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Abstract

Although prior studies have established a number of reasons why computer professionals leave their organizations, they have rarely suggested that lack of social support may be one reason. This study attempted to explain why social support is salient to computer professionals’ leaving intention. It developed a model that posits that (i) social support is positively related to job satisfaction, (ii) social support is negatively related to leaving intention, and (iii) social affiliation needs moderate the relationship between social support and leaving intention. The model was tested using data from a questionnaire. The results indicated that social support from supervisor and colleagues were negatively related to leaving intention for computer professionals with high social affiliation needs, and that job satisfaction mediated the relationship between social support and leaving intention. Social support from family and friends was not related to leaving intention, but it was positively related to job satisfaction.
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1. Introduction

A number of studies related to computer professionals’ leaving intention has been published in the literature. Generally, these have found that variables such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and role stressors are among the proximate factors that cause computer professionals to develop leaving intention [2,23]. Although these results are useful in helping to understand the psychological state of computer professionals before they leave their organization, there still existed a need for further research, because managers are not sure how they can make use of prior results in designing effective retention strategies. For example, managers know that they can minimize leaving intention by reducing role stressors. They are uncertain, however, how role stressors can be managed. Rapid changes in the computer industry often cause role settings to change, and as a result, it is inevitable for computer professionals to experience role stress [24]. While organizations may try to employ computer professionals with a high threshold for role stress, the shortage of computer professionals implies that employers have limited choice in selecting prospective employees.

While much of the turnover research has focused its attention on role stressors, there is little that explores the effects of social support on leaving intention. Although social support is a well-studied variable in the stress literature, it has rarely been examined in the context of leaving intention among computer professionals. But it is a salient variable because prior research has shown that computer professionals do
not like to socialize and they like to work alone [47]. As a result, computer professionals may not be well integrated into the company’s social network. Their bond with the employer may not be strong and their leaving intention may be higher than those for non-computer employees. Therefore, to gain a greater understanding of computer professionals’ leaving intention, my research focused on social support. It developed and tested a model that has three sources of social support that act as antecedents of job satisfaction and leaving intention. Hopefully, the results of this research will enable realistic recommendations to be made regarding how organizations can manage their computer personnel.

There are therefore several reasons for research on this topic. While prior studies on computer and non-computer professionals have consistently found that job satisfaction is a precursor of leaving intention, they have also found that job satisfaction accounts for only a small percentage of the total variance in leaving intention, usually less than 15% [38]. These results suggest that other precursors could have been overlooked. There have also been suggestions that the reasons for computer professionals leaving their organizations are different from those of non-computer professionals. Computer professionals form a distinct occupational group; on average, computer professionals have a stronger need for learning and self-development and a lower need for social interaction [11–13,46]. Thus, high turnover among computer professionals may be explained because of these characteristics. And finally, turnover incurs substantial costs. Computer projects have often been delayed or aborted due to computer professionals leaving their jobs. Trade journals, such as CIO and Computerworld, often report persistently high turnover rates of more than 20% [17]. Industry practitioners, therefore, would welcome recommendations on how to manage the computer workforce.

2. Model development

Fig. 1 shows the proposed model. It consists of six constructs: leaving intention, job satisfaction, social support from supervisor, colleagues, and family and friends, and social affiliation needs. The first two are frequently used in turnover research while the constructs for social support are frequently used in stress research. The last—social affiliation needs—originated from psychology and personality research. The model posits that the three sources of social support are negatively related to leaving intention, and that the relationships are moderated by social affiliation needs. It also posits that job satisfaction mediate the relationship between social support and leaving intention.

2.1. Leaving intention

Leaving intention is a proxy for actual departure from the organization. Prior research found that intention is the strongest cognitive precursor of behavior [28], and that leaving intention acts as a significant indicator variable for the latent construct for retention among computer professionals [30]. Such research used leaving intention, rather than actual departure, because the latter depends upon the general economic conditions [39]: employees who want to leave may only be able to do so when alternative jobs are available.

2.2. Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is the most frequently studied psychological variable in turnover research [33]. Studies have consistently shown that job satisfaction is significantly related to leaving intention [41]. This relationship is true for computer and non-computer professionals [10,16]. Dissatisfaction causes employees to develop leaving intention because unhappy employees seek more attractive alternatives. Hence, the following hypothesis.
H1. Job satisfaction is negatively related to leaving intention.

2.3. Social support

Social support has been defined broadly as the availability of helping relationships and their quality [27]. Social support leads a person to believe that he or she is cared for, esteemed, and valued and belongs to a network of communication and mutual obligation [8]. Social support provides receivers with emotional reassurance. As such, prior research has often associated social support with general well-being and positive health.

While the majority of prior research on social support is related to stress, some have suggested that social support is also related to employees’ intention to leave the organization [21]. For example, one study has found that social support has a significant impact on facilitating positive adjustment among newly employed nurses [14]. Nurses who cannot adjust to their work environment often leave.

There is little empirical research related to social support among computer professionals [42]. A literature search found only one article on work conducted about two decades ago about the effects of work stress and social support on information system managers [44]. The author found that social support results in lower levels of strain.

Prior research has shown that social support can originate from a number of sources: supervisor, colleagues, family, and friends. These sources of support are important to computer professionals because:

1. Computer professionals have high achievement and growth needs. In order to achieve their goals or fulfill their growth needs, they need to have support from people with whom they interact. If computer professionals do not have social support, they may find their work unnecessarily difficult.

2. The computer profession has become a very stressful profession [34], e.g. computer professionals have to cope with long working hours, unexpected user demands, unmet deadlines, and skills obsolescence. Thus social support is the necessary ingredient for successful work performance.

3. Computer professionals often need to work in teams, because their work spans different departments [29]. Having supportive relationships with people at the workplace is essential. Other people can make the work more pleasant and rewarding.

Hence, computer professionals with higher social support are likely to have lower leaving intention and higher job satisfaction.

H2a. Social support from supervisor is negatively related to leaving intention.

H2b. Social support from colleagues is negatively related to leaving intention.

H2c. Social support from family and friends is negatively related to leaving intention.

H3a. Social support from supervisor is positively related to job satisfaction.

H3b. Social support from colleagues is positively related to job satisfaction.

H3c. Social support from family and friends is positively related to job satisfaction.

2.4. Social affiliation needs

Prior work has suggested that computer professionals have low social needs. The media has reinforced this characteristic by portraying computer professionals as people who work only with machines. Some have even labeled computer professionals as ‘geeks’ and ‘nerds’—terms suggesting that they lack human empathy [7]. With regard to prior findings that computer professionals have low social needs, some researchers have recommended that tests of social needs should be carried out [4]. It would be useful if research could identify the specific aspects of social needs that are lacking among computer professionals.

Prior research, however, has found that the need for affiliation is a fundamental human motivation [5]. People may have varying needs for affiliation, depending on the individual’s desire for contact and “belonging”. Those who have high affiliation needs are likely to derive a sense of communion in associating with others. They also believe in receiving
social gratifications [35]. Thus, if people have high affiliation needs, they would like to have a high sense of social support. A combination of high affiliation needs and high social support is likely to result in lower leaving intention. In contrast to those with high affiliation needs, it is possible that the relationship between social support and leaving intention is less strong for those low in affiliation needs. In fact, when affiliation needs are low, it is possible that there may not be a significant relationship between the two variables.

Social affiliation needs, therefore, are likely to attenuate the relationship between social support and leaving intention. Fig. 2 summarizes the hypothesized interaction effects. The negative relationship between social support and leaving intention is posited to be stronger for computer professionals with high affiliation needs than those with low affiliation needs. The hypotheses are as follows.

**H4a.** Social affiliation needs moderate the relationship between social support (from supervisor) and leaving intention such that higher social affiliation needs strengthen the relationship.

**H4b.** Social affiliation needs moderate the relationship between social support (from colleagues) and leaving intention such that higher social affiliation needs strengthen the relationship.

**H4c.** Social affiliation needs moderate the relationship between social support (from family and friends) and leaving intention such that higher social affiliation needs strengthen the relationship.

3. Research method

The model was tested using data collected by a questionnaire survey. One thousand nine hundred readers of E-Week magazine (Singapore edition) were randomly selected as people to provide answers to the questionnaire. They included programmers, system analysts, system controllers, system administrators, software designers, and technical support executives. The respondents completed the questionnaires anonymously.

3.1. Measures

All constructs were measured at the individual level. Wherever possible, the instruments used to operationalize the constructs were adopted from past research where their psychometric properties have been established. All items in the questionnaire used a seven-point response format. The individual’s answer was given on a Likert scale for which the responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The format was used throughout the questionnaire to help respondents maintain their ease in responding. The following sections describe how the instruments parts were chosen. Appendix A provides a list of the items used.

3.1.1. Leaving intention

According to prior work, intention is more likely to lead to behavior if the two are measured within a reasonable time of one another. The shorter is the time frame, the more accurate is the prediction of behavior linked to the intention [1]. Three items from Peters and Jackofsky [37] and one item from Mobley et al. [32] were adapted to measure leaving intention. The items required a period of less than 6 months before exercising intention.

3.1.2. Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured with a generalized, global standard, using the instrument developed by Hoppock [18]. Although this was developed many years ago, it has been validated for contemporary use [31] and has been shown to have high reliability [9].
It comprises four items, but one relates to leaving intention and was therefore removed to avoid contamination.

3.1.3. Social support
Social support was measured using the instrument developed by Caplan et al. [6]. This is one of the established scales used in psychological research [15]. It also has been shown to have high reliability [26]. There are four items in the instrument. All were included in the survey. They were modified, however, so that respondents were asked for their agreement or disagreement with the statements. Three sets of social support items were used. Each measured social support from a particular source, for example, supervisor, colleagues, and family and friends.

3.1.4. Social affiliation needs
This construct was measured using the instrument developed by Hill [20]. There are six items in the instrument. Prior research has shown that the instrument has high reliability [45].

4. Results

Among the 1900 questionnaires distributed, 30 were returned because the addressees had already left the workplace. Three hundred and forty-two complete responses were received. The response rate, therefore, was more than 18%. Given that the survey was anonymous, the researcher could not identify those who failed to respond. Thus, it was not possible to determine whether non-respondents differed systematically from those who responded. As an alternative test of non-response bias, those who responded late were used as proxies for those who did not respond at all [43]. To use this method to measure non-response bias, the data from the first 30 respondents—categorized based on their postmarked dates in the returned envelopes for the survey—were compared with those for the last 30 respondents. The results indicated that there were no significant differences in the demographics of the respondents in the two cohorts.

4.1. Demographics

Table 1 shows the demographics of the respondents. The table shows that more than half the respondents were below 31 years of age. The sample, therefore, reflects the youthfulness of the computer workforce in Singapore, where more than 80% are less than 35 years of age [36].

4.2. Descriptive statistics

A factor analysis was first performed for the measurement items. Table 2 shows the results, with six factors that fall neatly into the constructs used in this study. All the individual item loadings meet or exceed the normal 0.7 criteria, and none of the individual items load more highly on another construct than they do on the constructs they were designed to measure. Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics. The table shows that all constructs have moderately high reliabilities, which are 0.88 and above. The correlation coefficients in the table show that leaving intention is negatively associated with three variables: job satisfaction, social support from supervisors, and social support from colleagues. It is not associated with social support from family and friends. All three sources of social support, however, are associated with job satisfaction.

4.3. Hypothesis testing

The hypotheses were tested using multi-sample analysis, which involves analyzing data from subgroups simultaneously and estimating the extent to which one general structural model fits the data from
Results of factor analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC3</td>
<td>0.918 0.068 –0.160 –0.263 0.316 0.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC4</td>
<td>0.914 0.062 –0.128 –0.281 0.295 0.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC2</td>
<td>0.913 0.021 –0.071 –0.242 0.341 0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC1</td>
<td>0.867 0.037 –0.067 –0.231 0.295 0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA2</td>
<td>0.012 0.855 –0.115 0.032 –0.055 –0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA3</td>
<td>0.080 0.838 –0.180 0.024 –0.088 –0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA4</td>
<td>0.107 0.816 –0.171 0.038 –0.029 –0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA5</td>
<td>–0.030 0.767 –0.134 0.074 –0.052 0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA6</td>
<td>–0.002 0.751 –0.217 0.087 –0.076 0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA1</td>
<td>0.094 0.750 –0.146 0.065 –0.049 –0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF2</td>
<td>0.108 0.151 –0.913 –0.055 0.073 0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF3</td>
<td>0.140 0.179 –0.905 –0.077 0.076 0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF4</td>
<td>0.112 0.233 –0.880 –0.065 0.059 0.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF1</td>
<td>0.047 0.133 –0.841 –0.129 0.025 0.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI4</td>
<td>–0.255 0.059 0.088 0.950 –0.340 –0.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI2</td>
<td>–0.271 0.057 0.081 0.950 –0.306 –0.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI1</td>
<td>–0.262 0.048 0.114 0.948 –0.340 –0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI3</td>
<td>–0.264 0.090 0.079 0.921 –0.361 –0.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS3</td>
<td>0.317 –0.076 –0.061 –0.310 0.937 0.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS4</td>
<td>0.313 –0.024 –0.096 –0.355 0.929 0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS2</td>
<td>0.350 –0.072 –0.051 –0.332 0.921 0.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS1</td>
<td>0.264 –0.079 –0.033 –0.286 0.847 0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>0.260 –0.019 –0.243 –0.413 0.275 0.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>0.303 –0.060 –0.207 –0.429 0.289 0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>0.249 0.030 –0.236 –0.317 0.172 0.878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fixing a parameter reflects the ways the subgroups are expected to behave similarly, while freeing a parameter reflects the opposite [19]. Thus, if the fit for a model where some parameters are freed across the subgroups is significantly different from the model where all the parameters are fixed across subgroups, then an interaction exists between the subgroup criterion and the parameters that have been freed across the subgroups.

Respondents were divided into two subgroups, based on the median value of the affiliation needs, which was equal to 4.40. Those who scored less than 4.40 were categorized under the low affiliation needs subgroup while those who scored 4.40 or more were categorized high. One hundred and sixty-nine respondents were categorized into the low affiliation needs subgroup while 173 were categorized into the high subgroup.

Figs. 3–6 show the results obtained using LISREL [25]. Fig. 3 shows the model when all the parameters were fixed. Fig. 4 shows the model where the parameter from job satisfaction to leaving intention was freed. Fig. 5 shows the model where the parameter from social support (supervisor) to leaving intention was freed. Fig. 6 shows the model where the parameter from social support (family and friends) to leaving intention was freed and was supported. The results for the parameter estimates and the model fit indices were used to test the hypotheses.

4.3.1. Job satisfaction and leaving intention

Fig. 3 indicates that the parameter from job satisfaction to leaving intention is negative and significant. Hence, hypothesis 1—which stated that job satisfaction is negatively related to leaving intention—was supported.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Cronbach alphas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Leaving intention</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Job satisfaction</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.90 –0.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Social support (supervisor)</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.93 –0.37** 0.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Social support (colleagues)</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.92 –0.28** 0.31** 0.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Social support (family and friends)</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.91 –0.11 0.26** 0.08 0.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Social affiliation needs</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.88 0.06 –0.02 –0.07 0.07 0.20**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < 0.05. ** P < 0.01.
Fig. 3. Model with all parameters fixed.

Fig. 4. Model with parameter for social support (supervisor) to leaving intention freed.

Fig. 5. Model with parameter for social support (colleagues) to leaving intention freed.
4.3.2. Social support and leaving intention

Fig. 3 shows that social support from supervisor is negatively related to leaving intention. Hence, hypothesis 2a—which stated that social support from supervisor is negatively related to leaving intention—was supported. The parameter for social support from colleagues to leaving intention, however, was not significant, even though it was in the hypothesized direction. The parameter for social support from family and friends to leaving intention was also not significant. Hence, hypotheses 2b and 2c were not supported.

4.3.3. Social support and job satisfaction

Fig. 3 shows that the three sources of social support are positively related to job satisfaction. Hence, hypotheses 3a, 3b, and 3c—which stated that social support from supervisor (3a), from colleagues (3b), and from family and friends (3c) are positively related to job satisfaction—were supported.

4.3.4. Moderating effects of social affiliation needs

Fig. 4 shows the model where one parameter was freed across two subgroups. The results showed that the parameters for social support (supervisor) to leaving intention were in the hypothesized direction for both the high and low affiliation needs subgroups. Only the parameter for the high affiliation needs subgroup, however, was significant. To test whether there is a moderating effect, the difference in chi-square for the model in Figs. 3 and 4 was computed. Table 4 shows that the difference in chi-square was significant. The relationship between social support

![Table 4](https://example.com/table4.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Model with all parameters fixed across the two subgroups</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Model with parameter from social support (supervisor) to leaving intention freed in the two subgroups</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Model with parameter from social support (colleagues) to leaving intention freed in the two subgroups</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Model with parameter from social support (family and friends) to leaving intention freed in the two subgroups</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between (1) and (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0$^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between (1) and (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5$^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between (1) and (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^*$ $P < 0.05.$
(supervisor) and leaving intention, therefore, was moderated by affiliation needs. Thus, hypothesis 4a—which stated that social affiliation needs moderate the relationship between social support (supervisor) and leaving intention such that higher social affiliation needs strengthen the relationship—was supported.

Fig. 5 shows the results where the parameter for social support (colleagues) to leaving intention was freed across the two subgroups. The parameter for the low affiliation needs subgroup was not significant and it was also not in the hypothesized direction. The parameter for the high affiliation needs subgroup, however, was significant, and it was in the hypothesized direction. Again, to test whether there is a moderating effect, the difference in chi-square was computed. Table 4 shows that the difference in chi-square was significant. The relationship between social support (colleagues) and leaving intention, therefore, was moderated by social affiliation needs. Thus, hypothesis 4b—which stated that social affiliation needs moderate the relationship between social support (colleagues) and leaving intention such that higher social affiliation needs strengthen the relationship—was supported.

Fig. 6 shows the results where the parameter for social support (family and friends) to leaving intention was freed across the two subgroups. The parameters for both the low and high affiliation needs subgroups were not significant. Table 4 shows that the difference in chi-square between the model where all parameters were fixed and the model in Fig. 6 was not significant. Thus, hypothesis 4c was not supported.

5. Discussion

This effort examined three sources of social support as antecedents of job satisfaction and leaving intention. There were two important findings. First, although it was shown that social support from supervisor was negatively related to leaving intention, a further analysis of the data indicated that the relationship was significant only for those with high affiliation needs but not significant for those with low affiliation needs. Similarly, it was shown initially that social support from colleagues was not related to leaving intention. When social affiliation needs were accounted, however, social support from colleagues was related to leaving intention for those with high affiliation needs and not for those with low needs. Thus, the relationship between workplace social support (social support from supervisor and from colleagues) and leaving intention depended on the strength of the individual’s affiliation needs.

The second important finding was that all three sources of social support were related to job satisfaction. On the other hand, only workplace social support was related to leaving intention. Non-workplace social support or support from family and friends was not related to leaving intention. It is possible that, because leaving intention is a workplace issue, non-workplace social support is not relevant. Non-workplace social support is related to leaving intention only indirectly—through its relationship to job satisfaction. The effects of social support on leaving intention, therefore, were mediated by job satisfaction. This effect is important because prior research has identified a few variables that are related to job satisfaction—such as role stressors, job characteristics, remuneration, and career incentives [3,22,40]. This study has identified additional variables: social support from supervisor, colleagues, and family and friends.

Overall, therefore, social support plays an important role in computer professionals’ leaving intention. Personnel practitioners and computer managers need to recognize that they can use workplace social support to manage job satisfaction and leaving intention. While managers may have tried to manage these two by controlling role stressors or job characteristics, these strategies have their drawbacks because roles change rapidly and employers may not always be able to offer challenges that fulfill the growth needs of computer professionals. It may be easier and more realistic to use social support to retain computer professionals, because managers can learn to cultivate it. For example, they can organize activities and events that help to build a supportive network in the workplace. Furthermore, they could identify those with high affiliation needs and apply social support to induce the desirable work outcomes.

The results of this study, however, are subject to a number of limitations. First, the data used are cross-sectional in nature. It is not possible, therefore, to infer causality. Second, there could have been a different theorization in the direction of linkages proposed in
the model. For example, it may be possible for leaving intention to precede social support. The third limitation is that the data used comprised one sample of Singaporean computer professionals. As such, there is limited generalizability in the results.
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Appendix A

Items used for to measure constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaving intention</td>
<td>LI1</td>
<td>I intend to leave my job in the next 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LI2</td>
<td>I will actively look for a new job in the next 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LI3</td>
<td>I have thoughts of leaving my job in the next 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LI4</td>
<td>I am likely to be working for another organization in the next 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>I like my job very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>I enjoy working in my job most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>I like my job better than most people like theirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support from supervisor</td>
<td>SS1</td>
<td>When things get tough at work, I can always rely on my supervisor to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS2</td>
<td>help me solve the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td>My supervisor will go out of his/her way to support me in my work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS4</td>
<td>It is easy for me to talk to my supervisor when I need help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS5</td>
<td>My supervisor is always willing to listen to my problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support from colleagues</td>
<td>SC1</td>
<td>When things get tough at work, I can always rely on my colleagues to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC2</td>
<td>help me solve the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC3</td>
<td>My colleagues will go out of their way to support me in my work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC4</td>
<td>It is easy for me to talk to my colleagues when I need help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC5</td>
<td>My colleagues are always willing to listen to my problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support from family and</td>
<td>SF1</td>
<td>When things get tough at work, I can always rely on my family and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends</td>
<td>SF2</td>
<td>friends to help me solve the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF3</td>
<td>My family and friends will go out of their way to support me in my work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF4</td>
<td>It is easy for me to talk to my family and friends when I need help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF5</td>
<td>My family and friends are always willing to listen to my problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social affiliation needs</td>
<td>SA1</td>
<td>If I feel unhappy or depressed, I usually try to be around other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA2</td>
<td>to make me feel better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA3</td>
<td>I usually have the greatest need to have other people around me when I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA4</td>
<td>feel upset about something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA5</td>
<td>One of my greatest sources of comfort when things get rough is being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA6</td>
<td>with other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When I have not done well on something that is important to me, I can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feel better by simply being around with other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whenever something bad or disturbing happens to me, I often just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>want to be with a close, reliable friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During times when I have to go through something painful, I usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>find that having someone with me makes it less painful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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