



Can some leaders have a good relationship with many followers?

The role of personality in the relationship between Leader-Member Exchange and span of control

Birgit Schyns

Durham Business School, Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom

John M. Maslyn

College of Business Administration, Belmont University, Nashville, Tennessee, USA, and

Marc P.M. van Veldhoven

Department of Human Resource Studies, Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to report a study of the relationship between Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) and span of control. The paper argues that depending on their extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness, some leaders will find it easier to establish and maintain LMX relationships with their followers in larger groups.

Design/methodology/approach – A survey was conducted among 52 leaders and 389 followers. As matched data were used, the final sample consisted of 244 individual employees who worked in 41 different groups.

Findings – Results show that extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness moderate the relationship between span of control and various dimensions of LMX. The results for agreeableness, however, were in the opposite direction than expected.

Research limitations/implications – The moderation effects that were found for leader personality indicate that organizations could foster LMX relationships by selecting leaders with certain personality patterns for larger groups or taking care to train leaders who do not show this pattern to overcome possible problems of low LMX relationships in large groups.

Originality/value – To the authors' knowledge, this study is one of the first to address the relationship between span of control and LMX dimensions, and the first to examine the effects of leader personality on that relationship.

Keywords Leadership, Leader-Member Exchange, Personality, Span of control, Leaders

Paper type Research paper



1. Introduction

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) describes the relationship quality between a leader and each of his/her followers (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995; for an overview see also van Breukelen *et al.*, 2006). Many studies, including two meta-analyses, each comprised of a large number of studies on LMX (Gerstner and Day, 1997; Ilies *et al.*, 2007), have confirmed the importance of LMX in organizations, indicating a positive relationship between LMX and valued organizational outcomes. It has, therefore, been recommended that leaders should strive for as many high-quality LMX relationships as possible in their team (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995; Schyns and Day, 2010).

The question is whether or not this is possible? Dansereau *et al.* (1975) have argued that managers have resource constraints that do not allow them to form a good relationship quality with all followers. In large groups in particular, trying to establish high-quality relationships with all followers seems a difficult endeavor. Despite calls to the contrary, the reality of resource constraints has led some scholars to suggest targeting some key followers, rather than trying to achieve high-quality exchange relationships with all followers in a large group (Liden *et al.*, 2006). This approach, however, is risky as other researchers (e.g. Bolino and Turnley, 2009) have warned about the negative effects of low-quality LMX relationships on the respective followers. To better guide leaders, other factors need to be explored that relate to how leaders of large groups might establish and maintain good relationship qualities with many followers. In this paper, we explore the role that leader personality plays in the relationship between LMX and span of control, arguing that depending on their personality characteristics, some leaders may establish and maintain high-quality LMX relationships in larger workgroups more easily than other leaders. Further, given that LMX has been characterized as consisting of multiple dimensions (Dienesch and Liden, 1986; Liden and Maslyn, 1998), we examine this question for each of the dimensions to better discern the effects of personality. Finding such relationships would indicate that when selecting leaders for large groups, attention could be paid to their personality characteristics or, if that is not an option, companies need to realize that some leaders may need more leadership development than others, again depending on their personality characteristics.

When looking at the empirical relationship between LMX and the number of followers a leader has, a common finding is that span of control (i.e. number of followers) is slightly negatively related to LMX (e.g. Green *et al.*, 1996; Schriesheim *et al.*, 2000; Schyns *et al.*, 2005; Schyns and Blank, 2010), indicating that the average relationship quality between leaders and their followers diminishes when leaders have many followers. This is consistent with the limited resources approach proposed by Dansereau *et al.* (1975). In examining leaders' personality, LMX, and span of control we will argue that leaders' extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness interact with span of control in impacting average levels of various dimensions of LMX quality. This is an important topic especially when organizations want to extend their spans of control (e.g. due to a lean management approach) as it could mean that some leaders have identifiable personality characteristics that make them better suited than others to lead large groups. In the following, we will first describe prior research into LMX and span of control, then outline the role of personality in building relationships, and derive our hypotheses. We report data from a study focussing on different aspects of leader personality.

2. LMX and span of control

Several recent articles have discussed the role of span of control (also called size of the work group) on LMX quality (Cogliser *et al.*, 2009; Henderson *et al.*, 2009; Schyns *et al.*, 2010). Recognizing that establishing and maintaining relationships in the workplace is resource consuming, Cogliser and Schriesheim (2000) point out that leaders in large groups may not be able to spend adequate time with all followers. Henderson *et al.* (2009) point to the problem of increasing diversity in large groups so that leaders do not have "the time and effort necessary to meet the unique needs and desires of all group members" (p. 522), resulting in fewer high-quality LMX relationships. Indeed, several studies found negative, if often insignificant, relationships between average

LMX quality and span of control (e.g. Cogliser and Schriesheim, 2000; Green *et al.*, 1996; Martinko *et al.*, 2007; Schriesheim *et al.*, 2000; Schyns *et al.*, 2005). In their meta-analysis, Schyns and Blank (2010) confirmed this slight negative relationship between span of control and LMX.

While we know quite a bit about the relationship between span of control and LMX, we know much less about the different dimensions of LMX (Dienesch and Liden, 1986; Liden and Maslyn, 1998). To our knowledge, only two recent theoretical papers and one empirical paper address the question as to whether or not there are different relationships between span of control and different dimensions of LMX (Schyns, 2012; Schyns *et al.*, 2010; Schyns and Blank, 2010). This question is interesting as it will shed light on which dimensions are particularly problematic in large groups. Below, we briefly discuss the dimensions of LMX and then outline the arguments for the different relationships between span of control and those LMX dimensions.

Based on social exchange theory, Dienesch and Liden (1986) differentiated three dimensions of LMX, namely, affect, loyalty, and contribution. Liden and Maslyn's (1998) empirical work added a fourth dimension, namely, professional respect. Affect describes the emotional bond between leader and follower, loyalty the degree to which they stand by each other, contribution in how far each contributes to performance and professional respect in how much they value each others job-related knowledge.

Schyns *et al.* (2010) argue that some of these dimensions need stronger or more intensive reinforcement and are therefore less likely to be prevalent in large groups. Based on considerations regarding leader distance, they proposed that the affect and contribution dimensions of LMX would on average be lower in large groups, whereas loyalty and professional respect can be maintained in larger group as well as smaller groups. Therefore, in expanding the study of LMX and span of control to the individual dimensions of LMX, we hypothesize:

- H1.* There will be a negative relationship between span of control and average LMX quality regarding affect and contribution within groups.

3. The role of leader personality

Given the positive organizational outcomes associated with high LMX and the potential problems attached to LMX in large groups indicated above, it is an interesting question to investigate whether or not some leaders more than others will find it easier to uphold many good LMX relationships. If this is the case, leaders could be specifically selected or trained to lead larger groups. In this section, we discuss how personality might affect the association between LMX and span of control.

The relationship between personality and social ties in general has been shown in several studies. For example, Wu *et al.* (2008) showed that in the workplace extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness are related to intimacy (defined as interpersonal comfort and emotional closeness). Totterdell *et al.* (2008) also found that extraversion in particular is related to the propensity to connect with others. It is therefore reasonable to assume an effect of leader personality on LMX quality and the number of high-quality relationships a leader can uphold in his/her group.

From past research on antecedents of LMX (see Liden *et al.*, 1997 for a review), it is clear that the behaviors associated with extraversion (e.g. socially engaging, assertiveness, and possessing a great number of friends), agreeableness (e.g. high motivation toward interpersonal relationships, caring, interested in others), and conscientiousness (e.g. dependable, more inclined to ensure the success of the work

group; Barrick and Mount, 1993; Costa and McCrae, 1985) are likely to be associated with the development of high-quality LMX relationships. In a specific test of this notion, Bernerth *et al.* (2007) examined associations between these personality characteristics (along with emotional stability and openness to experience; the Big Five) and LMX using a sample of workplace manager-subordinate dyads. Their model included both manager and subordinate personality characteristics as predictors of subordinate reports of LMX. Although they proposed a significant relationship between each Big Five-personality characteristic and LMX, they found that only managers' agreeableness and conscientiousness were (marginally) significant predictors.

While research into the effects of the Big Five and leadership, and particularly LMX, is just beginning, these authors provide compelling arguments for their proposed effects. Essentially, they suggest that leaders' personality, as conceptualized in these constructs, provides the basis for interaction between managers and subordinates that will yield efforts to initiate and/or reciprocate valued resources from subordinates. Such effort by managers has been shown to be a critical component of relationship development (Maslyn and Uhl-Bien, 2001).

Based on these propositions and studies, we expect that in cases of larger spans of control, the behavior associated with extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness will yield a greater number of attempts to build high-quality relationships and stimulate reciprocal behavior on the part of subordinates (Bernerth *et al.*, 2007). That means that leaders possessing these characteristics should ultimately be more successful in establishing larger numbers of positive LMX relationships. To conclude, with regard to span of control, we propose that managers with higher levels of extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness are more likely to show greater effort and have greater success in developing high-quality relationships in larger workgroups. That is, the relationship between span of control and LMX is moderated by leaders' personality[1]. This will result in a high average LMX quality reports among their subordinates.

Without sufficient past work on the interaction of manager personality and span of control, or even the expectation that personality and span of control would be related, we make these predictions without differentiating between the specific dimensions of LMX as our dependent variables. Instead, we explore the potential for differential effects and propose that the relationship between span of control and LMX is moderated by leaders' extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness, such that when leaders exhibit higher levels of these characteristics, followers will report a higher average LMX:

- H2a.* The relationship between span of control and LMX is moderated by leaders' extraversion so that the average relationship quality is higher for leaders high in extraversion.
- H2b.* The relationship between span of control and LMX is moderated by leaders' conscientiousness so that the average relationship quality is higher for leaders high in conscientiousness.
- H2c.* The relationship between span of control and LMX is moderated by leaders' agreeableness, so that the average relationship quality is higher for leaders high in agreeableness.

4. Method

4.1 Study considerations

While we propose that the relationship between span of control and LMX is influenced by leaders' personality, there are some limitations to this assumption. First, given the dyadic nature of LMX and the general need for some interaction, our assumptions are limited to the relationship between followers and their direct supervisors. Next, we also assume that, although leaders high in extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness will find it easier to uphold many good quality relationships, there will be a limit to the number of relationships that can be upheld (for a similar argument, see Schyns and Blank, 2010). Obviously, it is very difficult to specify a number, however, prior research can give some indication. Totterdell *et al.* (2008) reported social network sizes of their participants to be around ten people. For our study this implies that we want to investigate leaders and employees in groups of varying sizes, including sizes above and below the average found in Schyns and Blank's (2010) meta-analysis ($M = 11.60$) in order to ensure enough variance in span of control. The range of spans of control included in this study is two to 35.

4.2 Sample

For this study, we drew a convenience sample comprised of Dutch leaders and followers. All in all, 52 leaders (33 men, 19 women) took part in this study. The average age was 43 years ($SD = 9.52$).

Of the 389 followers 156 were men and 233 women. Their average age was 39 years ($SD = 11.71$). Of those, 249 could be matched with their supervisors into 46 teams, that is, both leader and follower data were available. In order to calculate group-level statistics, we limited the data to departments with a minimum of two respondents. This resulted in a sample of 244 individual employees who worked in 41 different groups.

4.3 Instruments

Span of control. Followers were asked how many followers report to their leader. The average reported span of control is 14.8 (Table III) with a standard deviation of 8.76. It is important to mention that the average number of respondents is 5.95 per group, implying a 36 percent response rate within participating groups.

LMX. Assessed by followers by filling in Liden and Maslyn's (1998) multi-dimensional instrument, the LMX-MDM. The instrument is comprised of four LMX dimensions, namely, loyalty, professional respect, contribution, and affect. Each dimension is assessed using three items. The reliabilities in this study were as follows: affect, $\alpha = 0.65$; contribution, $\alpha = 0.62$; loyalty, $\alpha = 0.82$; and professional respect, $\alpha = 0.85$. Confirmatory factor analyses using AMOS yielded an acceptable fit for four related factors ($CMIN/DF = 2.345$, $GFI = 0.953$; $CFI = 0.972$, $RMSEA = 0.06$) and for the second order factor ($CMIN/DF = 2.389$, $GFI = 0.951$; $CFI = 0.970$, $RMSEA = 0.061$).

Leader's personality. Assessed using three dimensions of the Big Six (de Vries *et al.*, 2008), extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness. The reliabilities of these established ten-item measures were extraversion ($\alpha = 0.79$), conscientiousness ($\alpha = 0.57$), and agreeableness ($\alpha = 0.65$). The reliability of the conscientiousness measure in particular did not exceed the benchmark typically cited (Nunnally, 1978), nor did it reach the levels typically found in past research by de Vries and his colleagues (e.g. de Vries *et al.*, 2008). We recognize that this will make the tests of our hypotheses more conservative (Nunnally, 1978).

4.4 Analyses

We first examined how far our data could be aggregated to the group level. We found that all intraclass correlations as a measure of within-group agreement (ICC 1) were substantial for all LMX dimensions except LMX contribution. Nonetheless, Bliese (2000) discusses a condition where “only one percent of the variance in a lower level response is shared among group members, and yet this shared variance can still allow one to detect strong aggregate relationships that are not evident in lower-level data” (pp. 372-3). This suggests the acceptability of further analyzing the contribution dimension. The ICC 2 values as a measurement of the reliability of the group mean (Bliese, 2000) are acceptable (> 0.50), implying that valid comparisons between group level scores are possible (see Table I) again with the exception of the contribution variable, which did not meet this criterion. After these preparations, we performed multi-level regression analyses using MLwiN 2.02 (Rasbash *et al.*, 2003).

Table II shows the means and standard deviations of all LMX dimensions as well as the correlations between the LMX dimensions. The correlations between the LMX dimensions are significant but not beyond findings from past research. Since we are interested in the differential effects on LMX dimensions and given the results of the CFA, we analyzed the LMX dimensions separately. As might be expected, extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness are not significantly related to span of control (Table III). Because of our relatively small sample size and the exploratory nature of our study, we decided to interpret significance levels of $p < 0.10$.

LMX dimension	ICC 1	ICC 2
LMX affect	0.15	0.55
LMX loyalty	0.19	0.63
LMX contribution	0.04	0.23
LMX respect	0.21	0.65

Table I.
ICC 1 and ICC 2 values for
LMX dimensions

Note: $N = 244$ followers in $N = 41$ groups

	Mean	SD	1	2	3
LMX affect	2.42	0.82			
LMX loyalty	2.64	0.82	0.54**		
LMX contribution	2.33	0.67	0.37**	0.33**	
LMX respect	2.58	0.84	0.67**	0.49**	0.35**

Table II.
Intercorrelations
(followers) – Level 1

Notes: $N = 244$; ** $p < 0.01$

	Mean	SD	1	2	3
Span of control	14.83	8.76			
Agreeableness	3.29	0.49	–0.24		
Extraversion	3.62	0.56	–0.00	–0.32*	
Conscientiousness	3.61	0.45	–0.06	0.05	0.11

Table III.
Intercorrelations (leaders)
– Level 2

Notes: $N = 41$; * $p < 0.05$

5. Results

Our first hypothesis is about the LMX-span relationship applied to the separate dimensions of LMX. As can be seen in Table IV, we found that the relationship between span of control and LMX is negative and significant for the loyalty dimension (see Model 1 in Table IV), indicating that the larger the group, the less loyalty followers report they experience in their leader. The effects on the other dimensions of LMX were not significant, suggesting a possible explanation for the inconsistent findings from past research using more general measures of LMX.

In our second hypothesis, we proposed that the relationship between span of control and LMX is moderated by leaders' personality. Specifically, we posited that the relationship between span of control and LMX is moderated by leaders' extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness, such that when leaders exhibit higher levels of these characteristics, followers will report a higher average LMX.

In order to test interaction effects, we conducted regression analyses, using the interactions of span \times extraversion, span \times conscientiousness, and span \times agreeableness in the prediction of each of the dimensions of LMX. There were six significant interaction effects: two for span of control and extraversion on LMX affect and loyalty, one for span of control and conscientiousness on LMX loyalty, and three for span of control and agreeableness on LMX affect, loyalty, and respect (see Table V). The results for extraversion and conscientiousness are in line with our hypothesis, in that, for leaders higher in extraversion and conscientiousness, the correlation between these dimensions of LMX and span of control is higher than for leader low in these personality characteristics. The interaction with agreeableness, on the other hand showed the opposite effect. High levels of agreeableness interacted with span of control in a negative direction, suggesting that the leader's reports of high agreeableness actually resulted in lower average LMX. None of the interactions predicted the contribution dimension of LMX, perhaps owing to the somewhat low reliability (Nunnally, 1978). As such, our second hypothesis is partially supported.

6. Discussion and limitations

To our knowledge, this study is one of the first to address the relationship between span of control and LMX, taking into account the different dimensions of LMX, and the first to examine the effects of leader personality on that relationship. Although we expected significant negative relationships between span of control and LMX affect and contribution, significance was found only for span and loyalty. This is in contrast to our expectation in so far as we assumed that span of control would be more relevant for the LMX dimension affect and contribution as these were proposed to require

Table IV.
t-values multi-level
analysis

	Span of control	Model 1		
		Agreeableness	Extraversion	Conscientiousness
LMX affect	-0.77	1.31***	0.76	-0.60
LMX loyalty	-2.00*	0.32	2.07*	-1.81*
LMX contribution	-0.67	-0.76	-1.16	-1.83*
LMX respect	0.10	1.46***	0.55	-0.15

Notes: df = 41-4-1 = 36; **p* < 0.05 (one-sided test); ***p* < 0.01 (one-sided test); ****p* < 0.10

	Model 2					
	Span of control	Agreeableness	Extraversion	Conscientiousness	Span × agreeableness	Span × extraversion
						Span × conscientiousness
LMX affect	-0.22	1.64***	0.57	-0.68	-1.46***	1.53***
LMX loyalty	-1.25	0.64	1.49***	-2.33*	-1.50***	1.86*
LMX contribution	-0.67	-0.40	-0.94	-1.68***	-0.42	0.20
LMX respect	0.10	1.46***	0.52	-0.15	-1.38***	0.69

Notes: Model 2 df = 41 - 7 - 1 = 33; * $p < 0.05$ (one-sided test); ** $p < 0.01$ (one-sided test); *** $p < 0.10$

Table V.
t-values multi-level
analysis

higher levels of manager effort, whereas we assumed that leader could more easily establish and maintain perceptions of loyalty even in larger groups (Schyns *et al.*, 2010). Our results indicate that in practice loyalty is not as easily or as frequently developed. This may be due to the relatively small number of groups in the study and therefore even smaller number of groups with a sufficiently large span of control. However, these results are in line with prior research that found low, often non-significant negative relationships between LMX and span of control (Schyns and Blank, 2010). Our results imply that the more followers a leader has, the less likely they are to perceive the leader as loyal to them.

It, therefore, seems that this dimension of LMX needs greater visibility by larger numbers of members of the workgroup in order to develop. Since the need for expressions of loyalty may not be frequent, leaders in larger groups might have to show more effort to make their expressions of loyalty visible, for example, by directly communicating instances of loyalty toward individual followers, or communicating to gatherings of subordinates critical incidents of such support that occurred outside the group. This way, workgroup members would be aware of this possibility for themselves.

Examining the interaction of leader personality and span of control, our results indicate that leaders high in extraversion find it easier to establish and maintain high LMX in large groups at least with respect to loyalty and affect. This is consistent with the idea proposed above that the loyalty effect may be a function of the extent to which leaders are communicative of their expressions of loyalty. Similarly, extraverted leaders are more likely to engage in actions that increase liking, while the contribution and respect dimensions of LMX are less consistent with the social aspects of extraversion.

Conscientiousness interacted with span of control for the loyalty dimension of LMX as well. Higher levels of leader conscientiousness resulted in higher average LMX loyalty for larger work groups. Again, since conscientiousness is characterized by proactivity and efforts to ensure the success of the work group, conscientious leaders are more likely to engage with followers and to exhibit increased communication.

Finally, agreeableness had negative effects on three of the four LMX dimensions: affect, loyalty, and respect. It was expected that leaders with a high motivation toward interpersonal relationships, caring, and interest in others would work to build higher quality relationships with more of their followers. In terms of the resulting levels of LMX, the opposite was found. In the case of agreeableness these results suggest that when leaders make efforts to build relationships with larger numbers of followers to maintain or create a sense of inclusion or fairness, the result is a large number of diluted, yet similar relationships. That this effect was found for three of the four dimensions is supportive of this notion and is also consistent with the propositions that there is a limit to the number of high-quality relationships one can build within the workgroup (Cogliser and Schriesheim, 2000; Dansereau *et al.*, 1975). In sum, while leader personality may change the tipping point, our data suggest that there may be a curvilinear relationship between LMX and span of control. Future research is needed to address this question.

Our results are an early indication of these effects. Larger numbers of groups (leaders as well as employees) than examined in this study are needed to further investigate the role of leaders' personality in the span of control/LMX relationship. Recommended areas for investigation would include social skills (e.g. Riggio *et al.*, 2003) and attachment styles (for a discussion on attachment styles in the context of leadership, see Keller and Cacioppe, 2001). While the Big Five/Big Six are broad

personality characteristics, social skills and attachment styles may be more relevant to interpersonal relationships captured in LMX.

As a limitation, the measurement of one of the LMX dimensions, contribution, was problematic. The measure for contribution has shown below benchmark reliabilities in some prior research (e.g. Maslyn and Uhl-Bien, 2001; Schyns and Paul, 2005), so our results are in line with prior studies. Therefore, in the examination of the individual dimensions of LMX our results do not render a complete picture. Further research on the dimensions is recommended.

7. Conclusion and implications

We can draw several conclusions and recommendations from our study. Generally, our results indicate that different dimensions of LMX might be affected differently by the number of employees a leader has. If future studies can confirm that loyalty is the dimension that is most negatively affected by larger spans of control, leaders will need to find ways in which to show loyalty without having to engage in individual loyal acts toward each of their followers, as this is not possible due to resource restrictions in larger groups. However, they might be able to “advertise” acts of loyalty, similar to the “importance of being seen to be ‘doing it for us’” (Haslam *et al.*, 2001).

Our results are also a first indicator that extraverted leaders may find it easier to establish and maintain good quality LMX relationships with many followers, not just individual followers as has been shown in past research (e.g. Bernerth *et al.*, 2007). Recognizing that our results are based on a relatively small sample and that this is the first study to examine this effect, the positive outcomes associated with good quality LMX relationships (e.g. Gerstner and Day, 1997) suggest that organizations may want to take this into account when selecting or training leaders for larger groups. That is, selecting extravert leaders may be advantageous when large groups are concerned. For extravert leaders, establishing and maintaining high-quality LMX relationships may come more “naturally” than for their more introvert colleagues.

At the same time, leaders of large groups who are low in extraversion may need some extra leadership development to successfully establish LMX relationships based on loyalty and affect. While affect may be difficult to achieve as it is an emotionally based connection between a leader and each follower, loyalty could be achieved by more open expressions of loyal acts (see preceding discussion). Introverted leaders may find this more difficult to do but could learn to do so in leader development sessions that, for example, use role play. One danger here is, of course, a lack of authenticity that could lead to even the reverse effect in followers, namely that they become cynical about their leader. Alternatively, introverted leaders could focus on a different LMX dimension, such as contribution, that may involve less direct interaction with followers.

There are also implications for those leaders high in agreeableness. Possibly, agreeableness drives managers to work at developing high-quality relationships with more followers that he or she can support, yielding the lower average quality within the work group. Since these leaders have lower average LMX across a number of dimensions, they are also likely to have less differentiation. Such an occurrence would help avoid the pitfalls of differentiation identified by Bolino and Turnley (2009), but it also reflects a loss of the value to leaders and followers from high-quality exchanges with key subordinates. As such, leaders of large groups that also are high in agreeableness should recognize the extra challenge they will have in building and maintaining high-quality relationships and consider either the extra attention and

effort that will be required to reap the benefit of high-quality exchanges or recognize and accept the realities of their limited resources.

In sum, our results underscore that a dimensional approach to LMX is useful when looking into antecedents of LMX generally and specifically at the impact of span of control. While our results need confirmation from future research, this study suggests that leaders should be aware of the likely effects of the size of their workgroups and their own personality on the development of high-quality LMX relationships.

Note

1. In our study, we used the HEXACO model (Ashton and Lee, 2001). While the dimension extraversion is basically the same as in the NEO model, agreeableness is defined somewhat differently. The facets of extraversion in the HEXACO model are expressiveness, social boldness, sociability, and liveliness (Lee and Ashton, 2004). The facets of the agreeableness dimension are forgiveness, gentleness, flexibility, and patience (Lee and Ashton, 2004).

References

- Ashton, M.C. and Lee, K. (2001), "A theoretical basis for the major dimensions of personality", *European Journal of Personality*, Vol. 15, pp. 327-53.
- Barrick, R.B. and Mount, M.K. (1993), "Autonomy as a moderator of the relationship between the Big Five personality dimensions and job performance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 78, pp. 111-8.
- Bernerth, J.B., Armenakis, A.A., Feild, H.S., Giles, W.F. and Walker, H.J. (2007), "Is personality associated with perceptions of LMX? An empirical study", *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, Vol. 28, pp. 613-31.
- Bliese, P. (2000), "Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability: implications for data aggregation and analysis", in Klein, K.J. and Kozlowski, S.W.J. (Eds), *Multilevel Theory, Research, and Methods in Organizations*, Jossey Bass, San Francisco, CA, pp. 349-81.
- Bolino, M.C. and Turnley, W.H. (2009), "Relative deprivation among employees in lower quality leader-member relationships", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 20, pp. 276-86.
- Cogliser, C.C. and Schriesheim, C.A. (2000), "Exploring work unit context and Leader-Member Exchange: a multi-level perspective", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 21, pp. 487-511.
- Cogliser, C.C., Schriesheim, C.A., Scandura, T.A. and Gardner, W.L. (2009), "Balancing leader and follower perceptions of Leader-Member Exchange: relationships with performance and work attitudes", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 20, pp. 452-65.
- Costa, P.T. and McCrae, R.R. (1985), *The NEO-Personality Inventory. Manual Form S and Form R*, Psychological Assessment Resources, Odessa, FL.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G. and Haga, W. (1975), "A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations – a longitudinal investigation of the role making process", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 13, pp. 46-78.
- de Vries, R.E., Lee, K. and Ashton, M.C. (2008), "The Dutch HEXACO personality inventory: psychometric properties, self-other agreement, and relations with psychopathy among low and high acquaintanceship dyads", *Journal of Personality Assessment*, Vol. 9, pp. 142-51.
- Dienesch, R.M. and Liden, R.C. (1986), "Leader-Member Exchange model of leadership: a critique and further development", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 11, pp. 618-34.
- Gerstner, C.R. and Day, D.V. (1997), "Meta-analytic review of Leader-Member Exchange theory: correlates and construct issues", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 82, pp. 827-44.

- Graen, G.B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (1995), "Development of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 6, pp. 219-47.
- Green, S.G., Anderson, S.E. and Shivers, S.L. (1996), "Demographic and organizational influences on Leader-Member Exchange and related work attitudes", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 66, pp. 203-14.
- Haslam, S.A., Platow, M.J., Turner, J.C., Reynolds, K.J., McGarty, C., Oakes, P.J., Johnson, S., Ryan, M.K. and Veenstra, K. (2001), "Social identity and the romance of leadership: the importance of being seen to be 'doing it for us'", *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, Vol. 4, pp. 191-205.
- Henderson, D.J., Liden, R.C., Glibkowski, B.C. and Chaudhry, A. (2009), "LMX differentiation: a multilevel review and examination of its antecedents and outcomes", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 20, pp. 517-34.
- Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J.D. and Morgeson, F.P. (2007), "Leader-Member Exchange and citizenship behaviors: a meta-analysis", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, pp. 269-77.
- Keller, T. and Cacioppe, R. (2001), "Leader-follower attachments: understanding parental images at work", *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, Vol. 22, pp. 70-5.
- Lee, K. and Ashton, M.C. (2004), "Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality inventory", *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, Vol. 39, pp. 329-58.
- Liden, R.C. and Maslyn, J.M. (1998), "Multidimensionality of Leader-Member Exchange: an empirical assessment through scale development", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 24, pp. 43-72.
- Liden, R.C., Sparrowe, R.T. and Wayne, S.J. (1997), "Leader-Member Exchange theory: the past and potential for the future", in Ferris, G.R. (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, Vol. 15 JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp. 47-119.
- Liden, R.C., Erdogan, B., Wayne, S.J. and Sparrowe, R.T. (2006), "Leader-Member Exchange, differentiation, and task interdependence: implications for individual and group performance", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 27, pp. 723-46.
- Martinko, M.J., Moss, S.E., Douglas, S.C. and Borkowski, N. (2007), "Anticipating the inevitable: when leader and member attribution styles clash", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 104, pp. 158-74.
- Maslyn, J.M. and Uhl-Bien, M. (2001), "Leader-Member Exchange and its dimensions: effects of self-effort and other's effort on relationship quality", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86, pp. 697-708.
- Nunnally, J. (1978), *Psychometric Theory*, 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Rasbash, J., Browne, W. and Goldstein, H. (2003), *MLwiN [Computer Software]*, Centre for Multilevel Modelling, Institute of Education, University of London, London.
- Riggio, R.E., Riggio, H.R., Salinas, C. and Cole, E.J. (2003), "The role of social and emotional communication skills in leader emergence and effectiveness", *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, Vol. 7, pp. 83-103.
- Schriesheim, C.A., Castro, S.L. and Yammarino, F.J. (2000), "Investigating contingencies: an examination of the impact of span of supervision and upward controllingness on Leader-Member Exchange using traditional and multivariate within- and between-entities analysis", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85, pp. 659-77.
- Schyns, B. (2012), "The role of distance in Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)", in Blighh, M.C. and Riggio, R.E. (Eds), *When Near is Far and Far is Near: Distance in Leader-Follower Relationships*, Wiley-Blackwell, San Francisco, CA.
- Schyns, B. and Blank, H. (2010), "The limits of interactional leadership: the relationship between Leader-Member Exchange and span of control", in Rigotti, T., Korek, S. and Otto, K. (Eds), *Gesund mit und ohne Arbeit*, Pabst Science Publishers, Lengerich, pp. 305-14.

- Schyns, B. and Day, D.V. (2010), "Critique and review of leader-member exchange theory: issues of agreement, consensus, and excellence", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 19, pp. 1-29.
- Schyns, B. and Paul, T. (2005), "Dyadic leadership and organizational outcomes – different results of different instruments?", in Graen, G.B. and Graen, J.A. (Eds), *Global Organizing Designs, LMX Leadership: The Series*, Vol. 3, Information Age Publishing, Greenwich, CT, pp. 173-203.
- Schyns, B., Maslyn, J.M. and Weibler, J. (2010), "Understanding the relationship between span of control and subordinate consensus in Leader-Member Exchange", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 19, pp. 388-406.
- Schyns, B., Paul, T., Mohr, G. and Blank, H. (2005), "Comparing antecedents and consequences of Leader-Member Exchange in a German working context to findings in the US", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 14, pp. 1-22.
- Totterdell, P., Holman, D. and Hukin, A. (2008), "Social networkers: measuring and examining individual differences in propensity to connect with others", *Social Networks*, Vol. 30, pp. 283-96.
- van Breukelen, W., Schyns, B. and LeBlanc, P. (2006), "Leader-member exchange theory and research: accomplishments and future challenges", *Leadership*, Vol. 2, pp. 295-316.
- Wu, P.-C., Foo, M.-D. and Turban, D.B. (2008), "The role of personality in relationship closeness, developer assistance, and career success", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 73, pp. 440-8.

Corresponding author

Birgit Schyns can be contacted at: birgit.schyns@durham.ac.uk

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.