

KAROLINA MAZUR

**Leader-Member
Exchange and Individual
Performance.
The Meta-analysis**

1. Introduction

Individual performance is one of the most important economic indicators (also called in workforce productivity, especially in Economics)(Wersty, 1993, p. 246), therefore in the literature exists many research into this phenomenon, especially concerned with determinants of performance and conditions for performance improvement. In the contemporary research, the sources of work productivity are searched in social conditions more often than in technical or organizational. One of the most important determinants of individual performance is the quality of employee relation with his/her supervisor (for ex. Lee, Wei, 2008, Davis, Bryant 2010). This quality can be measured with application of Leader-Member Exchange concept (LMX) (Liden & Maslyn, 1998).

Research into LMX revealed many times the existing correlation between LMX and work related outcomes. Those outcomes are: individual performance which is concerned with social role that employee plays in the organization IP (in-role performance or task performance) and performance exceeding employee tasks and duties called extra-role

PhD Karolina Mazur
University of Zielona Gora
Faculty of Economics
and Management

performance or Organizational Citizenship Behavior – OCB. The performance OCB type consists of such behaviors as altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, functional and advocacy participation etc. (Farth et al., 2004, p. 242).

The aim of this paper is demonstration of the relation between LMX and some specific types of individual performance on the basis of the different research. This specific types of individual performance are: in-role individual performance, Organizational Citizenship Behavior (total) and its two forms: Organizational Citizenship Behavior Individually Oriented and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Organizationally Oriented. The aim of the meta-analysis is to define a character of the relation between different types of individual performance and quality of social exchange. The problem presented paper is part of the wide research project concerned with determinants of individual performance.

2. Individual performance as a measure of employee effectiveness on the organizational context

Individual performance can be measured as relation between amount of production in certain periods and expense of work used to produce it (Wersty 1993, p. 246). This specific measurement allows the analysis of whole organization, its parts and some groups of employees (Wersty 1993, p. 247) but such measurement of performance does not allow the identification of performance components and individual performance. It allows only for assessment of average performance (or productivity) on one employee. The analysis between individual performance and other variables (such job satisfaction or quality of social exchange) is not possible with application of this measure. Therefore another assessment tool has been used in research into relation between IP and other variables. The researchers used performance scales (Dunegan et al., 1992) or performance ratings (Schriesheim et al., 1998) to asses individual performance. The measurement tool has been developed individually for the organization in compliance with its profile and goals. The assessment could base on the supervisor opinion or be self-appraisal too. In each The measures of OCB were more standardized and based on tools proposed by L.J. Williams and S.E. Anderson (Williams i Anderson, 1991). In certain cases performance rating has not been treated as measure of performance but as variable correlated (Parayitam, Guru-Gharana, 2011, p. 124).

The extra-role performance OCB has at least two dimensions. It can be *extra-role performance individually oriented* – OCBI and *extra-role performance organization*

oriented – OCBO (Williams & Anderson, 1991). It can be interesting, how differs the relation between LMX and different types of performance.

3. The essence and dimensions of LMX

The LMX concept has roots in social exchange theory and theory of norm of reciprocity (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960). It “focuses on the quality of dyadic interpersonal relationship between supervisor and subordinate. (...) Supervisors have been shown to confer favorable treatment upon subordinates with whom they have high-quality LMX relationships. In return, subordinates have been shown to reciprocate favorable treatment upon their behaviors and extra task effort” (Michael, 2011, p. 2). Therefore the analysis of the relation between performance and social exchange is rational.

During research process the dyads of employee-supervisor are units of analysis. The quality of social exchange has been measured with different tools too. Different scales can be used for this assessment. It is one of weaknesses such tools as mentioned R.M. Dienesch and R.C. Liden (Dienesch & Liden, s. 623).

The multidimensionality of LMX causes also some problems in research process. R.C. Liden and J.M. Maslyn distinguished such dimensions of LMX: contribution, loyalty, affect, differential relations with others and other dimensions (Liden & Maslyn, 1998, p. 45). Contribution can be defined as “perception of the amount, direction and quality of work-oriented activity each member puts forth toward the mutual goals (...) of the dyad” (Dienesch & Liden 1986, p. 624, after Liden & Maslyn, 1998, p. 45). Loyalty is “the extent to which leader and member are loyal to one another (...), the extent to which both leader and member publicly support each other’s actions and character.” (Liden & Maslyn, 1998, p. 46). Affect is defined as “The mutual affection members of the dyad have for each other based primarily on interpersonal attraction, rather than work or professional values” (Dienesch & Liden 1986, p. 625, after Liden & Maslyn, 1998, p. 46). Differential relations with outcomes means different levels of work-related outcomes (job satisfaction, organizational commitment etc.) caused by the same quality of exchange (Liden & Maslyn, 1998, p. 46). R.M. Dienesch and R.C. Liden suggest that this list of dimensions is not complete but they are the most frequently cited.

4. The research findings

The four base of electronic journals were used for the analysis: EBSCO, PROQUEST, ELSVIER and Wiley-Blackwel. Incorporation criteria was: phrases

“LMX” (or „Leader-Member Exchange”) and „Individual Performance” or “OCB” in publication title or keywords. The total number of 879 papers was analyzed (including repetitions). For the research there were selected research findings with intercorrelations between LMX, IP, OCB, OCBO and OCBI which allowed the meta-analysis. The final number of selected papers was 47 and they included 56 studies. The results of meta-analysis was presented in the table 1. The detailed explanation of the variables was not included in this paper because of editor requirements. They are described in other works of the author (Mazur, 2011b, pp. 103-110, 137-138)

Table 1. The weighted correlations between LMX and IP, OCB, OCBO and OCBI evaluated on the basis on the cited research

Authors:	N	IP	OCB	OCBO	OCBI	P<	We- ight	Weigh- ted in- tercor.
Bauer, Erdogan, et al., 2006	67	0,330				p<0,01	0,006	0,002
Bauer, Green, 1996*	112	0,480				p<0,01	0,010	0,005
Bauer, Green, 1996*	112	0,570				p<0,01	0,010	0,006
Bauer, Green, 1996*	112	0,460				p<0,01	0,010	0,005
Bauer, Green, 1996*	112	0,350				p<0,01	0,010	0,003
Bernerth, Armenakis et al., 2007	195	0,110					0,017	0,002
Burton, Sablynski et al., 2008	58	0,260				p<0,001	0,005	0,001
Chan, Mak, 2013	223	0,410				p<0,01	0,020	0,008
Davis, Bryant, 2010	51	0,630				p<0,05	0,004	0,003
DeConinck, 2011	356	0,400				p<0,01	0,031	0,012
Dunegan et al., 1992	152	0,380				p<0,001	0,013	0,005
Dunegan et al., 2002	146	0,360				p<0,001	0,013	0,005
Van Dyne, Jehn, Cummings, 2002	195	0,030					0,017	0,001
Fisk, Friesen, 2012	126	0,230				p<0,05	0,011	0,003
Greguras, Ford, 2006	422	0,190				p<0,05	0,037	0,007
Harris, Kacmar, 2005	1253	0,150				p<0,001	0,110	0,016
Hsiung, Tsai, 2009	184	0,290				p<0,01	0,016	0,005
Hu, Liden, 2008	275	0,430				p<0,01	0,024	0,010

Huang, Chan et al., 2010	493	0,110				p<0,05	0,043	0,005
Hui, Law, Chen, 1999	347	0,110				p<0,05	0,030	0,003
Janssen, Van Ypren, 2004	170	0,340				p<0,01	0,015	0,005
Johnson, Truxillo et al., 2009	154	0,320				p<0,01	0,014	0,004
Kacmar, Witt et al., 2003**	188	0,220				p<0,01	0,016	0,004
Kacmar, Witt et al., 2003**	153	0,320				p<0,01	0,013	0,004
Klein, Kim, 1998	74	0,280				p<0,05	0,006	0,002
Law, Hui, Hui, 2010	168	0,350				p<0,01	0,015	0,005
Lee, Wei, 2008	615	0,753				p<0,001	0,054	0,041
Li, Sanders, Frenkel, 2012	298	0,120				p<0,01	0,026	0,003
Liden, Erdogan et al., 2006	834	0,050					0,073	0,004
Loi, Ngo et al., 2011	177	0,200				p<0,01	0,016	0,003
Masterson, Lewis et al., 2000	205	0,160				p<0,05	0,018	0,003
Ouyang, 2011	228	0,503				p<0,01	0,020	0,010
Phillips, Bedeian, 1994	83	0,260				p<0,05	0,007	0,002
Scandura, Schriesheim, 1994	183	0,270				p<0,01	0,016	0,004
Schriesheim, Neider, Scandura, 1998	106	0,390				p<0,01	0,009	0,004
Sekiguchi, Butron, Sablynski, 2008*	125	0,440				p<0,05	0,011	0,005
Sekiguchi, Butron, Sablynski, 2008*	125	0,210				p<0,05	0,011	0,002
Townsend, Da Silva et al., 2002	420	0,280				p<0,01	0,037	0,010
Vecchio, 1998	45	0,270				p<0,05	0,004	0,001
Vecchio, Norris, 1996	86	0,370				p<0,01	0,008	0,003
Walumbwa, Cropanzano, Hartnell, 2009	398	0,500				p<0,01	0,035	0,017
Walumbwa, Mayer et al., 2011	201	0,290				p<0,01	0,018	0,005
Walumbwa, Cropanzano, Goldman, 2011	429	0,330				p<0,01	0,038	0,012
Wang, Law et al., 2005	162	0,380				p<0,01	0,014	0,005
Wayne, Shore, Liden, 1997	252	0,450				p<0,01	0,022	0,010
Zhang, Wang, Dhi, 2012	165	0,340				p<0,001	0,014	0,005

Zhang, Waldman, Wang 2012	361	-0,050					0,032	-0,002
Total N=	11396	Total weighted intercorrelation:					0,279	
Burton, Sablynski et al., 2008	58		0,190			p<0,01	0,009	0,002
Chan, Mak, 2012	223		0,380			p<0,01	0,036	0,014
Greguras, Ford, 2006	422		0,220			p<0,05	0,069	0,015
Hsiung, Tsai, 2009	184		-0,064				0,030	-0,002
Hui, Law, Chen, 1999	347		0,210			p<0,01	0,056	0,012
Kandan, Ali, 2010	165		0,560			p<0,01	0,027	0,015
Lpierre, Hacket, 2007	3311		0,320				0,539	0,172
Law, Hui, Hui, 2010	168		0,250			p<0,01	0,027	0,007
Ouyang, 2011	228		0,625			p<0,01	0,037	0,023
Sekiguchi, Butron, Sablynski, 2008*	125		0,420			p<0,05	0,020	0,009
Sekiguchi, Butron, Sablynski, 2008*	125		0,220			p<0,05	0,020	0,004
Waismel-Manor , Tziner et al., 2010	163		0,390			p<0,05	0,027	0,010
Wang, Chu, Ni, 2010	214		0,229			p<0,01	0,035	0,008
Wang, Law et al., 2005	162		0,290			p<0,01	0,026	0,008
Wayne, Shore, Liden, 1997	252		0,260			p<0,01	0,041	0,011
Total N=	6147	Total weighted intercorrelation:					0,308	
Johnson, Truxillo et al., 2009	154			0,350		p<0,01	0,105	0,037
Kim, O'Neill, Cho, 2010	233			0,120			0,159	0,019
Walumbwa, Cropanzano, Goldman, 2011	429			0,360		p<0,01	0,292	0,105
Masterson, Lewis et al., 2000	651			0,270		p<0,05	0,444	0,120
Total N=	1467	Total weighted intercorrelation:					0,281	
Johnson, Truxillo et al., 2009	154				0,250	p<0,01	0,105	0,026
Kim, O'Neill, Cho, 2010	233				0,590	p<0,01	0,159	0,094

Masterson, Lewis et al., 2000	651				0,270	p<0,05	0,444	0,120
Walumbwa, Cropanzano, Goldman, 2011	429				0,410	p<0,01	0,292	0,120
Total N=	1467	Total weighted intercorrelation:						0,360

*Research conducted in diversified periods

**Research conducted on diversified sample

where:

N - sample size

IP - Individual In-role Performance

LMX - the quality of social exchange,

OCB - Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCBI - Organizational Citizenship Behavior Individually Oriented

OCBO - Organizational Citizenship Behavior Organizationally Oriented

Source: own elaboration

The correlation between LMX and other variables exists, the partial correlations are weak (in case of IP it is 0,279 and in case of OCBO it is 0,281) or average (with OCB it is 0,308 and with OCBI it is 0,360). It means that correlation exists and relations exists too. It is also confirmed by some individual high correlations received in particular studies. The correlations differ but in the most cases they were positive. Only in two cases the correlation was negative. The highest partial correlation was observed between LMX and IP (0,753), which can be a result of conducting research in specific organization and environment or a result of diversified research tools.

5. Final remarks

The concept of LMX bases on the assessment, that treating employee in some way can cause a reciprocity, which is represented by higher individual performance. The question is, if the assessed cause and effects relationship is so obvious. It exists but direction is not clear. For example, the relation between individual in-role performance and the quality of exchange between employee and supervisor can be bilateral. There are some research that suggest the significant role of work-climate (including relation with supervisor) as factor positively motivating the employees. Supervisor can also reward high task performance and OCB achieved by employee because of his/her natural abilities. After this reward employee can evaluate a quality of exchange as higher then before. The

direction of the exchange and reciprocity can be bidirectional (see Michael, 2011, p. 2). It requires deeper examination and determining in which cases the quality of relation motivates the employee and in which cases is a result of work quality. There is also a questions which variables moderate the effect.

Because of editorial limits, there were many interesting clues, which were not developed in this paper. The first is concerned with standardization and validation of research tools. Is it right to conduct research with diversified tools and under diversified conditions (different culture, different economic conditions etc.)? Is it appropriate to compare results achieved in such diversified research process?

In this paper the analysis of the significance of correlations was not included because the promoted procedure of meta-analysis did not include it (Gondek, Mazur 2010, Mazur 2011a). It is a direction of the development of meta-analysis as a tool for further research. It requires a proposal of certain methods for application.

The next problem also appears: what values are object of exchange between leader and member? The dimension presented by R.C. Liden and J.M. Maslyn are not complete (Liden & Maslyn, 1998, p. 45-47). The list of dimensions cannot be equated with types of exchanged values. Another concept is better systematized: the concept of "currencies" developed by I.R. McNeil and promoted by J.A., Thompson and J.S. Bunderson (McNeil, 1985, Thompson & Hart, 2006, s. 232). This can be also further research area.

Summary

Leader-Member Exchange and Individual Performance. The Meta-analysis

The paper contents the meta-analysis of 56 studies published in 47 scientific papers. The intercorrelations between Leader-Member Exchange and Individual Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior has been examined. The meta-analysis confirmed the correlation between those variables. The research revealed some new problems: that research tools used for LMX examination are not standardized, what can cause some differences in achieved results. Another problem that has been recognized was concerned with cause and effects relationship between LMX and individual performance. The identification of value exchanged in LMX has been recognized as further direction of the research.

Keywords: *Leader-Member Exchange, individual performance, Organizational Citizenship Behavior*

Streszczenie

Wymiana LMX a zachowania indywidualne pracowników. Metaanaliza

Artykuł zawiera metaanalizę 56 studiów opublikowanych w 47 artykułach naukowych. Zbadano korelacje pomiędzy jakością wymiany pomiędzy przełożonym a podwładnym a wydajnością wynikającą z roli oraz zachowaniami etosowymi pracowników. Wyniki metaanalizy potwierdziły istnienie słabych i przeciętnych korelacji pomiędzy zmiennymi. Analiza badań ujawniła istnienie dwóch problemów: zróżnicowania narzędzi badawczych, co może mieć wpływ na wyniki badań oraz niejednoznaczność przyczynowo-skutkową, która kwestionuje założenia modelu LMX. Wskazano także na możliwości dalszych badań, szczególnie w zakresie identyfikacji wartości będących przedmiotem wymiany.

Słowa

kluczowe: *wymiana społeczna, indywidualna wydajność pracy, zachowania etosowe, metaanaliza*

References

1. 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*, "Journal of Applied Psychology", vol. 91, no. 2, pp. 298-310.
2. Bauer T.N., Green S. (1996), *Development of Leader-Member Exchange: A Longitudinal Test*, "Academy Management Journal", vol. 39., No 6., pp. 1538-1587.
3. Bernerth J.B., Armenakis A.A., Field H. S, Giles W., Walker H.J. (2007), *Leader-member social exchange (LMSX): development and validation of scale*, "Journal of Organizational Behavior", vol. 28, no 8, pp. 979-1003.
4. Blau P.M. (2009), *Wymiana i władza w życiu społecznym*, Zakład Wydawniczy „Nomos”, Kraków.
5. Burton J.P., Sablinski C.J., Sekiguchi T. (2008), *Linking Justice, Performance and Citizenship via Leader-Member Exchange*, "Journal of Business Psychology", vol. 23, no.1/2 pp. 51-61.
6. Chan B.C.H., Mak W. (2012), *Benevolent Leadership and Follower Performance: The Mediating Role of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)*, "Asia-Pacific Journal of Management" vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 285-301.

7. Cohen, J. (1988), *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*, Routledge.
8. Davis D.D., Bryant J.L. (2010), *Leader-member exchange, trust, and performance in national science foundation industry/university cooperative research centers*, "Journal of Technology Transfer", vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 511-526.
9. DeConinck J.B. (2011), *The Effects of Leader-Member Exchange and Organizational Identification on Performance and Turnover Among Salespeople*, "Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management", Vol. 31, no.1, pp. 21-34.
10. Dienesch R.M., Liden R.C. (1986), *Leader-Member Exchange Model of Leadership: A Critique and Further Development*, "Academy of Management Review", vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 618-634.
11. Dunegan K.J., Duchon D., Uhl-Bien M. (1992), *Examining the Link Between Leader-Member Exchange and Subordinate Performance: The Role of Task Analyzability and Variety as Moderators*, "Journal of Management", vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 59-76.
12. Dunegan K.J., Uhl-Bien M., Duchon D. (2002), *LMX and Subordinate Performance: the Moderating Effects of Task Characteristics*, "Journal of Business and Psychology", vol. 17, no. 2, pp.275-285.
13. Van Dyne L., Jehn K.A., Cummings A. (2002), *Differential effects of strain on two forms of work performance: individual employee sales and creativity*, "Journal of Organizational Behavior", vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 57-74.
14. Farth J.L., Zhong C.B., Organ D.W (2004), *Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the People's Republica of China*, "Organization Science", vol. 15, No. 2, s. 241-253.
15. Fisk G.M., Friesen J.P. (2012), *Perceptions of leader emotion and LMX as predictors of followers' job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors*, "The Leadership Quarterly", vol. 23, no. 1, pp.1-12.
16. Gondek A., Mazur K. (2010), *Job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job performance - partial meta-analysis*, "Management", vol. 14, no. 1, s. 143-157.
17. Gouldner, A. W. (1960), *The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement*, "American Sociological Review", vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 161-178.
18. Graen G.B., Uhl-Bien M. (1995), *Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective*, "Leadership Quarterly", vol. 6, pp. 219-247.
19. 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", vol. 79, no. 3, pp. 433-465.
20. Harris K.J., Kacmar M.M. (2005), *Easing the strain: the buffer role of supervisors in the perceptions of politics-strain relationship*, "Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology", vol. 78, no. 3, pp. 337-354.

21. Hsiung H-H., Tsai W-C. (2009), *Job definition discrepancy between supervisors and subordinates: The antecedent role of LMX an outcomes*, "Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology", vol. 82, no. 1, pp. 89-112.
22. Hu J., Liden R.C. (2008), *Relative Leader-Member Exchange within Team Context: How and When Social Comparison Impacts Individual Effectiveness*, [onlinelibrary.wiley.com /doi/1111/ peps.12008/pdf](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.peps.12008/pdf), data dostępu: 28.08.2012.
23. Huang X., Chan S.C.H., Lam W., Nan X. (2010), *The joint effect of leader-member exchange and emotional intelligence on burnout and work performance in call centers in China*, "The International Journal of Human Resource Management", vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 1124-1144.
24. Hui C., Law K.S., Chen Z.X. (1999), *A Structural Equation Model of the Effects of Negative Affectivity, Leader-Member Exchange, and Perceived Job Mobility on In-role and Extra-role Performance: A Chinese Case*, "Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes", vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 3-21.
25. Janssen O. Van Ypren N.W. (2004), *Employees' goal orientations, the quality of leader-member exchange, and the outcomes of job performance and job satisfaction*, "Academy of Management Journal", vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 368-384.
26. Johnson J., Truxillo D.M., Erdogan B., Bauer T.N., Hammer L. (2009), *Perceptions of Overall Fairness: Are Effects on Job Performance Moderated by Leader-Member Exchange*, "Human Performance", vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 432-449.
27. Kacmar K.M., Witt L.A., Zvinuska S., Gully S.M. (2003), *The Interactive Effect of Leader-Member Exchange and Communication Frequency on Performance Ratings*, "Journal of Applied Psychology", vol. 88, no. 4, pp. 764-772.
28. Kandan A., Ali I.B. (2010), *A correlation study of leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior in public sector organization*, "Journal of Global Business and Economics", vil. 1, no. 1, pp. 62-78.
29. Kim S., O'Neill J.W., Cho H-M. (2010), *When does an employee not help coworkers? The effect of leader-member exchange on employee envy and organizational citizenship behavior*, "International Journal of Hospitality Management", vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 530-537.
30. Klein H.J., Kim J.S. (1998), *A Field Study of the Influence of Situational Constraints, Leader-Member Exchange, and Goal Commitment*, "Academy of Management Journal", vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 88-95.
31. Lapierre L.M., Hackett R.D. (2007), *Trait consciousness, leader-member exchange, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior: A test of an integrative model*, "Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology", vol. 80, no. 3, pp. 539-554.
32. Law K.S., Wang H., Hui C. (2010), *Currencies of exchange and global LMX: How they affect employee task performance and extra-role performance*, "Asia-Pacific Journal of Management", vol. 27, no. 4, pp.625-646.

33. Lee J., Wei F. (2008), *Uncover the black-box of leadership effectiveness: Leader-Member exchange as mediator*, "Frontiers of Business Research in China", vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 240-255.
34. Li X., Sanders K., Frenkel S. (2012), *How leader-member exchange, work engagement and HRM consistency explain Chinese luxury hotel employees' job performance*, "International Journal of Hospitality Management", vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 1059-1066.
35. Liden R.C., Erdogan B., Wayne S.Y., Sparrowe R.T. (2006), *Leader-member exchange, differentiation, and task interdependence: implications for individual and group performance*, "Journal of Organizational Behavior", vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 723-746.
36. Liden R.C., Maslyn J.M., *Multidimensionality of Leader-Member Exchange: An Empirical Assesment through Scale Development*, "Journal of Management", vol. 24, no. 1., pp. 43-72.
37. Loi R, Ngo H-Y., Zhang L., Lau V.P. (2011), *The interaction between leader-member exchange and perceived job security in predicting employee altruism and work performance*, "Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology", vol. 84, no. 4, pp. 669-685.
38. 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", vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 738-748.
39. Mazur K. (2011a), *The impact of organizational justice on employee behaviour related to value creation. A meta-analysis*, "Management", Vol. 15, no 2, s. 105-118.
40. Mazur K. (2011b), *Tworzenie i przywłaszczanie wartości. Perspektywa pracownik-organizacja*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Uniwersytetu Zielonogórskiego, Zielona Góra.
41. McNeil I.R. (1985), *Relational Contract: What We Do and Do Not Know*, "Wisconsin Law Review", vol. 3, pp. 483-525.
42. Michael, D. (2011), *Supportive supervisor communication as an intervening influence in the relationship between LMX and employee job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and performance*, "Journal of Behavioral Studies in Business", vol. 4, pp. 1-28.
43. Obisi C. (2011), *Employee performance appraisal and its implication for individual and organizational growth*, "Australian Journal of Business and Management Research", vol. 1, no. 9, pp. 92-97.
44. Ouyang Y., (2011), *An Exploration of LMX and Personal Guanxi on Job Performance: The Mediating Effects of CSR*, "The Journal of Global Business Issues", vol. 5, no. 1, pp.1-10.
45. Phillips A.S., Bedeian A.G. (1994), *Leader-Follower Exchange Quality: the Role of Personal and Interpersonal Attributes*, "Academy of Management Journal", vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 990-1001.

46. Parayitam, S., Guru-Gharana, K. (2011), *The Relationship Between Organizational Performance and Performance Ratings of In-role and Extra-Role Behaviors*, "Academy of Strategic Management Journal", vol. 10, no.1, pp. 123-135.
47. Scadura T., Schriesheim C. (1994), *Leader-Member Exchange and Supervisor Career Mentoring As Complementary Constructs in Leadership Research*, "Academy of Management Journal", vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 1588-1602.
48. Schriesheim C., Neider L.L., Scadura T. (1998), *Delegation and Leader-Member Exchange: main Effects, Moderators, And Measurement Issues*, "Academy of Management Journal", vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 298-318.
49. Sekiguchi T., Burton J.P., Syblynski C.J. (2008), *The Role of Embeddedness on Employee Performance: The Interactive Effects with Leader-Member Exchange and Organization-Based Self-Esteem*, "Personnel Psychology", vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 761-792.
50. Thompson J.A., Bunderson J.S. (2003), *Violations of Principle: Ideological Currency in Psychological Contract*, "Academy of Management Review", vol. 28., s. 571-586.
51. Townsend J.C., Da Silva N., Mueller L., Curtin P., Tetrick L.E. (2002), *Attributional Complexity: A Link Between Training, Job Complexity, Decision Latitude, Leader-Member Exchange, and Performance*, "Journal of Applied Social Psychology", vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 207-221.
52. Vecchio R.P. (1998), *Leader-Member Exchange, Objective Performance, Employment Duration, and Supervision Ratings: Testing For Moderation and Mediation*, "Journal of Business and Psychology", vol. 12, no.3, pp. 327-341.
53. Vecchio R.P., Norris W.R. (1996), *Predicting Employee Turnover From Performance, Satisfaction, and Leader-Member Exchange*, "Journal of Business and Psychology", vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 113-125.
54. Walumbwa F.O., Cropanzano R., Harnell C.A. (2009), *Organizational Justice, voluntary learning behavior, and job performance: A test of the mediating effects of identification and leader-member exchange*, "Journal of Organizational Behavior", vol. 30, no. 8, pp. 1103-1126.
55. Walumbwa F.O., Mayer D.M., Wang P., Wang H., Workman C., Christensen A.L. (2011), *Linking ethical leadership to employee performance: The roles of leader-member exchange, self-efficacy, and organization identification*, "Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes", vol. 115, no. 2., pp.204-213.
56. Walumbwa F.O., Cropanzano R., Goldman B.M. (2011), *How leader-member exchange influences effective work behaviors: social exchange and internal-external efficacy perspectives*, "Personnel Psychology", vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 739-770.
57. Waismel-Manor R., Tziner A., Berger E., Dikstein E. (2010), *Two of a Kind?*

- Leader-Member Exchange and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: The Moderating Role of Leader-Member Similarity*, "Journal of Applied Social Psychology", vol. 40, no. 1, pp.167-181.
58. Wang L., Chu X., Ni J. (2010), *Leader-member Exchange and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A New perspective from Perceived Insider Status and Chinese Traditionality*, "Frontiers of Business Research in China", vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 148-161.
59. Wang H., Law K.S, Hackett R.D., Wang D., Chen Z.X. (2005), *Leader-member exchange as mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior*, "Academy of Management Journal", vol. 48, no.3, pp. 420-432.
60. Wayne S.J., Shore L.M., Liden R.C. (1997), *Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: a social exchange perspective*, "Academy of Management Journal", vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 82-111.
61. Wersty B. (red.) (1993), *Analiza ekonomiczna w przedsiębiorstwie*, Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej we Wrocławiu, Wrocław.
62. Williams L.J., Anderson S.E. (1991), *Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In- Role Behavior* "Journal of Management", vol. 17, no. 3, s. 601-617.
63. Zhang Z., Wang M., Shi J. (2012), *Leader-follower congruence in proactive personality and work outcomes: the mediating role of leader-member exchange*, "Academy of Management Journal", vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 111-130.
64. Zhang Z., Waldman D.A., Wang M., (2012), *A multilevel investigation of leader-member exchange, informal leader emergence, an individual and team performance*, "Personnel Psychology", vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 49-78.