 = high school, 2 = two-year degree or some college coursework, 3 = Bachelor’s degree, 4 = Master’s degree, 5 = Doctorate/JD/MD.

Table 7

Study 2 Regression Results for Relationship Functions

	Job Satisfaction	Meaningful Work	Work PE	Life Satisfaction
Positive Affectivity	.23*	.32*	.55*	.32*
Task Assistance	.31*	.14	.07	.00
Career Advancement	-.08	.09	.05	.12
Emotional Support	.12	-.09	.01	.02
Friendship	-.02	-.04	.21*	.07
Personal Growth	-.05	.07	.07	.26*
Giving to Others	.16	.34*	-.06	-.09
F (df = 7,143)	7.98*	18.29*	21.29*	10.31*
R ²	.28*	.47*	.51*	.34*
ΔR^2 for RFI	.14*	.15*	.07*	.11*

Note. N=151; * = $p < .05$. Work PE = Positive Emotions at Work. Job Satisfaction, Meaningful Work, and Life Satisfaction combine self and partner reports; Work PE is assessed by self reports. Slight differences in this pattern of relationships were found when using only self- or only other-reports of the dependent variables. Regression results for self- and other-reports are available from the first author upon request.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 8

Study 2 Relative Weights Analysis

	Job Satisfaction	Meaningful Work	Work PE	Life Satisfaction
Positive Affectivity	25%	32%	53%	33%
Task Assistance	32%	11%	6%	6%
Career Advancement	4%	11%	9%	16%
Emotional Support	13%	3%	4%	7%
Friendship	4%	5%	12%	10%
Personal Growth	7%	11%	9%	22%
Giving to Others	16%	28%	7%	6%

N=151; Work PE = Positive Emotions at Work. Job Satisfaction, Meaningful Work, and Life Satisfaction combine self and partner reports; Work PE is assessed by self reports.

Figure 1




Role of Positive Workplace Relationships in Employee Flourishing

Figure 2

Post Hoc Analysis of Age as a Moderator



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
Amy E. Colbert (amy-colbert@uiowa.edu) is an Associate Professor of Management & Organizations and the Lloyd J. and Thelma W. Palmer Research Fellow in the Henry B. Tippie College of Business at the University of Iowa. She received her Ph.D. in organizational behavior and human resource management from the University of Iowa. Her research interests include leadership, personality, motivation, and well-being.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
Joyce E. Bono (joyce.bono@warrington.ufl.edu) is a professor of management at the Warrington College of Business at the University of Florida. She received her Ph.D. in organizational behavior from the University of Iowa. Her research focuses on employees quality of work life, including personality, leadership, motivation, affect, and positive resources and relationships.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Radostina (Ina) K. Purvanova (ina.purvanova@drake.edu) is an Associate Professor of Management & Leadership in the College of Business and Public Administration at Drake University. She received her Ph.D. in industrial and organizational psychology from the University of Minnesota. Her research interests include virtual teams and virtual leadership, employee motivation and well-being, and women's career advancement and leadership development.