<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Presentation Title</strong></th>
<th><strong>Place in Schedule</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Perceived effectiveness of a workplace stress management intervention: Complementing or compensating for your supervisor | Poster Session
*Day 2 – Wednesday – May 9th, 2018
8:30am-9:30am* |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Description of Presentation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Presenter Name(s) And Credentials</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| This study examines the relationship between supervisor support for stress management (SSSM), or the degree to which an employee perceives that their supervisor cares about their stress management (Kath, Ehrhart, Gates, & Stichler, 2012), and participants' reactions to intervention tasks, reactions to intervention relationships, and overall perceptions of intervention helpfulness. We use curve estimation procedures to test linear, quadratic, and cubic relationships among SSSM and intervention process perceptions. Results will facilitate interventionists' ability to develop more nuanced understandings of the context of intervention delivery. | Kristin A. Horan, MA
*Bowling Green State University* |

**Methods**
Participants were 37 long-term care and skilled nursing employees in the treatment group of a two session, group-based Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) intervention for work stress (M age = 38.86, SD age = 14.10; nurse aide or nurse assistant = 70.3%; female = 86.5%, Caucasian = 70.3%). Perceptions of SSSM were measured at baseline (Kath et al., 2012; α=.91). Task reactions, relation reactions, and overall session helpfulness were measured at the end of each intervention session using the Revised Session Reaction Scale (Elliot & Wexler, 1994; overall Session 1 α= .76, overall Session 2 α= .79).

**Results**
The quadratic function (R²=.24, F(2, 33)= 5.32, p< .05) provided the simplest significant fit to Session 1 task reactions. Session 2 task reactions were unrelated to SSSM. The quadratic function provided significant fit to the data in both Session 1 (R²=.19, F(3, 32)= 3.92, p< .05) and Session 2 (R²=.20, F(3, 32)= 3.84, p< .01) relation reactions. The quadratic function (R²=.23, F(2, 33)= 4.88, p< .05) provided the simplest significant fit to Session 2 overall helpfulness reactions. Session 2 overall helpfulness |
reactions were unrelated to SSSM. All quadratic functions were characterized by a U-shape, such that those who perceived low and high levels of SSSM tended to perceive the intervention more favorably.

Discussion
Although limited by its exploratory nature and sample size, we provide important insights into how SSSM can influence intervention process variables. The U-shape of all significant functions indicate that data may be best interpreted through the lens of Situational Strength Theory (Meyer, Dalal, & Hermida, 2010). Low SSSM may create a weak situation, allowing proactivity to be expressed as seeking out helpful resources (compensating for the employee’s environment). High SSSM may create a strong situation that enhances transfer climate (complimenting the employee’s environment). Differences in Session 1 and 2 results also imply that environmental variables may be particularly important in early intervention experiences. These results provide evidence for the utility of enhancing SSSM.