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Abstract

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has been studied extensively in a variety of settings for the last thirty years. There has been no research, however, on OCB in the public library environment. OCB is grounded on the premise that helping others in the organization, even when such behavior is unrewarded, has a cumulative effect that is beneficial both for individual staff members and for the organization as a whole. This focus on “helpful” behaviors is especially relevant for a field such as public librarianship, given its foundation on altruistic ideals.

This dissertation begins to address the lack of research on organizational citizenship behaviors in public libraries by examining the relationship among OCB and two of its correlates: Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) and perceived supervisor support. Analysis of data reveals that OCB shows a statistically significant correlation with both LMX and perceived supervisor support, but that perceived supervisor support is a more powerful predictor of OCB in the workplace studied. One of the primary findings of this research is that institutions wishing to encourage OCB must focus not only on the citizenship behaviors of front-line staff, but also on the skills of the middle managers and other managerial leaders who directly oversee them. Immediate supervisors play a critical role in facilitating OCB by maintaining high quality
exchange relationships with, and demonstrating consistent support for, their supervisees. This finding has practical importance not only for how managerial leaders should be expected to perform, but also for their hiring, training, and development.

Organizational citizenship behavior has been shown to impact positively traditional work outcomes such as effectiveness and productivity, as well as attitudinal and behavioral outcomes such as organizational commitment and engagement. This research affirms the importance of OCB as an organizational construct and highlights its potential for the public library environment. Further, it provides practical methods for fostering and maintaining a workplace culture that values and encourages citizenship behaviors. This study will be of particular interest to library administrators, human resource managers, and those in managerial leadership positions as they seek to hire for, train, develop, and retain both managerial and front-line staff who demonstrate behaviors that improve interpersonal relationships and organizational effectiveness.
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Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is traditionally defined as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006, p. 3). These activities are “extra-role,” or not required by the formal job description, and prosocial in nature, directed more at creating effective relationships than effective task completion. Put simply, to exhibit OCB is to partake voluntarily in workplace activities that are above and beyond, even when there is no guarantee that such efforts will be rewarded. When many members of a work unit or organization perform OCB consistently over time, the result is not just improved interpersonal relationships, but better organizational performance (Podsakoff, Whiting, Blume, & Podsakoff, 2009).

First proposed nearly 30 years ago, the specific kinds of behaviors considered to be manifestations of OCB have changed little. Examples include taking the initiative to orient new colleagues, volunteering to attend events or functions that help to improve the image of the organization, tolerating temporary impositions without complaint, making timely and constructive statements to management or to outsiders, and protecting and conserving organizational resources (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006). These activities not only offer a means to manage organizational interdependencies and facilitate collective outcomes, they also improve productivity by reducing the need to focus
scarce resources on simple maintenance functions and “improve the ability of others (i.e., coworkers and managers) to perform their jobs by freeing up time for more efficient planning, scheduling [and] problem solving” (Netemeyer, Boles, McKee, & McMurrian, 1997, p. 86). In the most commonly used framework, citizenship behaviors are categorized into a five-dimensional taxonomy comprised of altruism (helping), compliance (conscienciousness), sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006). These behaviors are often distinguished in the literature by their intended target, which can be other individuals (OCBI) such as supervisors, co-workers, or customers, or the organization itself (OCBO) (Morrison, 1996; Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Two environmental factors that have the most influence on OCB are the quality of leader-follower relationships and the level of perceived leader support. Bateman and Organ (1983) initially suggested that “supervisory behavior—especially that generally described as ‘supportive’ or ‘considerate’” could lead to OCB (p. 593). Subsequent research confirms the critical importance of supportive leader behavior in fostering these extra-role behaviors (Bolino & Turnley, 2003; Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006). In addition, the organizational responsibility rests with the leader to provide the resources that encourage and enable employees to participate in OCB. Organ, Podsakoff, and Mackenzie (2006) propose that leaders:

. . . can select employees who have a greater ability to exhibit OCB because of their dispositional characteristics . . . or they can attempt to enhance employees’ ability to exhibit OCB through training or modeling forms of the behavior. This is important because even highly motivated employees may
not be able to exhibit some forms of OCB if they do not have the skills that
enable them to do so. (p. 94)

The leader can also directly influence the work environment in a way that facilitates OCB by
changing the structure of tasks, workflow, or other conditions, as well as the policies and
procedures that govern workplace behavior (Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006). Because
OCB requires employees to take action that is outside of strict role requirements, leaders must
also ensure that such departures are possible: “The extent to which an employee exhibits
organizational citizenship behavior, or any behavior, is a function of the employee’s ability,
motivation, and opportunity” (Organ, Mackenzie & Podsakoff, 2006, p. 93).

The overarching “helping” theme, as well as its relationship to innovative and extra-role
behaviors, makes OCB a natural fit with librarianship. The discipline of library and information
science (LIS) has a long historical and ideological relationship with altruism (Rubin, 2010). Since
the late 1800s, when librarianship emerged concurrently with other service professions such as
medicine, law, social work, teaching, and nursing, librarianship’s purpose has been to help
others and to improve the lot of the citizenry rather than to make money. Even after more than
a century, librarianship remains for the most part altruistic, and those who join its ranks
continue to embrace service as a core value (Rubin & Rubin, 2012).

Although a commitment to service continues, library practitioners and theorists agree
that libraries are experiencing other changes at an unprecedented rate. Just as front-line
library staff are expected to innovate and adapt to changes in technology, service expectations,
and staffing patterns, so too must managerial leaders\(^1\) be prepared to guide effectively their employees through an uncertain landscape. The role of library directors and middle managers encompasses not only organizational direction-setting and culture building, but also the selection, development, and retention of employees with the knowledge, skills, and abilities best suited to this rapidly-changing environment (Hernon, Powell, & Young, 2003). A critical element in fostering a flexible and innovative library culture is the conscientious development of the organizational citizenship behavior of employees (Peng, Hwang, & Wong, 2010).

**PROBLEM STATEMENT**

Organizational citizenship behavior has been linked to positive organizational outcomes including employee satisfaction, organizational effectiveness, service quality, and improved managerial productivity. Despite its positive influence on organizational health and the important implications of OCB vis-à-vis employer-employee relations, no study has explored OCB in a public library nor its relationship to perceived leader support in the context of leader-follower relationship quality. The purpose of this study is to address that void by examining the following overarching questions: Does the quality\(^2\) of the leader-follower relationship affect the extent to which library employees engage in OCB? What is the relationship among perceived leader supportiveness, leader-follower relationship quality, and OCB? Do demographic or external factors such as gender and leader-subordinate dyad duration affect OCB?

The results of this study will not only enhance the understanding of an organizational phenomenon that is currently absent from the literature of library and information science

---

1 Managerial leadership is the intersection of management and leadership and “refers to that activity in which managers help an organization establish and achieve its purpose and direction” (Hernon, 2010, p. 3).
2 See section “Leader-Member Exchange” in the literature review.
(LIS), it will provide further elucidation on a topic that remains enigmatic for organizational theorists and researchers. On a practical level, improving the understanding of OCB in the library environment will be beneficial to library managerial leaders, library staff, and public sector organizations as a whole. Indeed, Organ, Podsakoff, and Mackenzie (2006) reflect on the need to understand better OCB in alternative environments: “significant forms of OCB in nonprofit organizations might take a somewhat different form or emphasis—and therefore require variations in operationalization—from what we see in the private sector” (p. 30).

From selection and recruitment to job design, employee development, relationship building, and training for managers and leaders, OCB affects nearly every area of organizational life. A greater understanding of the antecedents and motivators of citizenship behaviors will allow library leaders to increase focus on OCB as an indicator of organizational fit as they seek to recruit, select, and retain employees with the skills and attributes to create both interpersonal and organizational success. In addition, it provides a new lens through which to view leadership ability, leader-employee relationships, and organizational outcomes.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Reciprocity and Social Exchange

Underlying the mechanisms of OCB are the norm of reciprocity and social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960). Gouldner (1960) postulated that “a norm of reciprocity, in its universal form, makes two interrelated, minimal demands: (1) people should help those who have helped them, and (2) people should not injure those who have helped them” (p. 171). Gouldner argued that the base egoistic motivation for reciprocity (i.e., reciprocating a good deed in anticipation that the favor will be returned) has evolved into a socially expected moral
norm (Deckop, Cirka, & Andersson, 2003; Gouldner, 1960). Although generally understood as a party-to-party direct exchange, the value of reciprocity transcends individual relationships and extends to the community as a whole: “one who fails to repay debts may benefit individually; however, such action is likely to cause conflict and a break-down of reciprocity, and thus threaten the stability of the social group. The norm of reciprocity inhibits such exploitation, and serves to maintain the social system” (Deckop, Cirka, & Andersson, 2003, p. 103). Thus, the benefits of successful reciprocal social relationships may extend far beyond the individuals involved in an exchange transaction.

These social exchange mechanisms also apply in the workplace setting. While a reciprocal relationship may exist directly between two parties, it is not limited to this arrangement. For example, an employee who receives a favor from a colleague may not return the favor directly. Instead, that person may “pay it forward” to another recipient and thus increase the number of exchange relationships in the system. The resulting expansion of reciprocal relationships will ultimately allow benefits to return to the original initiator, even if not from the initial recipient (Deckop, Cirka, & Andersson, 2003). Even organizations themselves can be seen as partners in exchange as employees seek to maintain these social systems.

In both social and organizational life, there are two types of exchange relationships: economic and social (Blau, 1964). In an economic exchange, the terms are fixed and time-bound (i.e., employees do their jobs, for which they receive a regular paycheck). In social exchange relationships, neither the terms nor the duration of the exchange are specified in advance:
One person does another a favor, and while there is a general expectation of some future return, its exact nature is definitely not stipulated in advance . . .

Since there is no way to assure an appropriate return for a favor, social exchange requires trusting others to discharge their obligations. (Blau, p. 93, p. 94)

Thus, the social exchange relationship is informal, unspecified, and predicated on the trust that the other party will experience a felt obligation to reciprocate.

On the surface, an organization’s exchange relationship with employees may appear purely economic. However, social exchange relationships in the workplace are pervasive. For example, receiving support (i.e, access to resources or information) from either the organization in general or from specific individuals creates in employees a desire to reciprocate (Wayne, Shore, Bommer, & Tetrick, 2002). In order to establish an ongoing exchange relationship, however, a high degree of trust must also exist among the participants. Wat and Shaffer (2005) note that “any uncertainty over the reciprocation of the unspecified role contributions would compel the violated party to be less bound to the relationship and less likely to perform OCBs” (p. 410). This is illustrative of the fact that one of the ways in which employees reciprocate support, especially from a leader, is by performing organizational citizenship behaviors (Deckop, Circka, & Andersson, 2003; Netemeyer et al., 1997). OCB can be used as a form of social capital in exchange relationships in the workplace, even by employees who may have few resources to offer to colleagues or supervisors.
Leader-Member Exchange

The centrality of the exchange relationship in OCB makes it a logical fit with Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory, which is unique among leadership theories in its focus on the dyadic relationship between a leader and an individual follower (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007). Leader-Member Exchange relationships are described based on their quality; employees are either part of an in-group, based on high quality exchanges and “expanded and negotiated role responsibilities;” or an out-group, with low quality exchanges “based on the formal employment contract” (Northouse, 2013, p. 163). LMX has traditionally been a predominantly descriptive theory, explaining why certain exchange dynamics exist in the workplace, although more recently theorists have focused on a more prescriptive approach (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Leader-Member Exchange theory was first proposed as an alternative to traditional leadership theories which focused heavily on the characteristics of the leader and considered followers collectively as a group instead of as individuals (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Vertical Dyad Linkage theory (VDL), as LMX was originally conceptualized, shifted the focus to the one-to-one relationship between an individual leader and an individual follower (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975). This allowed for the possibility that leaders might employ different leadership styles based on their relationships with individual subordinates. This was also the first theory to postulate that followers did not just follow; instead, they were active participants in an interdependent social exchange process. VDL also emphasized the concept of role-making, in which superiors permitted subordinates to “negotiate job-related matters” and to exert a degree of control over their role in the workplace (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975).
Over time, VDL evolved into the more egalitarian LMX, and the role-making model evolved into a leadership-making model (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). This change allowed theorists to move away from describing in-group and out-group dynamics and move toward a prescriptive approach that encourages leaders to develop actively high quality in-group relationships with all employees. Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) describe this as a process whereby: “emphasis is placed not on how managers discriminate among their people but rather on how they may work with each person on a one-on-one basis to develop a partnership with each of them” (p. 229). Thus, the theoretical growth from VDL to LMX shifted the sole authority for the relationship from the leader (who permits negotiation) to a mutually beneficial partnership model. This process of negotiation, much like OCB, has its theoretical roots in Gouldner’s (1960) theory of reciprocity and Blau’s (1964) social exchange theory (Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007).

The leader-member exchange cycle develops over time as the leader and follower progress through three stages: stranger, acquaintance, and mature partnership. In a successful leadership-making model, the final stage is defined by roles that are negotiated (informal) and reciprocal, and in which both the leader and follower have moved beyond self-interest to working for the good of the group (Northouse, 2013). These high quality LMX relationships are characterized by an advanced form of social exchange which is manifested in mutual trust, respect, reciprocity, obligation, and role negotiation for the subordinate (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Northouse, 2013; Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005). Conversely, low quality LMX is characterized by a hierarchical, rule-bound, contractual relationship (Northouse, 2013).
Thus, the formation of a healthy social exchange relationship is essential to the establishment and maintenance of high quality LMX.

Just as both the terms and duration of social exchange relationships are unspecified, the leader-member exchange process is inferred, not explicit. Exchanges are built on often spontaneous leader-follower interactions that amount to negotiations: “subordinates do certain activities that go beyond their formal job descriptions, and the leader, in turn, does more for these subordinates” (Northouse, 2013, p. 149). The type and timing of the reciprocation are unclear, and the rewards from a supervisor may be informal (praise or mentoring) or formal (promotions or salary increases) (Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997). Employees who maintain high quality exchange relationships with their supervisors reap a number of benefits including higher employee performance ratings, better objective performance, greater overall satisfaction, greater satisfaction with supervisor, increased organizational commitment, and more positive role perceptions (Fisk & Friesen, 2012; Gerstner & Day, 1997).

The importance of the supervisor-supervisee relationship cannot be over-emphasized. Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1995) note that “research on LMX suggests that the exchange between an employee and his or her direct superior is the primary determinant of employee behavior” [emphasis added] (p. 103). This places a tremendous amount of responsibility on the supervisor to manage social exchange actively and conscientiously in the workplace and to purposefully ameliorate low quality LMX.

While high quality LMX relationships result in improved employee performance, low quality relationships may negatively impact employee performance. Among the more ominous
possibilities of LMX is the self-fulfilling prophecy; if a leader has low expectations of a subordinate, the leader may only provide routine tasks, little feedback, and limited development opportunities, essentially encouraging the employee to demonstrate the expected poor performance (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997). Indicatively, the association between LMX and performance is stronger when measured from the leader’s point of view, suggesting that leaders may see what they expect to see in the performances of their subordinates (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Employees with access to a high quality exchange relationship, by contrast, will likely gain valuable skills and experiences and develop a positive affiliation with the leader that will lead to reciprocal behavior and nurture the LMX cycle (Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997).

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Discretionary work behaviors have been of interest to organizational theorists since the early twentieth century (Barnard, 1938; Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006). Barnard (1938) suggested that employees’ “willingness to contribute” is a fundamental component of organizational functioning that implies a commitment that goes beyond compliance with a formal contract (p. 84). Katz and Kahn (1966) later proposed that, in addition to hiring and retaining employees who are high-performing in their in-role requirements, effective organizations must inspire “innovative and spontaneous behavior: performance beyond role requirements for accomplishments of organizational function” (p. 337). Bateman and Organ (1983) helped to articulate a new vocabulary to describe this previously un-named and unstudied phenomenon by developing a new conceptual model of organizational behavior (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002).
Bateman and Organ’s (1983) proposed model emerged as a counterpoint to the commonly held belief that job satisfaction and job performance are empirically unrelated (Organ, 1988). They submitted that:

- Defined narrowly as quantity of output or quality of craftsmanship . . .
- Performance does not consistently or appreciably follow from satisfaction in a direct functional relationship. But there are other conceptions of performance that often may be more salient to the practitioner. (Bateman & Organ, 1983, pp. 587-588)

This broader understanding of performance highlighted the supra, or extra, role behaviors that “cannot be prescribed or required in advance for a given job. These behaviors include any of those gestures . . . that lubricate the social machinery of the organization but that do not directly inhere in the usual notion of task performance” (p. 588). Bateman and Organ called these kinds of discretionary activities “citizenship” behaviors.

In the original operationalization of OCB, Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) posited that there were two classes of organizational citizenship: (1) altruism, or helping, behaviors aimed at individuals and arising out of situational demands (e.g., a colleague in immediate need of assistance); and (2) generalized compliance, defined by an “impersonal sort of conscientiousness” that motivates employees to perform discretionary tasks for the benefit of the system rather than for individuals (p. 657). In other words, an employee who engages in these behaviors does what a “‘good employee ought to do’” (p. 662). Organ (1988) later expanded the construct from two to five dimensions:
1. **Altruism or helping**: spontaneously assisting others (e.g., helping to orient a new employee);

2. **Conscientiousness or compliance**: adherence to the spirit as well as the letter of the law (e.g., is punctual and does not take undeserved breaks);

3. **Sportsmanship**: tolerating trivial inconveniences without complaint (e.g., does not take up managers’ time with small inconveniences);

4. **Courtesy**: consulting with others before taking action (e.g., advises a manager or colleague in advance of a decision that may affect them); and

5. **Civic virtue**: keeping up with matters that affect the organization (e.g., makes suggestions to improve the quality of the organization)\(^3\) (Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006).

Although some researchers evaluate OCB on alternate scales, the five-item taxonomy above is the most robust and frequently used iteration of OCB dimensions (Kark & Waismel-Manor, 2005; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002).

One of the difficulties facing scholars of OCB is a lack of conceptual clarity (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). The construct has been criticized on the grounds that the distinction between in-role and extra-role behaviors can be difficult for managers or practitioners to distinguish (Williams & Anderson, 1991) and a number of studies have indicated that employees often are rewarded for OCB by supervisors, especially in performance evaluations and through promotions (Cochrane, Dumler, & Schnake, 1995; Mackenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1993; Mackenzie, Podsakoff, & Paine, 1999). Korsgaard, Meglino, Lester, and Jeong (2010) note

\(^3\) In 1990, Organ added two additional constructs, peacekeeping and cheerleading. These items, however, are difficult for managers to distinguish from altruism/helping (Podsakoff et al., 2009).
that even Organ (1997) modified his definition of OCB “such that it does not ‘require as a construct definition that OBC be “beyond the job” or “not lead to system rewards’” (Korsgaard et al., 2010, p. 277). Organ’s (1997) revised definition of OCB describes its functioning as “performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place” (p. 95).

Even in early writing on the subject, Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) acknowledged and accounted for the possibility that formal rewards might result. They argued, however, that it is highly unlikely that the possibility of reward would influence whether or not an employee engaged in OCB:

. . . given the infrequency and unsystematic nature of most appraisal systems, coupled with the fact that many supervisors have limited control over formal rewards, it seems unlikely that most of the variance in ‘good citizen’ behavior is explained by the calculated anticipation that they will pay off in largesse for that person. (p. 654)

Podsakoff et al. (2009) note that no matter which of Organ’s definitions is used, a positive correlation between discretionary OCB and organizational effectiveness can be expected.4

Some researchers have suggested additional components of OCB,5 while others have utilized only subsets of Organ’s five-dimensional model in their research (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesh, 1994). The variety of scales in use has led to

---

4 See Bolino, Turnley, and Niehoff (2004) for research on the possible negative aspects of OCB as related to individual and/or organizational effectiveness.

5 Moorman and Blakely (1995), for example, developed a four-dimensional conceptualization of OCB comprised of interpersonal helping, individual initiative, personal industry, and loyal boosterism based on the work of Graham (1989). Although a number of studies have used this scale for a variety of reasons, a majority of studies use of the five-dimensional tool as constructed by Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990), based on the work of Organ (1988).
some discrepancy in how OCB is operationalized and studied (Babcock-Roberson & Strickland, 2010; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). In their meta-analysis, LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) conclude that competing taxonomies largely overlap with Bateman and Organ’s (1983) original framework, but that substantive differences in measurement scales make comparison across the body of OCB literature difficult. Indeed, the authors remark that “in the pool of 133 studies, we count more than 40 different measures of behavior that scholars have referred to as OCB or something very similar. . .” (p. 62).

In addition, related organizational theories such as contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993); prosocial organizational behavior and organizational spontaneity (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; George & Brief, 1992); and extra-role behaviors (Van Dyne, Cummins, & McLean-Parks, 1995) overlap conceptually with OCB (Organ, 1990; Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006). Organ, Podsakoff, and Mackenzie (2006) argue that none of these companion concepts include all of the generally required components of OCB, and that OCB remains both practically and theoretically distinct. They concede, however, that even after nearly 30 years and more than 650 published research studies on the subject “the way we should define OCB is not crystal clear” (pp. 36-37; Podsakoff et al., 2009). Despite this lack of conceptual clarity, the behaviors identified as falling under the umbrella of OCB remain important influences on individual and organizational success (Podsakoff et al., 2009).

While the greatest impact of OCB is on an organization’s social mechanisms, its positive effect on organizational and individual performance is also well documented (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Podsakoff et al., 2009). A number of studies have shown that positive effects on traditional performance measures such as productivity, customer satisfaction, reduced
turnover, and reduced costs correlate with OCB (Podsakoff et al., 2009). In a study of general managers from a national restaurant chain, for example, Walz and Niehoff (2000) find that altruism, sportsmanship, and civic virtue had a moderate negative correlation with customer complaints ($r = -0.40$ to $r = -0.53$) and that helping and sportsmanship were negatively correlated with costs ($r = -0.58$ and $r = -0.57$). A meta-analysis by Podsakoff et al. (2009) found that overall OCB correlates with efficiency ($r = 0.40$), costs ($r = -0.52$), and unit level performance ($r = 0.47$). These findings are consistent with Borman, White, and Dorsey (1995) as cited in Gerstner and Day (1997): “the inclusion of interpersonal factors can increase the variance explained in performance ratings by as much as two times that explained by ability, job knowledge, and technical factors alone” (p. 834). OCB has also been linked to individual, as well as organizational, effects such as managerial ratings of employee performance and reward allocation, and demonstrates a negative correlation to counterproductive work behaviors such as absenteeism and theft (Bowling, 2010; Podsakoff et al., 2009).

**OCB: Antecedents and Motivation**

Bateman and Organ (1983) laid the groundwork for identifying possible antecedents of OCB. They posited that mood, satisfaction, personality, attributes, and leader supportiveness were potential precursors of citizenship activities. These factors were later examined and indeed found to be correlated with “good soldier” behaviors (Ilies, Nahrang, & Morgeson, 2007; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Organ, 1988; Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Since then, a number of studies have investigated the preconditions that lead to OCB, introducing numerous antecedents into the literature. In their meta-analysis, LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) note that in the pool of 133 empirical articles
included in their research, over 200 correlates were presented. The five most frequently appearing antecedents (statistically significant at \( p < .01 \)) were: leader support \((r = .32)\), satisfaction \((r = .24)\), fairness \((r = .23)\), conscientiousness \((r = .23)\), and organizational commitment \((r = .20)\).

Additional research suggests that organizational commitment, justice, fairness, and the “big five” personality traits (emotional stability, extraversion, openness, conscientiousness, and agreeableness) are also predictors of OCB (Chiaburu, Oh, Berry, Li, & Gardner, 2011; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). Indeed, Rioux and Penner (2001) note that past research “provides substantial evidence that individual difference in personality traits and affect account for significant amounts of variance in OCB” (p. 1306). They also conclude that personality traits and measures of affect, such as service orientation, positive affect, and extroversion, play a role on par with attitudinal and environmental influences. Proactive personality,\(^6\) in particular, is associated with high quality leader-follower relationships, greater job satisfaction, and higher levels of OCB (Li, Liang, & Crant, 2010). Thus, both intrinsic and extrinsic factors may influence an employee’s ability and willingness to engage in OCB.

Based on the work of Katz and Kahn (1966) and other social and organizational psychologists, Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) posit that mood state (positive affect), environmental factors (e.g., leader supportiveness and task interdependence) and individual attributes (e.g., neuroticism and extroversion) have the greatest impact on citizenship behaviors. In addition, different aspects of OCB (e.g., altruism as opposed to sportsmanship) may themselves be influenced by different factors (Chen & Chiu, 2008; Organ & Ryan, 1995;)

\(^6\) Proactive personality describes those individuals who take the initiative to influence their environment (Li, Liang, & Crant, 2010).
Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983). For example, Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) found that altruism was most strongly influenced by positive affect, as defined by job satisfaction. Environmental factors such as leader supportiveness, however, most directly influenced generalized compliance. They also found that the best direct predictor of generalized compliance was the participant’s score on a personality inventory, providing additional support for the hypothesis that personality type plays an important role in employee OCB (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Rioux & Penner, 2001).

Morrison (1996) and others argue that it is the responsibility of managerial leaders to hire staff with a strong service orientation, to create a positive service climate, and to socialize new employees effectively (Kelley & Hoffman, 1997; Morrison, 1996). Morrison (1996) notes that organizations must establish “social exchange, identification with organizational objectives, and empowerment” early on in the employee’s initiation in order to foster a climate that encourages OCB in addition to other social and service-oriented behaviors (p. 499). Even expectations established in the first days of working together can affect subordinate perceptions of exchange quality six months later (Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993). In their cross-departmental study, Cochran, Dumler, and Schnake (1995) found that the highest levels of OCB existed in the department rated highest in culture as defined by shared norms. Their findings suggest that a leader’s ability to create a strong culture with shared values and expectations of reciprocity will lead to more instances of OCB.

The question of what motivates employees to engage in citizenship behavior has also produced a distinct line of research. Rioux and Penner (2001) propose that there are two ways to think about the motivation to display OCB: (1) as a reaction (reciprocation) to antecedents
such as satisfaction and leader support, or (2) as a proactive display of intrinsic motivation. While much of the literature on OCB relies on the norm of reciprocity to explain why employees engage in social exchange in the workplace, Rioux and Penner (2001) posit that OCB can be driven instead by three personal motives: organizational concern, prosocial values, or impression management. These motives are either altruistic (i.e., organizational concern and prosocial values) or egoistic (i.e., impression management) (Connell, 2006; Yuan, 2007). The implication is that employees may conscientiously manipulate their display of OCB to satisfy an intrinsic need, at times even for their own benefit.

A review of the literature suggests that the question of what motivates OCB, internally or externally, consciously or unconsciously, has myriad possible answers. One antecedent on which almost all studies seem to agree, however, is that a subordinate’s relationship with his or her supervisor qua leader is one of the most powerful predictors of citizenship behaviors. Fortunately, the link between LMX and OCB has been explored in a number of studies.

**LMX and OCB**

Leader-Member Exchange and OCB share a theoretical foundation in reciprocity and a practical foundation in the power of the leader-follower relationship. Ilies, Nahrgang, and Morgeson (2007) conducted a meta-analysis in which they found a moderate ($r=.37$) positive correlation between LMX and OCB. They note that the predictive efficacy of LMX applies to OCB as much as to task performance: “the fact that LMX predicts citizenship behaviors as strongly as it predicts task performance suggests that the benefits associated with high-quality

---

7 Organizational concern indicates care for the organization; prosocial values suggest concern for others; impression management refers to concern for one’s image.
leader-member exchanges exceed what has been suggested by the validity of LMX in predicting task performance alone” (Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007, p. 273). Thus, the effect of high quality LMX relationships becomes even more important when their impact on OCB is considered.

While LMX is the most commonly studied leadership theory in connection with OCB, research has also connected OCB to ethical leadership, servant leadership, and, more frequently, transformational leadership. Li and Hung (2009) propose a relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and high-quality leader-member exchange. They note that:

Members in a transformational leadership context interact more frequently with their leaders and have their leaders’ support, confidence, encouragement, and consideration, and hence are more satisfied with their leader, identify with the leader, trust in the leader, and by extension, are more willing to form and maintain a high quality relationship with the leader.

LMX, they conclude, is the mechanism by which transformational leadership behaviors impact employee behavior.

It is unsurprising, then, that Wang et al. (2005) found that Leader-Member Exchange fully mediated the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and OCB. They contend that transformational leadership behaviors are essential for a leader to achieve high quality LMX relationships. Their findings suggest that transformational leadership behaviors function as a social currency that fosters high-quality LMX, and consequently OCB, by
enhancing follower receptivity to role-expanding offers and extra-role behaviors. They also articulate a gap in the LMX literature such that it: “focuses strongly on the outcomes of high-quality leader-member exchange, giving less attention to how leaders can build high-quality exchange relationships with their followers,” [emphasis added] a void they suggest can be filled with the integration of transformational leadership behavior into the LMX/OCB relationship (p. 430). Bhal, Ansari, and Aafaqi (2007) suggest that, in addition to transformational leadership behaviors, demographic variables such as length of LMX dyad tenure and gender similarity (i.e., whether or not the leader and member are of the same gender) may also correlate with LMX quality.

While leaders typically have easy access to resources and information to use for exchange, this is often not the case for subordinates. OCB is among the few organizational activities that employees can exhibit or withhold at their discretion, making it an ideal currency of exchange with which employees can “repay” their leaders should they chose to do so (Ilies, Nahrgan, & Morgeson, 2007, p. 269; Settoon, Bennet, & Liden, 1996). Anand, Vidyarthi, Liden, and Rousseau (2010) argue that this is because OCB, unlike task performance, is not dependent on skill level or job description. These kinds of activities are available to all employees, withholding them is not likely to be penalized, and their voluntary nature allows them to be demonstrated spontaneously in response to benefits received from others. Indeed, vanYperen, van den Berg, and Willering (1999) suggest that OCB also contributes to employees’ sense of agency by granting them a tool to help control the balance of power in the employee-supervisor relationship. That is, an employee has the ability to decide whether and to what degree to reciprocate. This is not the case with required in-role performance.
electively performed by employees in the workplace, their presence demonstrates a sense of obligation to the leader, to colleagues, and to the organization (Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007). Lapierre and Hacket (2007) conclude that:

Subordinates who display OCB are likely to convey to their supervisors a commitment to contribute beyond formally prescribed role requirements . . . In doing so, they are likely to make a favourable impression, thereby cultivating high-quality LMX. In this sense, OCB is a social currency that helps to nourish the social exchange relationship with the supervisor. (p. 542)

In return for OCB, leaders reciprocate with rewards such as special privileges, career development opportunities, additional support, and increased job autonomy. These extra resources may result in employees’ increased ability to perform at a higher level, in addition to strengthening organizational commitment (Basu & Green, 1997; Wang et al., 2005; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997).

Basu and Green (1997) note that the benefits of high quality exchange relationships lead to not only improved social functioning, but also additional creativity. Their findings suggest that employees who are supported by their supervisors and committed to the organization are also more likely to be innovative. Although they do not refer to OCB specifically, the latitude that high LMX relationships provide to employees is imperative for the demonstration of extra-role thought and behaviors: “leaders can create an environment that encourages free thinking, exchange of information . . . the latitude to explore and examine new ways of handling old problems . . . and have the opportunity to engage in unconventional thought and behavior” (p. 480). The high autonomy, high support environment described is precisely the kind of
environment in which both organizational citizenship behaviors and innovative thought processes thrive. In fact, a workplace that is high in leader support is one of the primary predictors of OCB.

**OCB and Perceived Supervisor Support**

Despite the myriad correlates presented as antecedents of OCB, Smith, Organ, and Near’s (1983) original suggestion that leader supportiveness is paramount has withstood empirical examination (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) assert that leaders can make the greatest impact on OCB because: (1) they serve as role models for discretionary, prosocial behaviors; and (2) leader supportiveness creates an exchange relationship that is non-contractual in nature. LePine, Erez and Johnson (2002) conclude in their meta-analysis that, of all correlates presented in the literature, leader support is the best predictor of OCB.

It is important to note that there is a clear distinction in the OCB literature between proximal and distant leaders. Burton, Sablynski, and Sekiguchi (2008) found that the direct supervisor has the greatest influence on extra-role behaviors: “when an individual perceives a good quality relationship with his/her supervisor and sees the formal procedures of the organization as fair, he/she goes above and beyond his/her ‘normal’ duties” (p. 57). Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vondenberghe, Sucharski and Rhoades (2002) similarly assert that because they are more frequently in contact with employees, direct supervisors more easily convey intangible, value-based skills. This view is substantiated by Choi (2009), who also attributes to supportive leaders the role of prescribing norms and values, which may influence behavior and create a culture that fosters helping. Gerstner and Day (1997) go so far as to
conclude: “on the basis of our review of the literature, we view the relationship with one’s supervisor as a lens through which the entire work experience is viewed” (p. 840). In sum, the literature overwhelmingly confirms the critical importance of the supervisor in developing a wide variety of workplace behaviors and attitudes among front-line staff.

One of the most important and influential aspects of this supervisor-employee relationship is the level of support the employee perceives from the supervisor. The construct of Perceived Supervisor Support (PSS) describes the degree of supervisor commitment felt by the subordinate (Shore & Tetrick, 1991). Chen, Wang, Chang, and Hu (2008) define PSS as “the positive feedback and benefits that subordinates receive from their supervisors for their contributions” (p. 322). In practical terms, this may include the assignment of challenging tasks, fair distribution of rewards, constructive feedback, consultation, delegation, recognition, development, empowerment, leading by example, and demonstrating empathy, among other behaviors (Basu & Green, 1997; Chen et al., 2008, p. 322; Hackett & LaPierre, 2004; Ladebo, 2008; O’Donnell, Yukl, & Taber, 2012; Sparrowe, Soetjipto, & Kraimer, 2006). Maertz, Griffith, Campbell, and Allen (2007) suggest that a supervisor who demonstrates high levels of support provides access to these benefits on a regular basis, yielding both increased trust and positive feelings toward the supervisor.

The nature of the reciprocal exchange relationship created by leader support is critical to the ongoing sustainability of OCB. In a high-quality leader-member exchange relationship, the employee feels obligated to not only perform the job adequately, but also engage in behaviors that directly benefit the leader and that are beyond the scope of usual job
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8 The terms supervisor and leader are used interchangeably in the OCB literature to address perceived support, and that convention is continued here.
expectations (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Wayne, Shore, Bommer, & Tetrick, 2002). Likewise, the leader feels obligated to reciprocate such actions by providing the employee with rewards and privileges (Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1995). A prequalification of these strong social exchange relationships is the perception that they are fair and justly\(^9\) distributed (Burton, Sablynski, & Sekiguchi, 2008; Mierhan, Rietmann, & Jonas, 2008; Netemeyer et al., 1997; Wat & Shaffer, 2005). Bolino and Turnley (2003) summarize:

> Research has shown that employees are more willing to go beyond the call of duty when they believe that: (1) important outcomes (e.g., promotions or pay raises) are fairly distributed by the organization; (2) the procedures used to make critical organizational decisions are just; and (3) their direct supervisors are truthful, consider employees’ point of view, and show concern for the rights of employees. (p. 63)

This itemization draws attention to the central issues of fairness, justice, trust, and the importance of the direct supervisor in the facilitation of citizenship behaviors. Consistent with the observations of Bolino and Turnley (2003), Mierhans, Rietmann, and Jonas (2008) conclude that fairness and PSS are so highly correlated as to be almost inseparable.

Wayne, Shore, Bommer, and Tetrick (2002) similarly found that employees are more likely to form positive relationships with supervisors who administer rewards on the basis of performance and provide opportunities to be involved in decision making. Increased participation in decision making augments an employee’s PSS and consequently the likelihood

---

\(^9\) Both distributive and procedural justice are described in the OCB literature. Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of an organizational outcome (i.e., pay increases), while procedural justice refers to the process by which that outcome was determined (Burton, Sablynski, & Sekiguchi, 2008).
that the employee will reciprocate the perceived support via OCB (Deckop, Cirka, & Andersson, 2003, vanYperen, van den Berg, & Willering, 1999). Berman, Costigan, and Itler (1998) found that the only demographic variable correlated with trust of supervisor is length of time in position. The importance of the length of the supervisor/supervisee relationship (dyad duration) is also reflected in research on LMX, suggesting that both increased trust and negotiated role responsibilities may increase over time (Bhal, Ansari, & Aafaqi, 2007). Wat and Shaffer (2005) found that trust in supervisor is significantly related to all dimensions of OCB and that high quality LMX relates to both greater trust in supervisor and to conscientiousness.

**OCB, LMX and PSS**

High quality LMX has a positive impact not only on the level of trust in a leader, but also on perceived supervisor support (Chen et al., 2008). Supervisor support can be operationalized in an LMX context by:

(a) spending time talking about each person’s problem, concerns, and expectations, (b) using “active” listening skills ... (c) refraining from imposing the leader’s or management’s frame of reference ... and (d) sharing some of the leader’s expectations about his or her own job, the member’s job, and their working relationship. (Gerstner & Day, 1995, pp. 838-839)

In a reversal of the traditional OCB/LMX relationship, the findings of Lapierre and Hackett (2007) suggest that conscientious displays of OCBs by employees may allow them to influence the quality of the relationship with their leaders, switching the direction of influence from LMX \( \rightarrow \) OCB to OCB \( \rightarrow \) LMX (p. 540). These results are consistent with the theoretical arguments of Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) that “followers can play a role in determining the quality of the
relationship with their leader” (Lapierre & Hackett, 2007, p. 548). This also highlights the reciprocal potential of exchange relationships in the organizational context.

Supervisor support not only positively influences OCB, but also impacts other behavioral and attitudinal outcomes such as employee turnover, perceived organizational support, and other extra-role behaviors (Chen, Eisenberger, Johnson, Sucharski, & Aselage, 2009; Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenbergh, Sucharski, & Rhodes, 2002; Maertz, Griffith, Campbell, & Allen, 2007). Settoon, Bennett, and Liden (1996) found that, while in-role behaviors are also affected by the nature of the relationship with the supervisor, extra-role behaviors are particularly sensitive to supervisory affect: “the more that relationships or exchanges between supervisors and subordinates are based on mutual trust and loyalty, interpersonal affect, and respect for each other, the better the subordinate’s performance in terms of expected and ‘extra’ or citizenship behaviors” (p. 224). The quality of supervisor support, therefore, is as or more critical than leader proximity to the facilitation of OCB.

Basu and Green (1997) also note the importance of supervisor support in creating an environment that encourages innovative behaviors, a subject of particular relevance for modern libraries. They point out that “by providing emotional support, leaders encourage and motivate followers to assert their ideas, take risks, and be innovative” (p. 481). Indeed, their findings suggest that followers who have support from their leaders and are committed to the organization are more likely to display innovative behaviors than those who do not feel supported. Unsurprisingly, the importance of supervisor support may become even more valuable during times of duress. Chen and Chiu (2008) describe highly supportive supervisors as those who:
back up subordinates, give credit to subordinates for difficult decisions and trade-offs that the subordinates make, avoid becoming overly critical . . . reframe stressful events as developmental opportunities, and will inspire subordinates to perceive difficult situations as meaningful challenges necessary for developing one’s personal and professional skills. (p. 3)

Supervisors may also provide support by fostering resilience and optimism in difficult times and by mitigating employment stressors such as work overload, role ambiguity, and role conflict (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). PSS, then, extends beyond the fair distribution of rewards and the engagement of employees in the decision-making process.

Finally, it is important to note the distinction between perceived organizational support (POS), which has its own body of literature, and PSS. In discussing POS, Morrison (1996) notes that “employees who feel that their organization cares about them will define their employment relationship as social rather than economic and thus their obligations as broad and diffuse rather than narrow and quid pro quo” (p. 503). Both PSS and POS can elicit positive outcomes in terms of extra-role behaviors such as those associated with OCB. Complicating this relationship is that supervisors serve as embodiments of the organization and contribute to employee’s conceptions of POS, in addition to being individuals with whom employees may form personal relationships (Anand et al., 2010; Maertz et al., 2007). Thus, the accessible leader is both an individual capable of developing exchange relationships with an employee and the personification of the organization with whom an employee may equally engage. Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1997) note, however, that:
the amount, usefulness, and consistency of feedback received from an organization are separate from the amount, usefulness, and consistency of feedback received from a leader. . . Thus, even though leaders are important organizational representatives, employees appear to view exchanges with an organization and a leader as distinct. (p. 85)

A further complication influencing this relationship is that employees relate decision making by top management to a global organizational sense of support. Nonetheless, it is almost exclusively the direct supervisor who provides what employees perceive as “supervisor” support as opposed to a sense of organizational support that might be provided by a distant leader (Wayne, Shore, Bommer, & Tetrick, 2002).

Employees, consciously or not, are sensitive to the relationship between perceived organizational support and perceived supervisory support. Wayne et al. (2002) found that the perception of organizational support over time leads employees to “desire and accept a high-quality exchange with their supervisor” (p. 592). They add that “because leaders tend to allocate more rewards to employees with whom they have high-quality exchanges, over time LMX may influence employees’ perceptions of organizational support” (p. 592; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997). This feedback loop illustrates the difficulty of teasing out the direction of causality between these interrelated phenomena.

When examined together, LMX is more strongly correlated with OCB than with POS (Anand et al. 2010; Settoon et al., 1996). This distinction is supported by research that suggests that LMX predicts OCBI (behaviors that benefit individuals) more strongly than it predicts to OCBO (behaviors that benefit the organization) (Ilies, Nahrgang & Morgeson, 2007). By
contrast, perceived organizational support, as opposed to leader support via LMX or PSS, has stronger predictive validity with OCBO (Eiseneberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhoades, 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). In the final analysis, however, Shanock, and Eisenberger (2006) found that PSS, not POS, appears to have the most direct influence on extra role behaviors such as OCB.

**Interaction Effects**

It is difficult to tease out all of the interaction effects among the related constructs of perceived supervisor support, perceived organizational support, and LMX, and even more complex to explore their relationships to OCB. All three constructs have been empirically established as conceptually distinct and predictive of each other, but directionality, strength, mediating effects, and intervening variables have not been definitively established (Settoon et al., 1996; Shanock, & Eisenberger, 2006; Wayne et al., 1997; Wayne et al., 2002). Smith, Organ, and Near (1983), for example, found a relationship between leader supportiveness and the conscientiousness (compliance) dimensions of OCB. Via job satisfaction, they also found a positive indirect influence on altruism. The correlation among PSS, job satisfaction, and OCB is supported by additional research suggesting that not only does PSS increase job satisfaction and subsequently OCB (Chen & Chiu, 2008), but that the performance of OCB could increase supervisor support, creating a circular effect that leads to increased employee satisfaction (Ladebo, 2008). These intercorrelations make it difficult to determine the direction of influence and the causal relationships among these variables.

In addition, supervisors may need to use different tactics to influence employee behavior depending on the quality of the LMX relationship. For example, Sparrowe, Soetjipto
and Kraimer (2006) found that among employees who perceive a low-LMX relationship, inspirational appeals and exchange tactics negatively affect helping behaviors, while consultation tactics (i.e., asking for input) are positively correlated. Exchange tactics are positively correlated with helping behavior, however, among employees with high LMX. In addition, employees may be motivated by having what they perceive to be comparatively “closer” relationships with their supervisors than do their colleagues. That is, employees who believe they have a higher quality relationship (as measured by LMX) with a supervisor relative to their coworkers will engage in more OCBs (Vidyarthi, Liden, Anand, Erdogan, & Ghosh, 2010). Given the complexity of these interrelationships, it is important to place the current study in the context of these multifaceted and highly interactive human behaviors.

**OCB and the Library**

Peng, Hwang, and Wong (2010) authored the only published empirical study of OCB in a library setting. Their research in an academic library in Taiwan suggests that the workplace skills necessary for success both at present and in the future require a new breed of employee capable of innovation, a high tolerance for change, and the ability to adapt to new intellectual and service challenges. They propose that these qualities are often manifested in extra-role behaviors, and that library leadership has a responsibility to adjust occupational roles and responsibilities, as well as environmental factors, in order to facilitate OCB.

Peng, Hwang, and Wong (2010) note that discretionary behaviors are not necessarily common or positively viewed in the library setting. They argue that administrators must create an environment that tolerates and even embraces extra-role initiative and independent task design: “OCB often requires employees to deviate significantly from workplace practices and
norms. An autonomous work environment may provide librarians with necessary discretion to perform OCB” (p. 288). They conclude that those in leadership positions should provide increased job autonomy, facilitate employee autonomy, and increase intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction, all of which have a positive impact on employee OCB. Ultimately, the responsibility for creating work environments that allow for and encourage OCB lies with managerial leaders.

Not only is OCB linked with innovation, it also has the potential to play a critical role in the service experience, both from the internal and the customer perspectives. Morrison (1996) argues that many service-oriented behaviors are inherently forms of citizenship, and Payne and Webber (2006) found that employee satisfaction positively correlated with service-oriented OCB10 as well as both customer satisfaction and customer loyalty. These findings have noteworthy implications for public library staff, as the majority of them perform in boundary-spanning roles.11 Although he was not writing about librarians specifically, Organ (1990) proposed that:

[A] certain personality trait may, on the one hand, predispose individuals toward careers in those jobs or professions which has as their raison d’etre the ministering to others’ needs or problems. That same trait might well predict the extent to which people will render such aid in a form or fashion well beyond formal role prescriptions. (p. 49)

10 Service-oriented OCB is directed at the customer. Examples include altruistic behavior, promoting the organization to the customer, and demonstrating a positive attitude (Bettencourt, Gwinner, & Meuter, 2001; Payne & Webber, 2006).
11 Boundary-spanning employees (those who have direct contact with customers) become a source of information to the customer about the organization and to the organization about the customer. This interaction is particularly vital because boundary spanners serve as an organization’s external representation. Effective boundary spanners have strong interpersonal skills, are flexible and adaptable, and are high in empathy (Brown & Schneider, 1985).
The notion that the same characteristics that predispose some people to choose librarianship may also incline them to partake in OCB has not been tested empirically. However, in a study that included academic library staff, Bettencourt, Gwinner, and Meuter (2001) note that personality accounted for the most unique variance in service-oriented OCB among boundary-spanning employees. Their findings on the impact of attitude, personality, and knowledge predictors on service-oriented OCB indicates “that the employee-disposition variables of service orientation and empathy are the best predictors of contact-employee service-delivery OCBs” (p. 36). In addition, they provide insight into the service orientation of the library staff who participated in their study, noting that: “the personality variables [service orientation and empathy] entirely account for the relationship between attitudes and participation in OCB” (p. 36). Indeed, the relationship between personality and disposition to both service behaviors and OCB is well documented (Bettencourt et al., 2001; Chiaburu, Oh, Berry, Li, & Gardner, 2011; Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Li, Liang, & Crant, 2010).

Service-oriented organizational cultures such as libraries may be prime environments for citizenship behaviors, in part because library staff may innately embrace a commitment to public service. Rayner, Lawton, and Williams (2012) argue that “public sector professionals are motivated to perform helping behaviors due to an intrinsic value system that includes altruistic behavior as well as a belief in a ‘public service ethos’” (p. 118). In order for this ethos to manifest as OCB, boundary-spanning staff must be empowered to engage in discretionary value-added behaviors. These behaviors are “critical in service encounters because no one can specify in advance the full range of things that a service employee might have to do in response to unpredictable customer requests” (Bowen, Gilliland, & Folger, 1999, p. 19). Employees
should also be encouraged to participate in citizenship behaviors directed not just at the customer, but at colleagues and peers throughout the organization. Bell and Menguc (2002) note that “in addition to making a direct contribution to service quality, OBC indirectly improves the customer-orientation of customer contact personnel through the provision of assistance and support among co-workers. In other words, OCBs make both direct and indirect contributions to the quality of service provided” (p. 134; Morrison, 1996). OCB, then, can improve not only customer contact interactions, but also internal efficiencies and relationships.

In addition to the developing literature on service, research on the relationship between gender and OCB has also begun to emerge (Farrell & Finkelstein, 2007). The evidence that OCB is a gendered phenomenon is diverse. Heilman and Chen (2005) suggest that women are expected to perform “altruistic” OBCs while men are expected to display “civic virtue” OCBs. Allen and Rush (2001) found that women are expected to perform OCB more frequently than men overall. These results reflect a possible gender expectation bias based on the assumption that women are naturally more nurturing and helpful than are men. There is also evidence that men’s participation in OCB is more noticeable (and thus more highly rewarded in performance evaluations) than women’s, who are “expected” to perform helping behaviors (Heilman & Chen, 2005; Kidder & Parks, 2001).

Farrell and Finkelstein (2007) suggest that when:

[A] woman (or a man) behaves as women (or men) are stereotypically expected to behave, their behavior will be more likely to be attributed to traditional [i.e., social exchange] motives. When a woman (man) doesn’t behave as women (men) are stereotypically expected to behave, their
behavior will be more likely to be attributed to impression management. (p. 85)

This is an interesting observation in the context of librarianship, which is often stereotyped as a feminized profession (Rubin, 2010). Librarianship has been and continues to be dominated by women, but historically women have held non-managerial roles (Golub, 2010). It is only recently that women have begun to take on the majority of managerial and directorial positions (Golub, 2010). As this shift takes place, the relationship among gender, leadership, and OCB will become increasingly relevant. Some facets of OCB, such as attending optional meetings or staying late to complete projects, may be inherently biased against women, who may be less able to adjust their schedules due to family responsibilities (Kark & Waismel-Manor, 2005). Work-life benefits, however, have been shown to increase OCB regardless of gender (Lambert, 2000; Morrison, 1996). Ultimately, leaders should be aware of the potential danger of attribution error due to gender stereotypes, especially as they more conscientiously explore OCB in the library environment.

In sum, the literature on OCB and its correlates is diverse and often inconsistent. The direction of causality between OCB and related constructs such as PSS, POS, and LMX has not been conclusively determined, and findings related to which correlates (i.e., gender or dyad duration) mediate and moderate influential relationships is not definitive (Cochrane, Dumler, & Shnake, 1995; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). Netemeyer et al. (1997) offer an example of the circuitous and inconclusive links among satisfaction, leader support, and the dimensions of OCB:
Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) find that leader supportive behaviors’ effect on
the OCB dimension of altruism is best modeled as indirect through job
satisfactions’ (sic) effect on altruism. However, they also find a direct
leadership support effect on compliance. Podsakoff and colleagues (1990) . . .
do find a direct individualized leader support to job satisfaction path.
However, they find no support of a direct effect from individualized leader
support to OCBs, nor did they find the satisfaction to OCBs link to be
significant. In fact, they find that the effect of individualized leader support on
OCBs is mediated, but by “trust” in leader, not by job satisfaction. (Netemeyer
et al., p. 88)

Adding to the complexity of the literature, factors such as person-organizational fit (Netemeyer et al. 1997), coworker support (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008), organizational commitment (Meierhans, Rietmann & Jonas, 2008), ethical climate (Huang, You, & Tsai, 2012), and employee engagement (Babcock-Roberson & Strickland, 2010) have been introduced and studied in the context of OCB. Further, in addition to OCBO and OCBI, more targeted forms of OCB have been proposed including change-oriented OCB (Bettencourt, 2004) and service-oriented OCB (Morrison, 1996).

Untangling the web of research and theory available on OCB has not been of primary interest to investigators. As noted by LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002), “the downside of this breadth . . . is that there has been less effort focused on replicating and conducting studies that systematically extend previous empirical research” (p. 62). They argue that even the dimensions of OCB themselves “have yet to be distinguished from one another in the empirical
literature beyond factor analysis . . . most of the dimensions of OCB . . . are highly related to one another and that there are no apparent differences in relationships with the most popular set of predictors” (p. 60). Despite these complications, the authors note that the most frequently utilized and evaluated method for assessing OCB is Organ’s original five-dimensional taxonomy. Thus, Organ’s (1988) five-dimensional taxonomy as operationalized by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) forms the foundation for this research.

**HYPOTHESED MODEL**

Given this discussion, the hypothesized model in Figure 1.1 is proposed. In this path diagram, perceived supervisor support is expected to mediate\(^{12}\) the relationship between LMX and the interpersonal dimensions of OCB, with the length of leader-member dyad duration as a moderator\(^{13}\) of the LMX-OCB relationship.

---

\(^{12}\) A mediating variable accounts, at least partially, for the relationship between a predictor variable and an outcome variable (McCartney, Burchinal, & Bub, 2006). A mediated relationship may be present among variables when (1) X is significantly related to M, (2) M is significantly related to Y, and (3) the relationship of X to Y diminishes when M is in the model (Little, Card, Bovaird, Preacher, & Crandall, 2007).

\(^{13}\) A moderator can be thought of as a variable that qualifies the relationship of the variables in a system (Little et al., 2007). In other words, “the effect of the predictor on the outcome shifts, depending on values of the moderator variable” (McCartney, Burchinal, & Bub, 2006, p. 88). Age is a typical example of a moderator.
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HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses will be tested based on this model. Results are considered significant at \( p = 0.05 \):

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{H1: There is a positive correlation between LMX quality and the five dimensions of OCB: (1) altruism, (2) courtesy, (3) sportsmanship, (4) civic virtue, and (5) compliance.}
  \item \textit{H2: There is a positive correlation between LMX quality and PSS.}
  \item \textit{H3: There is a positive correlation between Perceived Supervisor Support and OCB.}
  \item \textit{H4: Perceived Supervisor Support accounts for a statistically significant proportion of the variance between LMX quality and the helping dimensions of OCB: (1) altruism and (2) courtesy.}
  \item \textit{H5: Leader-member dyad tenure accounts for a statistically significant proportion of the variance between LMX quality and the helping dimensions of OCB: (1) altruism and (2) courtesy.}
\end{enumerate}

Outside the model (see Figure 1.1), four additional hypotheses related to leader-member gender similarity and employee gender are tested. Each of these hypotheses is also tested at \( p = 0.05 \). Because of the gendered nature of the library profession and the exploratory purpose of this study, null hypotheses are proposed:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{H6: There is no correlation between leader-member gender similarity and LMX quality.}
  \item \textit{H7: There is no correlation between leader-member gender similarity and Perceived Supervisor Support.}
  \item \textit{H8: There is no correlation between leader-member gender similarity and member OCB.}
  \item \textit{H9: There is no correlation between employee gender and the five dimensions of OCB.}
\end{enumerate}
PROCEDURES

Research Design

Data were collected from a single large public library system in the Midwest. The site was selected from a number of potential locations, all of which were large enough to provide a total sample of at least 300 individuals. All sites considered were library systems with 15 or more branches. Individual respondents include:

- Full and part-time boundary-spanning public service information professionals and paraprofessionals (degreed librarians and non-MLIS library assistants, or equivalent);

- Direct supervisors of these individuals

This study excludes boundary-spanning circulation staff and other support staff because these employees are neither likely to be degreed librarians nor to work in the same department as degreed librarians. This is an important distinction given the study’s focus on librarians and their exchange relationships with immediate supervisors and close colleagues. A final criterion for inclusion is that qualified staff were not unionized. Because of the rigidity of role breadth for union employees, extra-role behaviors may be adversely affected, and this variable is not accounted for in this study.

Initial contact was made in October, 2012 with three library systems that met the above criteria to assess feasibility and interest (see Appendix A). All of the directors contacted know the investigator. One director agreed to participate, and the dissertation committee concurred. The investigator met with this individual in December, 2012 and provided a summary of the research proposal, a timeline, and copies of all instruments. Members of the supervisee and
supervisor groups were contacted via their work e-mail addresses to inform them about the impending research. In January, 2013 the researcher attended a department heads meeting in order to describe the research, encourage participation, and to answer questions from supervisors.

**Methodology**

Participation in the research was voluntary. Via employer provided e-mail addresses, all potential respondents received an implied consent cover letter from the researcher explaining the purpose of the study and the methods by which their identities would be protected (Wu, 2009) (see Appendices B and C). A six digit code was assigned to each employee: two digits for each branch, two digits for each supervisor, and two digits for each employee. A single list matching the six digit codes to employees’ names for dyad matching purposes was maintained: once the data were matched and analyzed, the name/ID number list as well as any other identifying information was destroyed (Wu, 2009).

All survey instruments were distributed electronically via Survey Monkey. Demographic information including age, race, gender, degree status (master of library and information science), position title, length of leader-member dyad duration (supervisees only), and span of control (supervisors only), was collected. Supervisors were sent separate links to Podsakoff et al.’s (1990) 24-Item OCB Scale for each of their supervisees (see Appendix E). Out of consideration for the time of supervisors and to encourage quality responses, supervisors were asked to complete surveys for no more than 10 employees, who were randomly chosen. Rating
of OCB was completed only by supervisors in order to help prevent common method variance\(^\text{14}\) (Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Employees received a single link that allowed them to complete the LMX-7 measurement scale (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) and the 16-item Survey of Perceived Supervisor Support (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988) instrument (see Appendices F and G). Although LMX quality can be measured from either the supervisor or the subordinate perspective, LMX scores are more reliable when assessed by the supervisee (Gerstner & Day, 1997). A reminder e-mail was sent out two weeks after the initial distribution of surveys to increase response rate (see Appendix D).

**Data Quality**

Three existing surveys were used for this study: the 24-Item OCB Scale, the Survey of Perceived Supervisor Support, and the LMX-7. The reliability and validity of Podsakoff et al.’s (1990) 24-Item OCB Scale has been tested in a number of studies. Using factor analysis, the majority of these studies support Organ’s (1988) five-factor model of OCB. Reliability (alphas) for factor loading averaged .81 (Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006). Average internal consistency reliability scores for the five OCB dimensions are as follows: altruism (.88), courtesy (.87), conscientiousness (.85), sportsmanship (.88), and civic virtue (.84) (Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006). Although several OCB scales are available, Organ’s scale was chosen for a number of reasons: first, his framework has the longest history and the most related publications; second, a number of empirical studies have validated Podsakoff et al.’s (2009) scale.

---

\(^{14}\) Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff (2003) define common method variance as “variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the constructs the measures represent” (p. 879). For example, an employee who rates both LMX and her own OCB may lead to biased results. Obtaining OCB ratings from a separate source helps to prevent this kind of measurement error.
instrument assessing Organ’s (1988) five dimensions; lastly, it is the most commonly used framework (Netemeyer et al., 1997).

The Survey of Perceived Supervisory Support is a modified version of Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (POS), in which “supervisor” is substituted for “organization.” The original POS scale was developed in order to measure organizational commitment as perceived by employees and is grounded in social exchange theory (Shore & Tetrick, 1991), making its modified version ideal for this study. Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) repurposed the instrument to evaluate perceived supervisory support. Their analyses indicate that the modification of that scale for supervisor support nearly replicated the findings for reliability for the original scale. The reliability analysis for the new scale had an alpha of .98, and the median factor loading was .87, indicating high reliability for the supervisory support usage.

Lastly, the LMX-7 (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) is the most widely used LMX scale (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Gerstner and Day (1997) found the LMX-7 scale to have sound psychometric properties and reported an alpha of .89 for reliability. Although other measures of LMX exist that explore the multidimensionality of LMX, the alternative measures correlate highly with the LMX-7 instrument (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Thus, Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) and Gerster and Day (1997) recommend its use as the most appropriate measure of LMX.

**CONCLUSION**

The literature on OCB is robust, however its operationalization, mechanisms, and even its definition are not entirely clear. Further complicating this lack of clarity for public libraries is the absence of study participants who include librarians. While a number of studies have
explored OCB in other environments, the effect of perceived supervisor support and LMX on OCB may have noteworthy and profession-specific implications for the hiring, training, and support of managerial leaders in public and other types of libraries, as well as for other public service institutions.

Previous studies have linked organizational citizenship behavior to Leader-Member Exchange and supervisory support. This research further explores the relationship among these variables. In particular, findings will have implications for the role that high-quality leader-member exchange relationships between a front-line staff member and his or her direct supervisor play in the encouragement of OCB. Given the numerous variables already associated with OCB, LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002), emphasize a need for a deeper understanding of previously identified factors such as these, with the goal of providing greater precision, as opposed to the introduction of new elements. In addition, this study also explores these interactions in a new setting. Chapter 2 provides an overview of the findings of this research.
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A total of 389 participants were sent e-mail surveys. Of those, 347 (89.2%) were supervisees and 42 (10.8%) were supervisors. Supervisees completed 168 Leader-Member Exchange surveys and 166 Perceived Supervisory Support surveys for response rates of 48.4% and 47.8%, respectively. The 42 supervisors were asked to complete organizational citizenship behavior inventories for 284 employees, of which 248 were returned for a response rate of 87.3%. Of the 165 supervisees who provided gender information, 20.6% were male (n=34), and 79.4% were female (n = 131). There were 124 supervisors who provided gender information: female supervisors (n = 109) made up 87.9% of participants and male supervisors (n = 15) comprised 12.1%. Tables 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 provide summary statistics for the results of the OCB, LMX, and PSS instruments including standard deviations and mean scores.12

It is worth noting that responses from both supervisors and supervisees indicate relatively high levels of LMX, PSS, and OCB at the participating organization. Supervisors rated their employees’ OCB an overall average of 5.54 on the 7-point scale (79%). Supervisees reported combined mean scores of 5.71 out of 7 on the Survey of Perceived Supervisor Support (82%) and 3.88 on the 5-point LMX-7 scale (78%). The OCB item with the highest mean score (6.11) was “The employee is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him/her,” and

1 Copies of the complete OCB, LMX and PSS instruments and questions are presented in Appendices D, E, and F, respectively.
2 Reverse scored items are indicated by (R). Reverse scored items are worded such that a higher score represents a lower level of the attribute being measured. The scores must be “reversed” when coded so that a high score reflects high level of agreement.
The highest mean score on the Survey of Perceived Supervisor Support (6.28) was “My supervisor values my contribution to the well-being of my department.”
Table 2.1
Summary Statistics: OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCB1 HELPS OTHERS - WORKLOAD (ALT)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB2 IS A SQUEAKY WHEEL (R) (SPORT)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB3 HONEST WORK, HONEST PAY (CONSC)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB4 COMPLAINS ABOUT TRIVIAL MATTERS (R) (SPORT)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB5 AVOIDS CREATING PROBLEMS (CTSY)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB7 MAKES MOUNTAINS OUT OF MOLEHILLS (R) (SPORT)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB8 CONSIDERS IMPACT OF ACTIONS (CTSY)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB 9 ATTENDS OPTIONAL MEETINGS (CV)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB10 LENDS A HELPING HAND (ALT)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB12 KEEPS UP WITH ANNOUNCEMENTS (CV)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB13 HELPS OTHERS AFTER ABSENCE (ALT)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB14 DOES NOT ABUSE RIGHTS OF OTHERS (CTSY)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB15 HELPS OTHERS WITH WORK PROBS (ALT)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB16 FOCUSES ON WHAT’S WRONG (R) (SPORT)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB17 PREVENTS PROBLEMS (CTSY)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB18 ATTENDENCE ABOVE THE NORM (CONSC)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB19 ALWAYS FINDS FAULT (R) (SPORT)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB20 MINDFUL OF OTHERS (CTSY)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB21 DOESN’T TAKE EXTRA BREAKS (CONSC)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB22 OBEYS SPIRIT OF RULES (CONSC)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB23 HELPS ORIENT NEW EMPLOYEES (ALT)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB24 MOST CONSCIENTIOUS (CONSC)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N (listwise) 136

ALT=Altruism; SPORT=Sportsmanship; CONSC=Conscientiousness/Compliance; CTSY=Courtesy; CV=Civic Virtue
Table 2.2  
Summary Statistics: LMX 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMX1 I KNOW WHERE I STAND</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX2 UNDERSTANDS YOUR PROBLEMS</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX3 RECOGNIZES YOUR POTENTIAL</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX4 USES POWER TO HELP</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX5 WOULD BAIL YOU OUT</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX6 I WOULD JUSTIFY AND DEFEND MY LEADER</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX7 QUALITY OF WORKING RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3  
Summary Statistics: Perceived Supervisor Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSS1 VALUES MY CONTRIBUTION</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>1.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS2 WOULD REPLACE ME (R)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS3 APPRECIATES EXTRA EFFORT</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>1.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS4 CONSIDERS MY GOALS</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS5 WANTS TO KNOW IF I HAVE COMPLAINTS</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS6 HAS MY BEST INTERESTS IN MIND</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS7 HELP IS AVAILABLE</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS8 CARES ABOUT MY WELLBEING</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS9 NOTICE BEST JOB</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS10 WILLING TO HELP</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS11 CARES ABOUT MY SATISFACTION</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS12 WOULD TAKE ADVANTAGE (R)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS13 SHOWS CONCERN</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS14 CARES ABOUT MY OPINIONS</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS15 TAKES PRIDE</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS16 MAKES JOB INTERESTING</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERVIEW OF HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Statistical analysis of all hypotheses was completed using IBM SPSS Statistics versions 20 and 21. The significance and strength of the correlations between the variables in Hypotheses 1-3 were tested using a two-tailed test for Pearson’s $r$. Pearson’s $r$ is a measure of effect size that indicates the strength of a correlation. In general, $r$ values of 0-.2 are considered weak, values of .3-.6 are considered moderate, and values of .7-1 are considered strong (Brace, Kemp, & Snelgar, 2013). The proportion of variation ($r^2$) is also reported for some items.

Hypotheses 6-9 were tested using partial correlation and with the Generalized Linear Model (GLM) command in SPSS for the enter method of multiple regression. Partial correlation establishes whether or not a correlation exists between two variables after removing the effects of other predictor (independent) variables on the criterion (dependent) variable. GLM is the overarching model of which both linear regression and ANOVA are special cases. The general purpose of multiple regression is to explore the relationship between multiple independent variables and a dependent variable to help determine the best predictors of the criterion variable (StatSoft, 2013). The enter method is a procedure by which the various predictor variables are entered into the regression model at the same time as opposed to one by one, which would require a theoretically based order hierarchy (Brace, Kemp, & Snelgar, 2013).

Significance for hypotheses tested using multiple regression were determined by using the $t$ statistic and the beta ($\beta$) value. The $t$ statistic reports the unique variance explained by the predictor variable, and the $\beta$ values indicate the measure of the contribution to the model

---

3 This procedure also produces univariate ANOVA outputs.
in terms of standard deviations (Brace, Kemp, & Snelgar, 2013). That is, the higher the \( \beta \) value, the greater the impact of the predictor variable. The proportion of the variance accounted for by the regression model (Adjusted \( R^2 \)) is also reported.

**FINDINGS**

**H1: There is a positive correlation between LMX quality and the five dimensions of OCB: (1) altruism, (2) courtesy, (3) sportsmanship, (4) civic virtue, and (5) compliance**

Of the five dimensions of OCB, altruism, compliance, courtesy, and civic virtue show statistically significant, weak-to-moderate correlations with LMX (see Table 2.4). The correlations between LMX and the helping dimensions of OCB (altruism and courtesy) are the strongest (.284 and .292, respectively). The correlation between sportsmanship and LMX is not statistically significant. Thus, Hypothesis 1 is supported for four of the five dimensions of OCB, with the exception of sportsmanship.

**Table 2.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LMX</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
<th>ALTRUISM</th>
<th>SPORTSMANSHIP</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE</th>
<th>COURTESY</th>
<th>CIVIC VIRTUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.240**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**H2: There is a positive correlation between LMX quality and PSS**

The findings strongly confirm the correlation between LMX and PSS \( (r=.859, p \leq .05) \).

Thus, Hypothesis 2 was supported (see Table 2.5).
**H3: There is a positive correlation between PSS and OCB**

A moderate correlation exists between PSS and overall OCB ($r=.387, p \leq .05$). Thus, Hypothesis 3 is supported. As a further exploration of this correlation, a two-tailed t-test was also run on PSS and the individual dimensions of OCB (see Table 2.6). Statistically significant, moderate correlations exist between PSS and the helping dimensions of OCB, altruism and courtesy. There are also statistically significant, weak-to moderate correlations between PSS and the other three dimensions of OCB.

**Table 2.5**
Correlation Table: Overall LMX and Overall PSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H4: Perceived Supervisor Support is a statistically significant mediator of the relationships between LMX quality and the helping dimensions of OCB: (1) altruism and (2) courtesy**

**H4(1): Altruism**

When controlling for PSS using partial correlation, no statistically significant correlation emerges between LMX and altruism ($p=.319$) (see Table 2.7). In order to determine whether a correlation exists between PSS and altruism with LMX removed from the relationship, a second
partial correlation was run controlling for LMX quality (see Table 2.8). In this case, PSS demonstrates a statistically significant ($p=.002$) but weak ($r=.264$) correlation with altruism. In this partial correlation model, LMX essentially drops out of the relationship with altruism.

A further exploration of this correlation was undertaken using the enter method for multivariate regression (see Table 2.9). The regression model is sound and significant at $p \leq .05$. The Adjusted $R^2$ value indicates that the model accounted for 12.7% of the variance. A statistically significant Beta value ($\beta=.504$, $t=3.141$, $p=.002$) is found for PSS, but not for LMX ($\beta=-.160$, $t=-1.00$, $p=.319$), confirming the results of the partial correlation. Thus, Hypothesis H4(1) is supported.
Table 2.9

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>F Change</td>
<td>df1</td>
<td>df2</td>
<td>Sig. F Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.374a</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>4.17725</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), PSS, LMX
b. Dependent Variable: ALTRUISM

Table 2.9 (Continued)

Regression Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>22.934</td>
<td>1.827</td>
<td>12.551</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>3.141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ALTRUISM

H4(2): Courtesy

Testing this hypothesis using partial correlation, a statistically significant, weak negative relationship emerges between LMX and courtesy when controlling for PSS \((p=.044; r=-.174)\) (see Table 2.10). A second partial correlation was tested controlling for LMX: a moderate and statistically significant relationship remains \((p=.0005, r=.361)\) between PSS and courtesy when controlling for LMX (see Table 2.11).

A further exploration of this correlation using multiple regression indicates that the regression model is significant at \(p=.0005\) and accounts for 18.7% of the variance (see Table 2.12). A significant Beta value \((\beta=.689, t=4.452, p=.0005)\) exists for PSS. Although statistically significant, the Beta and t values for LMX are comparatively weak \((\beta=-.315, t=-2.035, p=.044)\). Thus, H4(2) is supported.
Partial Correlation: LMX and Courtesy, Controlling for PSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>COURTESY</th>
<th>LMX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.11

Partial Correlation: PSS and Courtesy, Controlling for LMX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>COURTESY</th>
<th>OVERALL PSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.12

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.446a</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>4.40159</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>16.378</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), PSS, LMX

b. Dependent Variable: COURTESY

Table 2.12 (Continued)

Regression Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.448</td>
<td>1.925</td>
<td>11.139</td>
<td>17.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMX</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-2.035</td>
<td>-.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>4.452</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: COURTESY
H5: Leader-member dyad tenure accounts for a significant proportion of the variance between LMX quality and the helping dimensions of OCB (1) altruism and (2) courtesy.

H5(a): Altruism

When controlling for dyad tenure, LMX retains a significant and moderate ($r = .306, p \leq .05$) relationship with altruism (see Table 2.13). When controlling for LMX, however, there is no statistically significant relationship ($p = .759$) between dyad tenure and altruism (see Table 2.14). Using multiple regression, the model is statistically significant ($p = .001$) and accounts for 10% of the variance (Adjusted $R^2 = .095$) (see Table 2.15). A significant Beta exists for LMX ($\beta = .306, t = 3.712, p = .0005$) but not for dyad tenure ($\beta = -.025, t = -.308, p = .759$) (see Table 2.12). Thus, Hypothesis 5a is not supported.

Table 2.13
Correlations: LMX/ALTRUISM, Controlling for Dyad Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>LMX</th>
<th>ALTRUISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DYAD TENURE</td>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>ALTRUISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.14
Correlations: DYAD TENURE/ALTRUISM Controlling for LMX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>DYADTEN1</th>
<th>OCBALTRUISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>DYAD TENURE</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.15
Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zero-order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>22.796</td>
<td>2.006</td>
<td>11.362</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>3.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DYAD TEN</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ALTRUISM

**H5(b): Courtesy**

There is a moderate relationship between LMX and courtesy when controlling for dyad tenure ($r=.300, p=.0005$) (see Table 2.16), but not between dyad tenure and courtesy when controlling for LMX ($p=.118$) (see Table 2.17). Using the enter method of multiple regression, the regression model accounts for 9% of the variance and is significant at $p=.001$ (see Table 2.17). As with altruism, LMX returns a statistically significant Beta ($\beta=-.298, t=3.628, p=.0005$) but dyad tenure does not ($\beta=-.129, t=-1.572, p=.118$) (see Table 2.18). Thus, Hypothesis H5(b) is not supported.

Table 2.16
Correlations: LMX/COURTESY, Controlling for Dyad Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>LMXTOT</th>
<th>OCB COURTESY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DYAD TENURE</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Df</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2.17
Correlations: DYAD TENURE/COURTESY Controlling for LMX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>DYAD TEN</th>
<th>COURTESY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>.1000</td>
<td>-.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYAD TEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.18
Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zero-order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>22.705</td>
<td>2.203</td>
<td>10.308</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DYAD TEN</td>
<td>-.540</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>-.135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: OCBCOURTESY

Proposed Model

Hypotheses 1-5 were reflected in the model proposed (see Figure 1.1). Figure 2.1 indicates correlations related to these hypotheses. This model shows all findings related to the hypothesized model, including findings that were not statistically significant. Paths H4(a) and H4(b) indicate the partial correlations between LMX and altruism and courtesy, when controlling for PSS.4

---

4 Correlations between PSS, altruism, and courtesy (without LMX) are shown in Figure 3.1.
**Figure 2.1: Proposed Model with Findings**

- **H1(1):** $r = .284$, $N = 138$, $p \leq .05$
- **H1(2):** $r = .292$, $N = 138$, $p \leq .05$
- **H1(3):** $r = .146$, $N = 138$, $p \geq .05^*$
- **H1(4):** $r = .240$, $N = 138$, $p \leq .05$
- **H1(5):** $r = .226$, $N = 136$, $p \leq .05$
- **H2:** $r = .859$, $N = 164$, $p \leq .05$
- **H4(1):** $r = -.087$, $N = 132$, $p \geq .05^*$
- **H4(2):** $r = -.174$, $N = 132$, $p \leq .05$

*Not statistically significant*
ADDITIONAL HYPOTHESES

In addition to the hypotheses related to the proposed model, four hypotheses were tested related to supervisor/supervisee gender match. Data are provided for 122 supervisor/supervisee pairs. There are 92 cases of gender matched relationships, including four male/male matches and 88 female/female matches. There are 19 cases of a male supervisor/female supervisee mismatch and 11 cases of a female supervisor/male supervisee mismatch.

The data were analyzed using the GLM command in SPSS for univariate ANOVA. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test can reveal the interactive effect of multiple independent variables on a dependent variable. In addition to the statistical significance, the estimate for overall effect size, Partial Eta Squared ($\eta^2$), is also given.

H6: There is no correlation between leader-member gender similarity and LMX quality

The effect of gender match on LMX was analyzed using univariate ANOVA procedures. The results are not statistically significant ($p=.226$; partial $\eta^2=.012$) (see Table 2.19). Therefore, the null hypothesis is supported.

Table 2.19
Tests of Between-Subjects Effects: Leader-Member Gender Similarity and LMX Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>39.783</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.783</td>
<td>1.483</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDERMATCH</td>
<td>66767.651</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66767.651</td>
<td>2489.227</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>39.783</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.783</td>
<td>1.483</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3218.717</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>26.823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95521.000</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>3258.500</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .012 (Adjusted R Squared = .004)
H7: There is no correlation between leader-member gender similarity and Perceived Supervisor Support

The effect of gender match on PSS was analyzed using univariate ANOVA. The results are not statistically significant ($p = .179$; partial $\eta^2 = .015$) (see Table 2.20). Thus, the null hypothesis is supported.

Table 2.20
Tests of Between-Subjects Effects: Leader-Member Gender Similarity and PSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>676.580</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>676.580</td>
<td>1.823</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>715129.770</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>715129.770</td>
<td>1927.370</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDERMATCH</td>
<td>676.580</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>676.580</td>
<td>1.823</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>44153.652</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>371.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1057598.000</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>44830.231</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .015 (Adjusted R Squared = .007)

H8: There is no correlation between leader-member gender similarity and member OCB

The effect of gender match on OCB was analyzed using univariate ANOVA. The results are not statistically significant ($p = .585$; partial $\eta^2 = .976$) (see Table 2.21). The null hypothesis is supported.
Table 2.21
Tests of Between-Subjects Effects: Gender Match and overall OCB

Dependent Variable: OVERALL OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>106.487a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>106.487</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1717954.880</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1717954.880</td>
<td>4832.873</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDERMATCH</td>
<td>106.487</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>106.487</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>42656.735</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>355.473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2377461.000</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>42763.221</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = -.006)

H9: There is no correlation between employee gender and the five dimensions of OCB

The hypothesis was tested using multivariate GLM procedures. There is no statistically significant relationship between gender and any of the five dimensions of OCB (See Table 2.22.)

The null hypothesis was supported.

Table 2.22
Tests of Between-Subjects Effects: Gender and the Five Dimensions of OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Noncent. Parameter</th>
<th>Observed Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>ALTRUISM</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPORTSMANSHIP</td>
<td>50.243</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.243</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLIANCE</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COURTESY</td>
<td>16.984</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.984</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIVIC VIRTUE</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = -.007)
b. R Squared = .009 (Adjusted R Squared = .001)
c. R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = -.007)
d. R Squared = .005 (Adjusted R Squared = -.002)
e. R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = -.007)
f. Computed using alpha = .05

CONCLUSION

Findings reveal that LMX has a statistically significant correlation with each of the five dimensions of OCB, except for sportsmanship. However, the correlations between perceived
supervisor support and the individual dimensions of OCB, as well as with overall OCB, are stronger than their correlations with Leader-Member Exchange. Further, PSS appears to almost completely mediate the relationship between LMX and the helping dimensions of OCB. Lastly, neither supervisor-supervisee gender match, supervisee gender, nor dyad tenure correlate with LMX, PSS, or OCB in this study population.

There are two main areas in which chapter findings are notable. First, the results add to the general understanding of the relationship among LMX, PSS, OCB, and the intervening variables of gender and dyad tenure. Second, they reveal initial insights into the previously unexplored area of OCB in the public library environment. Chapter 3 discusses hypotheses related to the former, and Chapter 4 discusses the latter. Because of the particular relationship between gender and librarianship, hypotheses related to gender are addressed in Chapter 4.
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Findings from this study reveal that PSS appears to mediate the relationship between LMX and OCB. In addition, the overall correlation between PSS and OCB is stronger than the correlation between LMX and OCB. This does not imply that the impact of LMX on OCB or other extra role behaviors is negligible, rather, it confirms the complexity of the interaction among these variables in the workplace environment. It also affirms the importance of the direct supervisor in the employer-employee relationship, irrespective of whether their influence is measured via LMX or PSS.

THE ROLE OF LMX

From its inception, LMX theory concerned itself with the exchange relationship between a single leader and a single follower. It is not surprising, given the shared theoretical origins in social exchange, that a number of studies show LMX to be a statistically significant predictor of OCB. As noted in Chapter 1, however, the myriad correlates of OCB presented in the literature complicate a clear understanding of the antecedents of OCB and the role that high quality LMX plays in its facilitation. Results of this study suggest that supervisors who wish to encourage OCB among their employees should focus on supervisory support (PSS), rather than overall LMX quality. That being said, the strong correlation between LMX and PSS ($r=.859$) suggests that the two constructs are conceptually linked, despite the much broader focus ostensibly encapsulated by LMX.
Overall, LMX shows statistically significant, weak-to-moderate correlations with four of the five dimensions of OCB. As theorized, the highest correlations are with the interpersonal “helping” dimensions: altruism (r = .284) and courtesy (r = .292). LMX does not show a statistically significant relationship with sportsmanship (r = .146; p = .087). This finding may be due, in part, to the difficulty of capturing the concept of sportsmanship, which is by definition the absence of particular behaviors (e.g., whining or taking up the time of the manager with minor complaints). In addition, all of the items designed to measure sportsmanship are reverse scored on the instrument (e.g., “The employee is the classic ‘squeaky wheel’ that always needs greasing”), and the definition of this aspect of OCB also appears to be the most nebulous. Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine and Bachrach. (2000) note that, among other characteristics, “‘good sports’ are people who not only do not complain … but also maintain a positive attitude … are not offended when others do not follow their suggestions, [and] are willing to sacrifice their personal interest for the good of the work group …” (p. 517). Determining an acceptable degree of abstention from or participation in a broad array of largely subjective organizational behaviors is a difficult proposition.

**LMX and Dyad Tenure**

When controlling for dyad tenure, LMX maintains a statistically significant correlation with both altruism and courtesy. This does not hold true for dyad tenure when controlling for LMX. These findings challenge the idea that high quality leader-member exchanges require a considerable amount of time to develop into “mature partnerships” before OCB or other forms of exchange become noticeable to supervisors. While some studies have used dyad duration as a moderator in assessing LMX and its correlates, Wayne, Liden, and Sparrow (1994) suggest
that “the quality of exchange that develops between a leader and a member is established fairly soon after the relationship begins and [remains] fairly stable throughout the duration of the relationship” (p. 697). Therefore, an emphasis on dyad duration may be misplaced when seeking to develop high quality LMX relationships (Bhal, Ansari, & Aafaqi, 2007).

The strong correlation between perceived supervisory support and OCB suggests the need not only for supervisors to engage proactively in high quality exchange relationships with all supervisees as early as possible in the employment relationship, but also to offer support (via recognition or expressions of caring, for example) as the initial gesture of exchange. The findings related to dyad tenure echo the need for early action on the part of the supervisor: if it is not necessary for exchange relationships to reach the “mature partnership” stage in order to result in reciprocation by employees via OCB, it becomes even more critical to build offers of support into employee orientation and initiation. Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) note that either party may initiate the “offering” that may open the door to a high quality exchange relationship. As the individual with control of both power and resources in the organization, however, the manager has a major responsibility to serve as the instigator of this process.

THE ROLE OF PSS

In their meta-analysis, LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) determine that leader support is the strongest predictor of OCB based on the cumulative results of previous research. Findings from this study support their conclusion to the extent that perceived supervisor support is a good predictor of OCB and a much better predictor than LMX. The relationship shown in this study between LMX quality and overall OCB ($r=.288$) is not as strong as the moderate correlation between OCB and PSS ($r=.387$). PSS, then, accounts for 15% of the variance in the
correlation model ($R^2=.150$), while LMX accounts for only 8% ($R^2=.083$). While the proportion of overall OCB predicted by PSS, nearly twice as much as LMX, is notable, the effect of PSS is even more important given the large number of potential correlates presented in the literature. The fact that PSS accounts for 15% of the variance is especially striking.

The initial finding that suggest a moderate correlation between PSS and OCB is also supported by the partial correlation and multiple regression analyses. These results indicate that in the presence of PSS, LMX has a minimal impact on the helping dimensions of OCB in the workplace. This finding implies that perceived supervisor support substantively mediates the relationship between LMX quality and altruism and courtesy. In addition, the correlations between PSS and altruism and courtesy ($r=.365$ and $r=.417$, respectively) were stronger than their correlations with LMX. Indeed, when controlling for PSS, LMX does not correlate with altruism and only weakly with courtesy. When controlling for LMX for the same variables, however, PSS maintains statistically significant correlations with both, accounting for 7% of the variance in altruism ($r=.264$) and 13% of the variance in courtesy ($r=.361$) in the partial correlation. These findings again indicate that PSS is a more powerful predictor of citizenship behaviors than is Leader-Member Exchange.

**PSS AND LMX**

Certainly, “support” is an important element of the exchange relationship between a supervisor and a supervisee. However, it is just one piece of a high quality LMX relationship, typically characterized by additional forms of social exchange such as approval, trust, esteem, and consideration (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The findings of this study are, therefore, notable in their suggestion that perceived support alone may play a more critical role than other LMX
mechanisms in the fostering of OCB in the workplace. While there may be other beneficial effects from the additional forms of social exchange through which LMX is operationalized, supervisors and organizations looking to encourage OCB among their employees may opt not to focus equally on developing all aspects of LMX quality. Instead, they might target their professional development models on fostering supportive behaviors that enhance an employee’s overall sense of care from direct supervisors.

A strong focus on expressions of supervisor support fits with the dyadic partnership building phase of LMX described by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995). In this conceptualization, managers take the lead in offering high quality LMX relationships to all employees as opposed to just a select few (a change from the passive focus on the in-group and out-group dichotomy to a more prescriptive model). This appears to support an approach to employee assimilation in which explicit offers of supervisor support are the initial exchange currency, ostensibly leading to higher levels of employee OCB.

The implication that PSS has a greater impact than LMX in predicting OCB may also stem from the limitations inherent in the LMX 7 instrument itself. While Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) contend that the 7-item scale is the most appropriate measure of LMX, Northouse (2013) and others have noted that while the LMX 7 is a reliable and valid measure, as well as being the most commonly used instrument, it may lack construct validity. In addition, its psychometric soundness has not been rigorously tested (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Liden & Maslyn, 1998). Of particular interest given the focus of this study, Berneth, Armenakis, Field, Giles, and Walker (2007) concluded that the measurement of “exchange” in available LMX scales “seems indirect at best and non-existent at worst” (p. 981). These scholars go on to assert that “the fact that
LMX 7 is a highly reliable instrument that predicts a number of important organizational outcomes does not necessarily mean that it is relevant to and representative of social exchange conceptualization of LMX” (Berneth et al., 2007, pp. 982-983). Berneth et al. (2007) developed a scale to measure leader member social exchange (LMSX) but few studies have utilized this instrument.

Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) state that the “centroid item” of the LMX 7 scale is the assessment of the effectiveness of the working relationship with the leader. If that is the case, then overall relationship quality becomes the foundational construct being measured, not the quality of the exchange relationship. The initial conceptualization of the LMX scale was intended to measure leadership support and leadership attention as part of the social exchange process (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975). Modern theorists, however, describe the dimensions of LMX measured by the LMX 7 alternatively as respect, trust, and mutual obligation, or as contribution, loyalty, and affect (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Although the inclusion of mutual obligation factors addresses the reciprocal nature of LMX, it may be that the seven items are more fully representative of relationship quality as operationalized through support rather than by exchange.1 Indeed, the high intercorrelation between LMX and PSS ($r=0.859$) implies as much. Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) argue that the ability to build and exchange partnership is predicated on trust, respect, and support, yet no empirical validation studies indicate that the LMX 7 does, in fact, measure exchange quality (Liden & Maslyn, 1998).

---

1 Several items on the LMX 7 scale, such as “Regardless of how much formal authority your leader has built into his or her position, what are the chances that your leader would use his or her power to help you solve problems in your work?” are similar to items on the Survey of Perceived Supervisor Support, for example, “Help is available from my supervisor when I have a problem.”
Given the conceptual link between LMX and PSS, and the fact that support appears to be a substantial contributor to the concept of LMX, a case can be made for placing PSS under the umbrella of the LMX construct. That is, supervisor support is a subset of LMX that serves as the currency with which leader-member exchange relationships are developed. As such, a revised and simplified model is proposed (see Figure 3.1) in which PSS is not considered a mediator of LMX, but instead is encapsulated by LMX as a mechanism through which work behaviors are influenced.

The primary focus of this study is on the helping dimension of OCB, based on the assumption that both Leader-Member Exchange and perceived supervisor support would be more strongly correlated with these person-oriented dimensions. This assumption is borne out in the findings, thus, these two dimensions are indicated separately in the figure. Findings also suggest that PSS is a statistically significant mediator of the relationship between LMX and OCB and that PSS is a stronger predictor both of overall OCB as well as its individual dimensions. Therefore, the correlations between LMX and the dimensions of OCB have been omitted and only the correlations between PSS and OCB are shown in the figure.
Figure 3.1
Revised Model: PSS as a Function of LMX: Correlations with Altruism, Courtesy and Overall OCB²

² Relationships shown are statistically significant correlations between PSS and the criterion variables.
BEYOND SUPPORT AND EXCHANGE: THE ROLE OF THE DIRECT SUPERVISOR

Findings that suggest that supervisor support is one of the more powerful predictors of OCB are not, in and of themselves, surprising. Gerstner and Day (1997) noted that “a high-quality relationship with one’s supervisor can affect the entire work experience in a positive manner, including performance and affective outcomes,” and they are not alone in attributing significant power to the supervisor vis a vis the organizational experience for employees (p. 835). Although this study focuses on the effects of supervisor support and exchange quality as predictors of OCB, it would be remiss not to explore briefly role modeling and organizational culture as components of supervisory influence.

As a result of the nature of their position in the power structure and their accessibility to employees, supervisors can have a particularly powerful impact on the experience of organizational socialization. This influence includes the role modeling and encouragement of specific work behaviors such as OCB (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Paine, 1999; Yaffe & Kark, 2011), in addition to less tangible outcomes such as work attitudes, adaptation to organizational culture, affective commitment, and ethical decision-making (Kottke & Pelletier, 2013; Loi, Lai, & Lam, 2012; Weiss, 1977). Kottke and Pelletier (2013) note that “for the majority of . . . employees, their immediate supervisor is the primary representation of the organization, providing daily direction, feedback, evaluation, and information about the job, work group, and organization” (p. 416). Thus, as the de facto source of organizational learning, the supervisor must not only normalize OCB as a workplace behavior, but also as a representation of a workplace culture that values interpersonal helping.
As noted, citizenship behaviors are not typically supported by formal job descriptions, training, or rewards (Yaffe & Kark, 2011). Because it is rarely formalized, one of the most effective ways for supervisors to demonstrate the importance and value of OCB is through role modeling. When supervisors role model OCB, they not only legitimize citizenship behaviors as desirable conduct, they also strengthen the team’s collective identity and shared values, signifying that the group is important and “worthy of members’ extra efforts” (Yaffe & Kark, 2011, p. 809). Thus, it should be of interest both to individual institutions and to professional organizations to develop OCB not only in front-line staff but also in supervisors. Mackenzie et al. (1999) note that:

… managers are in highly visible positions, affecting more people as role models and leaders . . . This wider span of influence means that managerial OCBs reach a larger audience with potentially greater impact than the behavior of nonmanagerial employees. . . Thus, OCBs may be more important at a managerial level, because the modeling of these behaviors has a “multiplier” effect on subordinates. (p 399)

Institutions and professional organizations engaged in employee development may wish to focus on hiring for and developing OCB in supervisors. Supervisory training should also draw attention to the managerial leader’s role as a source of organizational learning for supervisees not just for policy and procedures, but also as behavioral role models and a source of information about organizational culture.

The effect of supervisor OCB on group values and identity points to the larger implications about OCB as function of organizational culture (Yaffe & Kark, 2011). As defined by
Schein (1990), “culture is what a group learns over a period of time as that group solves its problems of survival in an external environment and its problems of internal integration. Such learning is simultaneously a behavioral, cognitive, and an emotional process” (p. 111). In lay terms, “organizational culture is the way things are done—especially when no one is looking” (Umiker, 1999). This simplified definition returns to the origins of OCB as a good Samaritan behavior: helping others in need even if no one is watching.

Although the responsibility for driving organizational culture is generally attributed to top-level leaders (Schein, 1990), immediate supervisors are in a unique position to model culturally acceptable behaviors as well as to monitor employee adherence to communal norms. Yaffe and Kark (2011) note that “deliberate role modeling is one of the primary mechanisms by which leaders create, maintain, and sometimes change their group culture” (p. 809). Whether or not the organizational culture supports going above and beyond to help others as a desirable problem solving behavior can be telegraphed by managers even, perhaps especially, without explicit instruction. Thus, managerial leaders should be aware that their own modeling of OCB, as well as their response to its display by others, has implications for organizational culture that extend beyond individual behaviors and inform employees’ understanding about the way “things are done.”

CONCLUSION

One of the primary implications of this study is the importance of the direct supervisor in creating a workplace in which OCB is fostered, encouraged, and modeled. Specifically, findings from this study suggest that, via LMX and/or PSS, the exchange relationship offered by a supervisor may have a profound impact on an employee’s resulting participation in citizenship
behaviors, especially if introduced early in the employment relationship. Further, a focus on
offering support, rather than on overall LMX quality, may magnify the effect of this initial
exchange. Finally, it is important for employers and human resource professionals to focus not
just on the OCB of supervisees, but also on ensuring that supervisors are effective OCB role
models capable of affirming a culture of interpersonal helping.

In organizations like public libraries, employees are required to engage in helpful
behaviors due to the nature of the work. It may be more likely, therefore, to find relatively
higher levels of reported LMX and PSS than those found in non-service organizations. The
results of this study not only confirm high levels of LMX, PSS, and OCB, but also suggest a
number of practical applications for libraries. Chapter 4 discusses these library-centric
implications.
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Chapter 4

STUDY IMPLICATIONS FOR LIBRARIES

Studies on OCB and librarianship are noticeably absent from the literature. This is the first to focus solely on library employees and to examine OCB in a public library setting. The dearth of research in this area is disappointing given the focus of other OCB studies on pro-social\(^1\) behaviors, altruism, service orientation, customer service, and other areas of critical importance to library work. In addition, the gender expectation bias and potential for leader-member gender similarity to affect OCB also augment its importance as a construct worthy of study. Given the gendered nature of the profession, with regard both to the high proportion of female employees and the feminized stereotype of library work, gender implications related to OCB may be especially pertinent in the context of librarianship.

**OVERVIEW OF PARTICIPATING LIBRARY**

Findings from this study reveal high levels of LMX, PSS, and OCB at the participating organization. There is no information available about average scores in public libraries for comparison purposes, however, the overall high scores on the PSS, OCB, and LMX inventories suggest a strong culture of collegiality, interpersonal helping, and recognition. In addition, they imply an environment in which employees generally feel supported by their supervisors and in which supervisees regularly engage in observable extra-role behaviors. As participation in the study was voluntary, the high response rates also suggest a strong level of commitment to the

---

\(^1\) Pro-social orientation suggests the high likelihood that an individual would assist another individual in need with no promise of reward (Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006). This characteristic has also been shown to correlate with OCB in a number of studies (Grant & Mayer, 2009; McNeely & Meglino, 1994).
organization: staff are willing to go “above and beyond” when asked to partake in activities that will benefit the institution, even when they are not required to do so.

The positive results may be explained in part by the formalized management training program in place for current managers and those on the management track. Strong management training may yield more, and more effective, supervisor support. In order to understand better the findings of the present research with regard to supervisor development, a follow-up e-mail was sent to the participating library director to seek additional details about the topic and format of the organization’s management training. The director described the program as being about nine months long and organized for a small group of no more than 18 employees.

The program is highly structured and includes both one-on-one and group instruction and mentoring. Each participant receives a coach, who is not his or her supervisor, with whom the trainee meets regularly. The participants meet as a class for formal instruction, provided by a member of the library staff, on the following topics: interviewing and selection; the manager’s role in on-the-job learning; sustaining high performance with feedback; redirection and reinforcement; resolution of problems; complaints and conflicts; positive discipline for a healthy workplace; stewardship of public resources; and recommitting to public service. Each participant is also given a leadership assessment tool at the beginning of the course that helps to identify areas for improvement on which the participant focuses throughout the process. In addition, participants complete assignments and role playing as part of the curriculum. This rigorous program also has the attention and support of library administration: participants who

2 It should be noted that a number of these topics are thematically related to the concepts underlying the survey of perceived supervisor support, including responsiveness/caring, recognition, and respect.
fail to learn and demonstrate effective management and leadership acumen are sometimes
removed from supervisory positions. Although it is not possible to conclude definitively that
this program is responsible for the high LMX, PSS, and OCB scores reported by study
participants suggest that this emphasis on supervisor training is highly successful.

In addition to strong supervisor support, the high overall scores given to supervisee OCB
may indicate strong hiring practices (i.e., successful recruitment and selection of pro-social,
service-oriented staff), effective and standardized training and onboarding, or a combination of
these factors. As previously noted, organizational citizenship behaviors may be more prevalent
in libraries than in other kinds of organizations due to the potential predisposition of library
staff toward “helping” behaviors. Managerial leaders in public libraries have the opportunity to
take advantage of these innate qualities in pursuit of service excellence. In this area,
supervisors may need only to encourage behaviors which are already intuitive. Supervisors
should be prepared to provide strong support to naturally pro-social subordinates in order to
foster OCB.

Supervisors did not rate all areas of OCB equally, however. The two lowest-rated OCB
items pertain to attending optional meetings or functions. It has been anecdotally observed
that this is one area in which public librarians tend to be less willing to engage (e.g.,
volunteering for after-hours events or attending early morning or after-hours meetings). For
most professions, these kinds of activities are considered par for the course; but this does not
appear to be the case for this study group and may reflect a more pervasive attitude toward
expectations around work time. A possible explanation for these findings is that public libraries
have service desks that need to be staffed between certain hours. This necessarily requires
that staff be present during set times. The rigorous and often immutable scheduling requirements may impact staff feelings of autonomy and create defensiveness around the hours that staff control. These results suggest that librarians tend to view this aspect of their work as a job and not as a profession, and may be hesitant to go above and beyond in this area.

**Implications for Managerial Leadership Training Programs**

The success of the program developed in-house at the participating institution also has implications for the management and leadership trainings offered by national organizations such as the Public Library Association (PLA) and the American Library Association (ALA). Each of these large entities has a program or programs dedicated to the development and ongoing education of managers and leaders. PLA, for example, offers both a Certified Public Administrator course as well as a Leadership Academy. The Library Leadership and Management division of ALA provides ongoing webinars and other trainings designed to encourage excellence in management and leadership practices in libraries.

The training provided to the supervisors in this study is a clear example that, even without a specific focus on LMX, PSS or OCB, an overall improvement in supervisory skills may result in higher quality LMX, an improved sense of perceived supervisory support, and more frequent displays of OCB. That is, supervisors are able to develop high quality LMX and provide effective supervisor support without being familiar with the underlying theoretical constructs. Further strengthening managerial leadership training by strategically incorporating the practical applications of these theories at the local and national level may further increase their

---

3 Additional information about the Certified Public Administrator program, which is open to those with three or more years of supervisory experience, can be found at http://ala-apa.org/certification/application/. The Leadership Academy is a new initiative, started in 2013, and accepts only a small group of selected participants. Information about the program can be found at http://www.al.org/pla/education/leadershipacademy.
effectiveness at encouraging OCB. In addition, strategic inclusion of these concepts will create a wider awareness of this construct and its impact on organizational effectiveness.

**OCB, LMX, PSS, AND GENDER**

One of the more surprising findings was the lack of correlation shown between leader-member gender similarity and LMX, PSS, or any of the five dimensions of OCB. This finding was unexpected given the variety of studies suggesting the powerful impact that leader-member gender similarity has on employee outcomes like role expectations, behavioral perceptions, and leader-member relationships (Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989; Waismel-Manor, Tziner, Berger, & Dikstein, 2010). Dienesh and Liden (1986) argue that leader-member characteristics such as gender may impact the development of high quality LMX, and Tsui and O’Reilly (1989) note that differences in characteristics between employees and supervisors have a negative impact on outcomes such as supervisor affect. In addition, Javidan, Bemmels, Devin, and Dastmalchian (1995) suggest that, while women may be more accepting of men as supervisory role models, men are less likely to identify with female leaders. The inference is that high quality LMX relationships may be harder to develop in leader-member dyads that are dissimilar, especially if the supervisor is female and the supervisee male. Further, Allen and Rush (2002) suggest that while women are expected to perform OCB as part of their traditional gender role, men’s OCB is often over-reported because it is outside the norm of typical male behavior. None of the above possibilities were observed in this study.

The relationship between librarianship and gender may also have implications for the statistically non-significant finding related to sportsmanship. Kark and Waismel-Manor (2005) suggest that some elements of OCB are stereotypically female (e.g., altruism and courtesy),
while others are more typically associated with men (e.g., sportsmanship). The term “sportsmanship” itself has masculine connotations, and the authors note that even its manifestations are tied to stereotypically masculine role expectations: “the implications of good sportsmanship are that emotional responses, sharing of sore feelings, paying attention to details and responses that seem personal and subjective should be ruled out” (p. 901). Thus, the gendered nature of the language used to describe OCB may have a particular impact when applied in feminized settings like public libraries.

**PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES**

This is not the first study to suggest that the intersecting areas of employee affect, personality, and work environment together help to determine levels of OCB. Public libraries, however, are in a unique position to develop new organizational practices centered around the facilitation of OCB as a foundation for hiring and training procedures, as well as internal and external customer service models.

In practical terms, the findings about both LMX and PSS are instructive. With regard to LMX, perhaps the most important actionable conclusion for leaders is to shift focus away from identifying members of the in-group and out-group, and to embrace a leadership strategy focused on equitable leadership-making activities as early as possible in the work relationship. Leaders and managers at all levels should be trained to provide, and rewarded for offering, high quality exchange relationships to their subordinates. This partnership-building approach encourages all employees to participate actively in the social exchange aspect of work-life and to move beyond a purely economic exchange model. Of course, not all employees will chose to participate in reciprocal exchanges, but a manager who attempts to build relationships with all
employees may be seen as fairer and more equitable. This perception alone may be improve a manager’s ability to initiate and maintain high quality relationships successfully. As the findings from this study suggest, initiating the LMX process with offers of supervisor support may yield the added benefit of reciprocation via OCBs.

With regard to PSS, there are also clear implications for library practice. Although the PSS scale is unidimensional (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988), the items that make up the instrument can be conceptually grouped into several themes (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Although the following groupings have not been tested empirically, a practical reading of the items (see Appendix G) results in some loose classifications of types of support:

- Appreciation/Recognition (items 1, 2, 3, 9, 15);
- Consideration/Caring (items 6, 8, 11, 13, 16);
- Attention/Respect (items 4, 5, 12, 14); and
- Assistance (items 7, 10).

Organizational hiring practices, interventions, and the structure of professional development for managerial leaders may be grounded in these areas in order to increase subordinate perceptions of support and to improve supervisory effectiveness. Two examples of how this might work in a library setting include: (1) the implementation of hiring practices that ensure the selection of supervisors who can successfully demonstrate competence in the four areas of supervisory support, and (2) management training that includes instruction on how to operationalize the four areas of support; for example, objective-setting activities that integrate the goals and values of individual employees with the goals and values of the organization. This
approach (promoting the right people into supervisory and other leadership positions and then training them to provide effective support to subordinate) should bolster not only PSS and subsequently OCB, but also high quality LMX relationships. High quality LMX, regardless of its impact on OCB, can lead to additional positive organizational and individual outcomes.

In addition to a focus on the hiring and training of supervisors, equally important is to devote strategic attention to the hiring and training of subordinates. In terms of recruitment and selection, organizations should embrace a strategic and consistent effort to identify and retain staff who not only have technical prowess, but who also possess the desired personality and dispositional characteristics (e.g., proactive personality, pro-social orientation, and positive affect\(^4\)) that lend themselves to OCB. Designing hiring practices that include some form of personality inventory may be beneficial both for front-line staff and for their leaders, who should be expected to model appropriate citizenship and interpersonal behaviors. Indeed, organizations must make a commitment to providing front-line staff with access to effective support and to supervisors who can serve as OCB role models. As noted by O’Donnell, Yukl, and Taber (2012):

... relations-oriented behaviors can be used in appropriate situations to develop subordinate skills, confidence, and trust of the leader . . . Leaders who expect subordinates to make sacrifices or to do more than is required in

\(^4\) A note of caution about proactive disposition and pro-social orientation. These are different than extroversion, which is a unique personality trait. Much has been made recently about the value of both extroverts and introverts in the workplace. Proactive personality is not extroversion, it is the ability to “actively create and manage exchange relationships within the organization and ultimately display positive work attitudes and behaviors” (Li, Liang, & Crant, 2010, p. 396). That being said, extroversion as a personality trait has also been shown to positively correlate with OCB (Chiaburu et al., 2011).
formal job descriptions should be prepared to set an example in their own behavior. (p. 152)

The findings from this research serve to support the suggestion made by Organ, Podsakoff, and Mackenzie (2006) to hire for disposition, provide targeting and adequate training, ensure supervisory role models, and to create a work environment that encourages and sustains OCB. Emphasis should be placed on the importance of providing access to an effective supervisor who may foster not only desired work behaviors, but also instill implicit norms such as work attitudes and expectations rooted in organizational culture (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Paine, 1999; Yaffe & Kark, 2011). Libraries need to be proactive, selective, and strategic in their support of employees from the point-of-hire, through the onboarding and orientation process, and for the duration of the career trajectory.

**CONCLUSION**

There are a number of ways in which public libraries interested in developing and maintaining high levels of OCB can do so. Hiring practices must be deliberate and well defined, library administrators should ensure that supervisors have the resources and skills to offer effective support to their subordinates, and supervisors must be empowered to recognize, reward, and negotiate with individual staff members not only to develop high quality LMX relationships, but to provide support to individual employees in the ways that yield the greatest impact. In addition, it is important to remember that OCB is a product of latitude. An organization that successfully assimilates OCB into its culture may also require a lessening of control: employees must be granted the autonomy to perform spontaneously outside their proscribed roles at their discretion.
A number of practical implications can be drawn from this research on OCB in the library environment, but it is important to emphasize the exploratory nature of the findings and conclusions. The results of this study have practical and important implications for the training and development of managerial leaders, but they also raise a number of important questions and areas for further study. Chapter 5 summarizes the overall findings of this research and offer a number of related topics for further investigation.

REFERENCES


Chapter 5

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The study of OCB in public librarianship is particularly apt albeit surprisingly absent. Rayner, Lawton and Williams (2012) note that OCB should be of interest to those in the public sector because it has practical implications such as improving relationships between colleagues and customers as well as increasing efficiency and reducing waste, all of which are pertinent to the effective administration and functioning of public libraries. In addition, they affirm the unique place of OCB in professions committed to public service and in which a “‘public service ethos’” is the dominant paradigm (p. 118). Consistent with the idea that librarians may be naturally inclined toward helping behaviors, results of this study find not only high levels of OCB at the participating institution, but also of perceived supervisor support and LMX quality.

Despite the theoretical and empirical evidence suggesting that OCB is a valuable organizational asset, it is currently absent from the library and information science (LIS) management literature. Formally integrating the theoretical implications and practical ramifications of OCB into LIS education may help to expand the capacity of public libraries by more consciously utilizing existing social mechanisms and value systems to improve organizational effectiveness. As a field that embraces service as a core value, an approach to management that privileges interpersonal relationships may find support and acceptance at all levels. In addition, more targeted attention in the LIS management literature on the supervisor-supervisee relationship may yield wide-ranging and beneficial organizational outcomes.
The most important finding from this study is that perceived supervisor support alone, not leader-member exchange, is the more powerful predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. That an immediate supervisor can profoundly impact the work behaviors of supervisees is not a new supposition. However, the implications from this research may alter the ways in which supervisors should be expected to approach and develop these critical workplace relationships and should encourage library administrations to focus greater attention on developing the skill-sets of managerial leaders. While other organizational factors such as perceived organizational support and the influence of more distant organizational leaders are also important to consider, this finding affirms the unique contribution of the supervisor as a source of support, a role model, and an enforcer of cultural norms. Thus, it is essential for those in supervisory roles to embrace these responsibilities in pursuit of creating library environments favorable to OCB.

In the final analysis, it may be that employees are more likely to perform OCB in response to perceived supervisor support not as a means to create or foster exchange, although this may be a by-product, but as an outcome of generally feeling more satisfied, committed, or positive as a result of feeling supported. Indeed, a better understanding of the role of satisfaction on performance outcomes was the original impetus for theories concerning the existence of organizational citizenship behavior, and mood state was one of the antecedents proposed by Bateman and Organ (1983) in their initial discussion of the OCB construct. Later studies have also supported the correlations among OCB, positive mood state, and job satisfaction (Chen & Chiu, 2008; Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006). Thus, while supportive leader behavior may have a direct impact on OCB, it is also possible that this
influence is mediated by additional attitudinal dimensions. The idea that PSS could be mediated by other variables in the facilitation of OCB also suggests a possible shift in research focus from reciprocity toward a motivational model related to the interaction among workplace environment (including supervisor support), affect, personality, and mood state.

The strength of PSS as a predictor of OCB does not, however, devalue the sizable number of studies that find a correlation between LMX quality and OCB. It is likely that the mechanisms through which high quality LMX relationships are developed, including support, trust, and reciprocity, may individually correlate to varying degrees with OCB. It is also probable that cultivating high quality exchange relationships will, even if indirectly, lead to higher levels of OCB by encouraging exchange behaviors. A number of studies also suggest that LMX may serve as the mediating variable for additional workplace factors that influence OCB such as fairness or justice climate (Manogran, Stauffer, & Conlon, 1994).

Leader-Member Exchange remains a fitting companion leadership theory for OCB. However, a deeper understanding of the specific ways in which LMX is operationalized (such as through PSS) may provide a more thorough picture of the OCB-LMX relationship and potentially reveal additional and actionable findings for practitioners. As it stands, the positioning of LMX as a direct or indirect predictor of OCB depends on the other variables in question. Thus, while much about the LMX-PSS-OCB relationship remains unclear, what is certain is that it is not just the role of the supervisor, and not just the responsibility of the supervisee, to create a work environment in which OCB is encouraged and appreciated. Organizational citizenship behavior is a team effort.
LIMITATIONS

One limitation of this study is that voluntarily filling out a survey may itself be considered a form of OCB. It is possible that those employees who did not participate in the study are those who do not feel supported by their supervisors or their organization and therefore did not feel compelled to participate in voluntary activities such as this research. If this is the case, then supervisory assessment results may be skewed (i.e., those employees who did not participate may not feel supported). It is worth noting, however, that supervisors were asked to rate a random sample of their employees, not necessarily those employees who agreed to participate in the study. Even so, supervisors’ overall ratings of employee OCB remained high.

One limitation regarding the findings related to gender is sample size. There were only four male/male matches, so it is difficult to draw substantive conclusions about the role of gender matching on OCB, LMX, or PSS from this study. The fact that there were no statistically significant findings related to gender should be considered with this sample size limitation in mind. It would be beneficial to replicate this study in additional library systems or to control for gender match in study design.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Although this study contributes new information to the understanding of organizational citizenship behaviors in the workplace, it also raises a number of additional questions and provides the foundation for a wide variety of future research. A number of possible areas for future exploration are discussed below.
Identify the Mechanisms by which Supervisor Support Leads to OCB

In their meta-analysis, LePine, Erez, and Johson (2002) found that leader support was the strongest predictor of OCB. This research supports this conclusion to the extent that perceived supervisor support is a good predictor of OCB and much better than LMX. However, more research is needed to understand better why this particular behavior on the part of supervisors leads to organizational citizenship behaviors:

• Is it because it initiates and maintains reciprocity?
• Is it because it leads to high levels of organizational commitment or job satisfaction among employees?
• Does it establish an organizational culture and environment in which positive mood state is more likely to be maintained?
• What kinds of employees are most positively influenced by supervisor support?

Identifying LMX, PSS, and OCB Best Practices in Model Libraries

Follow-up studies may focus on those libraries with high levels of LMX, PSS, and OCB in order to identify which employment practices are shared by those organizations so that a set of “best practices” can be created that may be used by other organizations. Once these best practices are identified, it would then be beneficial to examine whether or not these practices translate across different types of organizations, including those that are not service professions.
Replication Study Using an Exchange-Based Measure of LMX

Future research on the interrelationship among LMX, PSS, and OCB should replicate previous studies using the LMSX (or other similar instrument) to evaluate whether or not an exchange-based LMX instrument results in the same correlations with OCB.

Replication Study in Countries Other than the United States

There is a large body of literature examining OCB in an international context, but only Peng, Hwang, and Wong (2010) have begun to explore OCB in the library context abroad. Future research should examine the relationship among LMX, PSS, and OCB from a global perspective in order to evaluate the applicability of these constructs across cultures. This research may also be valuable for libraries in the United States, current and future employees of which are likely to be increasingly diverse.

Replication Study Using Multiple Library Locations and/or Library Types

This preliminary investigation was conducted at only one institution. A number of replication studies could be conducted exploring OCB in various library environments including library systems of different sizes, union environments, and types (e.g., academic and special libraries) in order to further explore the validity and generalizability of the findings presented here. Additional studies would also increase the profile and the importance of OCB among library administrators, trainers, and HR professionals.

Evaluation of the Constructs and Assessment Tools Used to Measure Perceived Supervisor Support and Leader Member Exchange

Due to the strong correlation shown between LMX and PSS, and the similarity of a number of the items on the LMX and PSS scales, further investigation into the nature and dimensionality of these constructs is warranted. It may be that the LMX 7 instrument is
weighted too heavily toward “supportive” exchange behaviors, or it may be that supervisor support alone has significant predictive validity for leader-member exchange quality.

**The Effect of Leader-Member Gender Similarity on LMX and OCB in Female-Dominated Professions**

While a number of studies have found that leader similarity, and gender match impact LMX and OCB, this study did not. Soldner (2009) also found no correlation between supervisor and supervisee gender match and OCB in his study of predominantly female (87.2%) employees at a rehabilitation facility. The implication from these studies supports the possibility that leader-member dyad similarity, even a characteristic as powerful as gender, may be less important in the delivery of OCBs than previously thought. Findings in both of these studies suggest the need to investigate further to ascertain if this is due to:

1. the characteristics of the men who self-select to join librarianship or other ‘helping’ occupations;
2. strong hiring or training practices; or
3. whether leader-member gender similarity is not a particularly powerful moderator in female dominated settings.

**Attributes of Male Librarians and Their Expectations of and Attitudes toward Female Supervisors**

Men who self-select to join a traditionally female-dominated field such as librarianship may be more comfortable with female supervisors and colleagues than men who choose to join less feminized or more gender neutral occupations. This is a hypothesis worth exploring further, especially as women move in greater numbers into library management and administration (Gollub, 2010).
An Exploration of the Impact of Race, Ethnicity, and Cultural Identity on LMX, PSS, and OCB

This study did not examine race, ethnicity, or cultural identity for either subordinates or supervisors. Traditional cultural factors such as power distance, collectivism, and assertiveness may impact both how subordinates interact with supervisors and to what degree they engage in OCB. In addition, leader-subordinate racial or ethnic similarity may also have an effect on LMX, PSS, and OCB. As public library staff and patrons become increasingly multicultural, this will be a critical area to explore in depth.

The Measurement of the Sportsmanship Dimension of OCB in a Female-Dominated Work Environment

This study reveals no statistically significant correlation between LMX and sportsmanship. Although there is no evidence to link directly this result with the stereotypically feminized workplace, the findings here lend credence to previous studies that suggest that such a connection may exist. More generally, the presence and ultimate importance of “sportsmanship” as a component of OCB is, especially in female dominated professions, an area worthy of future exploration.

Librarianship, Professionalism and the Concept of “Work Time”

This is an important area for further study, especially as it relates to professional identity. For most professions, meetings or commitments outside the standard work day, such as early morning or after-work meetings, are considered par for the course. This has not been the case with librarians: in this area, librarians anecdotally appear to view their work as a job and not as a profession. Given the current and expanding debate around librarianship as a career deserving of an advanced degree, further exploring the origins of this attitude, its
implications for both the present and future of the profession, and how it relates to internal and external perception of the field, could provide meaningful insights.

**An Exploration of the Impact of Leader-Leader Exchange on Leader-Member Exchange and Subsequent OCB**

This preliminary research focused solely on the exchange relationships between managerial leaders and boundary-spanning followers. An expansion of this hierarchy to include leader-leader exchange quality and its impact on the OCB of boundary-spanners would be beneficial. In other words: does the relationship between a manager (leader) and his or her administrator (leader) influence the manager’s ability to maintain exchange relationships with and offer support to subordinates? This research may be particularly valuable in identifying the behaviors in which library administrators should engage in order to facilitate PSS, LMX and OCB among managerial leaders and their subordinates.

**Follow-up of Survey Non-Participants and the Implications for OCB**

A follow-up survey of employees who choose not to participate in an OCB survey may be illustrative. Voluntary survey-taking may be a form of OCB, and the views of staff who do not display high levels of OCB may be under-represented with regard to perceived supervisory support or LMX.

**Proactive Personality, Boundary-Spanning Public Library Staff, and OCB**

This area for future research may have particular importance to the hiring process. Individuals with proactive personality are predisposed “toward taking personal initiative to influence one’s environment” and have a “behavioral tendency to identify opportunities to change things at work and to act on those impulses” (Li, Liang, & Crant, 2010, p. 395). In addition to the pro-social service orientation, proactive personality is also a good predictor of
OCB. It will be beneficial to investigate whether both professional and paraprofessional boundary-spanning public library staff also tend to exhibit proactive personalities. Proactive personality has been shown to lead to higher quality LMX relationships, greater satisfaction in the workplace, and higher levels of organizational citizenship behavior (Li, Liang & Crant, 2010). This is also suggestive of a strong sense of self-efficacy and external locus of control. A better understanding of both the personality and dispositional characteristics of current public library staff would be useful in further understanding the best ways to hire for and encourage both OCB and high quality LMX across institutions.

**An Investigation of the Personality Characteristics of Boundary-Spanning Public Library Staff and the Implications for OCB**

Several studies suggest that the five factor personality inventory predicts citizenship behaviors over and above job satisfaction (Chiaburu et al. 2011; Ilies et al., 2009). A better understanding of the current personality traits of boundary-spanning information professionals and paraprofessionals may be helpful as libraries look to recruit employees who are naturally inclined to service behaviors that include OCBs. Over time, the strategic inclusion of personality factors as a part of the interview and selection process, as well as the supervisor-supervisee matching process, may result in outcomes such as improved customer service experience, values consonance, and increased employee commitment.

**Dyad Tenure and OCB and Supervisor/Subordinate Matching**

If, as Wayne, Liden, and Sparrow (1994) suggest, “the quality of exchange that develops between a leader and a member is established fairly soon after the relationship begins and [remains] fairly stable throughout the duration of the relationship,” then it becomes even more critical to match new employees with supervisors with whom they will be likely to form high
quality exchange relationships (p. 697). It will be valuable to identify the dimensions on which matching may take place, and to develop a process for making these assessments at the point of hire.

**Organization-Directed OCB in the Public Library**

It is important to note that the present study focuses on the aspects of OCB related to helping other individuals (OCBI). There is a large body of research on elements of OCBO, or behaviors directed at helping the organization. This kind of citizenship may have different motivators and antecedents, especially in the public sector (Grant & Mayer, 2009; Ilies, Fulmer, Spitzmuller, & Johnson, 2009; Rioux & Penner, 2001). As such, this unexplored aspect of OCB in libraries also has notable research potential.

**The “Voice” Dimension of OCB in Public Librarianship**

The five-dimensional taxonomy of OCB used for this study does not include “voice,” a quality proposed by Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994), but not included in Organ’s model (see Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006). This item includes “speaking out to discourage activities harmful to the organization” (Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006, p. 29). Although this dimension includes a *speaking truth to power* component, it is constructive in nature and does not include criticizing the organization or its policies. As such, there may also be a natural tension between the “voice” and the “sportsmanship” dimensions of OCB that is worth exploring further. This is an area rich for future research, especially in a discipline like librarianship with a history of social action and staff members for whom the work is often driven by passion and a desire to advocate for others.
The Relationship among Organizational Values, Individual Values, and OCB

Such research would be especially timely given the current financial struggles of many public libraries and the resulting tensions between boundary spanning staff and administration, as the former seek to do more with less and the latter seek to find the most efficient and cost-effective methods to provide service (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Rayner, Lawton, and Williams (2012) caution:

If changing organizational values appear to privilege organizational goals, associated with economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, rather than citizen and/or user interests, then OCB maybe threatened. In terms of our conceptualization of the public service ethos, any change in public service practices may impact motivation towards public service. (p. 121)

Future research on the implications of these practices in libraries may help library administration better understand the views of library staff, and vice verse. It may also assist both groups as they navigate this new environment in which OCB may be increasingly threatened.

The Effectiveness of National Managerial Leadership Training Programs with Regard to OCB

The investigator could find no mention of organizational citizenship behavior in the training curriculums developed by either ALA or PLA. As demonstrated by the organization participating in this study, this does not necessarily mean that current training models have no impact on OCB among employees. A study of the effectiveness of these nationally promoted managerial leadership programs and the resulting impact on citizenship behaviors among front-line staff and managerial leaders may be advantageous. Results may indicate a need to
incorporate training based on PSS and/or LMX theories with an intent to further increase OCB among library staff.

CONCLUSION

The lack of research on OCB in librarianship is disappointing, but the topic need not remain a void in the LIS management and leadership literature. This valuable area is wide open for future research as well as for practical integration into hiring, training, development, and retention of library staff. The human resource management systems in place in libraries are far too often based on convenience and tradition rather than on evidence-based practices. A more thorough understanding of OCB in the public library setting may go far in helping to integrate best practices and set the stage for additional exploration of how employee behaviors, characteristics, and motivations can be leveraged to improve library service.

The world in which libraries function is changing rapidly and often surprisingly. In this period of uncertainty, a work environment in which employees feel that colleagues and supervisors alike are invested in mutually beneficial relationships and demonstrate a shared commitment to service may be increasingly powerful. Further, the ability to take risks, innovate, and act in ways that are not prescribed by role requirements allow boundary-spanning library staff to adapt quickly and flexibly in response to their changing environment and in the ways best suited to meet the evolving needs of patrons. Regardless of the changes that are sure to come to libraries, a commitment to service, both internal and external, will remain paramount.

Helping others is what librarians do. But library staff have focused much more intently on external customer service, often at the expense of internal relationships. Maintaining an
ethos of helpfulness over time will require that librarians help each other, as well.

Administrators and managerial leaders must be committed to the creation of organizations that support and encourage internal reciprocity as strongly as they are committed to serving their communities. Relationships matter, and the quality of the relationship between a supervisor and a supervisee matters a great deal.

The presence of organizational citizenship behaviors implies a deep commitment not only to the mission of the organization, but to the health of human connections in the workplace. Indeed, a healthy organization is not one which merely meets its goals and in which employees do only what is asked of them. In a healthy workplace, employees aspire to be good organizational citizens, to go above and beyond in support of their colleagues and customers, and in so doing advance the mission of their institutions. The broad implications of organizational citizenship behavior – from efficiency to service to social dynamics – make it a unique and far reaching foundation on which to build an organizational culture and the structures that support it.
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Appendix A
Feasibility and Interest E-mail to Directors

Dear [Director Name]:

As you may know, I am nearing the end of a Ph.D. program through Simmons College in Boston. I am preparing for the research portion of my dissertation, and [Insert Name of Library System] has been identified as a possible location to carry out the research. My study will examine a particular kind of organizational behavior, essentially “above and beyond” behavior, which is considered to be outside a traditional job description (i.e., helping to orient new employees, not complaining about trivial inconveniences, volunteering for teams, etc.). I will be looking at whether or not the quality of the relationship between the direct supervisor and the employee influences whether or not the employee engages in these activities. I will also be looking at whether or not employees feel like their supervisor supports them, and whether or not that also influences their helping behaviors.

The library system or systems that participate in the study will not be identified, and all data about employees and their supervisors will be anonymous. I hope to do this research in January of 2013.

If you would consider allowing this study to take place in your library system, please respond to the following items:

1. Total number of supervisors in your system who directly oversee full and part-time Public Service Information Staff
   a. “Public Service Information Staff” are Librarians and Library Assistants (or equivalent) whose primary job entails working with the public in an information (non-circulation) capacity.

2. Total number of full and part-time Public Service Information Staff described above (head count, not FTE)
   a. Whether or not there is a union that includes the Public Service Information Staff described above.

If I do not hear back from you or someone representing your library by Friday, October 12, I will follow up with a telephone call. Feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions at rrubin@bexleylibrary.org or 614-231-9709.

Thank you for your consideration.
Appendix B
Implied Consent E-mail (Supervisor)

Dear [Name],

[Name of institution] has given permission to Rachel Rubin, a Ph.D. student in the Managerial Leadership in the Information Professions program at Simmons College in Boston, MA, to invite you to participate in a research study for her dissertation.

The purpose of this research is to examine a workplace activity called “organizational citizenship behavior” and how it is affected by the supervisor-supervisee relationship. Organizational citizenship behaviors are above-and-beyond “helping” behaviors that, when performed over time by many people, improve organizational effectiveness.

For this study, you will be provided with links (below) to questionnaires for each of your direct supervisees. You will be asked to assess the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements about their organizational citizenship behaviors. You will also be asked to provide basic demographic information about yourself. The time required to complete the survey will be approximately 10 minutes per subordinate. Please complete the surveys in a non-public work space.

Participation in this research is entirely voluntary but very important. If you do choose to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time. Your identity and the identity of your supervisees will be protected. All questionnaires are assigned an identification number by me that will be used when entering the data. All data will be treated as confidential and kept in a secure location. Your name will not be linked to the survey, and the document linking your name with your identification number will be destroyed once the data entry is complete.

Questions regarding this research should be directed to Rachel Rubin: (330) 618-3354 or rrubin@bexleylibrary.org. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigator or if you wish to report any concerns about the study, you should contact Dr. Peter Hernon of Simmons College at 617-521-2794; email: peter.hernon@simmons.edu.

Thank you for your participation.

Rachel Rubin
Doctoral Candidate
Simmons College, Managerial Leadership in the Information Professions
Appendix C
Implied Consent Cover Letter (Subordinate)

Dear [Name],

[Name of institution] has given permission to Rachel Rubin, a Ph.D. student in the Managerial Leadership in the Information Professions program at Simmons College in Boston, MA, to invite you to participate in a research study for her dissertation.

The purpose of this research is to examine a workplace activity called “organizational citizenship behavior” and how it is affected by the supervisor-supervisee relationship. Organizational citizenship behaviors are above-and-beyond “helping” behaviors that, when performed over time by many people, improve organizational effectiveness.

For this study, you will be provided with a link (below) to complete two surveys and to provide some demographic information about yourself. Both surveys will ask you about your relationship with your supervisor. The time required to answer the questions will be approximately 20 minutes.

Participation in this research is entirely voluntary but very important. If you do choose to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time. Your identity and the identity of your supervisor will be protected. All questionnaires are assigned an identification number by me that will be used when entering the data. All data will be treated as confidential and kept in a secure location. Your name will not be linked to the survey, and the document linking your name with your identification number will be destroyed once the data entry is complete.

Questions regarding this research should be directed to Rachel Rubin: (330) 618-3354 or rrubin@bexleylibrary.org. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigator or if you wish to report any concerns about the study, you should contact Dr. Peter Hernon of Simmons College at 617-521-2794; email: peter.hernon@simmons.edu.

Thank you for your participation.

Rachel Rubin
Doctoral Candidate
Simmons College, Managerial Leadership in the Information Professions
Appendix D
Reminder E-mail

Dear [Name],

Recently you were invited to participate in a study examining the supervisee-supervisor relationship and organizational citizenship behaviors. If you have not had a chance to complete the surveys and would like to participate in this study, please complete them within seven days. To begin or complete the surveys, click the link provided.

Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary but very important.

Thank you for your time.

Rachel Rubin
Doctoral Candidate
Simmons College, Managerial Leadership in the Information Professions
Appendix E
Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale

(R) indicates a question that is reverse scored.

1. The employee helps others who have a heavy work load.
2. The employee is the classic “squeaky wheel” that always needs greasing. (R)
3. The employee believes in giving an honest day’s work for an honest day’s pay.
4. The employee consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters. (R)
5. The employee tries to avoid creating bigger problems for coworkers.
6. The employee keeps abreast of changes in the organization.
7. The employee tends to make “mountains out of molehills.” (R)
8. The employee considers the impact of his/her actions on coworkers.
9. The employee attends meetings that are not mandatory, but that are considered important.
10. The employee is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him/her.
11. The employee attends functions that are not required, but help the organization’s image.
12. The employee reads and keeps up with organizational announcements, memos, and so forth.
13. The employee helps others who have been absent.
14. The employee does not abuse the rights of others.
15. The employee willingly helps others who have work related problems.
16. The employee always focuses on what’s wrong, rather than the positive side of situations. (R)
17. The employee takes steps to try and prevent problems with other coworkers.
18. The employee’s attendance at work is above the norm.
19. The employee always finds fault with what the organization is doing. (R)
20. The employee is mindful of how his/her behavior affects other people’s job.
21. The employee does not take extra breaks or time away from work.
22. The employee obeys the organization’s rules and regulations even when no one is watching.
23. The employee helps orient new people even though it is not required of them.
24. The employee is one of my most conscientious employees.
Appendix F
LMX 7 Instrument

1. Do you know where you stand with your leader...do you usually know how satisfied your leader is with what you do?
2. How well does your leader understand your job problems and needs?
3. How well does your leader recognize your potential?
4. Regardless of how much formal authority your leader has built into her or her position, what are the chances that your leader would use his or her power to help you solve problems in your work?
5. Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your leader has, what are the chances that he or she would “bail you out” at her or her expense?
6. I have enough confidence in my leader that I would defend and justify his or her decision if he or she were not present to do so.
7. How would you characterize your working relationship with your leader?
Appendix G

Survey of Perceived Supervisor Support

(R) indicates a question that is reverse scored.

1. My supervisor values my contributions to the well-being of our department.
2. If my supervisor could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary he/she would I so. (R)
3. My supervisor appreciates extra effort from me.
4. My supervisor strongly considers my goals and values.
5. My supervisor wants to know if I have any complaints.
6. My supervisor takes my best interests into account when he/she makes decisions that affect me.
7. Help is available from my supervisor when I have a problem.
8. My supervisor really cares about my well-being.
9. If I did the best job possible, my supervisor would be sure to notice.
10. My supervisor is willing to help me when I need a special favor.
11. My supervisor cares about my general satisfaction at work.
12. If given the opportunity my supervisor would take advantage of me. (R)
13. My supervisor shows a lot of concern for me.
14. My supervisor cares about my opinions.
15. My supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments.
16. My supervisor tries to make my job as interesting as possible.