

2016

The Relationship Between Leader-Member Exchange and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in a Federal Government Organization

Shawn Boockoff
Nova Southeastern University, sboockoff@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://nsuworks.nova.edu/fse_etd



Share Feedback About This Item

NSUWorks Citation

Shawn Boockoff. 2016. *The Relationship Between Leader-Member Exchange and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in a Federal Government Organization*. Doctoral dissertation. Nova Southeastern University. Retrieved from NSUWorks, Abraham S. Fischler College of Education. (87) https://nsuworks.nova.edu/fse_etd/87.

This Dissertation is brought to you by the Abraham S. Fischler College of Education at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.

The Relationship Between Leader-Member Exchange and Organizational Citizenship
Behavior in a Federal Government Organization

by
Shawn M. Boockoff

An Applied Dissertation Submitted to the
Abraham S. Fischler College of Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Nova Southeastern University
2016

Approval Page

This applied dissertation was submitted by Shawn M. Boockoff under the direction of the persons listed below. It was submitted to the Abraham S. Fischler College of Education and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova Southeastern University.

Matthew M. Delaney, EdD
Committee Chair

Rosalyn S. Vaughn, PhD
Committee Member

Lynne R. Schrum, PhD
Dean

Statement of Original Work

I declare the following:

I have read the Code of Student Conduct and Academic Responsibility as described in the *Student Handbook* of Nova Southeastern University. This applied dissertation represents my original work, except where I have acknowledged the ideas, words, or material of other authors.

Where another author's ideas have been presented in this applied dissertation, I have acknowledged the author's ideas by citing them in the required style.

Where another author's words have been presented in this applied dissertation, I have acknowledged the author's words by using appropriate quotation devices and citations in the required style.

I have obtained permission from the author or publisher—in accordance with the required guidelines—to include any copyrighted material (e.g., tables, figures, survey instruments, large portions of text) in this applied dissertation proposal manuscript.

Shawn M. Boockoff
Name

Date

Acknowledgements

I am sincerely grateful and appreciative for the assistance and support I have received throughout the long process. In particular, I would like to extend an enormous thank you to Dr. Matthew Delaney, my committee chair. Not only did he shepherd me through the dissertation process, but I learned a lot about persistence and perfection in writing at the doctoral level. I could not have done it without his help.

I would also like to thank my committee member, Dr. Rosalyn Vaughn. Your kind words at the end of this journey helped make it a worthy endeavor. Thanks to the BS3 cohort for the fond memories and support.

I am grateful to Michael Duchon and John Eisenschmidt for their friendship and encouragement through the process. I am truly grateful to Erik Rasmussen for his enduring support, and Dana Coale and David Jamison for their backing, encouragement, and assistance.

My deepest love, thanks, and hope for Emily, Ellen, and Ethan. May you live your dreams.

Finally, profound appreciation for the friendship, love, and support of my best friend and the love of my life, Lisa. You made this possible. All that is positive about me in personality, demeanor, and success would be a shadow of what it is today because of her love and belief in me. You are the light in my life. Thank you!

Abstract

The Relationship Between Leader-Member Exchange and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in a Federal Government Organization. Shawn M. Boockoff, 2016: Applied Dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, Abraham S. Fischler College of Education. Keywords: role theory, leadership, social exchange theory, leadership styles

This applied dissertation was a study of the relationship between leader-member exchange (LMX) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in a federal government organization in Washington, DC. As a result of the organization's business and leadership challenges, understanding the relationship between a leader and a follower and extra-role behaviors may help to understand how high-quality relationships are developed with staff members that are productive and motivate staff to extend their efforts beyond normal expectations. Productive high-quality relationships demonstrate loyalty, consideration, and affect towards the organization and its leaders.

Understanding the relationship between LMX and OCB in a federal government organization may help to produce greater awareness of the factors that lead to high-quality leader-member relationships. Knowing the characteristics of high-quality relationships may promote extra-role behaviors enabling increased job satisfaction and greater results. Federal organizations find that many employees have low job satisfaction. In addition, only 38% of federal workers believe leaders generate high levels of commitment.

The researcher employed an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design that included surveys and interviews. The sample study was composed of 50 paired dyads from 433 employees of the target federal agency selected using convenience sampling.

Survey instruments were used for demographics, LMX, and OCB to gather data. The results from the LMX and OCB instruments were used to formulate interview questions for a select group from the core sample represented by the top and bottom 5% of raw survey score totals.

The targeted federal organization should benefit from this study. The results showed how differences in the quality of the relationship between a leader and a follower related to OCB, or extra-role behaviors and led to recommendations on leader-subordinate relationships.

Table of Contents

	Page
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Definition of Terms.....	8
Chapter 2: Literature Review	10
Leader-Member Exchange	11
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	20
Leader Behavior and Relationship Quality	22
LMX and OCB.....	29
Leadership in the Public Sector	34
Purpose of the Study	38
Research Questions	38
Chapter 3: Methodology	40
Participants.....	41
Instruments.....	41
Procedures	44
Timeline	48
Chapter 4: Results	50
Description of the Sample.....	50
Results for Quantitative Research Question 1	50
Demographics	52
LMX and OCB.....	56
Results for Qualitative Research Question 2	59
Results for Qualitative Research Question 3	60
Results for Mixed-Methods Qualitative Research Question 4	61
Conclusion	67
Chapter 5: Discussion	68
Interpretation of Results.....	69
Limitations	76
Recommendations for Future Research	77
References	79
Appendices	
A Interview Protocol	95
B Participant Demographic Survey.....	97
C LMX-MDM Subordinate Perspective and SLMX-MDM Supervisor Perspective	100
D Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale	103
E Employee Frequencies and Percentages of Supervisors' SLMX-MDM....	106
F Employee Frequencies and Percentages of Subordinates' OCB.....	108

Tables

1	Timeline of Procedures	48
2	Research Questions and Data Treatments Matrix for Mixed Methodology	49
3	Participant Gender.....	52
4	Participant Age Range	53
5	Participant Education	54
6	Participant Tenure	55
7	Participant Reporting Periods-Subordinates (<i>n</i> = 50)	56
8	Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables (<i>n</i> = 50)	57
9	Intercorrelation Matrix.....	58

Chapter 1: Introduction

Statement of the Problem

The federal government of the United States continually faces difficulties in leadership and supervision because of a challenging financial situation, aging workforce, and negative public perception (United States Department of Personnel Management [OPM], 2012). Further, the 2012 federal government survey of over 375,000 federal government employees' perceptions revealed that although employees believe their work is important, they are not satisfied with their jobs, and subsequently, their leaders (OPM, 2012).

The 2011 survey indicated that only 45% of respondents believed leaders generated high levels of commitment in the workforce and only 55% believed leaders promoted communication among the various work groups. The statistics for the 2014 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (OPM, 2014) for those responses were 38% and 50% respectively. In addition, the survey showed a 7% decline for followers' respect for their supervisor from 2011 to 2014. The 2014 survey also showed a decline in the perception that employees have of the integrity and honesty of their leaders. The results were 57% in 2011 and 50% in 2014.

The 2013 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey indicated a downward trend on most indices in the survey compared to the previous year and was administered before implementation of across-the-board sequestered budget reductions and a government shutdown. The director of the 2013 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey made the following comments:

Factors such as an unprecedented 3-year pay freeze, automatic reductions from sequester that include furloughs for hundreds of thousands of employees, and

reductions in training, and other areas are clearly taking their toll on the federal workforce—and this survey was administered prior to the recent government shutdown. (p. i)

Although the 2014 results continued with many downward trends, results showed a consistent tendency of federal employees willing to do extra work when needed despite low regard for their leaders and decreasing job satisfaction, perhaps indicating more altruistic motivations.

The Partnership for Public Service (2012) found that private sector scores were 14 points higher in communication from their leaders and six points higher in satisfaction. The relationship between an employee and his or her supervisor is important in producing commitment. One way to enhance the quality of the relationship is through healthy supervisory communication that can foster a positive view of organizational support for the subordinate resulting in stronger commitment (Bakar, Dilbeck, & McCroskey, 2010).

The study site was a federal government regulatory program, and is part of the Department of Agriculture. The federal government organization studied has 494 employees, five division heads, and seven organizational unit administrators who serve as supervisors in the organization. One person in addition to the five division directors serves as the administrator of the program. The reporting structure includes 13 individuals who report directly to the organizational leader, resulting in additional dyads. The program represented in this study oversees specific regulations relative to a commodity area implementing complex and varied regulatory provisions. The program administrator and division leaders ensure that operations are run efficiently and effectively within the construct of the governmental and departmental regulations, policies, and processes.

As a federal regulatory program, the organization employs staff with diverse backgrounds to aid in the operational aspects of the agency and fulfill its mission. This type of environment is representative of one that is complex and requires leadership to ensure effective communication, job satisfaction, engagement, and motivation. In addition, the environment must support establishment of social exchanges that produce organizational commitment to be successful.

The business climate for federal organizations is characterized by low rates of turnover, lower promise, and ever-increasing change. Restricted budgets and the need for faster decision making and innovation place a significant burden on leadership and staff in fulfilling the mission and objectives of every government organization. Federal agencies must also hold the public trust, requiring extra-role behaviors that encourage employee commitment and collaboration (Zhang, Wan, & Jia, 2008).

At times, the subject organization struggled to coordinate action effectively among the leaders, the division heads, and staff. Based on the results of the Federal Employee Viewpoint Surveys (OPM, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014), the agency head wanted to understand relationship quality between a supervisor (leader), and subordinate (follower). In particular, the program head wanted to know if that relationship supported an environment that increased engagement, job satisfaction, and motivation and produced behaviors that are beyond the basic transactional role required by the organization, often referred to as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). In short, how did the quality of the relationship that a leader has with a follower relate to extra-role or prosocial behaviors in a federal workplace?

The program administrator (personal communication, May, 15, 2012) indicated that as a result of leadership challenges, coordination, accountability, motivation, and

responsibility, there is often confusion on specific project tasks and deliverables. As a result, staff engagement and employee satisfaction are affected, which leads to an inability to complete tasks in an accurate and timely manner.

There are approximately 2 million federal employees making the federal government one of the largest employers in the world. There are unique issues of federal government agencies such as the impact of tenure and organizational politics on engagement and motivation. It has been shown that leadership behaviors influence leader-member exchange (LMX) and OCB with regard to performance, extra-role behaviors, and job satisfaction (Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007; Jordan & Troth, 2010; Lawrence & Kacmar, 2012). It should be noted the constructs of the supervisor leader (SLMX-MDM) and follower or subordinate (LMX-MDM) are multi-dimensional (Liden & Maslyn, 1998, Greguras & Ford, 2006) and provide a deeper fullness in understanding of the relationship.

Despite a significant amount of research on LMX and OCB leadership in the public sector, there is limited research specifically on the relationship between LMX and OCB in a United States federal government organization. Similar high demand and low engagement conditions and business environments have occurred in other research on institutional organizations and professions such as schools and teachers. Results of one study on teacher engagement showed that high-quality LMX relationships influence engagement and OCBs of teachers (Runharr, Knonermaann, & Sanders, 2013). This study provided organizational leadership in a program area of an agency of the federal government with a better understanding of supervisory relationships in an effort to improve individual, team, and organizational outcomes.

The quality of the relationship between a leader and subordinate can determine

the subordinate's behavior (Bakar, Mustaffa, & Mohammad, 2008). Further, bidirectional communication helps to determine fit and function within the group and organization. Leaders and followers exhibiting high-quality relationships are more likely to result in extra-role behaviors such as OCB in the subordinate (Van Dyne, Kamdar, & Joireman, 2008). In turn, a low-quality relationship between a leader and follower can be detrimental to team performance. The quality of the LMX relationship and its relationship to OCB is a fundamental problem addressed in the research.

The topic. A leader achieves success through others. In order to have influence, a leader must build strong relationships with followers. Relationships are especially important in the federal government because of the nature of the work and available resources. For a leader, inspiring, coaching for performance and development, fostering teamwork, and collaboration all serve to support the relationship between a leader and his or her employees.

The research problem. Much research has focused on the phenomenon of LMX and OCB. However, there is limited research on the relationship of LMX and OCB in a federal regulatory agency or the public sector in general.

Low-quality LMX is exemplified by a lack of commitment, coordination, communication, and accountability as well as low trust and respect of leaders. Further, understanding the relationship between LMX and OCB may help the organization to be successful (Sparrowe, Soejipto, & Kraimer, 2006). A federal regulatory agency has the unique challenges of politics, longevity of staff, and limited financial resources. These demands require social exchanges between a leader and a subordinate. Positive social exchanges enable high-quality LMX relationships to produce extra-role behaviors such as commitment and OCB for the organization to succeed.

Background and justification. The relationship between a leader and follower takes different forms and is influenced by social relationships. The quality of the LMX relationship affects the success of both parties and has a direct impact on organizational teams as well (Bakar et al., 2008; Law, Wang, & Hui, 2010). Among other factors, the quality of an LMX relationship is most affected by the exchange between a leader and a follower and the roles played in the relationship.

Organizational effectiveness requires coordination between leaders and subordinates. In order to affect coordination, leaders exhibit behaviors that, in turn, elicit actions and conduct from subordinates that go beyond organizational norms. Collective effort is established in organizations through the social exchange and power between leaders and followers. Empowered leadership provides the catalyst to promote collective effort through leadership behaviors such as leading by example, coaching, participating in decisions, showing concern, and providing direction (Xue, Bradley, & Liang, 2011).

Emotional intelligence as manifested in a leader's behaviors is one leadership capacity that affects visioning and role modeling, while the cognitive leader behaviors of adaptation, versatility, and curiosity significantly influence organizational effectiveness (Hambley, O'Neill, & Kline, 2007). The social contracts that exist in a workplace can enable or hinder success of teams. Social exchange theory posits that a fair exchange between parties results in the positive perceptions of organizational and supervisor trust, which influence a relationship along with personal obligation and gratitude (Blau, 2008).

Trust is positively related to OCB and influences the behaviors that occur among leaders, followers, and organizations as well as the effect of distributive, procedural, and informational justice on OCB (More & Tzafrir, 2009). In public-sector organizations, catalysts for OCB are somewhat different than in private-sector organizations. Vigoda-

Gadot and Beeri (2011) indicated that organizational politics affect how employees behave and, specifically, whether they extend themselves in extra-role behaviors like OCB or not. They suggested that public sector tenure is significantly different from private sector. Public sector employees' reactions to decreased procedural justice, fairness, honesty, and equity will be to withhold OCB and reduced engagement rather than leave the organization.

The uniqueness of the study is exhibited in the paucity of available literature available regarding LMX and OCB in United States federal government organizations. This study may extend existing research available in the literature. Specifically, Bakar et al. (2008) reported in their study on LMX, supervisory communication, and team-oriented commitment that future research should focus on not only the obligation to the team but to the organization and superior as well.

Deficiencies in the evidence. There is evidence in the literature regarding the relationship between OCB and LMX. However, as mentioned, there is limited research available on the relationship between the quality of the LMX and OCB in a federal government setting. Federal government environments, in particular, are characterized by complex social exchanges that can change the elasticity of the supply of information or service based on time constraints. In essence, it becomes more or less profitable for one to devote the time to compliance of a request based on the amount of exchange investment required (Blau, 2008). The choice of a follower to comply with a leader's request is relative to the reward of the association with that leader versus an alternative association of another entity or penalty from noncompliance.

The reviewed literature also indicated a substantial quantitative bent that did not take into account fundamental qualitative issues of the constructs. Specifically, issues of

trust, commitment, communication, and social exchange as well as the unique audience this study addresses provided a well-rounded study.

Audience. Understanding how the social exchange of leaders and subordinates affects an organization and its leaders can provide a better understanding of effective performance, individual engagement, and outcomes that are critical to high-performing groups. In addition, companies interested in the influence that leadership has on organizational performance will need to understand the connection between LMX and OCB. United States federal government agencies that are interested in understanding how the quality of the relationship between the leader and follower affects those institutions will also benefit from this research.

Definition of Terms

Emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence competencies encompass the abilities of an individual to manage his or her emotions as well as others including the ability to regulate, recognize, and understand those emotions. “Mayer and Salovey (1997) argue that emotional intelligence abilities enable individuals to recognize, understand, and manage emotions in themselves and others, and that this contributes to better relationships in the workplace” (as cited in Jordan & Troth, 2010, p. 262).

Ethical leadership. Ethical leadership can be defined as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (Walumbwa, Mayer, Wang, Wang, & Workman, 2011, p. 204). Positive relationships are the cornerstone of ethical leadership.

Leader-member exchange. LMX theory describes the two-way relationship between a leader and a follower, or subordinate. LMX presupposes that each relationship

between a leader and subordinate is different and dependent on social exchange and role. LMX operates as a construct with multiple dimensions including contribution, loyalty, affect, and professional respect.

Multidimensional measure of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX-MDM).

LMX-MDM (Liden & Maslyn, 1998) is a valid and reliable scale that measures the four LMX dimensions of affect, loyalty, contribution, and professional respect. This measure was developed to support the theory that LMX was a multidimensional construct.

NVivo 11 for Mac (2015 version). NVivo for mac is software that support qualitative, and mixed methods research using unstructured data such as interviews.

Organizational citizenship behavior. OCB is a construct of multiple dimensions. Organ (1988) defined five factor dimensions of OCB: civic virtue, conscientiousness, altruism, courtesy, and sportsmanship. OCB is the measure of frequency of extra-role or discretionary behavior. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) developed a scale built on the same constructs as Organ (1988) but using a different measure. Fox, Spector, Bruursema, Kessler, and Goh (2007) extended the work of Podsakoff et al. (1990) by creating a 42-item checklist, the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C), and reducing it to a 36-item scale, and a final 20-item scale. The adjustments to the OCB-C scale items were reflective of the organization and the people. The final scale uses a 5-point frequency.

Supervisor multidimensional measure of Leader-Member Exchange (SLMX-MDM). SLMX-MDM (Greguras & Ford, 2006) is a valid and reliable scale that measures the four dimensions of affect, loyalty, contribution, and professional respect from a supervisor's perspective. This measure was developed to support the theory that SLMX is a multidimensional construct and is a parallel version of the LMX-MDM.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Relationships between leaders and followers promote organizational success or failure depending on the quality of the affiliation. High-quality relationships may produce extra role behaviors enhancing outcomes whereas low-quality relationships may lead to negative associations, dysfunction, and lower organizational outcomes. The review provided foundational topics relative to the leader-follower relationship starting with Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 2008) followed by leader-member exchange (LMX) (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1976) and then organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Bateman & Organ, 1983). Topics directly related to the quality of the LMX relationship include leadership behavior, role theory, and followership and identity. Literature related to the aspects of leadership that influence LMX and OCB is discussed next. Finally, leadership in the public sector relative to LMX and OCB is considered.

The review of literature examined peer-reviewed journals, books, and dissertations from numerous sources including PsycArticles, PsycINFO, ABI/Inform Complete, ProQuest Central, and Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts. Search terms and descriptors included social exchange, supervisory communication, LMX, OCB, abusive supervision, emotional intelligence, emotional regulation, identity, organizational commitment, transformational leadership, trust, leadership behavior, leadership style, federal government, LMX, and OCB. The search terms and descriptors provided a large amount of information. However, as mentioned, literature to this specific study regarding the relationship between LMX and OCB, and in organizational leadership in the public sector, in general, was very limited.

Relationships are fundamental to social exchange and commitment in an

organization. Social exchange theory provides the underpinnings of much of the existing research on the relationship between LMX and OCB (Wang, Xiaoping, & Ni, 2010). In a leadership context, a leader's use of power that is fair and balanced in relation to the contribution made to the relative welfare of subordinates will be met with acceptance (Blau, 2008). Further, Blau (2008) theorized that the alternate is true, and demands made by a leader who is overbearing can result in an unequal exchange. As such, the dyadic relationship of a leader and a follower is founded on the social exchange between the two parties. Compliance requires social approval of subordinates, which in turn requires some equivalent value in service from the leader including gratitude, favor, and distributive rewards, such as salary and promotion (Blau, 2008).

Many researchers have found that the supervisor-subordinate relationship correlates to organizational commitment and extra-role behavior at the individual and group levels (Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, & Liu, 2008; Baker et al., 2008; Vandenberghe, Bentein, Michon, Chebat, & Tremblay, 2007). Characteristics of a high-quality dyadic relationship include a supervisor's empowerment of the employee's decision making, emotional support, and supervisory feedback (Loi, Ngo, Zang, & Lau, 2011). These aspects may relate directly to the construct of LMX, which is composed of contribution, loyalty, affect, and professional respect. Leader behaviors affect the relationship as well. Characteristics of low-quality relationships include turnover, lack of organizational engagement, lower task performance, less assistance of coworkers, and lower OCB (Xu, Huang, Lam, & Miao, 2012).

Leader-Member Exchange

LMX has been studied extensively, and results have shown that the effect the relationship a leader has with each follower impacts success, OCB, job satisfaction, and

many other aspects of organizational performance (Graen & Cashman, 1975; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Liden & Maslyn, 1998; Van Dyne et al., 2008). Social exchanges form the basis of the relationship between a leader and a follower; as such, the association is more than simply a distributive exchange that may produce economic gain. The quality of the exchange between a leader and a follower is conceptualized as LMX.

The most recent thread of LMX theory can be traced to the 1970s with the seminal studies of vertical linkage dyads in relation to organizational engagement (Graen & Cashman, 1975; Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) eventually produced the first instrument to measure the quality of LMX with the LMX-7, which is a 7-item Likert-type instrument.

The vertical link between a leader and a follower is varied within a work unit and is dependent on many factors. The basic understanding of LMX is that there are different types of relationships between leaders and followers that are predicated on roles and social and economic exchanges influenced by leader behaviors and follower outcomes (Chou, Jiang, Klein, & Chou, 2011). The exchange results in behaviors that reciprocate in relation to the quality of the relationship impacting the social exchange, task performance, turnover intention, and individual and organizational satisfaction (Ilies et al., 2007). These outcomes are most often follower related. However, Wilson, Hock-Pen, and Conlon (2010) suggested that one evaluates the outcomes of a leader relative to the LMX relationship, as well. Further, Wilson et al. believed that a leader obtains resource outcomes relative to the quality of the relationship with a follower. For instance, a high-quality relationship may produce OCB, where a leader would reciprocate by being flexible with scheduling based on each follower's needs.

Aspects that transform leadership and vertical-role relationships require one to

assess every leader-follower relationship within the context of organizational leadership and are important to assessing the quality of each relationship (Dansereau et al., 1975). Therefore, in order to address each relationship uniquely, it is important to understand the development of an LMX relationship.

Graen and Cashman (1975) submitted that there exist stages of development in the relationship between a leader and follower and that leaders routinely differentiate between transformational and transactional relationships. Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) further suggested that the transformational or transactional relationships represent higher or lower levels of LMX quality respectively. Further, Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) advocated that as a relationship moves through the developmental stages from the testing process to the actualized partnership process, they transform into grounded social exchanges rather than simple material or economic exchanges that are more transactional in nature.

Existing research suggests that while the quality of the LMX relationship is influenced by the social exchange process between a leader and a follower, it also varies among followers based on role (Graen & Scandura, 1987; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Uhl-Bien 2006). Roles serve to define expectations and exchange possibilities in the LMX relationship.

Role theory. First discussed in the 1960s, role theory suggests that organizational processes affect the physical and emotional behavior of an individual in the workplace (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964). Roles are defined as the expected set of activities for a specific position (Van Dyne et al., 2008). Role status refers to the categorization of the relationship role of a subordinate relative to the leader and group. The assumption is that the leader treats subordinates differently and there are insiders, or

in-role members, and outsiders and role status mediates the relationship (Wang et al., 2010). Differentiation creates variances in perception as well as actual behaviors towards followers.

Role perceptions refer to the leader's and subordinate's views of the expectations or roles of a specific job. Individuals will often differ on the role perceptions because of differing social cues (Van Dyne et al., 2008). Further, employees are more likely to engage in extra-role behavior if there is a high-quality relationship between the leader and follower. Role clarity is theorized to have a developmental impact on LMX at the early stage of a relationship and later through affective perception attributes such as agreeableness (Sears & Hackett, 2011). This suggests that roles play an important part in altering the quality of the exchange and LMX in a leader-follower relationship and may be cultivated through clarity to improve LMX quality.

One suggested theory of role making is that of narrative sense making. Kelley and Bisel (2014) found leaders who established role through a process of character assessment using narratives and a limited number of storylines. This allows for the management of role negotiation based on past performance and future assessment of trust on how a subordinate would perform. One point of note in their study was that leaders could fall into complacency in their stories, limiting future roles and outcomes. Communication practices can unknowingly convey doubt, potentially producing a lack of coherence in a leader's story and a follower's performance and, ultimately, relational trust.

Parker and Wickham (2005) studied how nonwork roles affected work-life balance, job satisfaction, and turnover intention. Their exploratory research design involved a questionnaire-survey structured with open-ended questions and semi-

structured interviews based on the issues found in the questionnaire-survey. The research was conducted on the Hobart Australia business community spanning varied firms within the community. After transcription and coding of the data into themes, concepts, terms, and issues, Parker and Wickham came up with a classification of five non-work roles: “The non-work roles that were identified were categorized into five broad groups: Family-Based, Sporting-Based, Charity-Based, Education-Based, and Socially-Based” (p. 7). They found that the most significant role was Family-Based, and it was by far the most important according to the results. The research showed the importance of the relationship between leader and follower in understanding motivators of turnover and job satisfaction. In addition, the research showed the direct change on the quality of the LMX relationship when leadership and organizational attention is placed on understanding the influence of outside roles on value and satisfaction. The many facets of LMX, differential treatment of followers, and the effect roles have on relationships demonstrate the complexity and dimensionality of LMX.

Multidimensionality of LMX. It should be noted that the LMX dyad has been shown to be bidirectional and multidimensional resulting in a two-way exchange that is influenced by available resources (Wilson et al., 2010; Liden & Maslyn, 1998; Greguras & Ford, 2006). Liden and Maslyn (1998) developed a scale (LMX-MDM) to determine the multidimensionality of LMX from the aspect of a subordinate using item analysis of 302 students and construct validation of 249 employees from two different organizations and four original factors of affect, loyalty, professional respect, and contribution. They collected data from the working students on 31 LMX items and used test-retest to assess item stability, variability, and exploratory factor analysis to determine appropriateness and narrow the selection to 11 items. Liden and Maslyn used confirmatory factor analysis

to understand the other data set consisting of two organizational samples and found that the four factors of affect, loyalty, contribution, and professional respect had a better fit than the other one-, two-, or three-factor models tested. The four factors have reliabilities of .90, .78, .59, and .89 respectively. Greguras and Ford (2006) mentioned that viewing the LMX construct as multidimensional allows for a broader view of the LMX relationships on individual and organizational outcomes.

Greguras and Ford (2006) developed a multidimensional instrument of supervisor LMX based on Liden and Maslyn's (1998) multidimensional subordinate instrument. In a cross-sectional design, 422 supervisor-subordinate dyads of employed adults were surveyed and mostly composed of male (59.2%) Caucasian (83.6%) supervisors and female (63.35) Caucasian (81.5%) subordinates. One disadvantage of their broad cross-sectional data collection method was that data were not reflective of homogeneous work environments as they collected samples across organizations and industries. Further, they found that loyalty significantly predicted subordinate job performance and that supervisor affect and professional respect, rather than resources towards subordinates predicted subordinate satisfaction with their supervisor, which leads to organizational commitment. In addition, they postulated that followers unhappy with their supervisor are more task focused and involved with the job than loyal to the organization. Finally, according to Greguras and Ford (2006), "affect plays a larger role in one's organizational commitment than in one's job involvement" (p. 457).

It should also be noted that the referenced literature previously related the vertical dyad link between a single leader and a single follower. Whereas a leader may have multiple followers, the measure in the construct was always construed as a single dyad. Vidyarthi, Ergodan, Anand, Liden, and Chaudhry (2014) extended the existing research

by studying a linkage in which a single follower reports to two leaders and has two LMX relationships. These researchers found that each LMX relationship has its own outcomes and quality levels and the optimal situation was when both were high-quality relationships. Vidyarthi et al. (2014) also found that extensive leader communication compensates for low-quality LMX relationships.

Followership and identity. Effective supervisory communication relates to leader affect and supports identity of the leader and follower within a relationship. Chang and Johnson (2010) hypothesized that leader relational identity plays an important part in moderating LMX relationships. Those with strong relational identity are defined by the dyadic relationship and the importance of their partners' welfare. Leaders guide the identity and power of followers, and followers inspire leaders' change motivation, which stimulates the social influence leaders possess. Time can affect both change motivation and social influence in establishing the underpinnings of the relationship between a leader and follower (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). This is especially important in government organizations in which staff tend to have long tenures of employment and supervisory relationships. Followership manifests based on the value in information or connection with the leader.

Oc and Bashshur (2013) mentioned that information and effect dependence can influence the power of a follower based on the level of each. Information dependence is a resource based on reliance on the follower for additional information the leader may not possess or information that might alter the level of performance. Effect dependence represents the leader's need for affiliation, to be connected and liked. If the leader has high reliance on follower information or effect dependence, the follower has increased influence to satisfy leader needs of information and affiliation.

Satisfying needs and affiliation are both important aspects of identity. Loi, Chan, and Lam (2014) proposed that LMX could mediate job satisfaction and organizational identity through the quality of the LMX relationship. Reducing uncertainty and meeting follower needs leads to increased self-efficacy and organizational identity.

Improved self-efficacy increases autonomy and self-determination. In a meta-analysis, Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer, and Ferris (2012) found that LMX moderates many antecedents of the LMX relationship including power and individualism. This suggests that as the quality of the LMX relationship increases, power is shared, producing follower autonomy and empowerment that enhances outcomes.

Graves and Luciano (2013) stated, "Self-determined individuals are 'authors' of their own behaviors; they experience their actions as volitional, intentional and self-initiated" (p. 518). Further, they found that self-determination is directly and positively related to LMX as well as the followers' satisfaction of needs related to competence, autonomy, and relatedness. Leader satisfaction of autonomy and competence needs of the follower are related to follower motivation resulting in increased job satisfaction. The outcome of this study again pointed to the fact that LMX relationships are differential and the follower has affect through identity and autonomy. Graves and Luciano advanced that the leader facilitates employee self-determination through the satisfaction of employee needs. Their study of 283 participants across a range of industries found that autonomy and competence through the satisfaction of needs positively related to LMX leading to enhanced organizational outcomes and job satisfaction. The results of this study show that follower consideration influences LMX quality and OCB.

In a study of 211 teachers in the Netherlands, Runharr et al. (2013) theorized that autonomy influences perception of work context. Specifically, engagement was related to

autonomy, and the more autonomy a follower had, the higher the OCB towards other individuals. The results also pointed to the importance of increasing autonomy to motivate followers who had low engagement and increase OCB and engagement of individuals.

The characteristics of a relationship affects outcomes depending on how followers view the role they play within the context of a relationship in general. Gabriel, Renaud, and Tippen (2006) conceived that the level of relatedness could be thought of differently by individuals. Some individuals have a dependent need to view social relationships as beneficial to self-confidence and self-efficacy, while others are self-independent of social relationships relative to self-concepts.

Another aspect of followership and identity that influences LMX is status. Kang and Bartlett (2013) suggested that external prestige was positively related to employee citizenship behaviors and that relationship was indirect and influenced by psychological empowerment as a proxy for autonomy. Ismail, Mohamed, Sulaiman, Mohamed, & Yusuf (2011) proposed that through transformational leader relational practices focusing on individualized consideration, followers perceived increased empowerment, resulting in increased organizational commitment, which is an antecedent of OCB.

In addition to autonomy and self-identity, attachment style can influence the quality of the LMX relationship (Richards & Hackett, 2013). Avoidant attachment style leads to a negative view of others as a compensating mechanism and an avoidance of affiliation and relationship. This becomes problematic in achieving higher quality LMX relationships. Positive attachment styles affect team performance and trust. Hinojosa, McCauley, Randolph-Seng, and Gardner (2014) indicated that attachment style serves as a contextual variable impacting authenticity, team productivity, team behaviors, OCB,

and organizational culture either positively or negatively. Insecure attachment styles, or narcissistic behaviors, limit trust and relational authenticity and increase negative leadership behaviors, which directly relate to the level of OCB. Trust takes a long time to build and, once broken, is extremely difficult to rebuild, resulting in numerous challenges for a leader when attempting to motivate a follower when it has been damaged (Han, 2011). Leaders can build trust within the organization and among individuals, but it requires leadership behaviors that provide support and role status commensurate with the level of relationship desired (Wells & Peachey, 2010).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Bateman and Organ (1983) discussed OCB in their seminal work. They proposed that job satisfaction was strongly related to OCB. Bateman and Organ defined OCB as “. . . behaviors that cannot be prescribed or required in advance for a given job” (p. 588). Further, they developed a 30-item construct that included cooperation, altruism, compliance, punctuality, housecleaning, protecting company property, conscientiously following company rules, and dependability.

OCBs enable individuals to cope within the organizational and relational dynamic that exists between an employee and supervisors, or a team. In another seminal work, Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) stated, “Substantively, citizenship behaviors are important because they lubricate the social machinery of the organization” (p 654).

Podsakoff et al. (1990) created a measurement scale for the OCB construct that included the five variables of altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy, and sportsmanship. They suggested that transformational and transactional leadership behaviors affected aspects of the construct differently. In addition, transactional leadership behaviors were more directly impactful on altruism and sportsmanship,

whereas transformational leadership behaviors had an indirect bearing on trust and satisfaction.

Leader OCB can influence the collective perception and belief about OCB, and actions taken by an individual or group outside normal roles (Yaffee & Kark, 2011). OCBs were positively related to organizational outcomes such as productivity, profits, customer satisfaction, and individual outcomes such as employee turnover and performance (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). It can be considered that group OCB can positively affect organizational effectiveness (Podsakoff et al., 2009; Yaffe & Kark, 2011). Interestingly, Spector, Bauer, and Fox (2010) suggested that counterproductive work behaviors were not mutually exclusive, meaning that one who performs counterproductive work behavior may also exhibit positive OCB. Empathy as a leadership behavior has been shown to produce OCB.

A leader who has empathy to understand and appreciate a follower positively influences the conscientiousness and identity of the follower. Through the leader's emotional intelligence, motivation, and satisfaction, a follower can be influenced, resulting in the exhibition of OCB (Korkmaz & Arpacı, 2009). Miao and Kim (2010) mentioned that favorable perception of organizational support and satisfaction led to favorable cross-cultural OCB in their study of Chinese leaders and followers and Western literature. Sahertian and Soetjipto (2011) declared that a subordinate's self-efficacy mediates the relationship between a leader and follower and commitment as represented by extra-role behavior, or OCB. When leaders are relationship oriented, consideration is affected and self-efficacy can be influenced, resulting in higher extra-role behavior. Further, Sahertian and Soetjipto suggested that OCBs decrease when working under task-oriented leadership and self-efficacy is low. In essence, leader behaviors that promote

follower identity and show empathy increase OCB and LMX.

The behavior a leader displays directly affects a follower's behaviors. This is exemplified by Peng and Chiu (2010), who found stronger organizational fit and commitment as well as followers who were more likely to display OCB when leaders provided high-quality feedback. Further, Peng and Chiu proposed that the quality of the feedback environment had a cumulative effect on job stress, role clarity, and the display of OCB.

Yen and Teng (2013) suggested that there is a difference between deviant work behavior and OCB in organizational structure. They found that centralized organizations had higher levels of OCB at the organizational and individual levels, and lower deviant behavior. Yen and Teng (2013) advised that this might be a result of centralized structures providing support, workplace friendships, and affective ties. One could posit that lower deviant behavior and higher quality feedback result in trust.

More and Tzafirir (2009) theorized trust to be a critical factor in OCB beyond formal organizational duties resulting in higher levels of commitment to the organization, and it has also been found to mediate the relationship between leader-member behavior and LMX quality. Zhu, Newman, Miao, and Hooke (2013) suggested that trust based on emotional ties between two parties in a relationship fully mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and OCBs. This supports the notion that how a leader behaves and the leadership style he or she displays alters the quality of the LMX relationship.

Leader Behavior and Relationship Quality

The literature documented to this point has shown that the behaviors of a leader directly affect the relationship differentially. In general, certain behaviors have been

shown to be supportive of high-quality relationships. Satisfying follower needs has also been shown to improve the quality of the LMX relationship.

Based on the literature, consideration for the follower through needs satisfaction that is positively related to LMX is predicated on the behavior of the leader towards the follower implying a power dynamic. Dulebohn et al. (2012) suggested that leaders play a dominant role in the relationship given a power differential. Certain leader characteristics, such as leader perception and leader behavior, play an important role in the LMX relationship, which affects the LMX quality, organizational commitment, OCB, and job satisfaction.

Given that there exists a power dynamic in LMX relationships, the abuse of authority can have significant ramifications on relationship quality. Leadership influence stems from referent and expert power as opposed to positional power. Referent power influences followers through role modeling, which demonstrates expectant behavior and acceptable norms (Yaffee & Kark, 2011). As such, the ethical use of power can set the stage for follower behavior. Ethical leadership can form a positive basis of a behavioral model that subordinates follow resulting in increased OCB and higher quality relationships (Avery, Palanski, & Walumbwa, 2011).

Sue-Chan, Au, and Hackett (2012) proposed that in the high power-distance Malaysian culture, supervisors whose behavior was associated with supportive, positive, and empathetic characteristics had higher levels of trust and LMX quality. Further, they advanced that high-quality LMX could also be predicted from employee job satisfaction.

Altruistic leader and follower behaviors may affect LMX relationships. Loi et al. (2010) discovered that LMX was positively related to altruism, and when under stressful situations such as concern for job security, the employee in a high-LMX relationship

would revert to altruistic behavior to benefit the supervisor rather than the organization indicating the effect power can have in the relationship. In addition, they theorized that under less stressful situations, LMX was not positively related to altruism, indicating that improving high-quality LMX can improve employee job performance and the direct effect behaviors and social exchanges have on the LMX relationship.

Leader behavior can significantly influence organizational commitment as well as job satisfaction, turnover intention, ethical climate, and many other factors in the exchange relationship. Hassan, Mahsud, Yukl, and Prussia (2012) discovered that the quality of the LMX relationship relates to leadership behaviors and outcomes. In addition, they suggested that the relationship between ethical leaders and their subordinates is social rather than reward based relative to exchanges. Supervisors' relationships with their followers can be predicted by their interpersonal behaviors (Piccolo et al., 2012). Supervisors who demonstrate strong ethical values, interpersonal skills, empathy, and consideration for their followers are successful and inspirational and assist followers in fulfillment of aspirations. Further, it has been shown that leader behaviors like empathy mediate effects of ethical values on LMX (Mahsud, Yukl, & Prussia, 2009). One could posit that low-quality LMX can be produced through the behaviors and ethical values of the leader.

The ancillary effects of a low-quality supervisory relationship include a follower's inability to manage emotional state. Medler-Liraz and Kark (2012) discovered that low-quality relationships between a leader and a follower in a service environment encouraged follower negative emotions that can leach into abusive service incidents. Alternatively, a high-quality relationship between a leader and follower may reduce employee hostility through the leader's ability to influence the emotional state of the

follower.

Caldwell and Hansen (2010) stated, “Commitment, extra-role behavior, close interpersonal relationships, perceptions of human resource practices, and social contracts are the media through which trust becomes action” (p. 183). Caldwell et al. further speculated that trust formation is behavior based and is a differentiator of the LMX relationship and organizational performance. Ding et al. (2012) found that high levels of supervisory emotional intelligence led to increased trust, indicating that management behavior affects the LMX relationship and trust.

Emotional intelligence. Leaders can play an important role in the regulation of emotion. Kaplan, Cortina, Ruark, LaPort, and Nicolaides (2014) suggested that leaders significantly influence followers’ emotions and organizational experience and that there are eight common emotion management behaviors leaders can make that have a base set of skills and resultant outcomes. These behaviors are considered interrelated and are moderated by other factors such as leader workload and self-emotion management. Further, Kaplan et al. (2014) theorized that the eight emotion management behaviors lead to proximal outcomes like LMX, and trust and satisfaction in the leader as well as ultimate outcomes such as cohesion, organizational commitment, and OCBs.

In a study of 285 Chinese leader-member dyads, Chen, Lam, and Zhong (2012) hypothesized that emotional intelligence of the follower as rated by the leader and trust in the leader by the follower predicted the quality of LMX relationships. In addition, LMX mediated the result of employee emotional intelligence and trust in the leader. Chen et al. found that a supervisor’s ability to assess a follower’s emotional intelligence accurately and directly shapes the quality of the relationship between a follower and a supervisor.

Jordan and Troth (2010) discovered that followers who had high emotional

intelligence and the ability to manage fellow employees' emotions had higher job satisfaction, lower turnover intention, and higher levels of LMX quality. In a survey of 232 employees and 88 supervisory South Korean hotel workers, Kim, Lee, and Carlson (2010) suggested a curvilinear relationship between LMX and turnover intention. Employees had higher turnover intention regardless of the quality of LMX, whereas supervisors had higher turnover intention only with low-quality LMX.

Ding, Kun, Chongsen, and Sufang (2012) revealed that the level of emotional intelligence of a leader affects abusive supervision. Further, supervisors with high levels of emotional intelligence use alternative supervisory methods that positively sway their own emotions as well as others' moods and trust resulting in improved social exchange.

Ethical and abusive supervision. Ethical leadership can influence employee performance and is positively related to LMX quality, self-efficacy, and organizational identity, which can enhance commitment (Walumbwa et al., 2011). Unethical leadership or abusive supervision may leverage power to corrupt the social exchange process between a leader and follower.

A social exchange is valued differently within a relationship based on power and group dynamics. For instance, Pelletier (2012) conceived that follower observations of toxicity were greater for followers in an out-group except when in-group followers observed unethical leader behavior to one of their own. Additionally, Pelletier surmised that in-group behavior could be enabling of leadership toxicity. They noted that enablement is accomplished through blind obedience as a result of perceived psychological or physical safety, cost-benefit of a challenging behavior, or simply behaviors of a bystander that remain disengaged.

Xu et al. (2012) reported that poor exchange relationships between a supervisor

and subordinate lead to lower motivation to perform, withheld resources, and lower commitment. Further, an abused subordinate may reciprocate his or her treatment with other coworkers, increasing organizational dysfunction. Xu et al. (2012) also maintained that LMX mediates the negative association of abusive supervision and employee in-role performance and that a negative association may exist between abusive supervision and the likelihood an employee will perform extra-role behaviors such as OCB. In other words, abusive supervision negatively influences the exchange relationship and the employee's willingness to perform above and beyond his or her normal role.

Decoster, Camps, and Stouten (2014) replicated Xu et al.'s (2012) study and established similar results for LMX mediation of the relationship between abusive supervision and OCBs at the individual and organizational levels. Decoster et al. (2014) were not able to replicate the results on LMX as a mediator of the relationship between abusive supervision and employee performance.

Decoster et al.'s (2014) study was centered on Belgian organizations as opposed to Chinese organizations as in Xu et al.'s (2012) research. The findings of Decoster et al.'s analysis contributed to generalization of results. The authors used data from multiple sources including surveys of employees and supervisors from multiple industries as well as government. Of the 203 employee surveys distributed, 114 were returned for a 56.2% response rate. The survey instruments included Tepper's abusive supervision survey (as cited in Decoster et al., 2014), an adapted survey for LMX using Liden and Maslyn's (1998) and Greguras and Ford's (2006) LMX surveys, Abramis' (1994) performance measure (as cited in Decoster, 2014), Konovsky and Organ's (1996) Organizational Citizenship Behavior Individual, and Lee and Allen's (2002) Organizational Citizenship Behavior Organization (as cited in Decoster et al., 2014). Each had a Cronbach's alpha of

0.83, 0.89, 0.94, 0.81, 0.92 respectively, showing internal consistency and reliability. In addition, Decoster et al. noted their inability to replicate the results of the mediating role of LMX on the relationship between abusive supervision and employee performance, which may be attributed to the difference in power-distance between Chinese and Belgian cultures.

Abusive supervision has also been shown to affect low-quality LMX relationships through displaced supervisory aggression on low-quality group members as a potential venting mechanism that shields the high-quality LMX relationship groups. This venting mechanism creates a domino effect on performance, work outcomes, and OCB (K. J. Harris, Harvey, & Kacmar, 2011). Additionally, K. J. Harris et al. put forward that LMX is a reflection of a multilevel, broad spectrum of LMX quality characteristics and that subordinates in low-quality LMX relationships exhibit either high levels of proactive or passive behavior resulting in increased levels of abuse by the leader.

Ethical leadership has a direct impact on the LMX relationship relative to trust, status and reputation. A leader's behaviors can result in positive and supportive relationships or breakdowns leading to low-quality relationships. Kalshoven, Den Hartog, and De Hoogh (2011) revealed that "Based on theory, interviews, and a student sample, we developed seven ethical leader behaviors (fairness, integrity, ethical guidance, people orientation, power sharing, role clarification, and concern for sustainability)" (p. 51). The construct of ethical leadership explained variances in trust, leader and follower effectiveness, and OCB, enabling a validated way to understand precursors and results of ethical leadership.

LMX and OCB

Concern for the relationship is key to improving outcomes and establishing success. As has been demonstrated in the discussion of the literature, the quality of the LMX relationship is generally directly related to prosocial behaviors such as OCB. Ilies et al. (2007) established that LMX strongly predicts citizenship behaviors as well as task performance in high-quality LMX.

Mahsud et al. (2009) posited that both hierarchical regression and structured equation modeling analysis results indicated that relations-oriented behavior fully mediates the effects of leader empathy and LMX and partially mediates the effects of ethical leadership. Their study is unique in that their model studied leader empathy, ethical leadership values, and relations-oriented behavior together as antecedents of LMX.

The connection between LMX and OCB is a social exchange process that includes economic and social relationship currency based on fairness and treatment that affects desired outcomes such as supervisory loyalty and OCB (Sun, Chow, Chiu, & Pan, 2013). Leadership relationships are a series of negotiated social exchanges. A further discussion on social exchanges relative to the affiliation is necessary to distinguish the connection of LMX to OCB.

Othman, Ee, and Shi (2009) stated that “Social exchange is said to evolve when employers takes [*sic*] care of their employees. Over time, this reciprocal relationship evolves into a trusting and loyal relationship” (p. 338). Trusting and loyal relationships are representative of high-quality LMX. Othman et al. (2009) theorized that social exchange relative to LMX has organizational effects as well as affecting the relationship between a supervisor and a follower. Further, high-quality relationships can be based on

dysfunction, such as an unfair assessment of the relationship. In addition, a good LMX relationship can be viewed as dysfunctional and lead to follower perceptions of injustice when the leader has not grounded the assessment as fair and factual. Dysfunctional positive LMX relationships affect the organization as well as the individuals in these cases and show that it is important to understand the LMX relationship from both parties in the dyad and from the perspective of the organization.

Social exchanges are governed by psychological contracts, which are the organizational terms that shape individual beliefs in a relationship between a leader and a subordinate (Bal, Chiaburu, & Jansen, 2010). Part of the psychological contract between a leader and subordinate is founded on trust. Byrne, Pitts, Chiaburu, and Steiner (2011) mentioned that “Social exchange relies on trust—trust that interactions will ignite obligation in the partners, such that each will reciprocate in order to fulfill his or her obligation” (p. 111). In the context of this study, trust is the positive result of a social exchange between a leader and a follower. Trust supports the supervisor-employee relationship and, as such, serves to sustain the quality of the LMX relationship, which in turn produces extant behaviors such as commitment, job satisfaction, and performance (Han, 2011).

Whereas trust in the organization is shown to influence OCB, another factor is the perception of support from the organization. Byrne et al. (2010) also stated, “We suggest that employees who perceive their managers as trustworthy partly attribute their manager’s integrity, ability, and benevolence (i.e., trustworthiness) to the values of the organization, form positive POS, and demonstrate high performance and commitment” (p. 110). This perception of positive organizational support is found to be instrumental in the “transference” process whereby a follower/employee transfers the behavior of the

leader/supervisor as a proxy for the organization, inferring that a supervisor's behaviors are representative of the organization's values and ethics and thus affects trust at the organizational and supervisory levels. Chou et al. (2011) noted that low-quality exchanges are essentially basic transactions that fulfill the work contract whereas high-quality relationships produce trust, preferential treatment, inclusion, and information.

These results demonstrate the importance of the dyadic LMX relationship and provide insight into how LMX quality influences OCB. Chou et al. (2011) surveyed a combination of public and private institutions and discovered that among 304 survey respondents, job satisfaction mediated the relationship between LMX and organizational commitment. Chou et al. (2011) proposed that organizational commitment is an antecedent to OCB as well.

It has been conjectured that high-quality group LMX can affect OCB outcomes and turnover intentions inversely (T. B. Harris, Li, & Kirkman, 2014). Further, the dyadic relationship between two individuals influences behaviors and outcomes of each member, and LMX differentiation helps the leader manage a group through dispersion of high-quality LMX relationships within a group.

Yunus, Ishak, Mustapha, and Othman (2010) theorized that LMX moderates OCB variables of civic virtue and emotional intelligence providing evidence that a leader's emotional intelligence changes a subordinate's OCB, and increases the quality of the leader-subordinate relationship. As previously suggested, the quality of the relationship between a leader and subordinate influences team and individual commitment within organizations and is an important factor in predicting OCB (Bakar, Mustaffa, & Mohamad, 2008; Ilies et al., 2007). Graves and Luciano (2013) deduced that satisfaction of basic psychological needs such as competence, autonomy, and relatedness are directly

applicable to the quality of the LMX relationship and subordinate outcomes.

Interpersonal and social relationships are the lifeblood of an organization's effective operation. Satisfying needs requires dialogue. Communication from the leader is a catalyst for behaviors and attitudes of followers (Dasgupta, Suar, & Singh, 2013). Further, Dasgupta et al. (2013) stated that in relation to supportive communication, "The more the supervisor communicates support to employees, the more satisfied are employees with the communication of their supervisors because their needs are met" (p. 192). Consistency in the message from the leader affects follower perception on integrity, directly influencing outcomes such as LMX quality and OCB. In a study of 698 full-time employees who were also students, Fritz, O'Neil, Popp, Williams, and Arnett (2012) proposed that supervisory behavioral integrity influences organizational outcomes as demonstrated by consistency of a supervisor's communication relative to organizational expectations and standards and his or her actions support what is said. Further, cynicism in a supervisor's communication can mediate employee commitment, affecting organizational outcomes through a lack of consistency with organizational expectations and standards.

Gajendran and Joshi (2012) suggested that increased frequency of communication with the leader increases the quality of the LMX relationship as well as provides an amplification of effects on team outcomes. Kwan, Liu, and Yim (2011) noted that OCB could play a role in LMX relationship development in high-quality relationships when the leader demonstrates OCB behavior that the follower can attribute to desired behavior on his or her part. Kwan et al. (2011) postulated that OCB in high-quality LMX relationships was viewed as impression management by other followers. Impression management as perceived by followers has an effect on observations of fairness. Torka, Schyns, and

Looise (2010) submitted that the quality of participation in an LMX relationship affects a follower's perception of fairness and influences positive attitudes and, potentially, organizational performance.

Fisk and Friesen (2012) considered a leader's emotional regulation relative to LMX and its effect on job satisfaction. They used an on-line survey and snowball sampling to survey 126 valid respondents. The instruments used included the 24-item Podsakoff et al. (1990) OCB scale as well as the Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) LMX-7 survey.

Fisk and Friesen (2012) discussed emotional regulation and the differences between surface acting and deep acting of supervisors. The study results showed that surface acting, which is viewed as inauthentic, affected OCB behavior more for those with high-quality LMX relationships than low-quality LMX relationships. This indicated that those followers who are in-group are likely to withdraw extra-role behaviors and perceive the lack of authenticity of their supervisor as a threat to status as well as a breakdown in trust between leader and follower in the LMX relationship.

Fisk and Friesen (2012) also noted a distinction between sincerity and authenticity tied to deep acting and that deep acting can be misread as authenticity. This is an important distinction because of the need for a leader to understand how his or her emotions sway followers and shift behaviors accordingly. Authentic leaders have a different makeup including optimism, resilience, self-awareness, and ethics at levels higher than one would expect when performing deep acting.

Additionally, a potential negative attribute that weighs on the quality of the LMX relationship and OCB is envy. Follower envy can be a detriment to the performance of the group and organization and can be improved by increasing the quality of LMX, which

leads to increasing OCB and higher levels of customer service and satisfaction (S. Kim, O'Neill, & Cho, 2010).

Leadership in the Public Sector

All levels of government face critical issues that impede the ability to provide public services in an efficient and effective manner. As French and Emerson (2014) pointed out relative to public sector motivation and differences with the private sector environment, "The public sector differs from private sector in many ways, including the availability of resources, public scrutiny of budgetary decisions and greater limitations on the provision of extrinsic rewards" (p. 554). These challenges create an environment that is political and bureaucratic, where employees follow a mantra of doing more with less. Further, French and Emerson discovered that government employees have intrinsic motivators such as benefits and job security and extrinsic factors such as altruism and purpose to motivate them. They also proposed future research around intrinsic and extrinsic factors influencing commitment, supporting the approach of this study, to explore the relationship between LMX and OCB.

Although there is limited availability of LMX and OCB research in the United States federal government, there is current literature on the topic in other countries' federal government organizations that has extended the research in the government arena. Brunetto et al. (2012) proposed that the quality of the LMX relationship had greater influence on public sector employees with low LMX versus private sector employees with high LMX. The study used quantitative survey results from three validated survey instruments as well as a demographic survey. The quantitative data were coupled with qualitative interviews and focus groups of 383 public and 900 private Australian hospital nurses. The interviews and focus groups used to support the quantitative results lasted 20

minutes and were tape recorded for transcription and analysis.

In a cross-sectional study of a 150 Malaysian government bank supervisors of the OCB levels of direct-report employees as measured by the supervisor, Yunus, Ghazali, and Hassan (2011) mentioned that regulation of emotion and emotional intelligence of the supervisor correlated with the variation in conscientiousness of the follower. The higher the ability of the supervisor to regulate his or her emotions and show empathy and other emotional intelligence attributes, the more likely higher OCB outcomes occur.

In a study of 1,122 South Korean central government agencies' employees, Park, Park, and Ryu (2013) noted that interpersonal trust is an important factor that enhances OCB and organizational commitment. They found this to be universal and not specific to culture. In addition, they posited that group culture and formalized structures foster organizational commitment and OCB in Korean public organizations.

Data also exists relative to LMX and OCB in the local United States government levels. Rosen, Harris, and Kacmar (2011) studied a state organization that manages disease control. The study focused on the role of LMX in moderating the effects of the perceptions of organizational justice and politics on job performance using an uncertainty management foundation to explain results rather than the traditional social exchange theory often used in LMX research. Rosen et al. found that followers who had low-quality relationships with their supervisors had stronger perceptions relative to organizational justice and politics. The researchers sampled 157 state government employees using an introductory email with a link to an on-line survey.

Meiners and Boster (2012) explored manager-employee negotiations in a Southern United States city government. Participants were 80 full-time employees and 25 divisional supervisors from a sample of 500. The researchers found that high-quality

LMX relationships were shown to have higher levels of mutual persuasion and reciprocal influence, indicating a flexible relationship open to compromise resulting in an improved work environment. In addition, the study results suggested that the level of formal organizational structure affected the opportunity for compromise or concessions by constraining flexibility as well as an unintended consequence of not knowing what is not negotiable. Meiners and Boster (2012) also stated that participative decision making was not correlated to any of their outcome expectations in their hypothesis.

Another state government study involved an entire division of health and hospital workers. In a study of 175 dyads, Andrews, Harris, and Kacmar (2009) suggested that the level of political skill one had influenced the level of OCB, and the ability of a follower to fit into any work environment including one where leader behavior might be abusive. OCB is an important factor in public sector organizations in order for them to manage the complex and rapid changes and provide effective public service. The first to benefit is often the public. Vigoda-Gadot and Beerli (2011) stated, "For example, performing extra-role behaviors and OCB may increase the level of public service, help overcome red tape and bureaucracy, and improve public perceptions about government" (p. 578).

Vigoda-Gadot and Beerli (2011) theorized, "Hence it may be argued that the quality of the relationship between the public employees and their supervisors contributes strongly to individual's willingness to engage in innovative and creative behaviors and toward other individuals that support the organization" (p. 591). A further hypothesis was that LMX is important in political environments and that it can help facilitate OCB. One interesting point in the study that counters much of the existing research was that the transactional leadership style had a direct and positive relationship to change-oriented OCB whereas transformational leadership had a direct negative effect. Vigoda-Gadot and

Beerli (2011) hypothesized that this may be a result of the environment influencing how charismatic leadership is enacted from the perspective of operational versus transactional processes. Specifically, charismatic leadership may be directed toward rallying the troops towards defined rules and structure as opposed to innovation and creativity.

Kellis and Ran (2013) proposed that a combination of leadership styles including values based, transformational, and distributed, results in improved outcomes through individualized consideration, individualized influence, empowerment, and engagement. Further, their study analyzed 6 years of Federal Human Capital Surveys and found that in addition to support for the combined leadership styles, rewarding employees for specific behavior did not correlate to improved outcomes.

The United States Office of Personnel Management's Federal Viewpoint Survey (2013) provides historical results from 2010 forward. The survey showed consistent decline in basic and fundamental characteristics of an environment that supports high performance based on the relationships between leaders and followers. This can be seen in the yearly declining result in all major factors including empowerment, creativity and innovation, pay, job satisfaction, and input in decision making. In addition, as mentioned, there were consistent declines in leaders who provide a motivating and supportive environment, integrity, collaboration, and communication, which are all factors in high-quality LMX and OCB.

Finally, power may play a role in the LMX relationship in the public sector. Martinez, Kane, Ferris, and Brooks (2012) studied 360 leader-follower dyads in state government and discovered that followers expect their leaders to possess power. However, their research did not confirm that followers with power needed their leaders less in terms of meeting needs. This could be indicative of a traditional regulatory

environment that expects a power differential between leader and follower.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this explanatory sequential mixed-methods study was to examine the relationship between a leader and follower (LMX) and extra-role behaviors (OCB) in a federal government organization. In this study, the first phase focused on quantitative research questions that were explored through surveys to address the relationship between LMX and OCB of the participants at the research site. Information from the first phase was used to construct pertinent qualitative questions, which were used in interviews of a specific subsection of the participant population at the federal program research site to further understand the quantitative survey data. The responses provided a contextualization of the broader LMX and OCB concept. The reason for using this approach in the second phase was to better understand the quantitative data at a greater depth and provide individual motivations not captured in the first phase of the study.

Research Questions

This study was guided by four research questions. The questions addressed qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods:

1. Quantitative: What are the indicators of LMX and OCB in a program area of a department of the federal government as reflected in the quantitative survey data?
2. Qualitative: To what extent is there a relationship between LMX and OCB in a program area of a departmental agency of the federal government as evidenced in the interview data that resulted from interview questions developed from the quantitative survey data?
3. Qualitative: To what extent does the quality of the LMX relationship affect OCB within a program area of a departmental agency of the federal government as

evidenced in the interview data that resulted from interview questions developed from the quantitative survey data?

4. Mixed methods: How and to what extent does the qualitative interview data contribute to a broader understanding of the relationship between LMX and OCB in a federal program area of a departmental agency of the federal government as revealed by the quantitative survey data reflected in a mixed-methods analysis?

Chapter 3: Methodology

The methodology used for this applied dissertation study was based on a mixed-methods correlational explanatory sequential design. A mixed-methods research design uses qualitative and quantitative research; a combination of both approaches provides a more comprehensive understanding of a research problem (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007). This researcher selected a mixed-methods approach to account for the smaller sample size available, to develop a larger view and understanding of the research problem, and to contextualize the broader concept of leader-member exchange (LMX) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) with individual information.

The quantitative data were the primary focus of the first phase that supported design and development of the qualitative questions and resulting data in the second phase of the study. In the first phase, surveys were distributed to capture quantitative information relative to demographics and LMX and OCB in a program of a federal government agency. Surveys were distributed to employees on LMX and OCB and to corresponding supervisors on LMX. In the second phase, the top and bottom 5% of survey participants based on raw scores of the surveys were selected to participate in interviews. This amounted to eight interviewees based on the number of paired responses. This method of selection was used to ensure reduced bias and to include a diverse representative interview sample within the existing population relative to the data results from the surveys. The questions were developed based on the research, and responses from the quantitative survey results. All participants had the choice of opting out of participation at any time without prejudice. Data were retained using the same procedures for respondents who agreed to participate in the survey but not the interview portion of the study.

Edmonds and Kennedy (2013) mentioned that qualitative data are usually presented in the first phase of the research, but qualitative, quantitative, or both can be used effectively. An explanatory correlational design was used to describe the relationship between the two variables of LMX and OCB. The population of the study consisted of all employees and leaders in the specified program of the federal government agency. The results for this study were generalized to the subject organization and may, but are not specifically intended to, be generalized to other government agencies.

Participants

The administrative leader of the organization sets the tone for the organization, provides directives for the staff, and is responsible for the performance of the organization. Originally, the study was limited to a smaller group of 92 participants but was later expanded to obtain a larger sample and broader results for the agency administrator. The agency program administrator was excluded from the study as a subordinate, and the primary researcher was excluded along with the researcher's seven direct reports as subordinates. Convenience sampling was used. Demographics were collected from the participants as well.

Instruments

The data-collection instruments consisted of one LMX instrument, which contains a supervisor (SLMX-MDM) and subordinate (LMX-MDM) survey portion. In addition to the LMX scale, instruments for OCB, demographics were administered. These surveys were combined for a total of 45 questions. Individual interviews were conducted after the quantitative survey data were collected and analyzed, as described in the data-analysis section of the methodology procedures.

Supervisor LMX was administered using the SLMX-MDM for supervisors and LMX-MDM for subordinates and each represent validated 12-item scales, (Greguras & Ford, 2006; Liden & Maslyn, 1998). The SLMX-MDM is identical to the LMX-MDM developed by Liden and Maslyn (1998) except that it is a parallel of the LMX-MDM for a supervisor. The LMX-MDM was the first multidimensional scale that measured the four dimensions of affect, loyalty, contribution, and professional respect in relation to a subordinate's perceptions of his or her supervisor. The SLMX-MDM and LMX-MDM use a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*.

Confirmatory factor analysis was used to support the validity of the LMX-MDM and SLMX-MDM within Greguras and Ford's (2006) study. Reliability coefficients for the four factors of the SLMX-MDM—*affect, loyalty, contribution, and professional respect*—were 0.85, 0.85, 0.75 and 0.91 respectively with an average reliability coefficient of 0.90. Data indicated that the four-factor SLMX-MDM model provided a goodness of fit to the data of $p < 0.05$. In addition, criterion-related validity was used for independent prediction of the model data. Supporting the theory that high-quality relationships result in positive outcomes, "These findings are consistent with the theory that higher quality LMX relationships relate to more favorable subordinate job attitudes, in-role performance, and OCBs" (Greguras & Ford, 2006, p. 448). The questions in the SLMX-MDM survey instrument were used to answer Research Question 1, What are the indicators of LMX and OCB in a program area of a departmental program of the federal government as reflected in the quantitative survey data?

OCB was measured using the scale developed by Podsakoff et al. (1990). The OCB instrument is a 24-item, five-factor scale that uses a 5-point scale ranging from 1=

never to 5 = every day. The factors are altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue.

Confirmatory factor analysis was used for validity resulting in α -coefficients for the five factors of altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue of 0.84, 0.81, 0.80, 0.82 and 0.79, respectively. Overall scale validity measured 0.93 for the composite scale (Podsakoff et al., 1995). The instrument was administered to subordinates rather than supervisors of the organization being studied, enabling ratings of subordinate OCB. The scale, originally designed for subordinate self-rating, was better suited to subordinate rating than supervisory rating of the subordinate.

Personal demographics were collected using a survey instrument developed by this researcher. Single-statement items were used to capture demographic information on participants. Questions related to age, gender, length of service, education, location, telework frequency, and supervisory reporting length.

Individual semi-structured qualitative interviews were conducted with selected staff who submitted consent forms and survey responses. The questions (see Appendix A) for the individual interviews were developed from the results of the data collected from the Demographic, LMX, and OCB instruments to help explain the relationship between LMX and OCB within the context of the federal government organization, and research questions being studied. The semi-structured interview questions were designed to explore interesting or unique areas and general background relative to the research questions and study purpose based on the quantitative survey responses. The two-phased research approach enabled an in-depth exploration, collection, and potential emergent trends of relevant data. Specifically, the qualitative interview questions were used to

answer Research Questions 2 and 3. Question 2 was, To what extent is there a relationship between LMX and OCB in a program area of a departmental agency of the federal government as evidenced in the interview data, which resulted from interview questions developed from the quantitative survey data? Question 3 was, Does the quality of the LMX relationship affect OCB within a program area of a departmental agency of the federal government as evidenced in the interview data, which resulted from interview questions developed from the quantitative survey data? The qualitative interview questions along with the SLMX-MDM, OCB and Personal Demographic instruments were used to answer Research Question 4, How and to what extent does the qualitative interview data contribute to broader understanding of the relationship between LMX and OCB in a federal program area of a departmental agency of the federal government as revealed by the quantitative survey data reflected in a mixed methods analysis?

Information from the interviews was coded and synthesized with the quantitative data to help address the research questions. In addition, this method provided information to help understand the relationship between LMX and OCB in a federal government agency.

Procedures

The purpose of this mixed-methods sequential, correlational, explanatory study was to understand the relationship between LMX and OCB in a U.S. federal government organization. According to Creswell (2007), “An explanatory research design is a correlational design in which the researcher is interested in the extent to which two variables (or more) co-vary, that is, where changes in one variable are reflected in changes in the other” (p. 358).

Purposeful convenience sampling was used to identify participants for the surveys. Raw-score response survey totals were used for interview selection. The surveys and interviews helped to understand the relationship between LMX and OCB in the federal government organization. Demographic questions were incorporated into the LMX and OCB surveys. All surveys were administered electronically via SurveyMonkey, an on-line survey tool, and distributed to participants for completion via a web link. The three surveys were combined for a total of 44 questions. The first part of the survey included eight personal demographic items (see Appendix B) followed by the 12 item LMX-MDM for followers and 12-item SLMX-MDM for leaders, and the 24-item OCB scale (see Appendix D).

Participants were employees of a specific departmental agency program of the federal government located in Washington, DC, and 20 outlying offices. Supervisors within the population were identified. A cover letter was sent to each participant ($N = 433$) via email with the informed consent form with an opt-out option. Once the signed informed consent form was returned, an email with the survey web link was sent to each participant.

Participants had 1 week to return the signed consent form and 1 week to complete the survey. As mentioned, all respondents had the choice to opt out of participation at any time without prejudice. Supervisors received the LMX subordinate and supervisor and OCB subordinate survey links and were asked to complete both as supervisor and subordinate. The supervisor completed one SLMX-MDM subordinate survey for each direct report submitting a survey. The letter explained the purpose of the study, thanked individuals for participating, ensured confidentiality, and provided instructions for completion as well as endorsement from the agency head or designee. A reminder email was sent to each participant 1 week following the initial email with the informed consent attachment. A second reminder email was sent 2 days

prior to the completion date provided in the cover letter email. The completion date was 2 weeks from the distribution of the cover letter email with the informed consent attachment.

Upon completion of the surveys, the collected data were organized and analyzed, and questions were constructed (see Appendix A) for the formal interviews of the selected participants. Interviews were conducted immediately after the data-collection phase was completed and finished in 1 week. Data were stored on a password-protected and encrypted USB drive to be retained for 3 years, then destroyed.

The top 5% and bottom 5% of responses of the total population ($N = 433$) who submitted a consent form ($N = 80$) and those who responded to the employee surveys ($N = 77$) were selected for the interviews. The selection was based on the total raw scores of the SLMX-MDM and OCB questions. The interviews occurred via Citrix GoToMeeting. The interviews were recorded. The digital files were to be originally imported into ATLAS.ti for computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software for content analysis (CAQDAS). However, difficulty in obtaining a license resulted in the switch to a similar product, NVivo 11 for Mac. Standard university informed consent forms modified for specific use were produced for subject protection and anonymity.

Data analysis. The responses to the LMX and OCB surveys were analyzed to understand the research questions and compare the survey responses with the interview responses. Data were collected from the quantitative surveys distributed to the participants ($N = 433$), and the variables of LMX and OCB were analyzed, providing means, standard deviations, and frequency percentages. The data were downloaded from SurveyMonkey for analysis in SPSS. Descriptive statistics were used to understand the characteristics of the data.

Interviews were analyzed for qualitative data analysis, coding, and content analysis using NVivo 11 for Mac (2015 version). Content analysis identified themes that emerged from the qualitative data. Some of the themes discovered for the analysis were communication, autonomy, trust, motivation, and LMX relationship in support of the purpose of the research study. Questions were designed to elicit a response from each interview participant to help understand his or her detailed personal response relative to the relationship between LMX and OCB. A narrative discussion on themes related to the quality of the LMX relationship and extra-role behaviors was included. Deductive coding was used to study the themes generated from analysis, and inductive coding was used to study within each theme. The responses to the interview questions were used to help understand the survey results.

Qualitative interviews. Eight interviews were conducted with eight questions being asked of each interviewee (see Appendix A). Followers were interviewed and asked questions about their supervisory relationship. Supervisors were not interviewed. Follow-up questions were asked to clarify responses. Participants could opt out of the interview at any point.

All interviews were conducted virtually using Citrix GoToMeeting©. The interviews were recorded within Citrix GoToMeeting© and exported as an MP3. NVivo 11 for Mac was used to analyze and code the data as well as to expose emerging themes.

The questions were developed based on the quantitative results of survey responses. The interview protocol consisted of four questions developed to reveal data regarding LMX and four questions designed to reveal data relative to the relationship of LMX and OCB (see Appendix A).

Timeline

In order to accommodate approval delays, scheduling, and limit staff impact, the timeline was adjusted in Weeks 1 and 2 to expedite data collection. Upon receiving university approval, the updated timeline (see Table 1) was designated to fulfill the requirements of the study. Table 2 provides the research questions and data treatments matrix for mixed methodology.

Table 1

Timeline of Procedures

Week	Procedure
1	Created surveys for demographics, and combined LMX and OCB surveys in SurveyMonkey. Introductory email letter and informed consent with a 1-week completion deadline was sent to all participants. As informed consent forms were received, an email with survey link was sent to participants.
2	Email reminder was sent for completion of surveys to all participants who returned an informed consent and received a survey link to complete.
3	Data were received, completion dates are met, the data were analyzed. Selected interview participants from the existing sample and email participation letter, and request to provide dates and time to schedule interviews. Sent out recorded interview invitation with contact details for Citrix GoToMeeting.
5-6	Conducted recorded interviews using Citrix GoToMeeting.
7-8	Transcribed and analyzed interview data.
9-13	The final dissertation report was drafted.

Table 2

Research Questions and Data Treatments Matrix for Mixed Methodology

Research question	Type	Instruments	Data treatment
1. What are the indicators of LMX and OCB in a program area of a departmental program of the federal government as reflected in a quantitative survey?	Quantitative	Survey of demographics, SLMX-MDM & OCB & OCB	Calculate range, means, and standard deviations for surveys; correlations
2. To what extent is there a relationship between LMX and OCB in a program area of a departmental agency of the federal government as evidenced in the interview data from interview questions developed from the quantitative survey data?	Qualitative	Interview questions	Code/theme interview transcripts supporting quantitative data
3. To what extent does the quality of the LMX relationship affect OCB within a program area of a departmental agency of the federal government as evidenced in the interview data that resulted from the interview questions developed from the quantitative survey data?	Qualitative	Interview questions	Code/theme interview transcript
4. How and to what extent do the qualitative interview data contribute to a broader understanding of the relationship between LMX and OCB in a federal program area of a departmental agency is revealed by the quantitative survey data reflected in a mixed-methods analysis?	Mixed methods	Demographic survey, LMX survey, OCB survey, interview transcript analysis	OCB & LMX values; analyze themes; correlations, means, SD from survey

Chapter 4: Results

This study examined the relationship between LMX and OCB of a program in a federal government agency. A mixed-methods correlational explanatory sequential design was used. The selected methodology first entailed collecting quantitative data via a 45-question survey, followed by qualitative data collection in the form of selected personal interviews that enhanced the understanding of the quantitative data. The personal interviews consisted of eight questions. Four questions related to LMX and four questions related to OCB. The interview questions were designed with consideration given to the quantitative survey data results.

Description of the Sample

The sample was drawn from 433 employees of a federal government agency program. Eighty individuals chose to participate by submitting an informed consent form to the researcher. Seventy-seven staff members (17.78%) completed the employee survey. In addition, 21 supervisors completed a supervisory LMX survey for their subordinates who completed an employee LMX survey, resulting in 50 paired employee-supervisor responses.

Results for Quantitative Research Question 1

What are the indicators of LMX and OCB in a program area of a federal government agency as reflected in the quantitative survey data? This portion of the survey was represented by Questions 10 through 21. Frequencies and percentages for each SLMX-MDM question were calculated for all supervisors who submitted an SLMX-MDM survey response for a paired employee LMX-MDM (see Appendix E). Survey answers were noted for all categories in the Likert scale of the instrument from a scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

As mentioned, the SLMX-MDM and LMX-MDM are parallel surveys of LMX for supervisors and subordinates respectively. The results for the supervisory responses were generally positive in relation to LMX and OCB. Supervisors liked their subordinates (84% agreed or strongly agreed) and thought their subordinates could be a friend (78% agreed or strongly agreed) but were somewhat less fun to work with (68% agreed or strongly agreed, 32% neutral or disagreed). Survey question replies that centered on supervisor perception of subordinate support were somewhat less positive. Leaders supposed subordinates were less likely to defend their decisions (46% neutral or disagreed) or come to their defense if attacked by others (34% neutral or disagreed). However, managers believed that a subordinate would defend them to others if they had made an honest mistake (82% agreed or strongly agreed).

Supervisors strongly believed they go above and beyond for their subordinates (92% agreed or strongly agreed), and apply extra effort (100% agreed or strongly agreed). As part of the contribution item of the LMX construct, supervisors were likely to work hardest for subordinates (96% agree or strongly agreed).

Supervisors generally respected their subordinate's knowledge and competence on the job (72% agreed or strongly agreed), but to a somewhat lesser extent than being impressed by their subordinate's knowledge of their job (84% agreed or slightly agreed). Finally, supervisors were less generous when it came admiring his or her subordinate's professional skills (36% neutral or disagreed).

Individual subordinate results are provided for the 50 follower participants paired with 50 leader responses. The outcomes are presented to show a parallel with the supervisory responses and provide a comparison of perception relative to LMX and OCB. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for employees, and are presented in

Appendix F.

The results for the OCB survey are presented in Appendix E and represent response frequencies and percentages to the survey questions on a scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The OCB construct of altruism was addressed in Questions 22, 31, 34, 36, and 44. Sportsmanship is addressed in Questions 23, 25, 28, 37, and 40. Conscientiousness encompassed Questions 24, 39, 43, 45, and 42. Questions 26, 29, 35, 38, and 41 addressed the construct item of courtesy, and Questions 27, 30, 32, and 33 covered civic virtue.

Demographics

The participants in this study were 77 individual employee respondents and 50 paired supervisor-subordinate dyads out of 433 individual employees of the selected United States federal government organization. Eighty participants returned informed consent forms, or 18.47%. The full subordinate sample size for gender had little variation from the 50 dyads as demonstrated in Table 3.

Table 3

Participant Gender

Gender	Subordinate (<i>n</i> = 50)		Supervisor (<i>n</i> = 50)		All employees (<i>n</i> = 77)	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Male	36	70.6	40	80.0	51	66.2
Female	14	28.0	10	20.0	26	33.8

Note. *f* = frequency.

Frequencies and percentages are presented in Table 4. The results are presented

for the total sample as well as supervisor and subordinate responses.

Employees, less diverse in all categories, were predominantly male (66.23%). Supervisors were male by a much larger percentage (91.89%). Table 4 lists participant ages and percentages for employees and supervisors as well as full sample responses.

Table 4

Participant Age Range

Age range	Subordinate (n = 50)		Supervisor (n = 50)		All employees (n = 77)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
18-24	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25-34	1	2.0	0.0	0.0	6	7.8
35-44	6	12.0	1.0	2.00	9	11.7
45-54	21	42.0	27	54.0	29	37.7
55-64	15	30.0	17	34.0	25	32.5
65-74	7	14.0	5	10.0	8	10.4
75+	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

The age group of 45-54 had 21 (42%) respondents. There were 15 (30%) subordinates in the 55-64. The 45-64 aged employee group represented the largest at 72%. This was true for supervisors as well. The Supervisory participants aged 45-54 numbered 27 (54%). The 55-64 cluster had 17 (34%) responses. The combined total for the 45-64 supervisor age group was 88%. The organization possessed a seasoned management staff and an aging workforce, based on how participants responded.

Table 5 presents responses relative to education. The question revealed levels

from high school to doctorate completion. The data presented are for supervisors, employees, and the full sample of respondents. The results provided a broader perspective into the demographics shaping the management and staff for the federal government agency program.

Table 5

Participant Education

Education	Subordinate (<i>n</i> = 50)		Supervisor (<i>n</i> = 50)		All employees (<i>n</i> = 77)	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
High school	3	5.0	3	6.0	7	9.1
Associate degree	7	14.0	1	2.0	7	9.1
Bachelor's degree	25	50.0	23	46.0	40	51.9
Master's degree	14	28.0	23	46.0	22	28.6
Doctoral degree	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.3

The results from survey responses on education level for subordinates resulted in 78% possessing a bachelor's or master's degree. 25 (50%) respondents indicated they held a bachelor's degree while 14 (28%) participants possessed a master's degree. The percentages for supervisors were even higher with 23 (46%) contributors holding a bachelor's degree and 23 (46%) with a master's for a total of 92%. These scores are indicative of a highly educated group of employees and management staff.

Employees averaged 10.6 years of service. The largest percentages for tenure were in the 30+ range at 26% (see Table 6). Supervisors did not respond to this question on the survey. In addition, all but one supervisor was also a subordinate in the study.

Participant tenure is represented as the percentage of frequency responses to the demographic survey question, “About how long have you been employed with your current organization?” The maximum tenure choice in the survey question was 30+ years. The minimum was 1 year (see Table 7). Despite the fact that supervisors did not answer this question, it can be deduced that a rough average for tenure of supervisors was 20.5 years. The full employee sample had a larger number of newer employees’ selections in the 1-5 years. The 30+ year range actually had a slightly larger percentage versus the paired subordinate response of 27.3% compared to 26.0%.

Table 6

Participant Tenure

Tenure	Subordinate (<i>n</i> = 50)		All employees (<i>n</i> = 77)	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1-5	7	14.0	14	18.2
6-10	2	4.0	4	5.2
10-15	7	14.0	9	11.7
15-20	7	14.0	12	15.6
20-25	9	18.0	10	13.0
25-30	5	5.0	7	9.1
30+	13	26.0	21	27.3

Supervisory reporting period results indicated higher response rates with a frequency of 13 at the over-30-years band. The bulk of the responses were in the 10-25 years ranges with 23 responses. Table 7 presents the frequencies and percentages of the

supervisory reporting periods for subordinates. The largest response for subordinates who worked for their current supervisor was 30+ (26%) or 20-25 years (18%). Subordinates' reported tenure was 49% for employees who worked for their supervisor for more than 20 years. Employees who worked for their leader for 10 to 20 years was 28%. These results indicated that there was a significant question on impact of tenure on the supervisory relationship.

Table 7

Participant Reporting Periods-Subordinates
(*n* = 50)

Periods	<i>f</i>	%
1-5	7	14.0
6-10	2	4.0
10-15	7	14.0
15-20	7	14.0
20-25	9	18.0
25-30	5	5.0
30+	13	26.0

LMX and OCB

First, the constructs for LMX and OCB were calculated based on the survey responses for paired employees and supervisors. Means, standard deviations, and ranges for the LMX and OCB constructs for employees and supervisors are presented in Table 8. In addition, the construct results for all employee participants were calculated. The results provided the means and standard deviations for the employee and supervisor responses

for the LMX and OCB surveys. The construct for LMX is made up of four items including affect, loyalty, contribution, and professional respect.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables (n = 50)

	Subordinate				Supervisor			
	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Affect	3.90	0.85	1.00	5.00	1.92	.70	1.00	4.00
Loyalty	2.15	0.96	1.00	5.00	2.33	.71	1.00	4.00
Contribution	1.71	0.67	1.00	4.67	1.76	.43	1.00	2.33
Respect	2.00	0.92	1.00	2.00	2.01	.82	1.00	4.33
LMX/SLMX-All	2.42	0.41	1.08	3.33	1.95	.48	1.08	3.33
LMX/SLMX-Quality	29.29	4.87	21.0	45.00	23.94	6.28	13.00	40.00
Altruism	6.02	0.67	4.00	7.00	-	-	-	-
Conscientiousness	6.01	0.64	4.60	7.00	-	-	-	-
Sportsmanship	1.93	0.65	1.00	3.60	-	-	-	-
Courtesy	6.24	0.56	4.40	7.00	-	-	-	-
Civic virtue	5.98	0.78	4.00	7.00	-	-	-	-
OCB employee	5.21	0.37	4.38	5.96	-	-	-	-
OCB	125	8.90	105	143	-	-	-	-

Note. LMX = leader-member exchange; OCB = organizational citizenship behavior.

On a scale of 1 (*strongly agree*) to 5 (*strongly disagree*), employees found that overall, the LMX affect dimension ($M = 3.90$, $SD = .85$) played a less significant role in the quality of the LMX relationship than supervisors ($M = 1.92$, $SD = .70$). Contribution

was an important aspect of LMX quality for employees ($M = 1.71, SD = .67$) as well as supervisors ($M = 1.76, SD = .43$).

Followers found the quality of the LMX relationship to be slightly higher in general ($M = 29.29, SD = 4.87$) than supervisors ($M = 23.94, SD = 6.28$). In addition, maximum answer ranges reached the highest level of 5 for employees on affect and loyalty, but only 4 for supervisors. For the OCB construct on a scale of 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly agree*), employees indicated that they perform OCBs. Subordinate responses indicated that civic virtue was an important aspect of OCB ($M = 5.98, SD = .78$).

Intercorrelations. Correlations for employee LMX, supervisor LMX, OCB, and the OCB construct variables are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Intercorrelation Matrix

Correlation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. LMX_EMP	1							
2. SLMXMDM_SUP	.294*	1						
3. OCB_ALL_MEAN	-.264	-.038	1					
4. Altruism	-.153	.141	.832**	1				
5. Conscientiousness	-.328*	-.048	.760**	.533**	1			
6. Sportsmanship	.205	-.014	-.294*	-.413**	-.391**	1		
7. Courtesy	-.090	-.076	.724**	.546**	-.477**	-.477**	1	
8. Civic virtue	-.350*	.105	.814**	.680**	-.537**	-.533**	.553**	1

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation results revealed that supervisory LMX is moderately related to employee LMX ($.29, p > .05$). In contrast, OCB was not statistically significant at a

negative relationship for supervisor (-.264) and employee LMX (-.038). Relative to the OCB construct, civic virtue (-.31, $p < .05$) and conscientiousness (.33, $p < .05$) had moderate negative associations with employee LMX but were not significantly related to supervisor LMX. In fact, none of the construct variables were significantly related to supervisory LMX (-.038, .141, -.048, -.014, -.076, .105). These correlations were the same from .14 ($p < .05$) for the altruism dimension to -.014 ($p < .05$) for the sportsmanship dimension.

Results for Qualitative Research Question 2

To what extent is there a relationship between LMX and OCB in a program area of a departmental agency of the federal government as evidenced in the interview data, which resulted from interview questions developed from the quantitative survey data? The interview questions probed the rapport and understanding between the employee and supervisor, exploring the relationship in general and how the relationship affects trust, engagement, motivation, and effort. Numerous themes emerged in the interviews about the supervisory relationship and OCBs including autonomy, demeanor, and trust.

Of the eight employee interviews conducted, all those interviewed discussed the potential importance of relationship aiding the ability to perform his or her job and the desire to do more for the supervisor and organization even when the current supervisory relationship was not high quality. One employee, Interviewee 7, indicated that the current supervisory relationship was suboptimal, but that the employee had supervisors in the past who “made you want to do well for them.” Another staff member, Interviewee 2, commented, “Well, I know that he appreciates the job that I am doing and that when I go the extra mile he acknowledges that. It feeds on itself. So, I will go the extra mile and do things that aren't just a regular part of my job but something out of the ordinary that I'd

maybe check.”

Of the eight interviewees who indicated that they had cordial to good working relationships with their supervisors, four used direct themes around autonomy at work. In particular, Interviewee 3 mentioned, “I’d say we have a pretty good working relationship. He tends to be fairly hands off with me.” Another interviewee stated, “I think that my supervisor’s trust and respect and somewhat hands-off approach to my work does motivate me to put in extra effort.” Trust coupled with autonomy enhances motivation.

Another theme revealed relative to relationship was demeanor of the supervisor. Interviewee 1 mentioned, “Definitely your supervisor’s demeanor toward you and how you’re treated by them; . . . it can either make you want to achieve or just throw up your hands.”

Results for Qualitative Research Question 3

To what extent does the quality of the LMX relationship affect OCB within a program area of a departmental agency of the federal government as evidenced in the interview data, which resulted from interview questions developed from the quantitative survey data? Several major themes emerged from the interviews including trust, autonomy, motivation or self-motivation, communication, availability, demeanor, knowledge, micromanagement, clarity, and respect.

The quality of the relationship was reflected in the respondent’s answers in two ways. First, employees valued autonomy, trust, and demeanor for high-quality relationships. This produced, among other things, clarity. When a supervisor trusted an employee, the employees felt more valued and willing to extend themselves and do more for the supervisor and organization. One employee commented, “I believe that my supervisor trusts me in a working relationship because he does not interfere. He leaves

the decision making up to me, and he relies on me to bring issues to him as I see necessary.” Self-motivation was a recurring theme in several employee responses.

Second, autonomy worked indirectly relative to the self-perceived value the employee placed on his or her skill set or ability to achieve greater outcomes. Several employees who had somewhat lower quality supervisory relationships attributed quality to self-motivation and the ability to complete work requirements and accomplish more. These same employees also believed their supervisor trusted them because of their ability to be technically successful in their job and gave them greater latitude and autonomy to get the job done.

In addition, a theme emerged that had bearing on OCB in the supervisory relationship. The theme was technical competence as a proxy for autonomy. The theme was particularly revealed by interviewee 5, who believed they were valued for their technical knowledge the supervisor lacked. Therefore, the interviewee served as a trusted confidant, which resulted in greater autonomy from the supervisor to achieve job success.

Finally, the concept of demeanor was revealed in the interviews with this question. Interviewee 7 discussed shutting down or leaving when a supervisor is rude and uninterested in dialogue on relevant work topics. The supervisor was referred to as arrogant and elicited terms such as being brushed off, being blamed, told to go away, and demoralized.

Results for Mixed-Methods Qualitative Research Question 4

How and to what extent do the qualitative interview data contribute to a broader understanding of the relationship between LMX and OCB in a federal program area of a departmental agency of the federal government as revealed by the quantitative survey data reflected in a mixed methods analysis? To examine Research Question 4, the

qualitative interview data from the eight interviews were used. The first four questions revealed data relevant to the relationship between a leader and subordinate. The last four questions were designed to reveal data on the impact the relationship had on OCB.

Demographic data for the eight interview participants included gender, age, ethnicity, education, and tenure. Gender was equally divided at 50% between male and female; 37.5% (3) of the interviewees were in the 55-64 age range, 12.5% (1) in the 65-74 group, 25% (2) in the 45-54 range, 12.5% (1) in the 35-44 range, and 12.5% (1) in the 25-34 range.

Ethnicity of employees was 75% White/Caucasian (6) respondents, 12.5% Black/African American (1), and 12.5% (1) Asian or Pacific Islander. Master's degree education level of the interviewees was 50% (4), 12.5% (1) possessed an associate degree, and 37.5% (3) earned a bachelor's degree. Interviewee tenure of 15-20 years was 12.5% (1). Tenure of 20-25 years was 37.5% (3). Service of 30+ years, 6-10 years, and 1-5 years were 12.5% each representing 3 survey responses.

The interview question responses provided a rich addition to the qualitative data collected from the surveys. One of the key words mentioned in the interviews was trust, as exhibited in the frequency of interviewees' use of the word in their responses. Trust was significantly related to the relationship as described by the interviewees. The keyword was the root of several aspects of relationship including feeling trusted, which in turn was connected to respect. Lack of trust was demonstrated by the interview participant based on the assessment of micromanagement or the level of autonomy provided by the supervisor. In addition, supervisors validated the subordinates' perception when they took action as an incentive or disincentive for not doing something such as performing OCBs. In addition, it was represented as a quality desired by the

interviewees from their supervisors, demonstrating trust as an important indicator of LMX and OCB. The interviewee responses to the eight items are provided in a general summation by question.

Interview Item 1. “Please describe your working relationship with your supervisor.” Based on coding of interview data including interview transcription, key words emerged that enhanced the understanding of the relationship between the leader and follower. The results from this question supported and expanded the LMX quantitative data. In particular, responses touched on all four dimensions of the LMX construct.

Demographic data for the interview participants showed that 75% of the female interviewees indicated that her supervisory relationship was not good, whereas 75% of the male interviewees described their relationship as good to excellent. Several interviewees stated that aspects of demeanor or how a supervisor interacted with them made a difference. The statement was nuanced, because those interviewees who believed they had a poor relationship considered they were micromanaged in some way, whereas those who indicated good relationships with their supervisor had autonomy and support from their supervisor. Interviewee 1 stated, “I guess by feeling trust and respect, it makes you more part of the team and do the best job you can do and perform.” Interviewee 6 indicated that their relationship allowed an exchange of information and an ability to give feedback. Interview 6 indicated the supervisor was a strong leader and decision maker despite providing an opportunity for dialogue and collaboration.

This question revealed examples of indicators of a positive supervisory relationship as noted by interviewee key words such as flexibility, friendly, professional, and good rapport. Alternatively, interviewees who had a lower quality relationship with

their supervisors used terms such as clumsy, missed opportunity, bully, unpleasant, target, afraid, ordering, and poor.

Interview Question 2. “How well does your supervisor understand your job issues and needs?” Most interviewees responded that their supervisors understood specific job needs. Several interviewees indicated that their supervisor comprehended specific employee job needs very well because of significant technical knowledge of the job the employee performed. Two interviewees who had indicated poor leader relationships mentioned that trust played a significant role. Two other interviewees who indicated positive supervisory relationships had somewhat different responses. Both interviewees had higher quality relationships based on the response to the first research question. The interviewees believed their supervisors trusted them because of their technical expertise, which the supervisors did not have. In turn, the response to Research Question 2 was that the supervisors generally understood job needs or were willing to help. In reality, the supervisors lacked the technical knowledge to truly understand the subordinates’ needs. Conversely, one interviewee with a low-quality relationship believed the supervisor understood the interviewee’s technical needs very well since the supervisor had done the job previously. The results in this example indicated that an understanding of job needs is not necessary to the quality of the relationship.

Interview Question 3. “Do you feel you are trusted and respected by your supervisor?” In the relationships where interviewees had a positive outlook about their supervisory associations, the interviewees indicated they were respected and trusted by their supervisor with simple “yes” or “no” answers. Those who indicated a troubled or less-than-desirable relationship with their supervisors provided more dialogue around the question with a focus on technical understanding of a position. This led to a broader,

more nuanced discussion of aspects of the relationship such as being flexible, providing freedom to do their job, and micromanaging.

Interview Question 4. “Is there anything else you’d like to share regarding your relationship with your supervisor?” This question revealed information that reinforced previous answers to the questions and provided additional background for theming. Specifically, those interviewees who indicated they had a good relationship with their supervisor provided additional support for that assessment with specific words such as defense, trust, appreciation, and flexibility. Alternatively, interviewees who indicated a poor or mixed relationship provided statements using words like busy, overworked, awful, quit, and unprofessional.

The OCB-related questions provided additional support for the results of the OCB data. Questions 5, 6, 7, and 8 were designed with respect to the OCB survey questions, specifically, the dimensions of the construct.

Interview Question 5. “How does your supervisor’s trust and respect for you produce extra effort in your job?” This question revealed that interviewees saw appreciation and acknowledgment as aspects of trust and respect from their supervisors. In addition, the interviewees stated that the way an individual is treated motivates that individual to put in extra effort; but when a supervisor places obstacles in the way, it shows a lack of trust in one’s abilities. This was exhibited by several means in the interviews, for example, less motivation or self-motivation, taking more or less time to explain work or situations, being questioned constantly, or not being provided freedom to do the job.

Interview Question 6. “How does your supervisor’s” working relationship with you affect your work effort, motivation, and engagement? This question disclosed that

the relationship, when positive, supported the work of the interviewees, which made them feel better about the job. When the relationship was negative, in some instances interviewees described a dysfunctional relationship. For example, Interviewee 7 said the relationship was so poor that they this individual was made to feel stupid, and responses from the supervisor were often condescending and scolding in nature.

Interview Question 7. “Do you feel you go above and beyond the ‘call of duty’? If so, why? If not, why?” Interview responses were again separated based on relationships. Those who had a positive relationship believed that trust and respect made a difference, and interviewee 3 specifically mentioned the fact the supervisory relationship was trusting, respectful, and inclusive, which led to extra effort above and beyond the normal job performance. Interviewees who had a poor relationship tried to do their best through self-motivation but did not go beyond what was required in their performance plan. In particular, two interviewees indicated poor supervisory relationships. The interviewees felt they would get in trouble by providing extra effort, and they indicated doing the minimum necessary.

Interview Question 8. “Is there anything else you’d like to share regarding your effort, and care for your organization, supervisor and job?” This open-ended question served to provide either reinforcement of previous responses or additional insight in the employee’s engagement with his or her supervisor and organization. The most interesting result to be discovered was interviewees who had poor supervisory relationships indicated hope and possibility for the future. Interviewee 7 acknowledged enjoyment in the work and believed the job was good but the supervisor needed to be more supportive and realize each employee is there for the supervisor. The employees’ success is the supervisor’s success. Interviewee 4 indicated the fire still was there but desired more

challenge.

Conclusion

This chapter provided quantitative and qualitative results and analysis for the study. The final chapter of the applied dissertation discusses interpretation, implications, limitations and this researcher's recommendations for future research relative to LMX and OCB in a federal agency program.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this applied dissertation was to explore the relationship between LMX and OCB in a federal government agency utilizing an explanatory sequential mixed-methods study design. Quantitative surveys for LMX, OCB, and demographic data were distributed to participants and provided insight into what the indicators were for LMX and OCB (Research Question 1). Interview questions were developed from the results of the quantitative data qualitative and offered awareness of scope of the relationship between LMX and OCB (Research Question 2). The qualitative data were used to examine how the leader relationship affected OCB (Research Question 3). Finally, quantitative and qualitative data were used to understand how the qualitative interview data supported a more expansive understanding of the relationship between LMX and OCB (Research Question 4).

The response rate of 77 total and 50 paired survey responses was limited relative to the total population of 433. For this study, research showed it is important to note that the response rate does not necessarily significantly reduce the quality of the survey data; additional effort to increase response rates has diminishing returns (Holbrook, Krosnick, & Pfent, 2008).

In the following section, results are interpreted and elaborated relative to each research question, along with sections on limitations and recommendations for future research. Results are discussed including the assessment of the correlational outcomes relative to the existing research. In addition, indicators of LMX and OCB, relationship extent, relationship quality and effect on OCB, and qualitative data support are considered to provide context to the interpretation of the results. Finally, implications are discussed in relation to supervisors, employees, and a broader perspective.

Interpretation of Results

LMX is an exchange process, and relationship between a leader and follower develop differentially (Graen & Cashman, 1975; Graen & Scandura, 1987). The LMX relationship is also multilevel and has dimension (Liden & Maslyn, 1998; Greguras & Ford, 2006; Henderson, Liden, Gilbowski, & Chaudhry, 2009). OCBs are discretionary behaviors of followers over and above the transactional details of their current role (Organ, 1988).

The study population was primarily White, male, older, and highly educated, and most had significant organizational tenure. The results of this study added to the discussion on the value of the relationship a leader has with each follower and the behaviors each supervisor displays to elicit high performance.

The first research question revealed indicators of LMX and OCB as measured by the quantitative surveys for LMX, OCB, and demographics. Next, a discussion of indicators is presented.

Indicators of LMX and OCB. The quantitative data from LMX, OCB, and demographics surveys revealed that supervisors viewed relationship quality with their subordinates somewhat differently. Greguras and Ford's (2006) multidimensional survey instrument's results indicated that both supervisor and subordinate dimensions of affect, loyalty, and professional respect predicted satisfaction with the supervisor more than contribution. In addition, they discovered that when a supervisor liked and defended a subordinate, a reciprocal effect was created with increased satisfaction of the supervisor. Supervisors and subordinates had high levels of affect, loyalty, and professional respect, whereas contribution was somewhat less significant. Supervisors and employees indicated affect specifically had the greatest effect on relationship. Both supervisors and

employees found that likeability, knowledge, and effort were aspects of affect, loyalty, and professional respect that related to higher quality relationships.

The results of this study were inconsistent with the results of Greguras and Ford (2006) and other existing literature (Graen & Cashman, 1975; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Liden & Maslyn, 1998). This study produced similar outcomes based on means for employees demonstrating indicators within the LMX construct such as likeability, support, and respect relative to affect, loyalty, and professional respect. These attributes can manifest in many ways, and the qualitative data from the interviews provided a more expansive context for how these indicators are made visible in the workplace. However, the correlations were contradictory or inconclusive at best. In addition, the qualitative data contradicted existing literature and quantitative results to a certain extent by showing contribution as a bigger factor in the LMX relationship.

The employee and supervisor LMX surveys had positive percentage responses for Questions 4, 5 and 6, which represented contribution as an indicator of LMX and was specifically revealed as support. In addition, the quantitative data confirmed that contribution was the least likely indicator of LMX.

One important result was found in Item 8 of the SLMX-MDM, "I am willing to apply extra efforts beyond those normally required to help my subordinate meet his or her work goals." Supervisors answered this particular item as *disagree* or *strongly disagree* at 75%, and another 16.67% were neutral, indicating a lower level of loyalty to their employees. Interesting to note, Ilies et al. (2007) predicted that contribution might play a larger role between LMX and OCB because of the nature of mutual effort towards common goals, resulting in extra effort beyond the normal transactional aspect of the LMX relationship.

Employee-perceived OCB as represented in the survey responses was consistently positive. Employees indicated across the population that they observed themselves as going beyond their normal work to support their organization and supervisor.

Relationship extent. The qualitative results coupled with the quantitative data showed that a relationship does exist between LMX and OCB. In particular, the association could relate in a positive or negative way towards job satisfaction, likeability, extra effort, as well as trust. Employees specifically mentioned that having a positive affiliation would result in increased trust and the desire to perform beyond their required role. In addition, employees mentioned that in a leader relationship that was either average, marginal, or exceptionally poor, the employee identified as self-motivated. They also indicated that a positive and supportive connection would enhance their desire to act or perform beyond their current required role. This specifically showed how deep of an impact a supervisor's presence and demonstration of leadership supported or diminished the relationship, affecting the performance of extra role behaviors.

As the results demonstrated, trust was important to high-quality LMX and OCBs. Trust was mentioned more than any other theme as influencing performance, and going above and beyond the normal work experience and performance.

Relationship quality and effect on OCB. As previously stated, a relationship does exist between LMX and OCB based on the results of this study. Employees indicated that the quality of a supervisory relationship affects their desire to produce extra effort. More specifically, aspects of the relationship that alter quality also have a bearing on OCBs. These include the demeanor of the supervisor; the autonomy the subordinate has to do his or her job; the respect the supervisor and employee have for each other; and the communication style, methods, and frequency the supervisor employs. These aspects

are influenced by the level of conviction in the LMX relationship (Harvey et al., 2014). Trust plays an important role at many levels and can facilitate a positive supervisory relationship. Research has shown that employee trust in peers leads to higher quality supervisory relationships (Han, 2011). Prior research also suggested that supervisors can build trust by creating an environment that promotes positivity, hope, and a growth mindset (Sue-Chan et al., 2012).

The results of this study have shown that supervisors had lower levels of affect and relationship quality relative to how their subordinates viewed their relationship quality and supervisor affect. In addition, the interviews demonstrated a level of consideration that the quantitative results did not, which was contrary to prior research (Greguras & Ford, 2006).

Qualitative data support. The qualitative results had a significant impact on the interpretation of the data and provided a deeper understanding and meaning of the LMX relationship and OCB. The qualitative data provided additional understanding of the indicators of LMX and OCB by offering themes such as autonomy, trust, communication, demeanor, and motivation. In addition, the qualitative data added perspective to low-quality relationships. Themes such as abusive supervision and lack of respect emerged as detriments to OCB. These themes are supported by existing research indicating that nonsupportive supervisory behaviors lead to lower LMX quality and fewer OCBs (Harvey et al., 2014).

The qualitative data also provided a deeper understanding of the quantitative data. Specifically, results from the survey questions suggested that affect, loyalty, and professional respect played a role as indicators of LMX and OCB. The qualitative data confirmed that affect, loyalty, and professional respect were important aspects of LMX

and OCB. Finally, in positive supervisory relationships, the qualitative data provided support for contribution playing a larger role in the LMX and OCB relationship. This was somewhat contrary to existing literature that indicated contribution served as a somewhat minor role in LMX and, as a result, OCB (Greguras & Ford, 2006). In part, the reason for this may have been the method employed to understand the relationship, which was one from leader to follower rather than exploring both sides of the relationship. Contribution has currency from both sides of the relationship.

Implications for employees. Employees can benefit from this study, as the results demonstrate the positive aspects of high-quality LMX relationships and OCBs. LMX is a relationship based on exchange. Working in a positive manner to enhance a relationship one has with a supervisor can only benefit an employee in terms of job satisfaction, purpose and worth, transactional benefits, and engagement.

Reversing the social exchange paradigm and enhancing a leader's effectiveness can be done through OCBs by exhibiting support for the leader and organization. This potentially creates a sense of felt obligation and loyalty between the leader and follower. Traditionally, a supervisor evaluates an employee through the role-making process, and an employee succeeds or fails based on the level of obligation and reciprocity created in the process (Harris, Harris, & Brouer, 2009; Katz & Kahn, 1966). This results in enhanced benefits such as informal rewards, increased communication with the supervisor, autonomy, and trust. The results of this study demonstrated that in high-quality LMX relationships, subordinates were satisfied and trusted. Low-quality LMX relationships were those in which employees were not trusted and lacked autonomy.

The results demonstrated an expectation by employees of how a supervisor should act and the relation that supervisory behaviors have to desire to demonstrate OCBs,

perform in general, and quality of the LMX relationship. The answers given in the interviews indicated a self-perception in the relationship different from the view the supervisor takes. Self-perception that is not in alignment with supervisory perceptions of effort and skill can result in disappointment, leading to frustration on the part of both parties, damaging the LMX relationship and potentially producing supervisory behaviors that may be considered abusive (Harvey et al., 2014).

Implications for supervisors. Research has shown that power can be used to organize work and stabilize an organization if the power is legitimized by the subordinates (Blau, 2008). Further, an employee who feels injustice at the illegitimate use of power shares the injustice through various means such as communication of anger and frustration, thereby potentially creating a shared purpose against the power and sense of injustice. This can be a direct result of the differentiation of the LMX relationship, which may result in some subordinates being treated differently and that difference being perceived as injustice. Results from this study did not specifically indicate injustice because of differential treatment. However, the implication was demonstrated in the qualitative results. In particular, interviewees who had a poor relationship shared their sense of unfairness. Interviewee 8 specifically mentioned the lack of listening on the supervisor's part, which was perceived as a lack of trust and bias.

Transformational leadership behaviors have been shown to affect follower OCB indirectly and are mediated by trust (Podsakoff et al., 2009). It has also been shown that LMX and OCB directly affect performance (Jordan & Troth, 2010; Lawrence & Kacmar, 2012). The result of this study provided a clear connection to trust and OCBs. Trust in the results of this study came in the form of congruency of action. A leader who demonstrated care and satisfaction of needs as well as leading by personal example fared

better than one who was dictatorial and less responsive.

LMX is an exchange relationship. As such, supervisors can benefit greatly from understanding the needs of their subordinates and satisfying them. Prior research has demonstrated that transformational leadership styles mediate the quality of the relationship and employee outcomes (Dulebohn et al., 2012; Podsakoff et al., 1990). Intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and idealized influence as components of transformational leadership are directly related to the results of this study. In particular, themes from the interviews provided a basis for transformational leadership as a potential mediator of the LMX relationship and resulting OCBs. Themes of respect, trust, support, and autonomy that arose in the qualitative interview comments suggested either follower expectations of a leader or recognized aspects of a high-quality LMX relationship.

Results from this study and previous research suggested that autonomy was a factor in high-quality LMX relationships. Empowerment can be facilitated by a leader and results in increased self-determination, higher expectations, and higher desire to perform OCBs (Zhong, Lam, & Chen, 2011). OCBs are a function of a leaders' relationship and satisfaction of follower needs. Cognitive needs such as ego and obligation can play a role in the LMX relationship. In turn, research has demonstrated that altruism and felt obligation mediate the LMX relationship and resultant outcomes (Lemmon & Wayne, 2015).

Macro implications. Using the scale developed by Greguras and Ford (2006), the responses to the quantitative surveys showed supervisors' and employees' perspectives in parallel, providing a more precise measure of the LMX relationship. Results were presented that demonstrated the importance of trust in the LMX relationship and

subsequent OCBs. The broader implications of this study showed that trust is important in the development and sustainability of an LMX relationship. Trust is a currency in the social exchange aspect of LMX. A supervisor who takes advantage of the conviction a subordinate has in his or her leadership or does not work at establishing that belief essentially does not build the capital necessary to expect behaviors that minimize the cost of a social exchange (Sue-Chan et al., 2012). Being able to use trust to facilitate an exchange reduces barriers to follower performance.

Abusive supervision or supervision that does not take into consideration employee's needs or the concept of trust building can expect lower performance. Longer term, potential distraction from passive-aggressive employee behavior such as upward-undermining intended to damage a supervisor's status and effect is also a result of unmet follower needs or abusive leadership (Harvey et al., 2014).

Limitations

The number of respondents was a limitation of this study in regard to statistical significance and power and the ability to generalize the results to a larger audience. External validity of this study may also be limited by the fact that the research site was only one federal government organization. In addition, the lack of demographic diversity in study population produced potential bias and limited the external validity and ability to generalize.

The two-phased data collection methodology may also be a limitation. Creating a direct connection between the quantitative and qualitative data was a limiting factor. The study examined a specific federal organization and not multiple entities across the government or other industries, which may have enhanced the depth of the results. Finally, sample bias may have existed because some participants were both supervisor

and subordinate and submitted responses for each role.

Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the quantitative and qualitative results of this study, there are many areas for potential research. The interviews provided a rich association with the quantitative results, showing potential areas to explore further. This researcher recommends that similar studies incorporating interviews and focus groups be performed to enhance the depth of the quantitative results. A deeper understanding of the theme of self-motivation and its antecedents relative to LMX quality would be beneficial to understanding the LMX relationship quality and the influence on OCBs, specifically, understanding self-motivation as a true employee behavior or a replacement for direction, communication, and LMX relationship quality.

It is recommended that interviews with supervisors be conducted to supplement the multilevel nature of the quantitative survey and results. Developing an interview protocol that elicits supervisor perspectives on their own behavior and its mark on relationship quality and follower performance, as well as perceptions of employee trust, OCBs, entitlement, and self-motivation, would assist in providing a deeper understanding of the relationship from both sides.

Providing a counter view of supervisors' perceived OCB for paired LMX dyads would help future researchers understand leader and follower perceptions. Understanding perceptions might provide direction on the effect on the quality of the LMX relationship and OCBs. Finally, using performance ratings and reviews as data points would be beneficial in order to develop a deeper understanding of performance in relation to LMX and OCB. In addition, given the length of tenure and reporting period, it would be beneficial to research the implications of tenure on the LMX relationship and OCB

levels. As this study was conducted at only one federal government agency, future studies should be extended to other federal government departments as well as state and local governments.

References

- Andrews, M. C., Harris, K. J., & Kacmar, K. M. (2009). Got political skill?: The effect of justice on the importance of political skill on job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 1427-1437. doi:10.1037/a0017154
- Avey, J. B., Palanski, M. E., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2011). When leadership goes unnoticed: The moderating role of follower self-esteem on the relationship between ethical leadership and follower behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 98*, 573-582. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0610-2
- Bakar, H. A., Dilbeck, K. E., & McCroskey, J. C. (2010). Mediating role of supervisory communication practices on relations between leader-member exchange and perceived employee commitment to workgroup. *Communication Monographs, 77*, 637-656. doi:10.10800367751.2010.499104
- Bakar, H. A., Mustaffa, C. S., & Mohamad, B. (2008). LMX quality, supervisory communication and team-oriented commitment. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 14*(1), 11-33. doi:10.1108/13563280910931054
- Bal, P. M., & Chiaburu, D. S., & Jansen P. G.W. (2010). Psychological contract breach and work performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25*, 252-273. doi:10.1108/02683941011023730
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*, 587-595.
- Blau, P. M. (2008). *Exchange and power in social life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Brunetto, Y., Shacklock, K., Bartram, T., Leggat, S. G., Farr-Wharton, R., Stanton, P., & Casimir, G. (2012). Comparing the impact of leader-member exchange,

- psychological empowerment and affective commitment upon Australian public and private sector nurses: Implications for retention. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23, 2238-2255. doi:10.1080/09585192.2011.616524
- Byrne, Z., Pitts, V., Chiaburu, D., & Steiner, Z. (2011). Managerial trustworthiness and social exchange with the organization. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26, 108-122. doi:10.1108/02683941111102155
- Caldwell, C., & Hansen, M. H. (2010). Trustworthiness, governance and wealth creation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97, 173-188. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0503-4
- Chang, C., & Johnson, R. J. (2010). Not all leader-member exchanges are created equal: Importance of leader relational identity. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 796-808. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.07.008
- Chen, Z., Lam, W., & Zhong, J. A. (2012). Effects of perceptions on LMX and work performance: Effects of supervisors' perception of subordinates' emotional intelligence and subordinates' perception of trust in the supervisor on LMX and, consequently, performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29, 597-616. doi:10.1007/s10490-010-9210-z
- Chou, T., Jiang, J. J., Klein, G., & Chou, S. T. (2011). Organizational citizenship behavior of information system personnel: The influence of leader-member exchange. *Information Resource Manager*, 24(4), 77-93. doi:10.4018/irmj.2011100105
- Creswell J. W., & Plano-Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to

- leadership within formal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
- Dasgupta, S. A., Suar, D., & Singh, S. (2013). Effect of managerial communication styles on employee's attitudes and behaviors. *Employee Relations*, 35, 173-199.
doi:10.1108/01425451311287862
- Decoster, S., Camps, J., & Stouten, J. (2014). The mediating role of LMX between abusive supervision and work behaviors a replication and extension. *American Journal of Business*, 29(1), 61-75. doi:10.1108/AJB-06-2013-0038
- Ding, X., Kun, T., Chongsen, Y., & Sufang, G. (2012). Abusive supervision and LMX: Leaders' emotional intelligence as antecedent variable and trust as consequence variable. *Chinese Management Studies*, 6, 257-270. doi:10.1108/17506141211236695
- Dulebohn, J. H., Bommer, W. H., Liden, R. C., Brouer, R. L., & Ferris G. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange: Integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, 38, 1715-1759. doi:10.1177/0149206311415280
- Edmonds, W. A., & Kennedy, T. D. (2013). *An applied reference guide to research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fisk, G. M., & Friesen, J. P. (2012). Perceptions of leader emotion regulation and LMX as predictors of job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 1-12. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.11.001
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Bruursema, K., Kessler, S., & Goh, A. (2007, August). *Necessity is the mother of behavior: Organizational constraints, CWB and OCB*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Philadelphia, PA.

- French, P. E., & Emerson, M. C. (2014). Assessing the variations in reward preference for local government employees in terms of position, public service motivation, and public sector motivation. *Public & Performance Management Review*, 37, 552-576. doi:10.2735/PMR1530=9576370402
- Fritz, J. H., O'Neil, N. B., Popp, A. M., Williams, C., & Arnett, R. C. (2012). The influence of supervisory behavioral integrity on intent to comply with organizational ethical standards and organizational commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114, 251-263. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1345-z
- Gabriel, S., Renaud, J. M., & Tippen, B. (2006). When I think of you, I feel more confident about me: The relational self and self-confidence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 772-779. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2006.07.004
- Gajendran, R. S., & Joshi, A. (2012). Innovation in globally distributed teams: The role of LMX, communication frequency and member influence on team decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 1252-1261. doi:10.1037/a0028958
- Graen, G. B., & Cashman, J. F. (1975). A role making model in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership Frontiers* (pp. 143-165). Kent, OH: Kent State Press.
- Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. In L. L. Cummings, & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 9, pp.175-208). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- 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. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 219-247.

- Graves, L. M., & Luciano, M. M. (2013). Self-determination at work: Understanding the role of leader-member exchange. *Motive and Emotions*, 37, 518-536. doi:10.1007/s11031-012-9336-z
- Greguras, G., & Ford, J. M. (2006). An examination of the multidimensionality of supervisor and subordinate perceptions of leader-member exchange. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 433-465. doi:10.1348/096317905X53859
- Hambley, L. A., O'Neill, T. A., & Kline, T. (2007). Virtual team leadership. *International Journal of E-Collaboration*, 3(1), 40-64. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.09.004
- Han, G. (2011). Trust and career satisfaction: The role of LMX. *Career Development International*, 15, 437-458. doi:10.1108/13620431011075321
- Harris, K. J., Harris R. B., & Brouer, R. L. (2009). LMX and subordinate political skill: Direct and interactive effects on turnover intentions and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39, 2373-2395. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00530.x
- Harris, K. J., Harvey, P., & Kacmar, K. M. (2011). Abusive supervisory reactions to coworker relationship conflict. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1010-1023. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.07.020
- Harris, T. B., Li, N., & Kirkman, B. L. (2014). Leader-member exchange (LMX) in context: How LMX differentiation and LMX relational separation attenuate LMX's influence on OCB and turnover intention. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 314-328. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.09.001
- Harvey, P. H., Harris, K. J., Gillis, W. E., & Martinko, M. J. Abusive supervision and the

entitled employee. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 204-217.

doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.08.001

Hassan, S., Mahsud, R., Yukl, G., & Prussia, G. E. (2012). Ethical and empowering leadership and leader effectiveness. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28, 133-146. doi:10.1108/02683941311300252

Henderson, D. J., Liden, R. J., Gilbowski, B. C., & Chaudhry, A. (2009). LMX differentiation: A multilevel review and examination of its antecedents and outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 517-534. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.04.003

Herold, D. M., Fedor, D. B., Caldwell, S., & Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of transformational and change leadership on employees' commitment to a change: A multilevel study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 346-357. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.346

Hinojosa, A. S., McCauley, K. D., Randolph-Seng, D., & Gardner, W. L. (2014). Leader and follower attachment styles: Implications for authentic leader-follower relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 595-610. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.12.002

Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., & Pfent, A. (2007) The causes and consequences of response rates in surveys by the news media and government contractor survey research firms. In J. M. Lepkowski, C. Tucker, J. M. Brick, E. D. de Leeuw, L. Japac, P. J. Lavrakas, M. W. Link, & R. L. Sangster (eds.), *Advances in Telephone Survey Methodology*, chapter 23. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons. doi:10.1002/9780470173404.ch23

Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Leader-member exchange and

- citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 269-277. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.26
- Ismail, A., Mohamed, H. A., Sulaiman, A. Z., Mohamed, M. H., & Yusuf, M. H. (2011). An empirical study of the relationship between transformational leadership empowerment and organizational commitment. *Business and Economics Research*, 2(1), 89-107.
- Jordan, P. J., & Troth, A. (2010) Emotional intelligence and leader member exchange. *Leadership & Organization*, 32, 260-280. doi:10.1108/01437731111123915
- Kahn, R., Wolfe, D., Quinn, R., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D., & De Hoogh, H. B. (2011). Ethical Leadership at Work Questionnaire: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1), 51-69. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.12.007
- Kang, D., & Bartlett, K. R. (2013). The role of perceived external prestige in predicting customer-oriented citizenship behaviors. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 24, 285-312. doi:10.1002/hrdq.21165
- Kaplan, S., Cortina, J., Ruark, G., LaPort, K., & Nicolaides, V. (2014). The role of organizational leaders in employee emotion management: A theoretical model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 563-580. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.015
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kelley, K. M., & Biesel, R. S. (2014). Leaders' narrative sensemaking during LMX role negotiations explaining how leaders make sense of who to trust and when. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 433-448. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.10.001

- Kellis, D. S., & Ran, B. (2013). Modern leadership principles for public administration: Time to move forward. *Journal of Public Affairs, 13*, 130-141. doi:10.1002/pa.1453
- Kim, B., Lee, G., & Carlson, K. D. (2010). An examination of the nature of the relationship between leader-member exchange (LMX) and turnover intention at different organizational levels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 29*, 591-597. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.10.025
- Kim, S., O'Neill, J. W., & Cho, H. (2010). When does an employee not help coworkers?: The effect of leader-member exchange on employee envy and organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 29*, 530-537. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.08.003
- Korkmaz, T., & Arpacı, E. (2009). Relationship of organizational citizenship behavior with emotion intelligence. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1*, 2432-2435. doi:10.2016/j.sbspro.2009.01.428
- Kwan, H. K., Liu, J., & Yim, F. H. (2011). Effects of mentoring functions on receivers' organizational citizenship behavior in a Chinese context: A two-study investigation. *Journal of Business Research, 64*, 363-370. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.04.003
- Law, K., H. Wang, W., & Hui, C. (2010). Currencies of exchange and global LMX: How they affect employee task performance and extra-role performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 27*, 625-646. doi:10.1007/s10490-009-9141-8
- Lawrence, E. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (2012). Leader-member exchange and stress: The mediating role of job involvement and role conflict. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management, 14*(1), 39-52.

- Lemmon, G., & Wayne, S. J. (2015). Underlying motives of organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing egotistic and altruistic motivations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 22, 129-148. doi:10.1007/s10490-009-9141-8
- Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, 24(1), 43-72.
- Loi, R., Chan, K. W., & Lam, L. W. (2014). Leader-member exchange, organizational identification, and job satisfaction: A social identity perspective. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87, 42-61. doi:10.1111/joop/12028
- Loi, R., Ngo, H., Zhang, L., & Lau, V. P. (2011). The interaction between leader-member exchange and perceived job security in predicting altruism and work performance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84, 669-685. doi:10.1348/096317910X51510468
- Mahsud, R., Yukl, G., & Prussia, G. (2009). Leader empathy, ethical leadership and relations-oriented behaviors as antecedents of leader-member exchange quality. *Journal of Management Psychology*, 25, 561-577. doi:10.1108/02683941011056932
- Martinez, A. D., Kane, R. E., Ferris, G. R., & Brooks, C. D. (2012). Power in leader-follower work relationships. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 19, 142-151. doi:10.1177/154805181143358
- Medler-Liraz, H., & Kark, R. (2012). It takes three to tango: Leadership and hostility in the service encounter. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 81-93. doi:10.1016/j.leaguan.2011.11.007
- Meiners, E. B., & Boster, F. J. (2012). Integrative process in manager-employee

- negotiations: Relational and structural factors. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 40, 208-228. doi:10.1080/00909882.2011.636374
- Miao, R., & Kim, H. (2010). Perceived organizational support, job satisfaction and employee performance: A Chinese empirical study. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 3, 257-264. doi:10.4236/jssm.2010.32031
- More, K. V., & Tzafirir, S. S. (2009). The role of trust in core team employees: A three-nation study. *Cross cultural management: An international journal*, 16, 410-433. doi:10.1108/13527600911000375
- Oc, B., & Bashur, M. R. (2013). Followership, leadership and social influence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 919-934. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.10.006
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Othman, R., Ee, F. F., & Shi, N. L. (2009). Understanding dysfunctional leader-member exchange: Antecedents and outcomes. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 31, 337-350. doi:10.1108/0143773011043357
- Park, S. M., Park, H. J., & Ryu, E. Y. (2013). Determinants of positive job attitude and behaviour in the Asian work context: Evidence from Korean central government agencies. *Public Management Review*, 15, 1154-1184. doi:10.1080/14719037.2013.816517
- Parker, M., & Wickham, M. (2005). *Organizational role theory and the multi-faceted worker*. Paper presented at the ANZAM Conference, December 5-7, Perth, Western Australia.
- Partnership for Public Service. (2012). *Best places to work in the federal government: The federal leadership challenge*. Retrieved from <http://ourpublicservice.org/>

OPS/publications/viewcontentdetails.php?id=174

- Pelletier, K. L. (2012). Perceptions of and reactions to leader toxicity: Do leader-follower relationships and identification with victim matter? *Leadership Quarterly*, *23*, 412-424. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.09.011
- Peng, J., & Chiu, S. (2010). An integrative model linking feedback environment and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *150*, 582-607. doi:10.1080/00224540903365455
- Piccolo, R. F., Bono, J. E., Heinitz, K., Roswold, J., Duehr, E., & Judge, T. A. (2012). The relative effect of complementary leader behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *23*, 567-581. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.12.008
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *1*, 107-142.
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(1), 122-141. doi:10.1037/a0013079
- Richards, D. A., & Hackett, R. D. (2013). Attachment and emotion regulation: Compensatory interactions and leader-member exchange. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *23*, 686-701. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.03.005
- Rosen, C. C., Harris, K. J., & Kacmar, K. M. (2011). LMX, context perceptions and performance: An uncertainty management perspective. *Journal of Management*, *37*, 819-838. doi:10.1177/0149206310365727

- Runharr, P., Knonerma, J., & Sanders, K. (2013). Teachers' organizational citizenship behavior: Considering the roles of their work engagement, autonomy, and leader-member exchange. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 30*, 99-108. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2012.10.008
- Sahertian, P., & Soetjipto, B. E. (2011). Improving employees' organizational commitment, self-efficacy, and organizational citizenship behavior through the implementation of task-oriented and relationship-oriented leadership behavior. *The Business Review, Cambridge, 17*(2), 48-60.
- Sears, G. J., & Hackett, R. D. (2011). The influence of role definition and affect: A process perspective on the personality-LMX relationship. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84*, 544-564. doi:10.1348/096317910x492081
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 653-663. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653
- Sparrowe, R. T., Soejipto, B. W., & Kraimer, M. L. (2006). Do leaders' influence tactics relate to members' helping behavior?: It depends on the quality of the relationship. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*, 1149-1208. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2006.23478645
- Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 781-790. doi:10.1037/a0019477
- Sue-Chan, C., Au, A. K. C., & Hackett, R. D. (2012). Trust as a mediator of the

- relationship between leader-member behavior and leader-member-exchange quality. *Journal of World Business*, 47, 459-468. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2011.05.012
- Sue-Chan, C., Chen, Z., & Lam, W. (2011). LMX, coaching and employee performance. *Group and Organization Management*, 36, 466-498. doi:10.1177/1059601111408896
- Sun, L., Chow, I. H. S., Chiu, R. K., & Pan, W. (2013). Outcome favorability in the link between leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior: Procedural fairness climate matters. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 215-226. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.10.008
- Torka, N., Schyns, B., & Looise, J. K. (2010) Direct participation quality and organizational commitment: The role of leader-member exchange. *Employee Relations*, 32, 418-434. doi:10.1108/014251011051622
- Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 654-676. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.007
- United States Office of Personnel Management. (2011). *Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey 2013*. Retrieved from http://www.fedview.opm.gov/2013files/2011_Governmentwide_Management_Report.PDF
- United States Office of Personnel Management. (2012). *Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey 2013*. Retrieved from http://www.fedview.opm.gov/2013files/2012_Governmentwide_Management_Report.PDF
- United States Office of Personnel Management. (2013). *Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey 2013*. Retrieved from http://www.fedview.opm.gov/2013files/2013_Governmentwide_Management_Report.PDF

- United States Office of Personnel Management. (2014). *Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey 2014*. Retrieved from http://www.fedview.opm.gov/2014FILES/2014_Governmentwide_Management_Report.PDF
- Vandenberghe, C., Bentein, K., Michon, R., Chebat, J., Tremblay, M., & Fils, J. (2007). An examination of the role of perceived support and employee commitment in employee-customer encounters. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1177-1187. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1177
- Van Dyne, L., Kamdar, D., & Joireman, J. (2008). In-role perceptions buffer the negative affect of low LMX on helping and enhance the positive affect of high LMX on voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 1195-1207. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.6.1195
- Vidyarthi, P. R., Ergodan, B., Anand, S., Liden, R. C., & Chaudhry, A. (2014). One member, two leaders: Extending leader-member exchange theory to a dual leadership context. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*, 468-483. doi:10.1037/a0035466
- Vigoda-Gadot, E., & Beerli, I. (2011). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior in public administration: The power of leadership and the cost of organizational politics. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 22*, 573-596. doi:10.1093/jopart/mur036
- Walumbwa, F. O., Mayer, D. M., Wang, P., Wang, H., & Workman, K. (2011). Linking ethical leadership to employee performance: The roles of leader-member exchange, self-efficacy, and organizational identification. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 115*, 204-213. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.11.002

- Wang, L., Xiaoping, C., & Ni, J. (2010). Leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior: A new perspective from perceived insider status and Chinese traditionality. *Management World*, 1(1), 97-107. doi:10.1007/s11782-010-0007-1
- Wells, J. E., & Peachey, J. W. (2010). Turnover intentions: Do leadership behaviors and satisfaction with the leader matter? *Team Performance Management*, 17(1/2), 23-40. doi:10.1108/13527591111114693
- Wilson, K. S., Hock-Peng, S., & Conlon, D. (2010). What about the leader in leader-member exchange?: The effect of resource exchanges and substitutability of the leader. *Academy of Management Review*, 35, 358-372. doi:10.5465/AMR.2010.51141654
- Xiaqi, D., Kun, T., Chongsen, Y., & Sufang, G. (2012). Abusive supervision and LMX. *Chinese Management Studies*, 6, 257-270. doi:10.1108/17506141211236695
- Xu, E., Huang, X., Lam, K. L., & Miao, Q (2012). Abusive supervision and work behaviors: The mediating role of LMX. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 531-543. doi:10.1002/job.768
- Xue, Y., Bradley, J., & Liang, H. (2011). Team climate, empowering leadership, and knowledge sharing. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 15, 299-312. doi:10.1108/13673271111119709
- Yaffee, T., & Kark, R. (2011). Leading by example: The case of leader OCB. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 806-826. doi:10.1037/a0022464
- Yen, C., & Teng, H. (2013). The effect of centralization on organizational citizenship behavior and deviant workplace behavior in the hospitality industry. *Tourism Management*, 26, 401-410. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2012.10.003

- Yunus, N. H., Ghazali, K., & Hassan, C. N. (2011). The influence of leaders' emotional intelligence: Mediating effect of leader-member exchange on employees' organizational citizenship behaviors. *Institute of Interdisciplinary Business Research, 3*, 1125-1134. Retrieved from ProQuest Central database. (Document ID No. 887726462)
- Yunus, N. H., Ishak, C. A., Mustapha, R. M. R., & Othman, A. K. (2010). Displaying employees' organisational citizenship behavior at the workplace: The impact of superiors' emotional intelligence and moderating impact of leader-member exchange. *Vision, 14*(1-2), 13-23. doi:10.1177/097226291001400102
- Zhang, Z., Wan, D., & Jia, M. (2008). Do high-performance human resource practices help corporate entrepreneurship?: The mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research, 19*, 128-138. doi:10.1016/j.hitech.2008.10.005
- Zhong, J. A., Lam, W., & Chen, Z. (2011). Relationship between leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behaviors: Examining the moderating role of empowerment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 28*, 609-626. doi:10.1007/s10490-0099163-2
- Zhu, W., Newman, A., Miao, Q., & Hooke, A. (2013). Revisiting the mediating role of trust in transformational leadership effects: Do different types of trust make a difference? *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*, 94-105. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.08.004

Appendix A
Interview Protocol

Interview Protocol

LMX Related:

1. Please describe your working relationship with your supervisor
2. How well does your supervisor understand your job issues and needs?
3. Do you feel you are trusted and respected by your supervisor?
4. Is there anything else you would like to share regarding your relationship with your supervisor?

OCB Related:

1. How does your supervisor's trust and respect in you produce extra effort in your job?
2. How does your supervisor's working relationship with you affect your work effort, motivation, and engagement?
3. Do you feel you go above and beyond the "call of duty"? If so, why? If not, why?
4. Is there anything else you would like to share regarding your effort, and care for your organization, supervisor and job?

Appendix B

Participant Demographic Survey

Participant Demographic Survey

Please provide some information about yourself. Select the answer that best describes you. As a reminder, all information collected will be confidential. The information will only be used for the purpose of research findings.

1. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

2. What is your age?

- 18 to 24
- 25 to 34
- 35 to 44
- 45 to 54
- 55 to 64
- 65 to 74

3. What is your ethnicity?

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian or Pacific Island
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- White/Caucasian
- Prefer not to answer

4. About how long have you been employed with your current organization?

- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 10-15 years
- 15-20 years
- 20-25 years
- 30+ years

5. How long have you worked for your current supervisor?

- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 10-15 years
- 15-20 years
- 20-25 years
- 30+ years

6. What is the highest level of education completed?

- High School
- Associate Degree
- Bachelor's Degree
- Master's Degree

___ Ph.D. or Ed.D.

7. How long have you been in your current position?

___ 1-5 years

___ 6-10 years

___ 10-15 years

___ 15-20 years

___ 20-25 years

___ 30+ years

Appendix C

LMX-MDM Subordinate Perspective and SLMX-MDM Supervisor Perspective

LMX-MDM Subordinate Perspective

Please rate the following items based on your relationship with your supervisor using the scale of how strongly you agree or disagree below.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

Affect

- ___ 1. I like my supervisor very much as a person.
- ___ 2. My supervisor is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend.
- ___ 3. My supervisor is a lot of fun to work with.

Contribution

- ___ 4. My supervisor defends my work actions to a superior, even without complete knowledge of the issue in question.
- ___ 5. My supervisor would come to my defense if I were “attacked” by others.
- ___ 6. My supervisor would defend me to others in the organization if I made an honest mistake.

Loyalty

- ___ 7. I do work for my supervisor that goes beyond what is specified in my job description.
- ___ 8. I am willing to apply extra efforts, beyond those normally required, to meet my supervisor’s work goals.
- ___ 9. I do not mind working my hardest for my supervisor.

Professional Respect

- ___ 10. I am impressed with my supervisor’s knowledge of his/her job.
- ___ 11. I respect my supervisor’s knowledge of and competence on the job.
- ___ 12. I admire my supervisor’s professional skills.

SLMX-MDM Supervisor Perspective

Please rate the following items based on your relationship with your subordinate using the scale of how strongly you agree or disagree below.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

Affect

- ___ 1. I like my subordinate very much as a person.
- ___ 2. My subordinate is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend.
- ___ 3. My subordinate is a lot of fun to work with.

Loyalty

- ___ 4. My subordinate defends my decisions, even without complete knowledge of the issue in question.
- ___ 5. My subordinate would come to my defense if I were "attacked" by others.
- ___ 6. My subordinate would defend me to others in the organization if I made an honest mistake.

Contribution

- ___ 7. I provide support and resources for my subordinate that goes beyond what is specified in my job description.
- ___ 8. I am willing to apply extra efforts, beyond those normally required, to help my subordinate meet his or her work goals.
- ___ 9. I do not mind working my hardest for my subordinate.

Professional Respect

- ___ 10. I am impressed with my subordinate's knowledge of his/her job.
- ___ 11. I respect my subordinate's knowledge of and competence on the job.
- ___ 12. I admire my subordinate's professional skills.

Appendix D

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale

Using the scale below, rate your behaviors at work based on how strongly you agree or disagree.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. I

help others who have heavy workloads. (Altruism)

___ 2. I am the classic “squeaky wheel” that always needs greasing. (Sportsmanship)

___ 3. I believe in giving an honest day’s work for an honest day’s pay.

(Conscientiousness)

___ 4. I consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters. ® (Sportsmanship)

___ 5. I try to avoid creating problems for coworkers. (Courtesy)

___ 6. I keep abreast of changes in the organization. (Civic Virtue)

___ 7. I tend to make “mountains out of molehills.” ® (Sportsmanship)

___ 8. I consider the impact of my actions on co-workers. (Courtesy)

___ 9. I attend meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important. (Civic Virtue)

___ 10. I am always ready to lend a helping hand to those around me. (Altruism)

___ 11. I attend functions that are not required, but help the company image. (Civic Virtue)

___ 12. I read and keep up with organization announcements, memos, and so on. (Civic Virtue)

___ 13. I help others who have been absent. (Altruism)

___ 14. I do not abuse the rights of others. (Courtesy)

- ___15. I willingly help others who have work related problems. (Altruism)
- ___16. I always focus on what's wrong, rather than the positive side. ® (Sportsmanship)
- ___17. I take steps to try to prevent problems with other workers. (Courtesy)
- ___18. My attendance at work is above the norm. (Conscientiousness)
- ___19. I always find fault with what the organization is doing. ® (Sportsmanship)
- ___20. I am mindful how my behavior affects other people's jobs. (Courtesy)
- ___21. I do not take extra breaks. (Conscientiousness)
- ___22. I obey company rules and regulations even when no one is watching.
(Conscientiousness)
- ___23. I help orient new people even though it is not required. (Altruism)
- ___24. I am one of this organization's most conscientious employees.
(Conscientiousness)

Appendix E

Employee Frequencies and Percentages of Supervisors' SLMX-MDM

Employee Frequencies and Percentages of Supervisors' SLMX-MDM

Questions	Responses					
10. I like my subordinate very much as a person.		23	19	7	1	0
	%	46.00	38.0	14.00	2.00	0.00
11. My subordinate is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend.	N	18	21	10	1	0
	%	36.00	42.00	20.00	2.00	0.00
12. My subordinate is a lot of fun to work with.	N	10	24	13	3	0
	%	20.00	48.00	26.00	6.00	0.00
13. My subordinate defends my decisions, even without complete knowledge of the issue in	N	4	23	14	9	0
	%	8.00	46.00	28.00	18.00	0.00
14. My subordinate would come to my defense if I were "attacked" by others.	N	9	24	12	5	0
	%	18.00	48.00	24.00	10.00	0.00
15. My subordinate would defend me to others if I made an honest mistake.	N	9	32	7	2	0
	%	18.00	64.00	14.00	4.00	0.00
16. I provide support and resources for my subordinate that goes beyond what is specified in my job description.	N	9	37	3	0	0
	%	18.00	74.00	8.00	0.00	0.00
17 I am willing to apply extra efforts, beyond those normally required to my subordinate meet his or her work goals.	N	16	32	1	1	0
	%	32.00	64.00	1.00	2.00	0.00
Q18 I do not mind working my hardest for my subordinate.	N	16	32	1	1	0
	%	32.00	64.00	2.00	2.00	0.00
Q19 I am impressed with my subordinate's Knowledge of his or her job.	N	18	18	11	2	1
	%	36.00	36.00	22.00	4.00	2.00
Q20 I respect my subordinate's knowledge of and competence on the job.	N	17	25	5	3	0
	%	34.00	50.00	10.00	6.00	0.00
Q21 I admire my subordinate's professional skills.	N	14	18	15	3	0
	%	28.00	36.00	30.00	6.00	0.00

Appendix F

Employee Frequencies and Percentages of Subordinates' OCB

Employee Frequencies and Percentages of Subordinates' OCB

Questions	Responses	STD	D	SLD	NE	SLA	A	STA
Q22 I help others who have heavy workloads..	<i>N</i>	2	1	0	5	3	28	11
	%	4.00	2.00	0.00	10.00	6.00	56.00	22.00
Q23 I am the classic "squeaky wheel" that always needs	<i>N</i>	21	24	1	2	1	1	0
	%	42.00	48.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	0.00
Q24 I believe in giving an honest day's work for an honest day's pay	<i>N</i>	1	24	25	0	0	0	0
	%	2.00	48.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Q25 I consume a lot of time trivial matters.	<i>N</i>	18	29	3	0	0	0	0
	%	36.00	58.00	6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Q26 I try to avoid creating problems for	<i>N</i>	2	1	25	22	0	0	0
	%	4.00	2.00	50.00	44.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Q27 I keep abreast of changes in the organization.	<i>N</i>	4	4	27	15	0	0	0
	%	8.00	8.00	54.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Q28 I tend to make "mountains Out of molehills."	<i>N</i>	16	32	2	0	0	0	0
	%	32.00	64.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Q29 I consider the impact of my actions on co-workers.	<i>N</i>	0	0	1	0	1	33	15
	%	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	66.0	30.00
Q30 I attend meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important.	<i>N</i>	0	2	2	4	27	0	15
	%	0.00	4.00	4.00	8.00	54.00	0.00	30.00
Q31 I am always ready to lend a hand to those around me.	<i>N</i>	0	0	0	0	4	22	24
	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	44.00	48.00
Q32 I attend functions that are not required, but help the company image.	<i>N</i>	0	3	2	6	4	21	14
	%	0.00	6.00	2.00	4.00	8.00	42.00	27.00
Q33 I read and keep up with organization announcements, memos, and so on.	<i>N</i>	0	0	0	3	5	25	17
	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.00	10.00	50.00	34.00

Q34 I help others who have been absent.	<i>N</i>	0	0	0	11	4	22	13
	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	22.00	8.00	44.00	26.00
Q35 I do not abuse the rights of others.	<i>N</i>	0	0	0	1	16	0	33
	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	32.00	0.00	66.00
Q36 I willingly help others who have work related problems.	<i>N</i>	0	0	0	2	2	30	16
	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	4.00	60.00	32.00
Q37 I always focus on what's wrong, rather than coworkers the positive side.	<i>N</i>	16	17	7	5	5	0	0
	%	32.00	34.00	14.00	6.00	10.00	0.00	0.00
Q38 I take steps to try to prevent problems with other workers.	<i>N</i>	0	0	0	5	4	28.00	13
	%	34.00	46.00	12.00	6.00	2.00	56.00	26.00
Q39 My attendance at work is above the norm.	<i>N</i>	0	1	2	6	8	17	16
	%	0.00	2.00	4.00	12.00	16.00	34.00	32.00
Q40 I always find fault with what the organization is doing.	<i>N</i>	14	24	6	4	2	0	0
	%	28.00	48.00	12.00	8.00	4.00	0.00	0.00
Q41 I am mindful how my behavior affects other people's	<i>N</i>	0	0	0	5	5	23	17
	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	10.00	46.00	34.00
Q42 I do not take extra breaks.	<i>N</i>	1	0	0	8	3	23	15
	%	2.00	0.00	0.00	16.00	6.00	46.00	30.00
Q43 I obey company rules and regulations even when no one is watching.	<i>N</i>	0	0	0	1	1	24	24
	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	48.00	48.00
Q44 I help orient new people even though it is not required.	<i>N</i>	0	0	0	7	3	29	11
	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.00	6.00	58.00	22.00
Q45 I am one of the organizations most conscientious employees.	<i>N</i>	0	0	0	10	6	23	11
	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	12.00	46.00	22.00

Note. STD = strongly disagree; D = disagree; SLD = slightly disagree; NE = neutral; SLA = slightly agree; A= agree; STA = strongly agree.