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Summary

Leader-Member exchange (LMX) literature describes two exchange relationships that are relevant to motivate employees to engage in desirable behaviors toward the group. The first one is LMX, the quality of relationship between a leader and a member. The second one is leader-leader exchange (LLX), the quality of the leaders’ upward exchange relationship with their own supervisors. Thus far, the current state of LMX research attributes the source of the leaders’ influence on members’ motivation to be the leader’s resources that he or she provides to their members. When members receive valuable resources from the leader, they attempt to reciprocate by displaying behaviors that benefits the leader. Moreover, the leaders with high LLX leverage the resources from the upper management to motivate their followers. In this study, I approach LMX and LLX more intrinsically. Members with high LMX and/or LLX are driven intrinsically, because high LMX and LLX lead to their identification with the group. To these members, the group membership is an important part of their selves. Moreover, they perceive the group’s success represents their own success. As such, their behaviors on behalf of the group are ways of enhancing their own self-views through group’s success rather than exchange processes between the leader and the members. To this end, I developed and tested a model contending that LMX and LLX qualities influence members’ status judgments, which, in turn, lead to identification with the group and discretionary behaviors toward the group. Moreover, I tested two moderators on the links between LMX and LLX and members’ status judgments and moderated mediation for the indirect effects of LMX and LLX on members’ identification with the group.

Using survey data from 328 employees and their team leaders from 63 teams in South
Korea, I discovered that LMX and LLX are significantly related to members’ perceptions of respect, and pride in the group, respectively. Furthermore, the results supported the influence of LMX and LLX on members’ discretionary behaviors by means of status judgments and identification with the group. The results provided support for the moderating role of LMX differentiation on the relationship between LMX and respect: the higher the LMX differentiation becomes, the weaker the link between LMX and respect.
1. Introduction

As more organizations structure work around teams, scholars have focused on the leader’s role in promoting members’ behaviors that help the group to function more effectively (Morgeson, DeRue, Karam, 2010). Leaders are in “linking-pin positions” that connect their members in a lower hierarchy to the upper management in the organization (Graen, Cashman, Ginsburgh, & Schiemann, 1977; Likert, 1961). The leaders’ roles include managing their own followers, but at the same time serving as subordinates to their own supervisors in upper management. As such, scholars have studied leaders’ interpersonal relationships with both their subordinates and their own supervisors. LMX theory delineates the exchange relationships between two parties from different hierarchies in the organization. Within a group, leaders typically build differentiated exchange relationships with each of their members. The LMX dyads are extended into the higher level within the organization (Sparrowe & Liden, 1997). Beyond the group, the leaders’ supervisors develop unique exchange relationships with the leaders, called LLX (Cashman, Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1976; Graen et al., 1977; Tangirala, Green, & Ramanujam, 2007; Venkataramani, Green, & Schleicher, 2010; Zhou, Wang, Chen, & Shi, 2012). Prior studies have demonstrated that both LMX and LLX are positively related to members’ desirable behaviors for group functioning (Graen, et al., 1977; Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer, & Ferris, 2012; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007; Zhou et al., 2012).

Relying on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), LMX scholars have explained that members’ motivation stems from the resource exchange process. When members receive or expect to receive favorable treatment from the leader, they attempt to reciprocate by displaying behavior that benefits the leader. Indeed, the high-quality LMX relationship involves exchange
of abundant resources between a leader and a member (Dansereau, Alutto, & Yammarino, 1984). Moreover, the leaders with high LLX are able to access more resources from their supervisors and redistribute them to their followers. As such, leaders can leverage their LLX quality to motivate their followers by developing high-quality LMX relationships (Venkataramani, et al., 2010; Zhou et al., 2012).

While the LMX literature in the past 20 years has been enhanced through the use of social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), alternative explanations have been neglected. It is indeed unfortunate when LMX theory was originally developed to explain the process of defining members’ roles, but this rationale has been rarely integrated to the LMX literature. Applying role theory to the leadership context, Graen (1976) suggested that LMX quality determines the members’ roles in the group and guides their behaviors. While members with higher LMX quality play more significant roles in the group, those with lower LMX quality perform more routine work (Liden & Graen, 1980). Accordingly, LMX and LLX are closely related to members’ and leaders’ social status. LMX quality determines a member’s contribution to the group, and therefore has been considered an indicator of the social status of the member. Similarly, LLX quality is related to the leader’s social status in the organization (Venkataramani et al., 2010), especially when the leaders’ supervisor is well recognized within the organization (Sparrowe & Liden, 2005). However, while LMX research has shown how status evaluations determined by LMX and LLX influence the exchange process between a leader and member, we still know little about further implications. Social identity theory suggests that the extent to which members identify themselves to the group is contingent to their perceptions of status pertaining to the group (Tajfel, 1982; Tyler & Blader, 2000, 2001). Moreover, this extent shapes how much they engage to supportive attitudes and behaviors for the group. As such, an
integration of social identity theory to LMX theory will extend our understanding how LMX and LLX motivate members.

In this study, I move LMX theory forward by elucidating an alternative motivational mechanism and potential boundary conditions by integrating social identity theory with LMX theory. Specifically, I examine a model that specifies why members with high LMX and LLX display discretionary behaviors toward the group, and when the influences of LMX and/or LLX on member outcomes become stronger. Firstly, in regards to “why”, I propose that LMX and LLX motivate members because they shape a social identity as a part of the group. Specifically, LMX and LLX enhance the value of the group membership, which in turn, facilitates members’ identification with the group. Social identity theory explains members’ motivation intrinsically; when members identify themselves with a group that enhances their self-esteem, they engage in beneficial behaviors toward the group because they view the group’s success as their own (Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Tajfel, 1982). In other words, the values of the group are essential to motivate the members. The group engagement model proposes that members assess the values of group membership based on two types of group-status evaluations: the members’ perceptions of being respected by the group (i.e. their own status within the group) and affiliation to a prestigious group (i.e. the group’s status in a larger group, such as organization) (Tyler & Blader, 2000, 2001; Blader & Tyler, 2009; Smith & Tyler, 1997). Applying this notion to LMX theory, I argue that LMX and LLX are related to members’ evaluations of the group, and in turn shape members’ self-perceptions as a part of the group.

Secondly, I explore potential group contexts that offer finer-grained explanations for the relationship between LMX and LLX and members’ evaluation of group-related status. Firstly, I propose leader’s group prototypicality, which refers to the degree to which the leader embodies
the unique characteristics of the group (Hogg, 2001), as a moderator. When the leader is high in group prototypicality, he or she is perceived to be an exemplary member of the group rather than an individual who is independent from the group. Under such leaders, members are more likely to associate the leader’s exchange relationships to members’ evaluations regarding their group. Specifically, members perceive high social status within the group when they have a high LMX with the group prototypical leader. Similarly, members tend to perceive the leaders’ standing with upper management (LLX) as an indicator of the status of the group when they view their leader as a part of the group.

In addition, I suggest the moderating effect of LMX differentiation on link between LMX and respect. LMX differentiation reflects the degree to which LMX varies within the group. While LMX has been frequently studied at the individual level, relatively few studies over the past decade have alluded to how the group context resulting from LMX differentiation influences members’ attitudes and behaviors (Anand, Vidyarthi, & Park, 2016). Although LMX differentiation promotes individual and group outcomes in some context (Erdogan & Bauer, 2010; Liden et al., 2006), LMX differentiation is detrimental for interpersonal relationships among group members (Hooper & Martin, 2008). In a similar vein, the social identity theory of leadership endorsed the leadership style that highlights equal treatment, because it allows members to feel camaraderie (Hogg, 2001; Hogg, Martin, Epitropaki, Mankad, Svensson, & Weeden, 2005; Hogg, Martin, & Weeden, 2003). Extending this line of rationale, I argue that low LMX differentiation, which exemplifies the equality principle, is beneficial to leverage one’s LMX to build members’ social identity as a part of the group. Figure 1 shows the research model.
Figure 1. Research Model
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2. Theory and Hypotheses

2.1. LMX Theory

LMX theory is the third most studied leadership theory in the past decade following trait leadership and transformational leadership (Dinh, Lord, Gardner, Meuser, Liden, & Hu, 2014). Driven from the vertical dyad linkage theory, LMX theory holds that leaders cultivate a distinctive dyadic relationship with each member, and the relationship quality guides members’ behaviors (Dansereau, Cashman, & Graen, 1973). Role theory (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964), which explains how individuals’ behaviors are connected to their social environment, provides the theoretical underpinning for how LMX relationship develops. Role theory (Kahn et al., 1964) posits that individuals’ behaviors are determined by the roles developed through “role episodes”, which are iterative processes between two entities in the organization to determine individuals’ roles. In regards to leadership within a group, the role episodes occur between the leaders and their members and pertain to differentiated LMX relationships within work groups (Graen, 1976; Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Graen & Cashman, 1975). In order to maximize group performance while satisfying individual members’ needs, leaders may strategically differentiate members (Dansereau et al., 1973). When a member starts working in a group, the leader initiates the exchange relationship by imposing certain roles on a member based on his or her expectation on the member (role sending). For instance, while the members that the leader highly evaluates will be responsible for integral tasks for the group, those who are considered to be relatively incompetent will be responsible for mundane ones. Additionally, compatibility between leaders and members is even more influential at this stage (Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993). Accordingly, the member accepts the roles (role receiving) and behaves accordingly (role behaviors). Then, the member’s
fulfillment of the roles determines the quality of the exchange relationships and their future tasks. The members who successfully meet the expectations of the leader develop high-quality LMX relationships and keep working on the task that is similar or more significant than the previous one. On the contrary, those who fail will develop a less favorable relationship with the leader and will take charge of more trivial tasks. In addition to such top-down process, members may actively participate to the role-making process by negotiating with the leaders and modify their roles (bottom-up process). After few role episodes, the leader and the member reach to the agreement regarding the members’ roles (role routinization). Furthermore, the LMX relationship stabilizes (Liden et al., 1993; Nahrgang, Morgeson, & Ilies, 2009). As leaders and members accumulate more role episodes, the variety of different role episodes will naturally differentiate the individual roles within the group, and thus differentiate the LMX relationships of the group.

From social exchange perspective (Blau, 1964), each role episode that pertains to the resource exchange process between a leader and a member. From this angle, members’ behaviors are considered as *byproducts* generated from each role episode rather than *results* of stabilized roles. When the leader provides valuable resources that are required to perform the member’s role, the member reciprocates by displaying behaviors that benefit the leader throughout a sequence of role episodes. Indeed, the equitable balance of contributions (i.e. member’s efforts to satisfy the leader’s expectations on the member’s role), and benefits (i.e. the leader’s favor to the member) in each role episode is the key for developing LMX quality (Dansereau et al., 1984). Members with high LMX reciprocate the leader’s favorable treatment and vice versa, whereas those with low LMX exchange would not feel obligated to reciprocate as much (Dulebohn et al., 2012; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Although this
perspective provides a plausible explanation for why LMX motivates members, it does not capture implications of a member’s roles that are determined by LMX.

2.2. Leaders’ Role in Members’ Identification Process

Identity derives from individuals’ roles in their social environment (Stryker & Burke, 2000). The roles endowed from the social environment affect how individuals define themselves and behave in the social context. However, given that individuals hold multiple behavioral options attached to multiple identities, only the salient ones regulate their behaviors. Studies have shown that committed interpersonal relationships with a social group shape identity salience, and foster role behaviors (Stryker & Serpe, 1982; Callero, 1985). When people have close relationships with other group members, they display the expected role behaviors by the group more frequently. For instance, Stryker and Serpe (1982) found that those who are committed to the roles based on religion hold salient religious identity and spend more time in religious activities. Similarly, Callero (1985) showed when peoples’ donor identities become salient, they donate blood more frequently. He found that their interpersonal relationships with others in the blood donor community affects the salience of donor identity and facilitates blood donation. In summary, the interpersonal relationships amongst members within the group influence both social identity pertaining to the group and their expectations to perform within the group.

Leaders, normally the most influential members of the group, play a significant role in developing members’ social identity as a part of the group. Indeed, one of the roles of the leader is defining members’ roles in the group. This way, the leader constructs their members’ social identities via a top-down process (i.e. leaders influence members through sense-making processes), and/or a bottom-up process (i.e. members negotiate the boundaries between their own
personal identity and the identity that leaders propose) (Ashforth, Harrison, & Corley, 2008). Moreover, the leaders’ interpersonal relationships with their members affect the member’s identity regarding group membership. When the relationship with the leader is attractive to members, the members are apt to include the relationship in their self-concept to fulfill their tasks and psychosocial needs (Aron & Aron, 2000). Moreover, members’ identification with the leader may be generalized to their identification with other entities that the leaders represent, especially the organization (Sluss & Ashforth, 2008). For instance, members’ relationships with their leaders, who are perceived to be the agents of the organization, affect their identification with the organization (Sluss & Ashforth, 2007; Sluss, Ployhart, Cobb, & Ashforth, 2012).

However, to my knowledge, only scant research has identified how the leaders cultivate members’ identity vis-à-vis the group that the leader governs rather than how the leaders facilitate members’ organizational identity (except Hogg, 2001; Hogg et al., 2005; Liden, Wayne, Liao, & Meuser, 2014). This means only half of the leaders role as a “linking pin” (i.e. leader as an agent of the organization) has been studied; yet the other half (i.e. leader as the head of the group) has received relatively less attention in social identity literature. One way for the leader to reinforce members’ group membership is developing high quality of relationships. High LMX improves the members’ feelings of self-enhancement based on their group membership (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Extending this line of the argument, I explore how leaders facilitate members’ identification with the group in order to intrinsically motivate their group-oriented behaviors. Specifically, leaders may utilize their high quality relationship with their members (i.e. LMX) and their own supervisors (i.e. LLX) to shape members’ self-perceptions as members of the group.
2.3. The Relationship between LMX and Respect

Respect refers to the “worth accorded to one person by one or more others” (Spears, Ellemers, Doosje, & Brancombe, 2006). While generalized respect naturally comes from the group membership so all members share, particularized respect is idiosyncratic to individual group members. (Roger & Ashforth, 2016). That is, some members, who display valued attributes and achievement, perceive more respect and acceptance from the group than the others. Consequently, members’ perception of respect is relevant to the evaluations about their social status within the group (Tyler & Blader, 2000; Blader & Tyler, 2009). In regards to leadership, leaders’ individualized relationship with each member should be related to how an individual member feels being valued.

Scholars have related LMX to members’ social status within a group to explain members’ behaviors (Bolino & Tunley, 2009; Sparrowe & Liden, 2005; Sparrowe, Soetjipto, & Kramer, 2006). Driven from the role theory, LMX theory highlights the leaders’ acts as determining each of their members’ roles in the group. Leaders assign insignificant tasks to members low in LMX, whereas they rely on members high in LMX to achieve more challenging tasks (Liden & Graen, 1980). Moreover, leaders provide more tangible and intangible resources that members can utilize to perform their task and influence other members (Law-Penrose, Wilson, & Taylor, 2016). Indeed, studies support that high LMX quality results in some group members being perceived as more influential than others (Sparrowe & Liden, 1997). In a work group, members have at least a rough sense of the differentiated LMX relationships within the group and understand who has high LMX (Duchon, Green & Taber, 1986). Indeed, those understandings influence members’ evaluations of the members with high LMX (Kilduff & Krackhardt, 1994). For instance, members are apt to view other members with high LMX as being more capable,
because the leader has acknowledged as much. As such, LMX quality has been interpreted as the social status of the member within the group.

In addition to obtaining high social status from the leaders, members with high LMX are acknowledged by the coworkers (Lau & Liden, 2008; Tse, Lam, Lawrence, & Huang, 2013; Sherony & Green, 2002). For instance, members with high LMX obtain trust from coworkers (Lau & Liden, 2008), receive more help from coworkers (Tse et al., 2013), and develop a high-quality relationship with coworkers (Sherony & Green, 2002). Indeed, recent meta-analysis confirmed the positive correlation between LMX and team-member exchange (TMX) (Banks, Seers, Batchelor, O’Boyle, Pollack, & Gower, 2014). As a result, members who have high LMX quality may attain higher social status within the group by receiving favorable treatment from both the leader and other team members. As a result, the members are apt to feel being respected by the group as a whole. Based on this logic, I expect that employees with high LMX are apt to feel respected by the group.

Hypothesis 1. LMX quality is positively related to members’ perception of respect.

2.4. The Relationship between LLX and Pride in the Group

Pride has been generally conceived as an emotion involving self-evaluative processes based on recognition from others (Tracy, Sheriff, & Cheung, 2010). When people experience successful achievement and are praised by others, pride is triggered. Depending on the causes of pride, it has two different facets. While authentic pride results from what has been earned, hubristic pride is about the global self, not necessarily related to actual accomplishments (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Moreover, pride enhances one’s self-esteem, which in turn affects a wide range of intra- and interpersonal processes (Tracy & Robins, 2007). On the other hand, some scholars, especially those who are interested in group-based or organization-based pride,
consider pride as a more stable attitude, rather than an emotion prompted by an event. That is, pride captures a psychological tendency driven by an overall assessment of a person or an object (Eagly & Chaiken, 1998; Gouthier & Rhein, 2011). This type of pride does not rely on a single event; rather it results from accumulated experiences in the past (Fairfield & Wagner, 2004). In this vein, organizational research has treated pride as an evaluative state grounded in the members’ group membership (Arnett, Laverie, & McLane, 2002; Tyler & Blader, 2000). When individuals are affiliated with a group which is recognized by others as having a prestigious reputation, they are apt to feel pride for being included in the group. As such, the pride is an indicator of the group’s status in the organization (Tyler & Blader, 2000, 2001; Blader & Tyler, 2009).

Analogous to the role of LMX quality as a determinant of a member’s social status within the group, LLX, determines the leader’s social status within a larger network (i.e. the organization) (Venkataramani et al., 2011). While the leader’s network centrality indicates his or her lateral network ties (i.e. network of other leaders), LLX indicates upward ties in the organization (Sparrowe & Liden, 2005; Venkataramani et al., 2011). While the leader is the representative of his or her group, s/he is the linking pin that connects his or her followers that are in the low-level hierarchy to the higher-level management (Likert, 1961; Eisenberger, Karagonlar, Stinglhamber, Neves, Becker, Gonzales-Morales, & Steiger-Mueller, 2010). A group that is led by a leader who has a good standing with upper management receives more chances to contribute to the organization, and these chances come with more resources such as funding and information (Cashman et al., 1976; Graen, Dansereau & Minami, 1972; Graen et al., 1977). As such, the leader’s standing with upper management influences the group’s standing within the organization.
However, different members may have different opinions about the quality of the relationship of the leader with upper management. Followers are not always able to accurately evaluate their leader’s LLX as an observer. They are not able to fully access to the relevant information because they are no directly involved in the LLX relationship. Moreover, in some cases, leaders may deliberately manipulate their subordinates’ perception of LLX by engaging in impression management. Given that pride in the group is the evaluation of the group from the perspective of its members, it is plausible that members’ perceptions of LLX are relevant to members’ pride in the group. When members perceive that the leader is highly valued by upper management and has access to important resources within the organization, they are likely to believe that the group is in a good position. In contrast, when the members view the leader as unappreciated by his or her boss, they are likely to be skeptical about the group’s status within the organization. Given that members’ perceive the organization through the supervisor, the supervisor’s status within the organization may give a sense of where the members are within the organization (Graen et al., 1977; Venkataramani et al., 2010). As such, both the members’ and leaders’ perceptions of LLX will influence the degree to which the members are proud of being in the group.

_Hypothesis 2. LLX quality (a) as perceived by the leader and (b) as perceived by the member is positively related to the member’s pride in the group._

2.5. Pride in the Group, Respect, and Identification with the Group as Mediators of the Relationship between LMX and LLX and Members’ Discretionary Behaviors

Social identity is defined as “the part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (Tajfel, 1978: 63). This indicates that value
connotation of group membership is an integral part of one’s social identity. Research proposes that there are two features of the group that affect members’ assessment of the group membership. Aligned with the original social identity theory, scholars highlighted the group characteristics determined by *intergroup* phenomenon. Furthermore, relatively recent scholars started looking at the group characteristics that capture *intragroup* phenomena (Doosje, Ellemers & Spears, 1999). The group engagement model highlights both intergroup and intragroup features of the group to explain why people identify themselves with a certain group (Tyler & Blader, 2000; Tyler & Blader, 2001; Blader & Tyler, 2009). That is, members evaluate the value of group membership based on two features of the group: a group’s status in a larger context, referred to as pride, and their own status within the group, referred to as respect. In regards to pride in the group, members who belong to a group with high status obtain high self-esteem by virtue of affiliation with the group. Such feelings are driven by the evaluation of the group’s status in an absolute sense, rather than by comparisons with other groups (Tyler & Blader, 2002). Moreover, the member’s status within the group, which reflects social reputation (Emler & Hopkins, 1990), also influences his or her self-esteem. In regards to leaders’ role in determining members’ social status, research on in-group favoritism also indicates that leaders’ favoritism towards an in-group reinforces the in-group members’ more favorable social identity, because the in-group members receive material resources such as tangible rewards and symbolic benefits (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In conclusion, research has shown that pride, respect, and identification with the group are connected and predict members’ behaviors.

Although LMX and LLX lead to members’ respect and pride in the group, respectively, LMX quality influences the member’s evaluation of his or her own status within the group, whereas LLX quality gives cues with regard to where the group is situated within the
organization. Integrating the rational for Hypothesis 1 and 2 with the group engagement model, I hypothesize that the members’ group-related status judgments mediate the relationship between leaders’ exchange relationships (i.e. LMX and LLX) and members’ identification with the group.

**Hypothesis 3.** Respect mediates the positive relationship between LMX quality and identification with the group.

**Hypothesis 4.** Pride in the group mediates the positive relationship between LLX quality and identification with the group.

Broadly speaking, members’ behaviors can be categorized into mandatory behaviors and discretionary behaviors (Katz, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1978). Employees need to perform their task, mandatory behaviors, in a reliable manner, as their job description states. On the contrary, discretionary behaviors go beyond the employees’ workplace duties. For positive discretionary behaviors, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), broadly includes desirable behaviors that contribute to effectiveness of organizations, yet are not acknowledged by a formal reward system (Organ, 1988). While both mandatory behavior and OCB contribute to high performance and share similar antecedents, employees’ motivations for the behaviors differ. Whereas task performance stems from employees’ “can do” motivation, OCB reflects employees’ “will do” motivation (Schmitt, Cortina, Ingerick, & Weichmann, 2003). For instance, OCB can be costly to individuals, because it sometimes requires self-sacrifice and takes away time and resources for their own tasks (Bergeron, 2007). As such, members’ OCB better captures employees’ motivation to contribute to the collective benefit of the group, compared to task performance, which is mandatory.

Although some scholars have questioned the multidimensionality of OCB (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002), a handful of studies illustrate the uniqueness of each dimension of OCB.
For instance, Podsakoff and colleagues (2000) summarized the studies and categorized OCB into seven categories based on the content of behaviors. Williams and Anderson (1991) focus on the target of OCB and grouped OCB into OCB toward individuals and OCB toward the organization. Van Dyne and colleagues (1995) proposed a typology that contrasts affiliative and challenging behaviors. Affiliative behavior is cooperative and therefore helps develop high-quality relationships with other people. One example is helping, which is most frequently studied in the literature (Podsakoff et al., 2000). By contrast, challenging behavior is about implementing new ideas and issues. Challenging behavior orients toward making constructive challenge to the status quo. As such, although it improves group functioning, it may cause conflict and sometimes damage interpersonal relationships. Based on this typology, Van Dyne and LePine (1998) illustrate the distinctions between helping, which is affiliative behavior, and voice, which is a challenging behavior. Both helping and voice describe members’ initiative actions to improve group effectiveness, yet they have distinctive purposes.

Scholars also shed light on negative side of members’ discretionary behaviors. Deviance, a form of negative discretionary behavior, is defined as “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995: p. 556)”. Robinson and Bennett (1995) originally proposed a two-dimensional configuration of deviance behaviors based on the organization, versus other people, as the target with severity ranging from minor to serious. Nevertheless, most empirical studies have focused on the first dimension and have identified distinctive antecedents of deviance toward different targets (Hershcovis et al., 2007; Hershcovis & Barling, 2009). For instance, interpersonal deviance is directly harmful to other individuals
around a focal employee, such as other group members. Research has suggested numerous reasons employees display deviance such as reactions to perception of unfairness, dissatisfaction with their work environment, role modeling effects of supervisors and coworkers, and simply seeking thrill (Bennett, 1998a, 1998b; Robinson & Bennett, 1997; Robinson & Greenberg, 1999).

Social identity theory suggests that members genuinely care about the group’s success and view it as their own when they cognitively merge their selves to the group (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Moreover, they are more likely to contribute to the collective benefit to express their connections to the group (Doosje et al., 1999; Tyler & Blader, 2001). Aligned with the social identity theory, I propose that members’ identification with the group promotes members’ helping and voice in the group and suppresses interpersonal deviance. Although the majority of social identity studies have focused on positive discretionary behaviors, a similar logic may explain members’ motivation for interpersonal deviance. When members perceive the group as a part of themselves, they attempt to contribute to the group’s functioning. To this extent, they will restrain their deviant behaviors toward other group members. Ultimately, members’ behavioral motivation comes from their social identity in regards to their group. As stated above, leaders play a pivotal role in facilitating members’ identification with the group (Ashforth et al., 2008). Specifically, leaders’ relationships with their subordinates and with their supervisors influence members’ judgments regarding the group (Tyler & Blader, 2000, 2001). Consequently, members’ evaluations of their group reinforce their identification with the group. As such, LMX and LLX, which lead to members’ respect and pride in the group, influence members’ discretionary behaviors toward the group through members’ identification with the group.
Hypothesis 5. Respect and identification with the group mediate the positive relationship between LMX and the member’s (a) helping, (b) voice, and the negative relationship between LMX and the member’s (c) interpersonal deviance.

Hypothesis 6. Pride and identification with the group mediate the relationship between LLX and the member’s (a) helping, (b) voice, and the negative relationship between LLX and the member’s (c) interpersonal deviance.

2.6. The Competing Hypothesis on Resource Judgment vs. Identification with the Group

The resource-based perspectives, such as social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) highlight individuals’ instrumental motives. Social exchange theory has its roots in the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) that emphasizes the give and take process between two parties. It further distinguishes a social exchange relationship from an economic one based on whether the relationship entails “unspecified obligations” (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano &Mitchel, 2005). In an economic exchange relationship, two parties’ actions rely solely on obtaining the resources that the other party provides. That is, the party who receives resources from the other party would reciprocate accordingly. When two parties develop mutual trust and reasonable expectations about the other party, the economic exchange relationship turns into a social exchange. In a social exchange relationship, two parties treat each other with a long-term perspective; they do favors without counting the immediate returns. Indeed, the social exchange relationship engenders “feelings of obligations, gratitude, and trust” (Blau, 1964: p. 94). As such, individuals engage in voluntary actions for the other party based on the potential or an actual acquisition of resources from the other party.

Even though the social exchange theory focuses on a reciprocal relationship between two entities, research has found that the target of the reciprocity may be shifted. This happens when
an entity (e.g. the leader) represents another entity (e.g. the group or organization). For instance, Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1997) found that LMX influences members’ perception of support from not only the leaders but also the organization. Furthermore, Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, and Rhoades (2002) found that support from the leader precedes perceptions of support from the organization. As such, the favorable treatment from the leader motivates members’ desirable behaviors toward the leader, the group and the organization.

The LMX theory suggests that leaders should capitalize social exchange to engage their followers. The key is developing social exchange instead of transactional exchange relationships with the followers. When LMX is high, a leader and a member develop mutual trust and expectations about the other party and achieve a social exchange relationship. When leaders provide valuable tangible and intangible resources to the members, or, at least, give expectations for future reward based on mutual trust, they encourage their followers to reciprocate by displaying desirable attitudes and behaviors and even going the extra mile. By contrast, a low-quality LMX relationship involves economic exchanges (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975). In this relationship, members count the amount of support that the leader has provided, and perform just as much. Without trust, members’ attention is more on not being exploited. As such, the members with low LMX would not perform above and beyond their duties. A similar argument has been made for the impact of LLX on members’ behaviors. Leaders with high LLX, who receive more resources from the upper management of the organization, are able to redistribute more resources to their followers, compared to leaders with low LLX. In other words, LLX represents the amount of resources that members can obtain outside of the group through the leaders’ exchange relationship with upper management. In summary, LMX and LLX motivate
members to help their group because they obtained or expect to obtain resources from their leader through the social exchange process.

While the social exchange perspective proposes a plausible explanation how leaders influence members’ motivation, it is not fully reconciled with the social identity perspective. The former perspective assumes the resources available within the group determine the members’ motivation, whereas the latter one assumes merging one’s self to the group is the key. Some scholars are intrigued by the relationship between the amount of resources available in the group and members’ identification with the group (Tyler, 1999; Tyler & Blader, 2001). Tyler (1999) compared the variance explained by status judgment, an integral part of social identity, with the variance explained by resource judgments (i.e., the total amount of resources available) stemming from social exchange for predicting members’ cooperative behaviors for group. Tyler and Blader (2001) examined whether members identify with the group based on their estimation of the amount of resources that they gain or lose by associating with the group. In this vein, some scholars highlighted that the amount of resources exchanged in the LMX dyad would increases not only one’s intention to reciprocate, but also one’s self-worth (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Moreover, LMX influences members’ organizational identification, because members perceive support from the organization (Sluss, Ployhart, Cobb, & Ashforth, 2012). To this end, I shed light on the intersection between exchange and identity. Specifically, I test whether resource judgment explains the impact of LMX and LLX on members’ discretionary behaviors toward the group beyond the identification process.
Hypothesis 7. Resource judgment mediates the relationships between LMX and LLX and members’ discretionary behaviors when identification with the group is taken into consideration as a mediator in the relationships.

2.7. The Moderating Effect of Leader Group Prototypicality

Individuals think of themselves based on their social groups to which they belong (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, 1987). Indeed, their social identity stemming from group membership comes from recognizing the difference between their own group and other groups (Turner, 1982; Turner, 1985). Group prototypes refer to “context specific, multidimensional fuzzy sets of attributes that define and prescribe attitudes, feelings, and behaviors that characterize one group and distinguish it from other groups.” (Hogg, 2001, p. 187). Group members conceptually compartmentalize themselves from others who belong to different groups. Within a group, members judge themselves and fellow members based on perceptions of group prototypicality, the extent to which the members embody group’s characteristics. A member high in group prototypicality embodies the attributes considered to be desirable for the group and is perceived as an in-group member. In contrast, a less prototypical member would be considered to be an out-group member or a member who happens to be in a group. In sum, increasing prototypicality will increase the level of a member’s acceptance in his or her group.

From social identity perspective, the leader, in the setting of group prototypicality, facilitates the social categorization of the group. The basic premise is that leaders differ in the degree to which they embody the group prototype, as do group members. Likewise, the group prototypical leaders are effective (Hogg, 2011). Leader group prototypicality indicates the extent to which the leader is perceived to be the representative of the group (Hogg, 2001). When a leader is not formally assigned to a group, the member with high group prototypicality tends to
emerge as the leader. Moreover, group prototypicality is essential for a formal leader. The group-prototypical leader is one who is perceived to personify the identity of the group. They share group values and other characteristics that are considered to be important. Group prototypicality of leaders entails members’ trust in their leaders, which in turn improves leadership effectiveness (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). When members believe that their leader pursues the best interest of the group, they tend to be open to their leaders’ influence (Giessner & van Knippenberg, 2008; van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). As such, group prototypical leaders are influential because their members perceive them as being a representative of their group.

Leader group prototypicality strengthens the linkage between the qualities of leaders’ exchange relationships with their followers and their supervisors and members’ group-related status judgments. First, when members perceive the leader as being group prototypical, they perceive that their own LMX quality indicative of how they will be treated by the group as a whole. In other words, they are apt to strongly associate their LMX with their evaluations on their own social status when the leader is group prototypical. In contrast, if the leader is low in group prototypicality, his treatment of the member may not necessarily be generalized to how the group treats the member. As such, LMX quality with a leader who is low in group prototypicality is perceived to be an interpersonal relationship with just that individual, rather than the member’s standing within the group. A similar logic can be utilized to explain the link between LLX and pride in the group. When a group prototypical leader achieves or is perceived to achieve a high social status in the organization, members tend to perceive the achievement as representing the group’s standing within the organization. In contrast, group members may not feel that the leader’s social status applies to the group, if the leader is not considered to be
representative of group. As such, I expect the relationships between LMX and respect and between LLX and pride in the group to differ according to the leader group prototypicality.

**Hypothesis 8a.** Leader group prototypicality moderates the positive relationship between LMX and respect, such that the relationship is stronger when leader prototypicality is high than low.

**Hypothesis 8b.** Leader prototypicality moderates the positive relationship between LLX and pride in the group, such that the relationship is stronger when leader prototypicality is high than low.

### 2.8. The Moderating Effect of LMX Differentiation

The basic premise of LMX theory is that LMXs varies within the group. Indeed, early LMX theory suggested that LMX differentiation is a leadership strategy, which aims at enhancing individual and group productivity through efficient distribution of limited resources (Dansereau et al., 1975). Also, it is an inevitable leadership phenomenon considering that the majority of work units in reality have LMX differentiation (Liden & Graen, 1980; Dansereau et al., 1975). Recognizing this phenomenon, scholars have begun to study the implications of LMX differentiation (Henderson, Liden, Glibkowski, & Chaudry, 2009; Henderson, Wayne, Shore, Bommer, & Tetrick, 2008; Erdogan & Bauer, 2010; Liden, Erdogan, Wayne, & Sparrowe, 2006). Applying social comparison theory (Festinger, 1964; Buunk & Gibbons, 2007) to LMX theory, scholars suggest that members compare their LMX quality with others’ LMX quality, and are affected by the social information arising from this comparison (Anand et al., 2016). Previous studies provide evidence on the employee outcomes of LMX differentiation beyond the effect of individual members’ LMX (Erdogan & Bauer, 2009; Hooper & Martin, 2008; Liden et al., 2006).
Although LMX differentiation may have positive outcomes in some contexts (Liden et al., 2006; Erdogan & Bauer, 2010), it may be detrimental, especially when it comes to members’ perceptions regarding the group or other group members. High LMX differentiation indicates that some of the group members may be neglected or are not provided enough resources by the leaders, although not all group members are pursuing high LMX (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Graen & Scandura, 1987). Furthermore, those members with low LMX may experience negative emotions, such as envy and contempt toward the supervisor or even those who have high LMX (Tse, Dasborough, & Ashkansy, 2008). Supporting this notion, Sherony and Green (2002) found that when two members have dissimilar qualities of LMX, it hampers the relationship between these two members. In other words, when two members have a similar quality of LMX, they tend to develop a high quality relationship. Furthermore, Hooper and Martin (2008) uncovered that LMX differentiation leads to relational conflicts among members.

Social identity theory of leadership highlights the common ground among members to promote members’ identification with the group (Hogg, 2001). Members’ identification with the group is the result of social categorization processes, which differentiate the group from the other groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, 1987). When members share much in common, they stick together and view themselves as ‘us’ rather than a group of individuals. In regards to leadership, social identity of leadership advocates depersonalized leadership style, which emphasize equal treatment for the members (Hogg, 2001; Hogg et al., 2005). This argument is contradictory to the early LMX theory, which highlights the benefits coming from differentiation. In this regard, social identity of leadership suggests LMX differentiation may not be effective to facilitate a collective identity (Hogg et al., 2005). When high LMX differentiation exists, members tend to have different ideas about their leaders and experience
interpersonal conflict with their colleagues. As such, members are less likely to associate their LMX with their perceptions of being respected within the team. In contrast, when LMX differentiation is low, members share similar experience with the leader thereby developing a common ground. The members with high LMX are more likely to feel respected by the group when other members also receive comparable treatment from the leader. Summarizing this rationale, I propose that the relationship between LMX and respect differs according to the level of LMX differentiation.

Hypothesis 9. LMX differentiation moderates the relationship between LMX and respect, such that the positive relationship is stronger when LMX differentiation is low than high.
3. Methods

3.1. Sample and Data Collection

First, I invited human resource (HR) managers of 12 companies in Seoul, South Korea to participate in the study. The companies are in various industries including insurance, human resource outsourcing, food production, airlines, energy, marketing research, manufacturing and information system. The companies that were selected have a hierarchical structure and use work teams. To be qualified as a work group, the group should have at least a three members or more. With the HR managers’ assistance, I distributed paper and pencil surveys with empty envelopes to potential participants at their offices. After completing the surveys, employees and supervisors sealed the envelopes for confidentiality and handed them to me. As an exchange of the completed surveys, I provided 5,000 Korean won (equivalent to 5 USD) gift cards to the participants. The surveys were coded in order to match responses of the leaders with their subordinates. The codes are five or six-digit number indicating company, group and employee ID. The purpose of collecting data from both employees and supervisors was to overcome the same source bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003) and to collect data from the most appropriate source.

Out of 385 employees in 63 teams who received surveys, 328 employees in 63 work groups completed the survey. The response rates were 85% for individual employees and 100% for team leaders. The size of the work groups range from 3 to 13 and the average was 6.11. 72% of the employees and 96.8% of group leaders were male. The average age of employees was 35.77 and that of the team leaders was 44.75. On average, employees had worked with the leader for 24.79 months and in the team for 35.77 months. Moreover, the team leaders’ average tenure with their supervisor was 28.05 and with the team was 43.38. For the analyses, I included
data from work teams with at least 60% participation by their members to ensure the degree to which variables aggregated to the team-level accurately portray the team (Timmerman, 2005).

3.2. Measures

The survey questions were written in Korean. All the items were translated into Korean by me, and then back translated by a Korean manager who is fluent in both English and Korean. After working individually, we resolved any discrepancies between the original English and back-translated English. The English items are attached in the Appendix. Before distributing the survey, a professor in management reviewed the questions and confirmed. Respondents rated the extent to which they agreed with the following statements about their particular work group. Their agreement with each statement on the scale ranges from 1, “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree”. I used a five-point scale because of the page limitations that the sponsored company requested.

*LMX quality.* Subordinates rated their LMXs using 12 items of LMX-MDM (Liden & Maslyn, 1998) ($\alpha=.95$). 12-items captures four dimensions: professional respect, loyalty, affect, and contribution. A sample item is “I like my supervisor very much as a person.”

*LMX differentiation.* Following Chan’s (1998) dispersion model and previous studies (e.g. Liden et al., 2006; Henderson et al., 2008), I operationalized LMX differentiation as the variance in the individual-level LMX scores for each team.

*LLX quality.* Both and leaders and subordinates measured LLX. Leaders assessed their LMX with their supervisor using 12 items of LMX-MDM (Liden & Maslyn, 1998) ($\alpha=.94$). Subordinates responded to seven items of LMX developed by Liden and colleagues (1993), but all the items were referent shifted from “I” to “my leader” ($\alpha=.92$). The sample item is “My leader’s working relationship with his supervisor is effective.” Although Dulebohn and
colleagues (2012) found there is no difference among existing LMX measures, I included two different measures for LMX to minimize the repetitiveness of survey items.

*Pride in the group.* Subordinates responded to a four-item measure of Tyler, Degoe and Smith (1996) (α=.81). A sample item is “I feel proud to be a part of my work group.”

*Respect.* Subordinates answered six items developed by Tyler and colleagues (1996) (α=.90). A sample item is “my group values you as a member of your work group.”

*Identification with the group.* Subordinates responded five items from the measure employed by Blader & Tyler (2009) (α=.81). These items are modified items of Mael and Ashforth’s (1992) organizational identification. A sample item is “Working with my team is important to the way that I think of myself as a person.”

*Resource judgment.* The operationalization of resource judgment is the extent to which employees perceive the availability of the resources within the group. To measure this construct, I modified a seven-item measure of perceived organizational support (Eisenberger et al., 2002) by shifting the reference from organization to group (α=.84). A sample item is “My team values my contribution to its well-being.”

*Helping.* Leaders rated helping behaviors of each of their members using Williams and Anderson’s (1991) seven-item measure (α=.91). I slightly modified the target of the behaviors from coworkers and the supervisor to the team members, or the team leader. A sample item is “This person helps his/her team members who have heavy workloads.”

*Voice.* Leader rated voice of each member using six items from Van Dyne and LePine (1998) (α=.89). A sample item is “This person develops and makes recommendations concerning issues that affect this team.”
**Interpersonal deviance.** Leaders rated each member’s interpersonal deviance using six items from Bennett and Robinson’s (2000) seven-item measure (α = .95). The target of deviant behaviors was shifter from someone to team member(s). The sample item is “This person made fun of their team member at work.” Because Korean companies are ethnically and racially homogeneous, the item that assumes the existence of multiple ethnic and racial groups at work does not fit Korean context. Therefore, I deleted the item “This person made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work.”

**Leader group prototypicality.** In order to rate the leader’s group prototypicality, subordinates responded to five items developed by Platow and Van Knippenberg (2001) (α = .93). A sample item is “Overall, I would say that the leader represents what is characteristic about our team”. Given that leader group prototypicality is a group level moderator, the responses were aggregated to the group level. To justify aggregation and assess the reliability of the group mean, I calculated ICC(1) and ICC(2) based on the results of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Bliese, 2000). ICC(1) was .26 and ICC(2) was .71. ICC(1) reflects the extent to which members’ ratings are agreed within the group. The acceptable range based on previous published studies is from .00 to .50 (James, 1982). ICC(2) indicates whether group mean is appropriate to use. ICC(2) is expect to exceed .70 (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, & Mount, 1998). Therefore, aggregating the responses to the group level was appropriate.

**Control variables.** To control for plausible alternative explanations, I controlled for several variables that are theoretically linked to the relationships of interest. Amongst potential variables including the demographic information of members and leaders (i.e. age, sex, education level, tenure), I included only the variables that are significantly correlated to outcomes and mediators (Becker, 2005). First, I controlled both leaders’ and subordinates’ perceptions of
perceived organizational support (POS), which indicates how much support is available within the organization (Eisenberger et al., 2002). Second, identification with the leader was controlled because high LMX and LLX may enhance members’ relational identification with the leader, which influences their identification with another entity that the leader represents (Sluss & Ashforth, 2007; Sluss et al., 2012). In order to measure identification with the leader, I employed a reference shifted organizational identification measure developed by Mael and Ashforth (1992). I modified “organization” to “my team leader” for all the items. Third, I controlled the dyadic tenure of (1) the leader and his or her group members and (2) the leader and his or her supervisor. This is because it is relevant in developing dyadic relationships.

3.3. Analytical strategy

I conducted ANOVA and calculated ICC(1) to test whether organization accounts for significant variance in group level variables, LLX and POS rated by leaders. First, ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of organizations on LLX and POS rated by leaders. ANOVA results indicate that at least one organization is significantly different from other organizations in regards to LLX (F (11, 51)= 2.25, p< .05). On the contrary, leader-rated POS is not significantly different among organizations (F(11, 51)= 1.02, p= .44). To detect the organization that is significantly different from others, I conducted Post-hoc tests using Sheffé and Bonferroni methods, which are used when the size of groups are different (Neter & Wasserman, 1974). While post hoc comparison using Sheffé did not yield significant mean differences, that using Bonferroni test indicated that the mean of a manufacturing company, which produce anchoring system, hammer drills and various tools, is significantly lower than the means of four organizations in service industry. Seven employees and two group leaders were participated in this study. ICC(1) was .16 for LLX and .00 for POS rated by leaders. Considering that the
characteristics of industry may cause differences, I also conducted the ANOVA to examine whether leader-rated LLX and POS are significantly different between manufacturing and service industries. Results showed that there is no significant difference on LLX (F(1, 61) = .416, p = .52) and POS (F(1, 61) = 1.306, p = .26) between these two industries.

To test the research model with cross-level effects and multiple mediators, I employed Mplus version 7 (Muthén & Muthén, 2012). I used manifest variables in the path model. All study variables except the employees’ and leaders’ tenure with the supervisor and in the team were grand mean centered. This is because the research model includes cross-level mediation (Hofmann & Gavin, 1998). For the interaction term between LLX rated by the leader and leader prototypicality, I multiplied the centered variables. (Aiken & West, 1991). For the cross-level moderating effects of leader prototypicality and LMX differentiation, I set a model with random slopes. To estimate the research model, I compared the Akaike information criterion (AIC) values of the model with those of alternative models. Furthermore, I calculated pseudo $R^2$ (Snijder & Bosker, 1999) to identify how much variance the hypothesized multi-level model explains. The significance of indirect effects (mediation) and conditional indirect effects (moderated mediation) (Edward & Lambert, 2007) were verified by bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals (CI) calculated by Monte Carlo method with 20,000 iterations (Preacher, Zyphur, & Zhang, 2010).
4. Results

4.1. Discriminant Validity

To obtain discriminant validity, I conducted exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using Mplus 7 (Muthén & Muthén, 2012). Overall model fit was assessed by Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker Lewis Index (TLI), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). Cutoffs of reasonable fit indices are CFI > .90, TLI > .90 RMSEA < .08, and SRMR < .08 (Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Williams, Vandenberg & Edwards, 2009). Among these indices, CFI and RMSEA are considered to be the most critical indices for assessing the model (Williams et al., 2009).

For EFA analysis, I used oblique GEOMIN rotation, which assumes that the variables of interest are correlated. The EFA results indicate that ten-factor received a reasonable fit ($\chi^2$ (1953) = 19727.67, $p < .01$, CFI = .92, TLI = .89, RMSEA = .05, SRMR = .02). The Table 1 presents the factor loadings of items above .3. However, this factor structure is not completely aligned with theories. For instance, some theoretically distinctive factors are loaded on the same factor. Two items of leader group prototypicality and three items of professional respect, a subdimension of LMX were loaded on a same factor. Moreover, items of pride in the group and resource judgment were loaded on the same factor. Some items such as LMX items 7-9, which measure the contribution dimension of LMX, and leader group prototypicality items 4 and 5 were not loaded on any factor. Such inconsistency may be because LMX is a multidimensional construct, which theoretically includes four factors, there are high correlations between some constructs, and relatively small sample size compared to the number of items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Helping</th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>ID$^a$</th>
<th>LLX</th>
<th>Affect (LMX)</th>
<th>Loyalty (LMX)</th>
<th>Professional respect (LMX)</th>
<th>Pride in the group &amp; Resource judgment</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>GI$^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping2</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping3</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping4</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping5</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping6</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping7</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Deviance1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Deviance2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Deviance3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Deviance4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Deviance5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $^a$ ID = Interpersonal deviance; $^b$ GI=Identification with the group.
Table 1. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helping</th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>LLX</th>
<th>Affect (LMX)</th>
<th>Loyalty (LMX)</th>
<th>Professional respect (LMX) &amp; Leader group prototypicality</th>
<th>Pride in the group &amp; Resource judgment</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>GI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLX1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLX2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLX3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLX4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLX5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLX6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLX7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader group prototypicality1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leader group prototypicality2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leader group prototypicality3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a ID = Interpersonal deviance; b GI=Identification with the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>LLX</td>
<td>Affect (LMX)</td>
<td>Loyalty (LMX)</td>
<td>Professional respect (LMX)</td>
<td>Pride in the group &amp; Resource judgment</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>GI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource judgment1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource judgment2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource judgment3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource judgment4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource judgment5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource judgment6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource judgment7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: <sup>a</sup>ID = Interpersonal deviance; <sup>b</sup>GI=Identification with the group.
In order to further determine the factor structure with theoretical reasoning, I conducted CFA. I conducted CFA at the individual levels because individual-level CFA is more reliable with larger sample sizes and the group-level construct (i.e. leader group prototypicality) shared by the members are originally assessed at the individual level, and (Kline, 2005). Given the small subject-to-item ratio (4.43:1), I employed the item parceling method for LMX, which is a multidimensional construct. The ideal ratio for reliable CFA is 10:1 and the acceptable one is 5:1 (Bandalos, 2002). According to Liden & Maslyn (1998), four parcels were formed with three items per dimension. The ten-factor model yields a reasonable fit ($\chi^2 (1385) = 2704.81$, $p < .01$, CFI= .90, TLI= .89, RMSEA= .05, SRMR= .05). This model is superior to the alternative models: (1) the eight-factor model (i.e. employees behaviors combined as one factor and seven factors for the rest of variables) ($\chi^2 (1402) = 4520.63$, $p < .01$, CFI= .77, TLI= .75, RMSEA= .08, SRMR= .07), (2) another eight factor model with one factor related to leaders (i.e. LMX, LLX, and leader prototypicality) and seven factors for the rest of variables ($\chi^2 (1402) = 3686.64$, $p < .01$, CFI= .83, TLI= .82, RMSEA= .07, SRMR= .07), (3) the seven-factor model with one factor related to group (i.e. respect, pride in the group, identification with the group, and resource judgment) and six factors for the rest of variables ($\chi^2 (1485) = 14776.80$, $p < .01$, CFI= .86, TLI= .85, RMSEA= .06, SRMR= .06), (4) the five-factor model with the three variables related to leaders loading on one factor, the four variables related to group loading on another factor and three factors for members’ behaviors ($\chi^2 (1420) = 4265.73$, $p < .01$, CFI= .79, TLI= .78, RMSEA= .08, SRMR= .07) and (5) the three-factor model with a factor related to leaders, a factor related to group, and a factor related to members’ behaviors ($\chi^2 (1427) = 6071.37$, $p < .01$, CFI= .65, TLI= .64, RMSEA= .10, SRMR= .09). Even though the ten-factor model does not
yield a good fit, I still used this factor structure because it is still the best amongst alternative models.

4.2. Hypothesis Testing

The mean, standard deviation, and correlations among study variables at the individual and group levels are shown in Table 2 and 3, respectively.
Table 2. Mean, standard Deviations, and correlations among variables at the individual level\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tenure with the leader(^b)</td>
<td>24.78</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tenure in the team(^b)</td>
<td>35.77</td>
<td>36.13</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. POS(^b)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-0.11*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identification with the leader(^b)</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. LMX(^b)</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. LLX(^b)</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Respect(^b)</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pride with the group(^b)</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Identification with the group(^b)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Resource judgment(^b)</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.10†</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Helping(^c)</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Voice(^c)</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>0.10†</td>
<td>0.11†</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Interpersonal deviance(^c)</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)N=328. \(^b\)Member rated variables. \(^c\)The group leader rated variables. Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities are reported in italic along the diagonal. 
†p<.10. *p<.05. ** p<.01
Table 2. Mean, standard Deviations, and correlations among variables at the individual level (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tenure with the leader&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tenure in the team&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. POS&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identification with the leader&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. LMX&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. LLX&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Respect&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pride with the group&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Identification with the group&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Resource judgment&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Helping&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Voice&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Interpersonal deviance&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.10†</td>
<td>-0.42**</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>N=328.  <sup>b</sup>Member rated variables.  <sup>c</sup>The group leader rated variables. Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities are reported in italic along the diagonal.

†<i>p</i><.10. *<i>p</i><.05. **<i>p</i><.01
Table 3. Mean, standard deviations, and correlations among variables at the group level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tenure with the supervisor&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28.05</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tenure in the team&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>43.38</td>
<td>41.84</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. POS&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LLX&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. LMXD&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Leader prototypicality&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.45**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>N=63.  <sup>b</sup>The group leader rated variables.  <sup>c</sup>The variance of member rated LMX.  <sup>d</sup>The aggregation of member rated leader prototypicality.  Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities are reported in italic along the diagonal.
†<i>p</i>&lt;.10.  *<i>p</i>&lt;.05.  **<i>p</i>&lt;.01.
The hypothesized models were tested with control variables loaded on both mediators and outcomes. Firstly, I examined a model to test Hypothesis 1 to Hypothesis 8. This model includes LMX and LLX leading to members’ behavioral outcomes via respect, pride in the group, and identification with the group. The results are shown in Figure 2.

\[ p < .10. \quad * p < .05. \quad ** p < .01. \]

Figure 2. Results of the path analysis on mediation (Hypothesis 1-7)

To estimate the research model, I compared the AIC value of hypothesized model (AIC=2683.83) with that of alternative models. The first alternative model includes the path from LMX to pride in the group and the paths from LLX rated by leaders and members to respect, instead of the path from LMX to respect and the paths from LLX to pride in the group (AIC=2700.31). The second alternative model includes additional paths from independent variables (LMX and LLXs rated by leaders and members) to the distal mediator (i.e. identification with the group) (AIC=4003.50). The third alternative model includes additional paths from independent variables to outcomes (i.e. helping, voice, and interpersonal deviance) (AIC=4091.00). Finally, I compared the hypothesized model with the alternative model with additional paths from independent variables to distal mediator and outcomes (AIC=4096). In
conclusion, the hypothesized model is superior to the alternative models. Furthermore, pseudo $R^2$ (Snijders & Bosker, 1999) was calculated to estimate the explained variance. The proportion of variance explained by the hypothesized model was 10.26% for helping, and 6.77% for voice.

Supporting Hypothesis 1, LMX was positively related to members’ perceptions of respect ($\beta=.39, p<.01$). The Hypothesis 2 was on the positive relationship between LLX and members’ perceptions of pride in the group. While LLX rated by the member was significantly related to members’ pride in the group (Hypothesis 2a) ($\beta=.14, p<.01$), LLX rated by the leader was not significantly related to members’ pride in the group (Hypothesis 2b) ($\gamma=.05, n.s.$). This result indicates a discrepancy between leader rated LLX and member rated LLX. Hence, the Hypothesis 2 was partially supported. Given that the cross-level effect of LLX on pride in the group was not significant, I tested mediation hypotheses only at the individual level.

To test the mediation hypothesis, I examined the indirect effects and calculated 95% bias-corrected CI with 20,000 iterations. As shown in Table 4, the indirect effects of LMX on identification with the group via respect ($\beta=.06$, bias-corrected 95% CI=[.03, .12], excluding zero) and on helping via respect and identification with the group ($\beta=.01$, bias-corrected 95% CI=[.003, .04], excluding zero) were significant. Thus, the Hypothesis 3 and 5a are supported. Moreover, the indirect effects of LLX on identification with the group via pride in the group ($\beta=.02$, bias-corrected 95% CI=[.003, .05], excluding zero) and on helping via pride in the group and identification with the group ($\beta=.01$, bias-corrected 95% CI=[.001, .01], excluding zero) were significant. Therefore, the Hypothesis 4 and 6a were supported. While the paths between identification with the group and voice were significant, the indirect effects of LMX ($\beta=.09$, bias-corrected 95% CI=[.00, .03], including zero) and LLX rated by members ($\beta=.06$, bias-corrected 95% CI=[.00, .01], including zero) on voice via status judgments and identification
with the group were not significant. The indirect effect of LLX rated by leaders on voice through pride in the group and identification with the group was not tested because LLX rated by leaders is not significantly related to members’ perceptions of pride in the group. Moreover, the path between identification with the group and interpersonal deviance was not significant. As such, Hypothesis 5b, 5c, 6b, and 6c were not supported.

To test the competing hypothesis on identification vs. resource judgment, I added resource judgment into the model. According to psuedo-$R^2$, this model explains 9.84% of variance of helping and 8% of variance of voice. Compared to the hypothesized model that was tested earlier, the model with resource judgment explains less of the variance of outcomes. As shown in Figure 3, resource judgment is only related to LMX whereas identification mechanism is significantly related to LMX and LLX rated by members. However, the impacts of identification with the group on behavioral outcomes become insignificant when perceived group support is included into the model. This unexpected finding is discussed in the later section.

†$p<.10$. *$p<.05$. **$p<.01$.

Figure 3. Results of the path analysis for mediation.
Figure 4 shows the results of testing cross-level moderating effects of LMX differentiation and leader group prototypicality. For the sake of readability, I did not present the control variables in the model. The first moderator is leader group prototypicality. I hypothesized that leader group prototypicality strengthens the relationship between LMX and respect (Hypothesis 8a) and between LLX and pride in the group (Hypothesis 8b). In contrast to the hypothesis, the cross-level interactions were not significant. Therefore, Hypothesis 8 was not supported. The second moderator is LMX differentiation. Supporting Hypothesis 9, the moderating effect of LMX differentiation on the relationship between LMX and respect was significant ($\beta = -0.40, p < .01$). The results of the simple slope test indicate that the effect of LMX on respect was stronger when LMX differentiation is low ($\beta = 0.70, p < .01$), compared to LMX differentiation is high ($\beta = 0.41, p < .01$).

†$p<.10$. *$p<.05$. **$p<.01$.

Figure 4. Moderating effects of LMX differentiation and Leader prototypicality
The interaction plot is presented in Figure 5.

![Interaction Plot](image)

**Figure 5.** Moderating effect of LMX differentiation

Furthermore, I tested the first-stage moderated mediation following Edward and Lambert’s (2007) approach. Considering that conditional indirect effects are not normally distributed, I used Monte Carlo methods to verify the significance of conditional indirect effects. The indirect effect of LMX on identification with the group was stronger when LMX differentiation is low ($\beta = 0.12$, bias corrected 95% CI=[0.03, 0.19], excluding zero), than high ($\beta = 0.07$, bias corrected 95% CI=[0.02, 0.11]). The indirect effect was significant in both when LMX differentiation is high and low. This result indicates the less the leader differentiates, the more members associate their LMX with their feeling of being respected and their identification with
the group. The summary of the conditional indirect effects for moderated mediation is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Summary of Indirect effects and Conditional Indirect effects

| Indirect paths | Indirect effects  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H3: LMX → Respect → Identification with the group</td>
<td>β=.06 CI=[.03, .12]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: LLX_M → Pride in group → Identification with the group</td>
<td>β=.02 CI=[.003, .05]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a: LMX → Respect → Identification with the group → helping</td>
<td>β=.01 CI=[.001, .01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b: LMX → Respect → Identification with the group → voice</td>
<td>β=.09 CI=[.00, .03]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6a: LLX_M → Pride in group → Identification with the group → helping</td>
<td>β=.06 CI=[.02, .11]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6b: LLX_M → Pride in group → Identification with the group → voice</td>
<td>β=.06 CI=[.00, .01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9: Moderating effect of LMX differentiation on the path between LMX and Respect:</td>
<td>β = -0.40**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High LMX differentiation</td>
<td>High: β = 0.41**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low LMX differentiation</td>
<td>Low: β = 0.70**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderated mediation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional indirect effect of LMX → Respect → Identification with the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High LMX differentiation</td>
<td>β = .07 CI=[.02, .11]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low LMX differentiation</td>
<td>β = .12, CI=[.03, .19]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* The indirect effect and conditional indirect effect tests were based on 20,000 parametric resamples.

†p<.10. *p<.05. ** p<.01.
5. Discussion

The present research proposes an answer for the question of why leaders’ exchange relationships foster members’ discretionary behaviors, and when the influence of leaders’ exchange relationships on members’ evaluations of the group is stronger. Specifically, the current study uncovered the process through which LMX and LLX influence members’ positive behaviors toward the group and boundary conditions. First, the results suggested that LMX and LLX are related to members’ perceptions of social status pertaining to the group. LMX was related to a member’s perception of respect, which reflects the member’s social status within the group. Moreover, LLX rated by a member was related to the members’ pride of being in the group, which reflects the group’s social status within the organization. In contrast to the hypothesis, only LLX perceived by the members predicts their group pride, whereas LLX perceived by leaders was not significantly related to members’ pride in the group. This finding implies a discrepancy between the leaders and the members regarding their perceptions of LLX.

Second, members’ status judgments regarding the group, which are determined by LMX and LLX, facilitate the group identification process and engage members’ desirable behaviors toward the group. According to the group engagement model, pride in the group and respect are integral parts of members’ group identification (Tyler & Blader, 2000). Moreover, a strong identification with the group intrinsically motivates members’ positive discretionary behaviors toward the group. Supporting this notion, I found that LMX and LLX indirectly influence members’ identification with the group via respect and pride. Furthermore, this leads to intrinsically motivate members’ positive discretionary behaviors, such as helping and voice. Compared to voice, helping behaviors displayed by members were more strongly related to members’ identification with the group. This may be because voice, a change-oriented
discretionary behavior, entails risks to hamper interpersonal relationships or collectivity within the group (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998).

In regards to the behavioral outcomes of members’ identification with the group, there was another unexpected finding. That is, the impact of LMX and LLX via members’ status judgments and identification with the group were not significantly related to interpersonal deviance. Scholars generally explain that individuals display hostile behaviors toward coworkers when they attempt to retaliate against the entity that has treated them unfairly (Bies & Tripp, 2005; Gouldner, 1960; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), when they experience a threat to their ego (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998), and/or when they have role models who display such behaviors (Bandura, 1977). This means that negative events or treatment trigger defiant reactions, rather than positive ones. The damage to members’ identities may better predict members’ deviant behaviors. In this regard, threats to their respect or pride might cause deviant behaviors toward the group.

Third, the current study highlights the competing hypothesis on members’ motivation: resource judgment vs. identification. The results showed that resource judgment is not related to LLX, nor members’ behavioral outcomes, when the identification mechanism, which includes members’ respect, pride, and identification with the group, was included in the hypothesized model. Nevertheless, resource judgment was relevant to LMX. This means that members make judgments on the amount of resources within the group based only on their LMX.

Unexpectedly, the identification process did not mediate the impacts of LMX and LLX on team oriented behaviors of members when resource judgment was included in the model. One plausible explanation is that the identification process and social exchange process are not concurrent or negate each other, as hypothesized. Rather, depending on the maturity of LMX
relationships, either identification or social exchange may occur. Previous studies have delineated how a leader and a member develop LMX relationships (Bauer & Green, 1996; Diener & Liden, 1986; Nahrgang et al., 2009). Steering from a transactional exchange to a social exchange, the leader and the member achieve a high quality LMX relationship. Moreover, once they achieve high LMX at the early stage of relationship, it maintains; members and leaders are devoted to each other based on mutual trust of reciprocity. However, we know little about whether the relationship can move to a next step. I believe identification can be one. The power of LMX may not be limited to fostering a long-term give-and-take process based on mutual trust, but influence members’ work-related social identity. As the LMX relationship matures, the members who attained high LMX may experience identification process after social exchange process occurs. As such, the mediators may differ according to at which the LMX relationship is.

Finally, the moderating effect of LMX differentiation on the relationship between LMX and respect was verified. The result indicates that in addition to individual member’s LMX quality, the level of differentiation within the group matters; when the leaders differentiate, members are less likely to see the link between their LMX and feeling of being respected by the group. This result extends the research that sheds light on the negative results of high LMX differentiation.

5.1. Theoretical Implications

The current study makes contributions to LMX and social identity research by adding to the body of literature that integrates these two realms. First, the major contribution of the current study is that it advances our knowledge of members’ motivation resulting from LMX and LLX. Despite an abundance of research on LMX, remarkably little research has shed light on alternative explanations other than social exchange process. The extant literature on LMX has
explained the impacts of LMX and LLX on members’ team oriented behaviors, because the members attempt to reciprocate leaders who are the representative of the group (Dulebohn et al., 2012). The results demonstrated that members’ identification process mediates the impacts of LMX and LLX on members’ discretionary behaviors, above and beyond the resource judgment.

Second, this study enhances our understanding of how LLX influences subordinates’ outcomes. Although scholars have suggested that leaders’ exchange relationship with their supervisors should have an influence on members’ outcomes (Graen et al., 1977), only few studies have empirically examined how LLX influence members’ outcomes (Venkataramani et al., 2010; Zhou et al., 2012). Venkataramani and colleagues (2010) found that LLX is related to leaders’ status within the organization. Zhou and colleagues (2012) showed that team empowerment mediates that LLX and individual member’ empowerment, which leads to job satisfaction and performance. However, we know still very little about how LLX operates in organizational setting. The present study fills the gap in the previous studies in LLX by (1) manifesting the impacts of LLX from two different sources and (2) demonstrating the mediating role of identification with the group. The results showed that members perceive LLX differently than the leader does. Considering that members are not the direct actor in their leader’s relationship with his or her supervisor, they have to rely on limited information, such as cues displayed by leaders or their observation. However, to my knowledge none of the previous studies on LLX have shed light on this discrepancy. Therefore, the current findings on LLX advance our understanding of LLX.

Third, the present study contributes to the literature on social identity theory by illustrating the role of LMX and LLX that perform as antecedents of members’ identification with the group. Scholars have found how leaders facilitate members’ work-related social
identity. Some scholars focus on leaders’ role in forming a social identity vis-à-vis the group (Hogg, 2001; Hogg et al., 2005), the others highlighted that leaders, as an agent of the organization, influences members’ organizational identification (Sluss & Ashforth, 2007; Sluss et al., 2012). By investigating how qualities of exchange relationships influence on the identification process, the present study fleshes out the process.

5.2. Practical Implications

The primary practical implication following from this research is a nuanced understanding of members’ motivation to engage in discretionary behaviors toward the team. Working in groups is prevalent in organizations in the current era. In order to achieve organizational success, scholars and practitioners highlighted how to improve team effectiveness (Hackman & Walton, 1986). The key is members’ behaviors that facilitate the group functioning. Indeed, both helping and voice behaviors have been considered as examples (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). The current study found that members’ motivation for these behaviors is not as instrumental as it has been thought. That is, they may engage in those behaviors regardless of the amount of resources that they have obtained or expect to obtain in the future from their leaders. In order to do so, the leaders need to develop a high quality LMX relationship as well as impress their followers with high LLX. As a result, members are apt to interpret these high quality relationships as favorable features of the group thereby identifying themselves with the group. Once the leaders successfully form a strong social identity, the members genuinely care about the group. This would be good news for the managers, especially when they have insufficient resources for all subordinates.

Second, the managers can capitalize on the findings that show the discrepancy between members’ perceptions of LMX and leaders’. In fact, only members’ perceptions of LLX were
relevant to members’ feeling of being proud of the group. This finding serves to urge managers to manage their impressions in front of their subordinates to promote their team-oriented behaviors. In LMX development, supervisors initiate the relationships and the quality of relationships is determined by his or her evaluation of followers’ performance (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Liden et al., 1997; Bauer & Green, 1996). As such, even if a leader is not able to develop high LLX relationships, some impression management in front of his or her subordinates may be still effective to promote group functioning.

Another recommendation for managers is about the way they treat each subordinate. The results suggest that LMX differentiation weakens the impact of LMX and members’ perceptions of respect. LMX research has found high LMX differentiation can be advantageous under some circumstances (Dansereau et al., 1975; Erdogan & Bauer, 2010; Liden et al., 2006). On the contrary, some scholars shed light on the negative consequences of LMX differentiation (Anand et al., 2016). Extending this line of argument, the findings of the current study add another evidence of negative side of LMX differentiation. Therefore, despite the potential benefits of differentiation, leaders should maintain at least certain levels of equality when developing relationships with group members.

5.3. Strengths, Limitations and Future Research

In addition to the theoretical implications listed above, strengths of the study also come from the data used to test the hypotheses. I acquired data from the team leaders and members to gather information from appropriate sources and diminish the common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Furthermore, the generalizability of the results is arguably attained with the sample consisted of work groups from diverse industries.
Despite the strengths, this study entails several limitations. Firstly, the non-experimental cross-sectional design precludes confirming causality. Even though the group engagement model provides a strong theoretical foundation for the causal relationship between members’ status judgments and their identification with the group (Tyler & Blader, 2000), the reversed causal relationship is also plausible. That is, members who identify themselves with the group may have a more favorable lens regarding the group’s status. People tend to overestimate their own performance or situation regardless of the reality (Kruger, & Dunning, 1999). This is a natural cognitive coping mechanism for maintaining and enhancing their self-esteem. On the basis of this argument, members who identify themselves with the group may overestimate their feelings for being valued in the group and the status of the group in the organization. As such, it is plausible that the members’ identification with the group can be an antecedent of members’ status judgments. This inquiry leads to the recommendation that future studies clarify this causal relationship by using different study design such as longitudinal field study or experiments.

Secondly, the data were collected in South Korea, which is considered to be high in collectivism and power distance (Hofstede, 2001). In collective cultures, the group that individuals belong to is crucial for the self-perceptions of the individual members. As such, they are likely to hold a more salient social identity related to the group, compared to those who represent individualistic cultures. Moreover, in the setting of a high power distance culture, subordinates perceive their leaders as superior and defer judgments to them by accepting the power differential (Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen & Lower, 2009). Consequently, the leaders’ role in forming social identity pertaining to the group membership should be more salient in high in power distance cultures. To identify the potential cross-cultural differences, future studies may investigate how the hypothesized relationships differ according to cultures. Scholars may
conduct studies in different nations, or consider individual’s cultural values (Earley & Erez, 1997; Kirkman et al., 2009) or organizational/group culture as moderators. In this way, the generalizability of the results in different cultural contexts would be obtained to some extent.

Although employing perceived group support is appropriate to capture the amount of resources available in the group, another promising future research area is exploring different impacts of different types of resources exchanged through LMX relationship. LMX is indeed a multidimensional construct (Liden & Maslyn, 1998). Furthermore, prior LMX research involves variety types of resources suggested in Foa and Foa’s (1980) framework (Law-Penrose et al., 2016). LMX involves the monetary resources (e.g. Wayne et al., 1997), information resources (e.g. Vidyarthi, Erdogan, Anand, Liden, & Chaudhry, 2014), service resources (e.g. Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996; Wayne et al., 1997; Bauer & Green, 1996), status resources (e.g. Venkataramani et al., 2010), and affiliation resources (Wayne et al., 1997). Moreover, leaders and members obtain different sets of resources out of the LMX relationships (Wilson, Sin, & Conlon, 2010). This line of research further points to an intriguing research question on how those different sets of resources may have different implications for members’ motivation.

Finally, the finding of inconsistency between leaders and members in regards to LLM requires further investigation. Although the current study suggests the inconsistency, why and when this happens is unclear. As I mentioned earlier, it could be because the members do not have sufficient information. Moreover, some leaders may deliberately display a positive image of themselves in front of their followers. In this case, leaders’ motivation for self-enhancing and protecting their image may be a plausible explanation. On the other hand, leaders’ may do so for their members rather than for themselves. Knowing that the leaders’ position within the organization provides cues about the group’s status, leader may embellish the reality to
encourage their members. Extending this line of rationale, future study should explore the intersection between leaders’ impression management and LMX.

5.4. Conclusions

In summary, this dissertation addresses how and when LMX and LLX motivate members’ discretionary behaviors toward their groups. These findings highlight the mechanism for the underlying motivation of the member to identify with his or her group as well as pursue desirable behaviors for the group. The motivation stems from leaders’ exchange relationships and the values of group membership. Moreover, the current study demonstrated LMX differentiation as a contingency for the influence LMX has for members’ group identification process. The findings advance our understanding of employees’ motivation and suggest future research directions.


Dansereau, E, Cashman, J., & Graen, G. (1973). Instrumentality theory and equity theory as
complementary approaches in predicting the relationship of leadership and turnover among managers. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 10*, 184-200.


APPENDIX

LMX-MDM (Liden & Maslyin, 1998).

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.
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.
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 further the interests of my work group.
9. I do not mind working my hardest for my manager.
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.

LMX-7 (Liden et al., 1993).

1. Regardless of how much power he/she has built into his/her position, my supervisor would be personally inclined to use his/her power to help me solve problems in my work.
2. I can count on my supervisor to “bail me out” even at his or her own expense, when I really need it.
3. My supervisor understands my problems and needs.
4. My supervisor recognizes my potential.
5. My supervisor has enough confidence in me that he/she would defend and justify my decisions if I were not present to do so.

6. I usually know where I stand with my supervisor.

7. My working relationship with my supervisor is effective.

**Pride (Tyler et al., 1996).**

1. I feel proud to be a part of my work group.

2. My work group is highly respected within the company.

3. My work group is one of the most desirable within the company.

4. I work in one of the best work groups in the company.

**Respect (Tyler et al., 1996).**

Would you agree or disagree that your work group.

1. values you as a member of your work group.

2. respects your work-related ideas.

3. values what you contribute at work.

4. respects the work you do.

5. appreciates your unique contributions on the job.

6. approves of how you do your job.

**Identification with the group (Blader & Tyler, 2009 based on Mael & Ashforth, 1992).**

1. Working at my team is important to the way that I think of myself as a person.

2. When someone praises the accomplishments of my team, it feels like a personal compliment to me.
3. When someone from outside criticizes my team, it feels like a personal insult.

4. The place I work says a lot about who I am as a person.

5. I think I am similar to the people who work in my team.

**Helping behavior (Williams & Anderson, 1991).**

1. The subordinate helps other team members who have heavy workloads.

2. The subordinate helps other team members who have been absent.

3. The subordinate assists supervisor with his/her work (when not asked).

4. The subordinate takes time to listen to his/her team members’ problems and worries.

5. The subordinate goes out of way to help new team members.

6. The subordinate takes personal interest in other team members.

7. The subordinate passes along information to team members.

**Voice (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998)**

1. The subordinate develops and makes recommendations concerning issues that affect this work group.

2. The subordinate speaks up and encourages others in this group to get involved in issues that affect the group.

3. The subordinate communicates his/her opinions about work issues to others in this group even if his/her opinion is different and others in the group disagree with him/her.

4. The subordinate keeps well informed about issues where his/her opinion might be useful to this work group.
5. The subordinate gets involved in issues that affect the quality of work life here in this group.

6. The subordinate speaks up in this group with ideas for new projects or changes in procedures.

**Interpersonal Deviance (Bennett & Robinson, 2000)**

1. The subordinate made fun of team member(s) at work
2. The subordinate said something hurtful to team member(s) at work.
3. The subordinate cursed at team member(s) at work.
4. The subordinate played a mean prank on team member(s) at work.
5. The subordinate acted rudely toward team member(s) at work.
6. The subordinate publicly embarrassed team member(s) at work.

**Leader group prototypicality (Platow & Van Knippenberg, 2001).**

Overall, I would say that the leader,

1. represents what is characteristic about our team.
2. is a representative of our team
3. is a good example of the kind of people who work in this team.
4. stands for what people who work in this team have in common.
5. is very similar to most people in this team.

**Perceived Group Support (Eisenberger et al., 2002)**

1. My team strongly considers my goals and values.
2. My team really cares about my well-being.
3. My team shows very little concern for me. (R)
4. My team would forgive an honest mistake on my part.
5. My team cares about my opinions.
6. If given the opportunity, my team would take advantage of me. (R)
7. Help is available from my team when I have a problem.
8. My team is willing to help me when I need a special favor.

**Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger et al., 2002)**

1. My organization strongly considers my goals and values.
2. My organization really cares about my well-being.
3. My organization shows very little concern for me. (R)
4. My organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part.
5. My organization cares about my opinions.
6. If given the opportunity, my organization would take advantage of me. (R)
7. Help is available from my organization when I have a problem.
8. My organization is willing to help me when I need a special favor.
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