

THE INFLUENCE OF SUBORDINATE AFFECT AND SELF-MONITORING ON MULTIPLE DIMENSIONS OF LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGE

Mark Kunze, Virginia State University

Kim Gower, Virginia State University

ABSTRACT

In this research we investigate possible differential effects of subordinate positive trait affect and negative trait affect upon four dimensions of supervisor-rated leader member exchange: affect, loyalty, contribution, and professional respect. In addition, self-monitoring is tested for its potential moderating effect upon these relationships. Data was collected from 267 subordinate/supervisor dyads in six different organizations. Results revealed that subordinates' negative trait affect is negatively related to the supervisor-rated dimensions of affect, loyalty, and respect, while subordinate positive affect is positively related to the dimensions of contribution and professional respect. Conversely, the hypothesized moderating effect of self-monitoring upon the relationships received no support, despite existing research to the contrary. We conclude with a discussion of the implications for theory, practice, and future research.

JEL: M12

KEYWORDS: LMX, Affect, Self-Monitoring

INTRODUCTION

The fable “The Two Dogs,” by Ivan Kriloff, ends with this exchange between Barbos, the yard dog, and Joujou, the housedog:

“How did you, Joujou, who were so small and weak, get taken into favor, while I jump out of my skin to no purpose? What is it you do?” ““What is it you do?” A pretty question to ask!” replied Joujou, mockingly. “I walk upon my hind legs.”

This excerpt illustrates an idea drawn from conventional wisdom - that those who are able to act in a manner pleasing to others will reap the rewards for doing so, even if they have to bear the cost of a certain degree of discomfort. Individuals who are adept at reading social cues and altering their behavior to please others are known as high self-monitors (Snyder, 1974; Gangestad & Snyder, 2000), and there is evidence that high self-monitors are more embedded in social relationships at work (Sasovova, 2006) and establish a greater number of mentoring relationships (Blickle, Schneider, Perrewé, Blass, & Ferris, 2008). Conversely, low self-monitors prefer congruency between their inward state and outward behavior, regardless of the social context (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000).

A number of studies have identified favorable outcomes associated with a positive exchange relationship between subordinate and supervisor, such as increased job satisfaction (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000) and higher performance ratings and level of delegation (Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994; Schriesheim, Neider, & Scandura, 1998). However, few studies have investigated the role of dispositional traits such as affect, or the tendency to experience positive or negative emotional states, upon this relationship (Day & Crain, 1992), and none have investigated the potential moderating impact of self-monitoring ability.

When managers are trained to provide resources to subordinates in an equal manner, subordinates who have low quality exchange relationships with their supervisors often show improvements in productivity

and job satisfaction (Scandura & Graen, 1984). Higher quality supervisor/subordinate relationships have also been found to ameliorate the inhibiting effects of introversion on job performance for new executives (Bauer, Erdogan, Liden, & Wayne, 2006). However, not all organizations may be willing or able to provide this type of relationship training to their supervisors. Therefore, it becomes the subordinate's responsibility to develop an awareness of how dispositional factors influence his/her relationship with the supervisor and then make the decision as to whether it would be more advantageous to modify his/her behavior or seek a new situation with a different supervisor. Our research answers calls for additional studies into the effects that the individual traits of affect and self-monitoring have on the leader-member exchange (LMX) relationship (Barsade & Gibson, 2007; Brower, Schoorman, & Tan, 2000; Engle & Lord, 1997) as well as to deconstruct these effects by LMX dimension.

In the remainder of this article we shall first review the literature and develop hypotheses pertaining to LMX, trait affect, and self-monitoring. We will then describe the methods used for gathering data and testing the hypotheses. For the final sections, we report our findings, discuss their implications in the context of extant research, and then conclude by noting the contributions to theory and practice as well as any limitations of our research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Although leader-member exchange (LMX) theory has undergone a number of reviews, extensions, and critiques in the years since its first inception, the essence of the construct has remained the same in that it proposes that supervisors develop relationships of differential quality with their subordinates (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999; Schyns & Day, 2010). High quality LMX relationships are characterized by such attributes as mutual trust, respect, liking each other, extra-role behavioral exchanges, and higher levels of emotional support. Low quality LMX is at the opposite end of the continuum and can be characterized as being transactional in nature, with the two parties engaging in a more strictly role-defined, top-down relationship (Graen & Schiemann, 1978).

Several research studies have linked LMX quality to a number of positive outcomes for both employees and organizations. Subordinates experiencing higher quality LMX have been found to be the beneficiaries of faster salary progression, a greater number of promotions, and higher career satisfaction (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Wayne, Liden, Kraimer, & Graf, 1999). They also have been found to hold favorable attitudes toward their jobs and their organizations (Connolly & Viswesvaran, 2000; Stringer, 2006; Suazo, Turnley, & Mai-Dalton, 2008). Conversely, those with lower quality LMX have been found to be more susceptible to perceptions of broken promises on the part of the organization (Restubog, Bordia, Tang, & Krebs, 2009), which can lead to negative work behaviors (Turnley & Feldman, 1999) and stifle innovativeness (Lee, 2008).

More recently, Liden and Maslyn (1998), drawing upon role theory and social exchange theory, proposed a multidimensional structure for LMX in which they postulated that there may be more than a single mechanism that contributes to the development of high-quality LMX, and that multiple dimensions may be differentially related to outcomes. These dimensions, which they did not propose to be exhaustive, are "contribution," or the in-role and extra-role tasks that the subordinate completes for the supervisor; "loyalty," which is exemplified by the degree to which the subordinate and supervisor are willing to publicly support one another; "affect" or the degree to which the subordinate and supervisor mutually like each other based on interpersonal attraction; and "professional respect" or the degree to which each member of the dyad perceives the other as excelling at his or her work. Based on this conceptualization, they constructed and validated a 12-item scale, the LMX-MDM, consisting of four, 3-item subscales that tap into each of the four dimensions. Greguras and Ford (2006) subsequently replicated the four-factor structure of the scale in a study that used a different sample and they found the different dimensions to be

differentially predictive of outcomes such as satisfaction with supervisor, organizational commitment, and in-role job performance, depending upon whether LMX was rated by the supervisor or by the subordinate.

While positive outcomes have been linked to high quality LMX, few studies have examined its antecedents. Some have reported a positive relationship between “supervisor liking” (of the subordinate) and LMX quality (Dockery & Steiner, 1990; Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993; Murphy & Ensher, 1999; Wayne & Ferris, 1990). Other studies have found positive relationships between subordinate characteristics such as conscientiousness (Lapierre & Hackett, 2007), internal locus of control (Harris, Harris, & Eplion, 2007), extraversion (Phillips & Bedeian, 1994), and LMX quality. However, in all of these studies, LMX was measured as a unidimensional construct. In this study, we investigate the relationship between the fundamental dispositional factors of positive and negative affect and the LMX sub-dimensions of affect, loyalty, contribution, and professional respect. We then examine the possibility that self-monitoring ability acts as a moderator with respect to the relationships between affect and supervisor-rated LMX.

Trait Positive and Trait Negative Affect

In their theory of dyad formation, Thibaut and Kelley (1959) proposed that exchanges between two individuals function as rewards and costs for each. Drive reductions and need fulfillments would represent rewards; exchanges in which mental effort is required or unpleasant feelings are aroused would represent costs. The finding that high quality LMX is partially a function of a supervisor’s liking for a subordinate raises the possibility that subordinate characteristics that contribute to pleasing exchanges may play a role in a supervisor’s liking of, or “affect” toward a subordinate. Likewise, since humans are predisposed to attend to negative information about others (Cacioppo & Gardner, 1999), subordinate characteristics that contribute to greater interpersonal exchange effort for the supervisor have the potential to influence negatively the supervisor’s liking for the subordinate.

The terms “trait positive affect” (PA) and “trait negative affect” (NA) refer to a tendency to experience one of these mood states more often than the other. These traits are conceptualized as being unipolar and independent of each other; for example, an individual low in one of the affective traits does not necessarily exhibit more of the other (Cropanzano, Weiss, Hale, & Reb, 2003; Watson, 2000). Therefore, in each person’s domain of possible behaviors, it can be expected that those high in either type of affect would exhibit a greater number of behaviors that would be reflective of their trait.

In the model of affective social competence, the expression and recognition of emotion is a fundamental determinant of successful social exchange (Halberstadt, Denham, & Dunsmore, 2001). Research has found that PA and NA influence their respective emotional reactions in the workplace (Grandey, Tam, & Brauburger, 2002). Naïve observers have also been found to be able to distinguish between individuals in which either PA or NA has been induced by merely observing the participants’ behavior in relation to another individual (Forgas, 2002). Negative affect also predicts deterioration in relationship quality over time, while PA predicts improvements in relationship quality and these effects hold whether or not individuals remain in the same relationship or switch partners (Robins, Caspi, & Moffitt 2002).

Wright and Staw (1999) found that dispositional PA predicted supervisory performance ratings of subordinates over a four-year period. They speculate that interactions with happy people are more pleasant and that this factor influenced the supervisors’ performance evaluations. Supporting this assertion, displays of positive emotions by individuals have been found to elicit PA in others (Pugh, 2001; Wampler, Shi, Nelson, & Kimball, 2003). Conversely, those high in NA have been found to be more prone to negative interpersonal interactions and comments (Bolger & Schilling, 1991; Joiner Jr. & Metalsky, 2001; Robins, Caspi, & Moffitt, 2002).

Based on these theories and findings, we expect subordinate trait affect to influence supervisor LMX ratings in the following manner:

Hypothesis 1a: Subordinate PA is positively related to overall supervisor-rated LMX.

Hypothesis 1b: Subordinate NA is negatively related to overall supervisor-rated LMX.

Hypothesis 2a: Subordinate PA is positively related to the supervisor-rated affective dimension of LMX.

Hypothesis 2b: Subordinate NA is negatively related to the supervisor-rated affective dimension of LMX.

Hypothesis 3a: Subordinate PA is positively related to the supervisor-rated loyalty dimension of LMX.

Hypothesis 3b: Subordinate NA is negatively related to the supervisor-rated loyalty dimension of LMX.

While we have not generated hypotheses regarding the influence of subordinate affect on the supervisor-rated LMX dimensions of contribution and respect, we shall investigate them on an exploratory basis.

Self-Monitoring

As conceptualized by Snyder (1974), self-monitoring refers to the ability of some individuals to be sensitive to situational cues and to alter their expressive behavior deliberately in order to appear situation appropriate (high self-monitors). Individuals who can monitor their verbal, facial, and bodily expressions simultaneously for congruence with the desired image will be more successful in conveying that image. Other individuals (low self-monitors) are either relatively insensitive to social cues or simply unconcerned with expressing socially appropriate behavior; rather, they allow their internal state to be reflected by their external expressions.

In a subsequent refinement, Gangestad and Snyder (2000) made it clear that the construct excludes defensive expressions of behavior that communicate passivity and submission by the sender. While these behaviors could be considered an adaptive response to social cues, they are ineffective in eliciting a socially desirable response from other individuals. Thus, all individuals who are simply sensitive to social cues cannot be considered high self-monitors. High-self monitors are not only sensitive to social cues, but also actively engage in impression management intended to project a favorable image and “they seem to believe in the appearances they create and take stock in the fact that these social appearances can and do become social realities.” (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000, p. 531).

In accordance with the construct, we might expect high self-monitors to be perceived by others as more likeable than low self-monitors. A laboratory study of non-verbal behavior bears this out: high self-monitors expressed more happiness, less negative emotions, and were judged by others as being more likeable and competent than low self-monitors (Levine and Feldman, 1997). High self-monitors are also perceived as more capable in the use of ingratiation tactics, while low self-monitors who attempt to engage in these tactics are perceived as “sycophants” (Turnley & Bolino, 2001). Furthermore, high self-monitors have been found to occupy advantageous positions in the organizational social network, receive more favorable performance reviews (Mehra, Kilduff, & Brass, 2001), and obtain more cross-company and internal promotions (Kilduff & Day, 1994).

Lennox and Wolfe (1984) argue that Snyder’s (1974) Self-monitoring Scale is not congruent with the self-monitoring construct and that it taps theatrical acting ability rather than individuals’ self-presentation ability in relation to a focal other. In response, they revised the Self-monitoring Scale to include only the dimensions of *ability to modify self-presentation* (ability) and *sensitivity to expressive behavior of others* (sensitivity). Extending this logic, it follows that while high self-monitors are sensitive to others’ behavior, they are only able to exert their influence through the ability to modify their own behavior. Thus, while sensitivity to others would be a necessary condition for high-self monitors’ socially

appropriate behavior, if they lack the ability to modify self-presentation they do not exert the desired effect.

Little (2011) proposed that self-monitoring is a mechanism used by those to conceal traits that might make them appear less socially adept. It is possible that in those who display socially engaging behavior will also be perceived as more capable by the supervisor. High self-monitors would be expected to be able to do this regardless of their inner state – they are reading and responding to cues from others. Those who are high in PA, regardless of self-monitoring ability, would also be expected to influence the supervisor's liking of him/her, because their behavior would be reflective of their positive inner state. High NA individuals who are able to mask their inner state could also be expected to influence the supervisor's liking for him/her. Therefore, we propose that self-monitoring ability will moderate the hypothesized relationship between subordinate affect and the supervisor-rated LMX dimensions of affect, contribution and loyalty in the following manner:

Hypothesis 4a: High self-monitoring ability moderates the impact of subordinate NA on the supervisor-rated LMX dimension of affect such that high self-monitors experience weaker negative relationships between NA and the supervisor-rated LMX dimensions of affect and loyalty.

Hypothesis 4b: High self-monitoring has no significant effect on the relationship between trait PA and the supervisor-rated LMX dimensions of affect and loyalty.

We will also explore the potential moderating effects of self-monitoring on subordinate affect as it relates to the supervisor-rated dimensions of contribution and respect.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Participants and Procedures

Survey data were collected during the period from June 2005 to October 2005. Respondents consisted of 267 employee/supervisor dyads from six different organizations: a fast-food restaurant, a chain of casual dining restaurants and their administrative headquarters, a recreation park, the nursing division of a county health department, the human resources department of a large hospital, and a records processing division of a state government. The number of participating subordinates per supervisor ranged from a low of 1 to a high of 10. Two of the dyads had missing data and were not used in the analyses.

The surveys were administered to both employees and their supervisors, with the supervisors completing surveys on each of their subordinates. Four of the organizations allowed on-site access, and surveys were administered and collected in the same visit. For the other organizations, the surveys were either mailed to the respondents with an accompanying recruitment letter or were distributed to their workplace mailboxes by an organizational representative. To guarantee anonymity in these cases, a self-addressed stamped return envelope was provided to the respondent.

Response rates varied across the organizations from a low of 17% of subordinates (mail in) to a high of 95% of subordinates (on-site collection). Subordinates were largely unaware as to whether or not their supervisor would complete and submit a survey, and those whose supervisors were unable to complete a supervisor survey were not included in the analyses.

The sample consisted of 164 males and 32 females with an average age of 35.8 years. The average length of time that they had been with their current supervisor was 2.26 years.

Measures

Leader-member exchange quality was measured from the supervisors' perspectives with a modified version of the 12-item LMX-MDM scale developed by Liden & Maslyn (1998). The instrument, as originally developed, was noted as one that has undergone reasonable psychometric testing (Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999). It also possesses the capability of measuring four LMX dimensions – affect (SLMXA), loyalty (SLMXL), contribution (SLMXC), and professional respect (SLMXR) (Liden & Maslyn, 1998; Greguras & Ford, 2006). The wording of the scale was changed to reflect the supervisor's perspective of the relationship with respect to the employee. For example, the item “My supervisor is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend,” on the employee's survey was altered to read, “This employee is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend” on the supervisor survey. Reliability estimates for the dimensions of affect, loyalty, contribution, and respect were $\alpha = .89, .71, .93,$ and $.93$ respectively. A confirmatory factor analysis using LISREL 8.8 software indicated that the four factor model was the best fit when tested against both a one factor model and a two factor model in which items from the affect and loyalty dimensions were combined to form one factor and the contribution and professional respect dimensions were combined to form the second factor. A copy of the survey items appears in the appendix.

Trait positive and negative affect was measured with the Positive Affect Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen; 1988). The PANAS consists of two ten-item adjectival subscales: one for positive affect and the other for negative affect. The two subscales have been used extensively since their development (Schmukle, Egloff, & Burns, 2002; Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky, Warren, & de Chermont, 2003) and have exhibited reasonable psychometric properties (Watson et al., 1988; Depaoli & Sweeney, 2000).

Respondents' self-monitoring “ability to modify self-presentation” was measured with 7 items from Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) revised Self-Monitoring scale. A 2002 meta-analysis (Day, Schleicher, Unckless, & Hiller) revealed that the Lennox and Wolfe version of the scale exhibits improved average reliability over other self-monitoring scales. Use of the 7 items comprising the “ability” dimension is supported by extant research into its dimensionality (O'Cass, 2000; Shuptrine, Bearden, & Teel, 1990). The scale includes items such as “I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them,” and is scored on a 6 point Likert type scale with responses ranging from “generally false,” to “certainly, always true.”

Potential control variables such as age, gender, and organizational tenure were not included in the analysis due to their lack of effects on LMX, as demonstrated in other studies (Hochwarter, 2005; Phillips & Bedeian, 1994; Suazo et al., 2008). In the absence of a theoretical linkage between control variables and criterion variables, or evidence from research findings establishing such a linkage, including them in an analysis may result in masking relationships between the variables of interest (Spector & Brannick, 2010). While self-monitoring sensitivity has been shown to differ by gender, there is no significant difference in self-monitoring ability (O'Cass, 2000).

RESULTS

Means, standard deviations, scale reliabilities, and correlations for the variables are displayed in Table 1. Scores are reported as averages of the scale items. The first three variables in the “variable” column are the independent variables PA and NA and the proposed moderator SM. The next four in the column are the dimensions of SLMX: affect, loyalty, contribution, and (professional) respect. The last variable, SLMX, represents the summed and averaged value of the total scale.

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations, and Reliabilities of Study Variables

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 PA	3.70	0.82	.90	1.00							
2 NA	1.88	0.53	.82	0.25***	1.00						
3 SM	4.44	0.67	.70	0.24***	-0.09*	1.00					
4 SLMXA	5.52	1.13	.89	0.14*	-0.22***	0.08	1.00				
5 SLMXL	5.75	1.01	.71	0.15**	-0.17**	0.06	0.69***	1.00			
6 SLMXC	5.59	1.22	.93	0.20**	-0.14**	-0.00	0.57***	0.60***	1.00		
7 SLMXR	5.58	1.20	.93	0.20***	-0.22***	-0.01	0.61***	0.61***	0.75***	1.00	
8 SLMX	5.61	0.98	.94	0.20***	-0.22***	0.04	0.84***	0.83***	0.86***	0.89***	1.00

N=265. The table above reports the means and standard deviations of the study variables, and the inter-correlations between each of the variables. All the variables are significantly correlated except for Self-Monitoring. The correlations that exceed a .60 benchmark (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003) are those between each of the dimensions of SLMX and overall SLMX. Scale reliabilities are $\geq .70$ (Cortina, 1993) Significance levels are indicated as follows: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$ level, *** $p < 0.001$.

All variables were significantly correlated with each other except self-monitoring. Variables that were highly correlated ($> .60$) were the dimensions and overall measure of SLMX.

To test hypotheses 1a and 1b, supervisor-rated overall LMX (SLMX) was regressed on subordinate PA and NA. The same procedure was used to test hypotheses 2a through 3b, except that the SLMX dimensions of affect and loyalty were regressed on subordinate PA and NA in two separate calculations. The results the regression analysis are reported in Table 2. For each of the three regression equations represented in the table, we have reported the F statistic, the degrees of freedom, the adjusted R^2 , and the standardized regression coefficients (β). The three dependent variables are reported at the top of each section of the table and the last column contains the standardized coefficients for each of the independent variables that appear in the first column of the table. For example, the first section of table 2 indicates that the dependent variable is SLMX and the two independent variables upon which it was regressed are PA and NA. The fact that the F statistic of 10.07 is significant at the $p = 0.001$ level demonstrates that the likelihood is quite low that the modeled relationship would occur by chance. The adjusted R^2 indicates the percentage of variance in the dependent variable of SLMX that is explained by PA and NA, while the standardized coefficients (β) of 0.16 and -0.18 indicate the number of standard deviations that the dependent variable of SLMX will change per unit change in PA and NA.

The results of this first set of regression equations suggest that both PA ($\beta = .16, p < 0.1$) and NA ($\beta = -.18, p < 0.05$) are significantly related to overall SLMX and to the SLMX dimension of SLMXL (for PA, $\beta = .12, p < 0.1$ and for NA, $\beta = -.14, p < 0.05$). Only NA ($\beta = -.19, p < 0.05$) is significantly related to SLMXA.

$$SLMX = \beta_1(PA) + \beta_2(NA) \quad (1)$$

$$SLMXA = \beta_1(PA) + \beta_2(NA) \quad (2)$$

$$SLMXL = \beta_1(PA) + \beta_2(NA) \quad (3)$$

Table 3 provides results for hypotheses 4a and b. Prior to testing, the focal independent variables were first converted to Z scores in order to reduce multicollinearity with the interaction terms (Frazier, Barron, & Tix, 2004) and these variables are represented by inclusion of the letter "Z" in the variable designation. Hierarchical moderated regression analysis was then used to test the hypotheses that self-monitoring functions as a moderator of the impact of NA on SLMXA, such that high self monitors experience weaker negative relationships between subordinate affect and the supervisor rated LMX dimensions of affect and

loyalty. All independent variables including the hypothesized moderator were entered in the first step, followed by the interaction terms in the second step.

Table 2: Regression Results for PA and NA on SLMX, SLMXA, and SLMXL

Step 1: Dependent Variable SLMX regressed on PA and NA				
Variable	F	df	Adj. R ²	β
Dep. Var. SLMX	10.07***	2	0.06	
PA				0.16*
NA				-0.18**
Step 1: Dependent Variable SLMXA (Affect) regressed on PA and NA				
Dep. Var. SLMXA	7.57***	2	0.05	
PA				0.09
NA				-0.19**
Step 1: Dependent Variable SLMXL (Loyalty) regressed on PA and NA				
Dep. Var. SLMXL	5.62**	2	0.03	
PA				0.12
NA				-0.14**

*N=265. The table shows PA and NA as regressed on SLMX, SLMXA (Affect) and SLMXL (Loyalty), respectively. The results suggest that both PA (p<0.1) and NA (p< 0.05) are significantly related to SLMX (Equation 1) and SLMXL (Equation 3), but only NA (p< 0.05) is significantly related to SLMXA. Significance levels are indicated as follows: *p<0.1, **p< 0.05 level, ***p< 0.001.*

The table contains two sections with two steps for each section. In the first section, the dependent variable SLMXA is regressed in step 1 on PA, NA, and SM, and then the interaction terms between SM and the affect variables, PA and NA are entered into the equation in step 2. For each of the four regression equations represented in the table, we have reported the F statistic, the degrees of freedom, the adjusted R², and the standardized regression coefficients (β). Results showed that SM did not significantly moderate the relationship between affect and SLMXA or SLMXL, nor was there any interaction. For example, in the first set of equations where SLMXA is the dependent variable (step 1), the standardized regression coefficient (β) of .00 on SM indicates that it did not exert any influence upon SLMXA. In step 2, the coefficients of -.07 and .09 on ZSM x ZPA and ZSM x ZNA respectively, fail to reach significance, thus indicating no moderating effect of SM upon either PA or NA for ZSLMXA.

$$SLMXA = \beta_1(ZPA) + \beta_2(ZNA) + \beta_3(ZSM) \tag{4}$$

$$SLMXA = \beta_1(ZPA) + \beta_2(ZNA) + \beta_3(ZSM) + \beta_4(ZSMxZPA) + \beta_5(ZSMxZNA) \tag{5}$$

$$SLMXL = \beta_1(ZPA) + \beta_2(ZNA) + \beta_3(ZSM) \tag{6}$$

$$SLMXL = \beta_1(ZPA) + \beta_2(ZNA) + \beta_3(ZSM) + \beta_4(ZSMxZPA) + \beta_5(ZSMxZNA) \tag{7}$$

In addition to the stated hypotheses, regression analyses were conducted to test the potential moderating effects of SM on the other two dimensions of SLMX: SLMXC and SLMXL. The results, reported in Table 4, show that SM does not moderate these relationships either. For example, in the first set of hierarchical regression equations, where SLMXC is the dependent variable, the standardized regression coefficient (β) of -.07 on SM is statistically insignificant, indicating that it did not exert any influence upon SLMXC (step 1). In step 2, the coefficients of -.05 and .05 on ZSM x ZPA and ZSM x ZNA respectively, also fail to reach significance, thus indicating no moderating effect of SM upon either PA or NA for SLMXC.

Overall, these results indicate that both subordinate PA and NA are related to supervisor-rated LMX total, while only subordinate NA is significantly related to the LMX dimensions of affect and loyalty, thus fully supporting H1a, H1b, H2b, and H3b. While the regression coefficient for subordinate PA on the supervisor-rated dimension of loyalty did not reach significance at the *p* =.05 level, (β = .12, *p* = .06), it was in the hypothesized direction, thus lending partial support to H3a. Hypothesis 2a regarding the effect of PA on the affect dimension was not supported in that the standardized coefficient was quite small and

insignificant ($\beta = .09$, $p = .15$). The interaction terms between subordinate self-monitoring and subordinate PA and NA were not significantly related to any of the supervisor-rated LMX dimensions of affect or loyalty, nor were the main effects for the moderator significant, thus supporting H4b but not H4a.

Table 3: Regression Results for SM as a Moderator on Subordinate Affect (PA and NA), and with Hypothesized Interaction Effects on Dependent SLMXA and SLMXL

Step 1: Dependent Variable SLMXA regressed on ZPA, ZNA, and ZSM				
Variable	F	df	Adj. R ²	β
Dep. Var. SLMXA	5.03**	3	0.04	
ZPA				0.09
ZNA				-0.19**
ZSM				0
Step 2: Dependent Variable SLMXA regressed on ZPA, ZNA, ZSM, and interactions				
Dep. Var. SLMXA	3.91**	5	0.05	
ZPA				0.1
ZNA				-0.18**
ZSM				0.01
ZSMxZPA				-0.07
ZSMxZNA				0.09
Step 1: Dependent Variable SLMXL regressed on ZPA, ZNA, and ZSM				
Dep. Var. SLMXL	3.74	3	0.03	
ZPA				0.12
ZNA				-0.14
ZSM				-0.01
Step 2: Dependent Variable SLMXL regressed on ZPA, ZNA, ZSM, and interactions				
Dep. Var. SLMXL	2.82	5	0.03	
ZPA				0.12
ZNA				-0.13
ZSM				0
ZSMxZPA				-0.06
ZSMxZNA				0.06

*N=265. Step 1 shows PA, NA, and SM as regressed on SLMXA, and then SLMXL. Step 2 adds the interaction terms between SM and PA and between SM and NA. The results suggest that self-monitoring does not moderate the relationship between SLMXA or SLMXL and PA or NA. Additionally, there is no significant interaction effect from SMxPA or SMxNA in either model. Significance levels are indicated as follows: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$ level, *** $p < 0.001$.*

In our exploratory analysis, the beta coefficients for subordinate PA on supervisor-rated dimensions of contribution and respect were significant and positive ($\beta = .18$, $p < .05$; $\beta = .17$, $p < .05$), and the beta coefficients for subordinate NA were significant and negative ($\beta = -.11$, $p < .10$; $\beta = -.19$, $p < .05$) for contribution and respect, respectively. When regressed on supervisor-rated dimensions of contribution and respect, there were no significant main or interaction effects for subordinate self-monitoring.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to first to investigate the potential effects of subordinate trait positive affect (PA) and trait negative affect (NA) upon four dimensions of supervisor-rated leader-member exchange (SLMX) and second, to determine whether subordinates self-monitoring ability acts as a moderator upon the hypothesized negative relationship between NA and the supervisor-rated LMX dimensions of affect and loyalty. Results indicate that PA and NA are differentially related to the four dimensions of supervisor-rated LMX; however, there was no support for the hypothesized moderating effect of subordinate self-monitoring ability upon the NA/LMX relationship. Specifically, we found subordinate

PA to be significantly and positively related to the supervisor-rated LMX dimensions of contribution and respect, with partial support for its relationship to loyalty, while subordinate NA was significantly and negatively related to the dimensions of affect, loyalty, and respect.

Table 4: Regression Results for Non-hypothesized SM as a Moderator on Subordinate Affect (PA and NA) on Dependent Variables SLMXC and SLMXR

Step 1: Dependent Variable SLMXC regressed on ZPA, ZNA, and ZSM				
Variable	F	df	Adj. R ²	β
Dep. Var. SLMXC		3	0.04	
	4.8**			
ZPA				0.18**
ZNA				-0.11*
ZSM				-0.07
Step 2: Dependent Variable SLMXC regressed on ZPA, ZNA, ZSM, and interactions SMxPA and SMxNA				
Dep. Var. SLMXC	3.18**	5	0.05	
ZPA				0.19**
ZNA				-0.1
ZSM				-0.07
ZSMxZPA				-0.05
ZSMxZNA				0.05
Step 1: Dependent Variable SLMXR regressed on ZPA, ZNA, and ZSM				
Dep. Var. SLMXR	7.4***	3	0.07	
ZPA				0.17**
ZNA				-0.19**
ZSM				-0.08
Step 2: Dependent Variable SLMXR regressed on ZPA, ZNA, ZSM, and interactions SMxPA and SMxNA				
Dep. Var. SLMXR	5.38***	5	0.08	
ZPA				0.18**
ZNA				-0.17**
ZSM				-0.07
ZSMxZPA				-0.07
ZSMxZNA				0.09

N=265. Step 1 shows PA, NA, and SM as regressed on SLMXC and SLMXR. Step 2 adds the interactions between SM and PA and SM and NA. The results suggest that self-monitoring does not moderate the relationship between either SLMXC or SLMXR and PA or NA. Additionally, there is no significant interaction effect from SMxPA or SMxNA. Significance levels are indicated as follows: **p*<0.1, ***p*< 0.05 level, ****p*< 0.001.

These results indicate that subordinate PA and NA exert differential influences upon supervisors' perceptions of the exchange relationship. The lack of a significant relationship of subordinate PA to the dimension of affect, while being significantly related to the contribution and respect dimensions, is probably the most intriguing result, since the survey items related to the latter dimensions essentially ask the supervisor to rate the employee in terms of in-role/extra-role job performance and perceived job competence. However, this finding is somewhat consistent with a recent meta-analysis in which PA and NA were related to supervisor-rated task performance as well as organizational citizenship behaviors (Kaplan, Bradley, Luchman, & Haynes, 2009). It is also consistent with the finding that supervisors tend to assign more weight to the subordinate's task performance when evaluating the exchange relationship (Zhou & Schriesheim, 2010). It is conceivable that supervisors find higher PA individuals more pleasant in initial interactions, and they begin to develop a higher quality exchange relationship with them at the expense of subordinates who find themselves in the "out-group" This is borne out by the fact higher PA individuals have been found to be more likely to have higher initial leader-member exchange quality (Day and Crain, 1992). Once the relationship is established, these initial effects may unconsciously influence the supervisor's evaluation of the subordinate's task performance.

The fact that we found no support for the hypothesized moderation of the NA/LMX relationship by self-monitoring is also interesting given that the proposed relationship is theoretically plausible in that someone high in self-monitoring ability would be able to present his or her “best” social self to others and thus mitigate the negative effects of NA upon social performance. In a recent study, self-monitoring was found to moderate the relationship between three of the “big five” personality traits - extraversion, openness to experience, and emotional stability - and supervisory ratings of interpersonal performance (Barrick, Parks, & Mount, 2005). In that particular study, those personality traits were positively associated with interpersonal performance for low self-monitors only; in other words, those specific traits represent the positive ends of their respective continuums and the absence of self-monitoring ability allowed these positive traits to predominate and influence supervisors’ ratings. Conversely, they found that high self-monitoring compensated for low extraversion such that high self-monitors who were low on extraversion were rated more favorably than those low self-monitors who were also low on extraversion. Given the set of results from the Barrick et al. investigation, we would have expected high self-monitoring to ameliorate the negative effects of high NA on supervisors’ impressions of the affective dimension of LMX.

Possible explanations for our findings regarding the proposed moderation of self-monitoring include the fact that Barrick et al. sampled a population for whom interpersonal performance is necessary for job performance, and/or that high NA acts as suppressor of either sensitivity to the emotional state of others or the ability to portray oneself in a socially facile manner. As a test of the former possibility, we conducted a post-hoc analysis by first extracting from the sample only the organizations where the surveyed employees were engaged in jobs where they would be expected to have extensive interactions with outside customers (N=120) and then regressing supervisor-rated LMX affect dimension on NA with self-monitoring as a moderator. This did not yield significant interactions either, even though the sample size was slightly greater than that used in the Barrick et al. study (N=102). Thus, the latter explanation may hold, or the results differ because of different measurement instruments – Snyder’s SM scale vs. Lennox and Wolfe’s revised SM scale - as noted in our methods section.

It has been proposed that high self-monitors primary motivation is to protect their positive self-affect by altering their behavior to elicit positive responses from a focal other rather than using self-monitoring as a tool specifically for instrumental gain (Ickes, Holloway, Stinson, & Hoodenpyle, 2006). It is possible that those high in NA do not have such a motivation since they do not have positive affect to protect, even though the constructs are theoretically independent of one another. This aspect of the self-monitoring construct will need to be investigated further.

Contributions

In terms of theory and research, this investigation fills a gap in the literature regarding LMX antecedents and their differential relationships to LMX dimensions from the supervisor’s perspective. While the relationship between worker affect and job behaviors is well established (Kaplan et al., 2009), as is the relationship between LMX and positive work outcomes (Gerstner & Day, 1997), the examination of subordinate characteristics that contribute to high-quality LMX is only beginning to be explored (Schyns & Day, 2010), and investigations into their relationship to supervisor-rated dimensions are rare at this point in time (Greguras & Ford, 2006). By analyzing these relationships between the fundamental individual attributes of trait PA and NA, and the dimensions of LMX from the supervisor’s perception, we have demonstrated that these subordinate characteristics contribute to the evaluation of LMX in a differential manner.

In terms of practice, it is our hope that this research can be a step in addressing the needs of both organizations and individuals within those organizations. By definition, there are always two parties involved in the LMX relationship – the member and the leader, i.e., the subordinate and the supervisor.

Supervisor-rated LMX has been found to predict subordinate salary progression and promotability, while subordinate-rated LMX predicts career satisfaction (Ang, Hwa, Jantan, & Ansari, 2008). As noted previously, higher-quality LMX contributes to a number of favorable outcomes for both parties. Taking the findings of our study into account, organizations must grapple with the decision of whether or not to implement measures that might partially accomplish the enhancement of this relationship by assisting employees and supervisors to mitigate the negative effects of high NA, while increasing the positive effects of high PA. At the same time, employees may experience a desire to navigate the path between accruing the rewards of organizational progression and their own career satisfaction.

From an organizational standpoint, there are some relatively inexpensive methods for accomplishing these suggestions. For example, properly designed web-based exercises have been shown to reduce individuals' NA (Mongrain & Anselmo-Matthews, 2012), while engaging in kind acts increases individuals' PA (Alden & Trew, 2012). These techniques, while available to individuals, are probably not widely known about at this point, and participation in them outside of an unstructured situation may be low. However, these types of activities would certainly be available to career counselors and coaches who serve the public or act as organizational development consultants.

Limitations

The primary limitations of this study are the cross-sectional design and the collection of data from a variety of organizations. With cross-sectional designs, temporal precedence of one variable over another is impossible to establish, therefore negating a requirement for the establishment of causality (Cook & Campbell, 1979). It is also difficult in cross-sectional designs to investigate relationships that may be reciprocal rather than unidirectional. Repeated measurements over time would provide data that would shed more light on the nature of the relationships.

The pooling of data from different organizations also represents a limitation in the sense that group-specific variables may be operating in the samples from the different organizations (Byrne, Shavelson, & Muthen, 1989). Alternatively, combining data from different organizations may also reduce the chance that these same unique factors will restrict the findings to the conditions present in a single organization. Unfortunately, ideal situations for the collection of data do not always present themselves in field research.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The LMX literature has focused to a greater degree on outcomes of LMX rather than antecedents to the exchange relationship between subordinates and their supervisors (Engle & Lord, 1997), while the literature regarding dispositional constructs to work-related outcomes has been comparatively rich (Ng & Sorensen, 2009). In this study we contributed to the existing literature by first examining the degree that subordinate disposition differentially influences four dimensions of the supervisor's perceptions of LMX, and then determining whether self-monitoring acts as a moderator on these possible effects. The results indicate that while subordinate affect does exert an influence on LMX, it does not do so uniformly across dimensions. Contrary to our hypotheses, PA was not significantly related to the supervisors' affect for the subordinate, yet was related to the evaluation of the relationship based on in-role and extra-role behavior, while NA was related to supervisor affect as hypothesized. In contrast to other research into the moderating effects of self-monitoring, we obtained no significant results in our tests for the potential interaction effects with respect to PA and NA.

A primary direction for future research is the investigation of the effects of trait mood interventions upon supervisor and employee perceptions of LMX. While some employers will take advantage of the current economic climate and refuse to invest in their employees, others will want to create working conditions

that will foster a more committed workforce. While the positive psychology movement certainly has its supporters and detractors (Fernández-Ríos & Novo, 2012), it may offer some solutions to employers wishing to create climates in which employees are better able to relate to supervisors. However, these types of studies offer the challenge of data collection over multiple periods, both before and after interventions.

Finally, the lack of support for the self-monitoring hypotheses invites further research because it is supported by related findings and theory. It is quite possible that the limitations of this study prevented it from uncovering genuine effects or that the measurement instrument either fully captured the portion of the construct for which it was designed and the effect sized was insignificant, or that it is capturing either an unintended portion of the construct.

APPENDIX

Supervisor version of LMX-MDM survey items:

Affect Dimension

- 1 I like this employee very much as a person.
- 2 This employee is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend.
- 3 This employee is a lot of fun to work with

Loyalty Dimension

- 4 I would defend this employee's work actions to a superior, even without complete knowledge of the issue in question.
- 5 I would come to this employee's defense if he/she were "attacked" by others.
- 6 I would defend this employee to others in the organization if he/she made an honest mistake.

Contribution Dimension

- 7 This employee does work for me that goes beyond what is specified in his/her job description.
- 8 This employee is willing to apply extra efforts, beyond those normally required to meet his/her work goals.
- 9 This employee does not mind working his/her hardest for me.

Professional Respect Dimension

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

REFERENCES

- Alden, L. E., & Trew, J. L. (2012). If It Makes You Happy: Engaging in Kind Acts Increases Positive Affect in Socially Anxious Individuals. *Emotion (Washington, D.C.)*. doi:10.1037/a0027761
- Ang, M., Hwa, C., Jantan, M., & Ansari, M. A. (2008). An Investigation of the Differential Impact of Supervisor and Subordinate-Rated Leader-Member Exchange on Career Outcomes. *University Journal of Business*, 7–20.
- Barrick, M. R., Parks, L., & Mount, M. K. (2005). Self-monitoring as a moderator of the relationships between personality traits and performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 745–767.
- Barsade, S. G., & Gibson, D. E. (2007). Why Does Affect Matter in Organizations?, *Academy of Management Perspectives*, February, 36-59.
- Bauer, T. N., Erdogan, B., Liden, R. C., & Wayne, S. J. (2006). A longitudinal study of the moderating role of extraversion: leader-member exchange, performance, and turnover during new executive development. *The Journal of applied psychology*, 91(2), 298–310. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.2.298
- Blickle, G., Schneider, P. B., Perrewé, P. L., Blass, F. R., & Ferris, G. R. (2008). The roles of self-disclosure, modesty, and self-monitoring in the mentoring relationship: A longitudinal multi-source investigation. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 224–240. doi:10.1108/13620430810870485

Bolger, N., & Schilling, E. A. (1991). Personality and the problems of everyday life: The role of neuroticism in exposure and reactivity to daily stressors. *Journal of Personality*, 59(3), 355-386.

Brower, H. H., Schoorman, F. D., & Tan, H. H. (2000). A model of relational leadership: The integration of trust and leader-member exchange. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11(2), 227-250.

Byrne, B. M., Shavelson, R. J., & Muthen, B. (1989). Testing for the equivalence of factor covariance and mean structures: The issue of partial measurement invariance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 105(3), 456-466.

Cacioppo, J. T., & Gardner, W. L. (Eds.). (1999). *Emotion*. (Vol. 50): Annual Reviews Inc.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Connolly, J. J., & Viswesvaran, C. (2000). The role of affectivity in job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 29(2), 265-281.

Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Cortina, J. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(1), 98-104.

Cropanzano, R., Weiss, H. M., Hale, J. M. S., & Reb, J. (2003). The structure of affect: Reconsidering the relationship between negative and positive affectivity. *Journal of Management*, 29(6), 831-857.

Day, D. V., & Crain, E. C. (1992). The Role of Affect and Ability in Initial Exchange Quality Perceptions. *Group & Organization Management*, 17(4), 380-397.

Day, D. V., Shleicher, D. J., Unckless, A. L., & Hiller, N. J. (2002). Self-monitoring personality at work: A meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 390-401. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.87.2.390

DePaoli, L. C., & Sweeney, D. C. (2000). Further validation of the positive and negative affect schedule. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 15(4), 561-568.

Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-Member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), 618-634.

Dockery, T. M., & Steiner, D. D. (1990). The role of the initial interaction in leader-member exchange. *Group & Organization Studies*, 15(4), 395-413.

Engle, E. M., & Lord, R. G. (1997). Implicit theories, self-schemas, and leader-member exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(4), 988-1010.

Fernández-Ríos, L., & Novo, M. (2012). Positive Psychology: Zeitgeist (or spirit of the times) or ignorance (or disinformation) of history? *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 12(2), 333-344.

- Forgas, J. P. (2002). Feeling and Doing: Affective Influences on Interpersonal Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13(1), 1-28.
- Frazier, P. A., Barron, K. E., & Tix, A. P. (2004). Testing moderator and mediator effects in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 51(1), 115-134.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Snyder, M. (2000). Self-monitoring: Appraisal and reappraisal. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(4), 530-555.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827-844.
- Graen, G., & Schieman, W. (1978). Leader-Member Agreement : A Vertical Dyad Linkage Approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(2), 206-212.
- Grandey, A. A., Tam, A. P., & Brauburger, A. L. (2002). Affective States and Traits in the Workplace: Diary and Survey Data from Young Workers. *Motivation & Emotion*, 26(1), 31-55.
- Greguras, G. J., & Ford, J. M. (2006). An examination of the multidimensionality of supervisor and subordinate perceptions of leader-member exchange. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79(3), 433-465. doi:10.1348/096317905X53859
- Halberstadt, A. G., Denham, S. A., & Dunsmore, J. C. (2001). Affective social competence. *Social Development*, 10(1), 79-119.
- Harris, K. J., Harris, R. B., & Eplion, D. M. (2007). Personality, leader-member exchanges, and work outcomes. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 8(2), 92-107. Retrieved from http://ibam.com/pubs/jbam/articles/vol8/no2/JBAM_8_2_1.pdf
- Hochwarter, W. (2005). Lmx and Job Tension: Linear and Non-Linear Effects and Affectivity. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19(4), 505-520. doi:10.1007/s10869-005-4522-6
- Ickes, W., Holloway, R., Stinson, L. L., & Hoodenpyle, T. G. (2006). Self-monitoring in social interaction: the centrality of self-affect. *Journal of personality*, 74(3), 659-84. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2006.00388.x
- Joiner Jr., Thomas E., & Metalsky, G. I. (2001). Excessive reassurance seeking: Delineating a risk factor involved in the development of depressive symptoms. *Psychological Science*, 12(5), 371-378.
- Kaplan, S., Bradley, J. C., Luchman, J. N., & Haynes, D. (2009). On the Role of Positive and Negative Affectivity in Job Performance : A Meta-Analytic Investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 162-176. doi:10.1037/a0013115
- Kilduff, M., & Day, D. V. (1994). Do chameleons get ahead? The effects of self-monitoring on managerial careers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 1047-1060.
- Lapierre, L. M., & Hackett, R. D. (2007). Trait conscientiousness, leader-member exchange, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour: A test of an integrative model. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80(3), 539-554. doi:10.1348/096317906X154892

Lee, J. (2008). Effects of leadership and leader-member exchange on innovativeness. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(6), 670–687. doi:10.1108/02683940810894747

Lennox, R. D., & Wolfe, R. N. (1984). Revision of the Self-Monitoring Scale. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 46(6), 1349-1364.

Levine, S. P., & Feldman, R. S. (1997). Self-Presentational Goals, Self-Monitoring, and Nonverbal Behavior. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology*, 19(4), 505-518.

Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, 24(1), 43-72.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Stilwell, D. (1993). A longitudinal study on the early development of leader-member exchanges. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 662-674.

Little, B. R., (11/24/2011) Personal projects and free traits: Personality and motivation reconsidered. Retrieved July 07, 2012, from <http://www.brianrlittle.com/articles/personal-projects-and-free-traits/#more-196>

Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 738-748.

Mehra, A., Kilduff, M., & Brass, D. J. (2001). The social networks of high and low self-monitors: Implications for workplace performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(1), 121-146.

Mongrain, M., & Anselmo-Matthews, T. (2012). Do Positive Psychology Exercises Work? A Replication of Seligman et al. (2005). *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 68(4), 382–389. doi:10.1002/jclp.21839

Murphy, S. E., & Ensher, E. A. (1999). The effects of leader and subordinate characteristics in the development of leader-member exchange quality. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(7), 1371-1394.

Ng, T. W. H., & Sorensen, K. L. (2009). Dispositional Affectivity and Work-Related Outcomes : A Meta-Analysis, 1255–1287.

O’Cass, A. (2000). A psychometric evaluation of a revised version of the Lennox and Wolfe revised self-monitoring scale. *Psychology and Marketing*, 17(5), 397–419. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1520-6793(200005)17:5<397::AID-MAR3>3.0.CO;2-D

Phillips, a S., & Bedeian, a G. (1994). Leader-follower exchange quality: the role of personal and interpersonal attributes. *Academy of Management journal. Academy of Management*, 37(4), 990– 1001. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10137271>

Pugh, S. D. (2001). Service with a smile: Emotional contagion in the service encounter. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 1018-1027.

Restubog, S. L. D., Bordia, P., Tang, R. L., & Krebs, S. a. (2009). Investigating the Moderating Effects of Leader-Member Exchange in the Psychological Contract Breach-Employee Performance Relationship: A Test of Two Competing Perspectives. *British Journal of Management*, 21, 422–437. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2009.00673.x

- Robins, R. W., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2002). It's not just who you're with, it's who you are: Personality and relationship experiences across multiple relationships. *Journal of Personality*, 70(6), 925-964.
- Sasovova, Z. (2006). Academy of Management Best Conference Paper 2006 OB:J1, 1–7.
- Scandura, T. A., & Graen, G. B. (1984). Moderating effects of initial leader-member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(3), 428-436.
- Scandura, T. A., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1994). Leader-member exchange and supervisor career mentoring as complementary constructs in leadership research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(6), 1588-1602.
- Schmukle, S. C., Egloff, B., & Burns, L. R. (2002). The relationship between positive and negative affect in the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36(5), 463-475.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Castro, S. L., & Cogliser, C. C. (1999). Leader-member exchange (LMX) research: A comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data-analytic practices. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(1), 63-113.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Neider, L. L., & Scandura, T. A. (1998). Delegation and leader-member exchange: Main effects, moderators, and measurement issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(3), 298-318.
- Schyns, B., & Day, D. (2010). Critique and review of leader – member exchange theory : Issues of agreement , consensus , and excellence. *Psychology*, 19(1), 1–29. doi:10.1080/13594320903024922
- Shuptrine, F. K., Bearden, W. O., & Teel, J. E. (1990). An analysis of the dimensionality and reliability of the Lennox and Wolfe revised self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 54(3 & 4), 515–522.
- Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 30(4), 526-537.
- Stringer, L. (2006). The link between the quality of the supervisor-employer relationship and the level of the employee's job satisfaction. *Public Organization Review*, 6, 125-142.
- Spector, P. E., & Brannick, M. T. (2010). Methodological Urban Legends: The Misuse of Statistical Control Variables. *Organizational Research Methods*, 14(2), 287–305. doi:10.1177/1094428110369842
- Suazo, M. M., Turnley, W. H., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (2008). Characteristics of the supervisor-subordinate relationship as predictors of psychological contract breach. *Journal of Managerial Issues* 20(3), 295-312.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The Social Psychology of Groups*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Thoresen, C. J., Kaplan, S. A., Barsky, A. P., Warren, C. R., & de Chermont, K. (2003). The Affective Underpinnings of Job Perceptions and Attitudes: A Meta-Analytic Review and Integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(6), 914-945.

Turnley, W. H., & Bolino, M. C. (2001). Achieving desired images while avoiding undesired images: Exploring the role of self-monitoring in impression management. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(2), 351-360.

Turnley, W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (1999). The impact of psychological contract violations on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect. *Human Relations, 52*(7), 895-922.

Wampler, K. S., Shi, L., Nelson, B. S., & Kimball, T. G. (2003). The adult attachment interview and observed couple interaction: Implications for an intergenerational perspective on couple therapy. *Family Process, 42*(4), 497-515.

Watson, D. (2000). *Mood and Temperament*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 54*(6), 1063-1070.

Wayne, S. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment and field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(5), 487-499.

Wayne, S. J., Liden, R. C., Kraimer, M. L., & Graf, I. K. (1999). The role of human capital, motivation and supervisor sponsorship in predicting career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*(5), 577-595.

Wright, T. A., & Staw, B. M. (1999). Affect and favorable work outcomes: Two longitudinal tests of the happy-productive worker thesis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*(1), 1-23.

Zhou, X. (Tracy), & Schriesheim, C. a. (2010). Quantitative and qualitative examination of propositions concerning supervisor-subordinate convergence in descriptions of leader-member exchange (LMX) quality. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*(5), 826-843. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.07.010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Mercedes Jalbert and Terrance Jalbert, the journal editors, as well as two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments for improving this article.

BIOGRAPHY

Mark Kunze (Ph.D. Georgia State University) is an assistant professor of management at Virginia State University. He teaches courses in organizational theory, collective bargaining, and human resource management. His primary research interests lie in the areas of personality in the workplace and strategic human resource management. He can be contacted at: Department of Management and Marketing, Virginia State University, P.O. Box 9209, Petersburg, VA 23806, (804) 504-7079 (O). The research reported in this paper is based partially on data collected for his doctoral dissertation.

Kim Gower is an assistant professor of management and marketing at the Reginald F. Lewis School of Business at Virginia State University. Her research interests lie in leadership, multisource feedback, teaching, assessment, and applied business research. Her Ph.D. is from Virginia Commonwealth University and she teaches a variety of business courses including strategy and corporate sustainability.