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ABSTRACT

MANAGERS’ AND SUBORDINATES’ PERCEPTIONS OF AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP, SUBORDINATE OUTCOMES, AND MEDIATING MECHANISMS
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University of Guelph, 2011

Advisor:  
Dr. Leanne Son Hing

How does authentic leadership influence subordinate outcomes? It depends on whom you ask. Using Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, and Peterson’s (2008) theory-based measure of authentic leadership, this dissertation research advances the authentic leadership literature by: 1) examining relations between managers’ self-reported and subordinates’ ratings of authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes; 2) testing the theoretical proposition that more authentic leaders are inherently more ethical both in the values they subscribe to and in their behavior when compared to less authentic leaders; and 3) examining the mediating mechanisms that account for relations between authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes. Using a field sample of 188 managers and 75 subordinates, results revealed that subordinates and their managers do not see eye to eye in their perceptions of managers’ authentic leadership as the correlation between their ratings was only marginally significant. General support was found for the notion that more authentic leaders subscribe more to self-transcendent values and less to self-enhancement values when compared to less authentic leaders; they also engage in more ethical decision making. Furthermore, results showed that authentic leadership is associated with a broad range of subordinate outcomes, including leader-member
exchange, affective organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and job performance. However, these relations were found only within source. Mediation analyses revealed that subordinates’ trust in their manager partially mediated the relation between subordinate-rated authentic leadership and subordinates’ perceptions of the quality of their relationship with their manager (LMX). Mediation analyses also revealed that subordinates’ trust in their manager and their sense of psychological empowerment each mediated relations between subordinate-rated authentic leadership and subordinates’ affective organizational commitment. In addition, managers’ self-reported empowering leader behavior mediated the relation between managers’ self-rated authentic leadership and their ratings of their subordinates’ organizational citizenship behavior. Implications for research and practice are discussed.
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As a result of high profile cases of leader misconduct, a preoccupation with maximizing shareholder value, and ongoing corporate downsizing and restructuring, employee trust in leaders may be at an all time low. Paradoxically, as organizations have flattened their structures to compete globally, they require higher levels of autonomy and decision-making from employees at all levels (Connell, Ferres, & Travaglione, 2003), which necessitates a greater level of trust between employees and leaders and a greater need for employees to be empowered by leaders in order for them to be successful (Jones & George, 1998; Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998). Despite the plethora of positive outcomes associated with both trust and empowerment, and their association with leadership, little research has examined the influence of leadership on both trust and empowerment within a single study. Yet, theorizing on empowerment suggests that leadership is one of the driving forces of subordinates’ psychological state of empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995), which in turn positively impacts subordinate outcomes. Moreover, trust in leaders has been shown to have a profound impact on subordinate outcomes (see meta-analysis by Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Given changes in the attitudes and needs of today’s workforce as well as flattened organizational structures and dynamic work environments, it is an opportune time to examine leaders’ influence upon subordinate levels of trust and psychological empowerment.

Drawing upon authentic leadership theory and literatures on empowerment and trust, I make the case that authentic leadership may be effective in circumnavigating the complexity and challenges of today’s business environment through the way such leaders influence important subordinate outcomes. Thus, in this dissertation, I explored the subordinate outcomes I expected to be associated with authentic leadership, namely
leader-member exchange, affective organizational commitment, psychological well-being, organizational citizenship behavior, and job performance, and proposed two key mediating mechanisms – trust and empowerment – through which more (vs. less) authentic leaders influence subordinates. Please refer to Figure 1 for an illustration of the proposed relations among the overall constructs. In addition, I tested the assumptions inherent in the theory of authentic leadership that more authentic leaders are inherently more ethical both in the values they subscribe to and in their behavior when compared to less authentic leaders.

**Authentic Leadership: Its Roots and Theoretical Development**

The concept of authenticity is not new. In fact, the roots of authentic leadership theory stem from Greek philosophical notions of “Know Thyself” and “Be True to Thyself.” However, only in the last 7-8 years have researchers and practitioners started to examine the notion of authenticity in an organizational, and in particular, a leadership context. The theory of authentic leadership emerged from the intersection of the leadership, ethics, and positive organizational behavior and scholarship literatures.

The broad theoretical conception of authentic leadership posits that more (vs. less) authentic leaders draw upon their life experiences, psychological capital (i.e., hope, optimism, resilience, and self-efficacy), a moral perspective, and a supporting organizational climate (e.g., ethical, strengths-based) to produce greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors (i.e., relational transparency, internalized moral perspective, and balanced processing). This in turn fosters their own and their followers’ authenticity and development, resulting in well-being and veritable, sustained performance (Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May & Walumbwa,
Figure 1. The hypothesized mediation model with trust and empowerment as mediators of the relations between authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes. Source of ratings are represented by different lines: single lines = constructs measured in the subordinate survey (i.e., subordinate self-ratings or perceptions of manager); double lines = constructs measured in the manager survey (i.e., manager self-ratings or perceptions of subordinate); triple lines = constructs measured in both surveys (i.e., manager self-ratings or subordinate ratings of authentic leadership).
In conceptualizing authentic leadership theory, researchers have articulated a number of fundamental characteristics of authentic leadership. First, authentic leadership is defined as a “root construct” underlying all positive forms of leadership and its development (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004; Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Gardner et al., 2005; Luthans & Avolio, 2003). While authentic leadership is considered independent of other forms of leadership theoretically, and has been shown empirically to explain additional variance in subordinate outcomes above and beyond ethical and transformational leadership (Walumbwa et al., 2008), it is theorized to explain some of the basic component processes, such as self-awareness, that underlie all positive forms of leadership (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). This means that while a transformational leader may be authentic because he truly cares about developing (transforming) his followers and peers into leaders (a key goal of transformational leaders), an authentic leader will not necessarily be transformational. This is because authentic leaders are purported instead to focus on developing their own authenticity and fostering the development of their followers’ authenticity.

A second fundamental characteristic of authentic leadership theory, and one that is unique relative to other theories of leadership, is that authentic leadership and authentic followership are considered inherently dynamic and interactive processes (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). While this proposition has not yet been tested empirically, Avolio and Gardner (2005) suggest that the espoused values and beliefs of authentic leaders become aligned with their actions over time and across situations; followers respond positively to these leaders’ integrity, which in turn fosters the leaders’ sense of authenticity. Third,
authenticity is recognized as being a matter of degree. Thus, leaders are not entirely authentic or inauthentic but instead they can be more accurately described as achieving levels of authenticity (Erickson, 1995; Heidegger, 1962, as cited in Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

In conceptualizing authentic leadership and in particular the components that define authentic leaders, the theory draws heavily upon Deci and Ryan’s (1995, 2000) *self-determination theory* and Kernis’s (2003) conception of authenticity. According to Deci and Ryan’s (1995, 2000) self-determination theory, authenticity is achieved through internally driven regulatory processes, rather than through external standards or consequences. Furthermore, Kernis’s *theory of optimal self-esteem* identifies four elements of authenticity: self-awareness, unbiased processing, relational authenticity, and authentic behavior/action. While both theoretical paradigms significantly influenced the initial conceptualization of authentic leadership theory, some meaningful developments have taken place, in particular with regards to the definition of unbiased processing and re-labeling of relational authenticity, and these are presented next.

Gardner et al. (2005) suggest that *balanced processing* is a more appropriate term than *unbiased processing* (originally coined by Kernis, 2003) when describing authentic leadership, in light of consistent findings in the field of cognitive psychology showing that humans are inherently flawed and biased in their information processing (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). Thus, in conceptualizing authentic leadership theory, Gardner et al. assert that more authentic leaders are not necessarily free from bias when compared to less authentic leaders. Instead, more authentic leaders are expected to have the capacity and motivation to assess the perspectives of several stakeholders in a more objective manner.
when making decisions whereas less authentic leaders are expected to be less inclined to assess multiple objectives in an objective fashion. In other words, less authentic leaders are less objective in processing information than are more authentic leaders. Moreover, Gardner et al. note that the term relational transparency more accurately reflects the open and transparent manner in which more (vs. less) authentic leaders and subordinates share information, as compared to relational authenticity.

**Authentic Leadership: Operationalization of the Construct and Initial Empirical Support**

To enable the empirical study of authentic leadership, Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson (2008) developed and validated a measure of authentic leadership, the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ). In line with recent theoretical developments, the ALQ consists of four components: self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing, and internalized moral perspective. These components are defined below.

- **Self-awareness** refers to a leader’s demonstrated understanding of self, including his or her strengths and weaknesses, how he or she is perceived by others, and how his or her actions impact others (Kernis, 2003; Walumbwa et al., 2008).

- **Relational transparency** refers to a leader’s expression of his or her authentic self (i.e., true thoughts, feelings and values) to others and his or

---

1 The Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) is copyright 2007 by Bruce Avolio, William Gardner, and Fred Walumbwa. The instrument is available for research purposes at http://www.mindgarden.com/products/alq.htm.
her encouragement of others to do the same. He or she openly shares information and presents the “hard truth,” but also admits mistakes when they are made (Kernis, 2003; Walumbwa et al., 2008).

- **Balanced processing** refers to a leader’s demonstrated objectivity with regards to his or her decision-making process. Thus, he or she analyzes all relevant data, listens to and carefully considers others’ perspectives, and solicits input that challenges his or her deeply held positions prior to coming to conclusions (Gardner, et al., 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2008).

- **Internalized moral perspective** refers to a leader’s internalized and integrated form of self-regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2003). In other words, the leader’s behavior and decision-making is guided by high internal standards of ethical conduct (as opposed to group, organizational or societal pressures) and his or her actions are seen as being consistent with his or her internalized values and beliefs. The leader models high standards for moral and ethical conduct and encourages others to take positions in line with their own values (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Gardner et al., 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2008).

To summarize, according to authentic leadership theory, leaders who are more authentic are anchored by a deep sense of self when compared to leaders who are less authentic. They are highly aware of their own capabilities and their impact on others. They know where they stand on important issues. Their leadership approach is grounded in a set of core ethical values and their decision-making is guided by high standards of ethical conduct. Such leaders express their thoughts, feelings, and values in a transparent
and genuine manner, demonstrating consistency with their actions. When compared to
less authentic leaders, more authentic leaders are conceptualized to strike a balance
between acting in accord with a strong set of personal convictions and fostering open
two-way communication with others (e.g., subordinates), through seeking their input,
listening actively, and being open to having their deeply held positions challenged.

According to authentic leadership theory, the high self-awareness, objectivity in
decision making, transparency in interactions with others, and consistency between
values, words and actions exhibited by more (vs. less) authentic leaders is expected to
instill elevated levels of commitment, a willingness to perform extra-role behaviors,
improved job performance and a sense of well-being, among others. Recent empirical
evidence suggests that subordinate-rated authentic leadership is positively associated with
subordinates’ self-reported organizational commitment, organizational citizenship
behavior (Walumbwa et al., 2008), work engagement (Giallonardo, Wong, & Iwasiw,
2010; Walumbwa, Wang, Wang, Schaubroeck, & Avolio, 2010), satisfaction with
supervisor, and job satisfaction (Giallonardo et al., 2010; Walumbwa et al., 2008), as well
as supervisor ratings of subordinates’ organizational citizenship behavior (Walumbwa et
al., 2010) and job performance (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Of note, initial empirical
evidence also suggests that authentic leadership accounts for additional variance in
desirable organizational outcomes (i.e., subordinates’ self-reported organizational
citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, and satisfaction with supervisor)
beyond that explained by transformational or ethical leadership (Walumbwa et al., 2008).
Do Authentic Leaders’ Self-Perceptions Align with Their Subordinates’ Perceptions?

Most of the leadership literature addresses research questions from one perspective – that of subordinates. Thus, one of the purposes of this dissertation was to examine relations between managers’ and subordinates’ perceptions of managers’ authentic leadership. Given that more (vs. less) authentic leaders are characterized by higher levels of self-awareness, transparency in their interactions with their subordinates, a close alignment between their emotions and behavior, and objectivity in their decision making, I would expect managers’ perceptions of their own authentic leadership to overlap to some degree with the extent to which their subordinates’ perceive them as authentic leaders.

Although to my knowledge no empirical research exists comparing managers’ self-reported authentic leadership with subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership, related research on multisource feedback\(^2\) suggests that managers’ self-ratings frequently diverge from ratings provided by others, such that a discrepancy exists between managers’ self-ratings and others’ ratings on the constructs measured by the multi-source instrument (Brutus, Fleenor, & McCauley, 1999; Morgeson, Mumford, & Campion, 2005; Mount, Judge, Scullen, Sytsma, & Hezlett, 1998; Sala, 2003). Overall,

\(^2\) Multi-source or 360 degree feedback is used by most Fortune 500 companies, most often as part of leadership development programs and consists of ratings on a leadership/management instrument provided by the self as well as multiple observers, which may include peers, subordinates, supervisors, clients, and customers (London & Smither, 1995).
correlations between managers’ self-ratings and others’ ratings are weak. For instance, in a meta-analytic study, Harris and Schaubroeck (1988) found that the mean correlation between managers’ self-ratings and their supervisors’ ratings on leadership was .22 (corrected for sampling error). In another study that utilized more than 6,000 subjects, Atwater, Waldman, Ostroff, Robie, and Johnson (2005) found that the correlation between managers’ self-ratings and their subordinates’ leadership ratings was .27. In light of the aforementioned research and reasoning, I expected managerial self-reports of their authentic leadership to be significantly but weakly correlated with subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership.

_Hypothesis 1:_ Managers’ self-reported authentic leadership will be significantly and positively but weakly correlated with subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership.

**Do Authentic Leaders Subscribe more to Self-Transcendent than Self-Enhancement Values, and are they More Ethical in Their Decision Making?**

One of the key debates that remains unresolved in the authentic leadership literature is related to whether a moral perspective is an inherent component of authentic leadership, or whether it is at best an antecedent and/or consequence (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Cooper, Scandura, & Schriesheim, 2005; Shamir & Eilam, 2005). Most authentic leadership researchers purport that a moral perspective is a key component of authentic leadership and, as such, they consider it to be an inherent characteristic of the theory (e.g., Avolio & Gardner; Luthans & Avolio, 2003). Specifically, these scholars argue that authentic leadership includes a positive moral perspective characterized by high ethical standards that guide decision-making and behavior (e.g., Avolio & Gardner; Luthans &
Avolio, 2003; May, Chan, Hodges, & Avolio, 2003). They argue that it is this quality that separates authentic leadership from pseudo-leadership, thereby fostering the kind of trust in leaders that is a necessary condition for effective leadership and enduring organizational performance.

Given the profound impact that leaders can have on followers, for their betterment or harm, it is clear that ethics lie at the heart of leadership (Ciulla, 2004). Thus, as noted by Walumbwa et al. (2008), any theory of leadership development, but particularly one focused on authentic leadership development, would be incomplete and misguided if it did not contribute to increased awareness and attention to the inherent ethical responsibilities that reside in the leadership role.\(^3\) This perspective is echoed in the operationalization of their construct (Authentic Leadership Questionnaire, ALQ, Walumbwa et al., 2008), which includes internalized moral perspective as one of the four key components that define authentic leadership. However, while items reflecting this dimension of authentic leadership, such as “demonstrates beliefs that are consistent with actions” and “makes decisions based on his or her core values” suggest that more (vs. less) authentic leaders have strong personal convictions that guide their actions, these items do not identify the content of authentic leaders’ values or convictions. In addition,\(^3\)

\(^3\) Avolio & Gardner (2005) assert that the inclusion of a positive moral perspective is crucial to the emerging work on authentic leadership development. They compare this notion to Burns (1978, as cited in Avolio & Gardner) notion of transforming leadership, who invoked a positive moral perspective of such leaders, which Bass (1990, as cited in Avolio & Gardner) later agreed to after having left ethics out of his groundbreaking model of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985, as cited in Avolio & Gardner).
only one item refers to ethics in a general manner (i.e., “Makes difficult decisions based on high standards of ethical conduct”).

In summary, neither the theory, operational definition, nor ALQ questionnaire items specify the content of authentic leaders’ values or convictions beyond indicating that this facet encompasses a positive moral perspective and is characterized by leaders’ own high ethical standards (Avolio & Gardner, 2005, Walumbwa et. al., 2008). Thus far, it has largely been assumed that in contrast to less authentic leaders, more authentic leaders are guided by the kind of values that foster positive subordinate outcomes theorized by authentic leadership theory (e.g., subordinate eudemonic well-being, veritable and sustainable performance) and that they are perceived by others as acting in accordance with high ethical standards. Therefore, in this dissertation, I addressed gaps in theory and research by explicitly testing the association between authentic leadership and values as well as the extent to which authentic leaders’ actions reflect ethical standards.

Schwartz (1992) has pioneered the measurement of universal human values. For the purposes of this dissertation, self-transcendent values, which include both benevolence and universalism values, and self-enhancement values, which include both power and achievement values, were of particular interest. **Benevolence** refers to a concern for the preservation and enhancement of the welfare of those with whom one closely interacts (Schwartz, 1992). **Universalism**, considered compatible with benevolent values, refers to a concern with understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and nature (Schwartz, 1992). Thus, universalism values are applied more broadly than are benevolence values. The **power** value reflects the importance of social status and prestige, and control or dominance over people and
resources (Schwartz, 1992). The *achievement* value, considered compatible with the power value, reflects the importance of personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards (Schwartz, 1992). Theory and research indicates that universalism and benevolence values, which serve collective interests and emphasize concern for the welfare and interest of others, are postulated to be opposed to and in direct conflict with values that serve individual interests and emphasize the pursuit of one’s own interests and relative success and dominance over others (e.g., power, achievement; Schwartz, 1992, 2006).

Given that universalism and benevolence both reflect a type of goal or motivational concern with the enhancement of others’ welfare, the acceptance of others as equals, and transcendence of selfish interests (Schwartz, 1992), these values conceptually reflect the theory and operationalization of authentic leadership. For instance, more (vs. less) authentic leaders are posited to be concerned about the development of their followers; they model and support their followers’ self-determination in an effort to foster their authenticity and well-being (Gardner et al., 2005; Ilies, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005). Moreover, in contrast to less authentic leaders, more authentic leaders are posited to solicit views that challenge their deeply held positions, admit mistakes when they are made, and seek feedback to improve interactions with others – all of which reflect their concerns for the welfare of others and their acceptance of others as equals. These characteristics also reflect the notion that more (vs. less) authentic leaders’ are willing to sacrifice their own self-interests for the greater good, which appears incompatible with achievement and power values. Thus, while no empirical research exists examining the relations between authentic leadership and
values, given the aforementioned rationale, I expected authentic leadership to be positively associated with values of benevolence and universalism and negatively associated with values of power and achievement.

*Hypothesis 2a:* Authentic leadership will be positively correlated with self-transcendence values of benevolence and universalism.

*Hypothesis 2b:* Authentic leadership will be negatively correlated with self-enhancement values of power and achievement.

As another means by which to test the theoretical assumption that more (vs. less) authentic leaders are in fact more ethical in their actions, and not just in their internally held values, I examined the extent to which more authentic leaders are more ethical in their decision making. While no empirical research to date has examined the relation between authentic leadership and ethical decision-making, given that more (vs. less), authentic leaders are more objective in their decision-making, model high standards of ethical conduct, and are transparent about their position yet willing to admit mistakes when they are made, I expected more authentic leaders to be perceived by subordinates as being more ethical in their decision-making when compared to less authentic leaders.

*Hypothesis 2c:* Authentic leadership will be positively correlated with ethical decision making.

**What Subordinate Outcomes are Associated with Authentic Leadership?**

Given that the empirical literature related to authentic leadership is still in its infancy, I chose to examine a broad range of subordinate outcomes that are both widely studied, considered important to organizational success, and ones that I expected to be associated with authentic leadership. These include relational outcomes (i.e., leader-
member exchange), attitudinal outcomes (i.e., affective organizational commitment), psychological outcomes (i.e., psychological well-being), and behavioral outcomes (i.e., organizational citizenship behavior, job performance). Below I provide a rationale for the expected association between authentic leadership and these subordinate outcomes.

Theory postulates that in contrast to less authentic leaders, more authentic leaders are interested in fostering high-quality relationships based on principles of social exchange rather than economic exchange (Ilies et al., 2005). As a result, subordinates of more authentic leaders are expected to report both elevated levels of leader-member exchange and the willingness to engage in organizational citizenship behavior to reciprocate the social exchanges within these highly-valued relationships when compared to less authentic leaders. Authentic leadership theory also suggests positive relations with job performance (Avolio et. al., 2004; Gardner et al., 2005). In a recent study involving the newly validated ALQ measure, subordinate self-reported organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior as well as supervisor-rated job performance were found to be positively associated with subordinates’ ratings of their managers’ authentic leadership (Walumbwa et al., 2008). I expected to replicate these initial empirical findings.

While empirical research does not yet exist linking authentic leadership and subordinates’ psychological well-being, strong theoretical arguments emphasize that by modeling and fostering authenticity in subordinates, more authentic leaders should increase subordinates’ psychological well-being (Ilies et al., 2005) when compared to less authentic leaders. Importantly, the link between authenticity and well-being is well established (Kahneman, Diener, & Schwartz, 1999; Kernis, 2003; Ryan & Deci, 2000;
Sheldon & Elliot, 1999; Sheldon, Elliott, Ryan, Shirkov, Kim, Wu, et al., 2004, as cited in Gardner et al., 2005). Although no direct empirical evidence relating authentic leadership to subordinate outcomes of leader-member exchange or psychological well-being are available, I expected positive relations to emerge in line with aforementioned theoretical propositions and related empirical research findings.

Hypothesis 3a: Authentic leadership will be positively associated with subordinates’ perceptions of the quality of the manager-subordinate relationship (LMX; leader-member exchange).

Hypothesis 3b: Authentic leadership will be positively associated with subordinates’ affective organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 3c: Authentic leadership will be positively associated with subordinates’ psychological well-being.

Hypothesis 3d: Authentic leadership will be positively associated with subordinates’ organizational citizenship behavior.

Hypothesis 3e: Authentic leadership will be positively associated with subordinates’ job performance.

How do Authentic Leaders Affect Subordinate Outcomes?

Leadership research is often criticized for failing to address the “black box” of leadership (Luthans, 2005), that is, the means by which leadership has its effects on subordinates. Given that authentic leadership is an emerging field of research, it is not surprising, as noted by Yammarino, Dionne, Schriesheim and Dansereau (2008), that “there is a need in AL (authentic leadership) to articulate theoretically and test empirically processes and process variables and measures” (p. 705). To address this
issue, I identified and tested two key mechanisms by which authentic leadership is likely to influence subordinate outcomes. In particular, I utilized a trust and an empowerment framework to establish the means by which more (vs. less) authentic leaders influence subordinate outcomes. Below, I outline my rationale for trust, followed by empowerment, as the key mediating mechanisms, and present the hypothesis related to these two mediating outcomes at the end of the empowerment section.

**Trust as a mediating mechanism.**

Trust is defined as a psychological state that reflects one individual’s willingness to accept vulnerability based upon his or her belief about the positive intentions or behavior of another (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998). The relations between leadership and subordinate trust in leader have been widely studied, as captured in a meta-analytic study by Dirks and Ferrin (2002). In addition to strong empirical evidence of the relations between leadership and trust, I expected authentic leadership to engender trust in subordinates for a number of reasons, as outlined below.

First, a more (vs. less) authentic leader is portrayed as being “genuine, reliable, trustworthy, real, and veritable” (Luthans & Avolio, 2003, p. 2); thus, trustworthiness is theorized as an inherent characteristic of authentic leadership. Empirical research suggests that behavioral consistency, behavioral integrity, sharing of power, open communication, and benevolence – all characteristics that reflect the theoretical construct of authentic leadership – have been found to be associated with subordinates’ perceptions of their manager’s trustworthiness (Whitener et. al., 1998). Second, the kind of conditions that foster trust, including: availability, competence, consistency, fairness, integrity, loyalty, openness, overall trust, promise fulfillment, and receptivity (Butler, 1991),
appear to closely resemble the core characteristics of authentic leadership. Furthermore, as noted by Zhu, May, and Avolio (2004), “most perspectives on trust acknowledge that a leader’s words must accurately predict his/her future actions in order to create a necessary, though perhaps not sufficient, condition for the development of trust” (p. 19). Given that reliability and dependability are considered to be the key dimensions upon which people base their cognitive judgments about another individual’s trustworthiness (McAllister, 1995), the alignment between the values and behavior of authentic leaders and the transparency of their decision-making process appears to be consistent with the importance of reliability and dependability judgments.

Recent research indicates that subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership are positively correlated with their trust in their manager at the individual level (Wong, Spence Laschinger, & Cummings, 2010) as well as at the collective group level (Walumbwa, Luthans, Avey, & Oke, 2011). At the group level of analysis, group level authentic leadership has also been found to be positively related to group level trust in management (Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang & Avey, 2009). Thus, taking into consideration theory and empirical research, I expected subordinates to report higher levels of trust in more authentic leaders when compared to less authentic leaders.

In turn, I expected trust in leader to be positively associated with the subordinate outcomes being examined in this research. Trust research draws heavily upon social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), which suggests that when subordinates trust their manager, they hold more favourable attitudes towards their exchange relationship. Specifically, trust is believed to have an important influence on the quality of manager-subordinate relationships (Butler, 1991; Liden & Graen, 1980). In fact, in the leader-member
exchange literature, in-group relationships, described as high quality exchange relationships, are characterized by high levels of trust. When they trust their manager, subordinates should be more willing to engage in extra effort in terms of job performance and organizational citizenship behavior (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Mayer & Gavin, 2005). This is because high trust relationships tend to be characterized by a history of successful exchanges, which create a feeling of obligation in the subordinate to reciprocate the benefits they have received from their manager with extra effort (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). In an environment of trust, subordinates are also likely to believe that their extra efforts will be recognized in the future, and as such, they should be more motivated to perform well in their job, to go above and beyond their job description (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990; Settoon, Bennett & Liden, 1996), to feel more attached to the organization (Nyhan, 1999), and to experience a sense of psychological well-being.

On the contrary, those considered out-group, portrayed as low quality exchange relationships between managers and subordinates, are characterized by low trust (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). Subordinates who do not trust their manager are likely to experience psychological distress because the manager has power over key aspects of one’s job (Rich, 1997), which is likely to contribute to lower levels of psychological well-being. When the interpersonal relationship between subordinate and managers is characterized by low trust, subordinates may be reluctant to take risks (Tyler & Kramer, 1996, as cited in Connell et al., 2003) and be concerned about being taken advantage of by their manager, which is likely to make them feel less motivated to perform in their job,
go beyond minimum requirements (Mayer & Gavin, 2005), or feel attached to their organization (Nyhan, 1999).

The significant body of research that has emerged to date on trust convincingly confirms its critical role in engendering desirable organizational outcomes. Specifically, research shows that trust in leader is associated with leader-member exchange (Gomez & Rosen, 2001; Nyhan, 1999; Wat & Shaffer, 2005), organizational commitment (Butler, Cantrell, & Flick, 1999; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Rubin, Bommer & Bachrach, 2010), well-being (Lium, Siu, & Shi, 2010), organizational citizenship behavior (Colquitt, Scott, & LePine, 2007; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Korsgaard, Brodt, & Whitener, 2002; Robinson, 1996), and job performance (Colquitt, Scott, & Pine, 2007; Dirks, 2000; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Robinson, 1996), among others. Thus, I expected trust in leader to be associated with these subordinate outcomes.

Taken together, the research on antecedents of trust is closely aligned with the behaviors and relational characteristics of authentic leadership. When compared to less authentic leaders, more authentic leaders are likely to engender a sense of trust in their subordinates because they are open and transparent in their interactions and decision-making process, they demonstrate respect for their subordinates by encouraging them to express their viewpoints, and they exhibit consistency between their core values, actions, and emotions. Subordinates’ trust in their manager is posited to foster a willingness to cooperate with their manager for the benefit of the organization (Avolio, et al., 2004). As such, it is expected that subordinate trust in their manager will be positively associated with the hypothesized subordinate outcomes. Taken together, I proposed that trust plays a key mediating role in the relations between authentic leadership and subordinate
outcomes, namely leader-member exchange, affective organizational commitment, psychological well-being, organizational citizenship behavior, and job performance, which is articulated in hypothesis 4 on page 26.

**Empowerment as a mediating mechanism.**

Empowerment has been conceptualized in a number of ways, including as a relational, social-structural and psychological construct (Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayner, 1997). Empowerment as a psychological construct is well established theoretically and empirically. However, while a number of authors have identified leadership as a key factor that influences subordinates’ psychological empowerment (see Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Spreitzer, 1996), the development of theory underpinning empowering leader behavior has lagged (Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, & Drasgow, 2000). Moreover, research has typically examined either leader empowering behavior or subordinate state of psychological empowerment, with the majority of studies focused on the latter. Thus, one key goal of this dissertation was to examine both empowering leader behavior and subordinate state of psychological empowerment as key mediating mechanisms between authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes.

Thomas and Velthouse (1990) and later Spreitzer (1995) defined psychological state of empowerment as increased intrinsic task motivation that is characterized by four cognitions reflecting an individual’s orientation to his or her work role, including: meaning, competence/self-efficacy, self-determination/choice, and impact. **Meaning** is the experience of one’s job having value or importance (Fulford & Enz, 1995; May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004). **Competence** or **self-efficacy** is one’s belief that one has the necessary skills to successfully perform their work activities within a specific context
(Bandura, 1986; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Fulford & Enz, 1995; Thomas & Tymon, 1994). Self-determination or choice is one’s felt sense of autonomy or discretion to perform one’s work in the way that one chooses, including making decisions about work methods, procedures, pace, and effort (Fulford & Enz, 1995; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Impact is the extent to which one feels that one’s work makes a difference in achieving the overall purpose of the task (Thomas & Tymon, 1994; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990) and the extent to which one believes that one can influence organizational outcomes in a positive way (Spreitzer, 1995).

In the leadership literature, several researchers have suggested that effective leadership is characterized as empowering leadership, and that this form of leadership is expected to foster positive attitudes and behaviors in subordinates (Conger, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1988). While inconsistently defined, the most common type of empowering leader behavior represented in the empowerment literature reflect consulting (sometimes referred to as participative decision making), delegating, and informing. Only recently has research begun to explore the empowering leader behaviors that may influence subordinates’ psychological empowerment. Specifically, Arnold et al. (2000) developed a theory of effective team leadership in empowering organizations, consisting of the following dimensions: leading by example, participative decision-making, coaching, informing, and showing concern/interacting with the team. For the purposes of this
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4 While the team leadership behaviors identified by Arnold et al. (2000) would presumably overlap with empowering leader behaviors aimed at the individual level, it is important to note that the focus of Arnold et al.’s research was on leadership behaviors associated with effective team leadership in empowered organizational environments.
research, I used the *consulting*, *delegating*, and *informing* subscales from an established theory and measure of leadership behaviors (Yukl, Wall & Lepsinger, 1990) to represent empowering leader behavior.

Drawing from authentic leadership theory, when compared to less authentic leaders, more authentic leaders are expected to engage in empowering behavior by fostering transparent and high-quality relationships based on principles of social exchange rather than economic exchange (Ilies et al., 2005). Thus, I expected more (vs. less) authentic leaders to foster open two-way communication such that critical information is shared, and constructive feedback is provided and solicited. Although it has not been operationalized, I presumed from examining the scale items of the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire that more authentic leaders are comfortable with providing direct feedback to their subordinates (e.g., “tells the hard truth”) when compared to less authentic leaders. Moreover, authentic leadership theory directly posits that when compared to less authentic leaders, more authentic leaders model and support subordinates’ self-determination (Gardner, et al, 2005; Ilies et al., 2005). As such, I expected that more authentic leaders would be more likely to consult with and delegate to their subordinates than less authentic leaders. To my knowledge, research has not examined relations between authentic leadership and empowering leader behavior. However, in the practitioner literature, empowerment of subordinates by leaders is stressed as a key mechanism by which authentic leadership fosters superior long-term organizational results (George, 2003; George, & Sims, 2007; George, Sims, McLean, & Mayer, 2007).
Leaders that engage in empowering leader behavior, including involving subordinates in decision-making, consulting with them on important organizational matters, and sharing critical information, are likely to make subordinates feel that their opinions and contributions are respected and valued by the leader. These empowering leader behaviors are likely to facilitate subordinates’ development and confidence in their work. As a result, subordinates should experience a greater sense of psychological empowerment. Related research suggests that when supervisors engage in participative behavior (e.g., encourage subordinate initiative and provide feedback in an autonomy-supportive rather than in a controlling way), subordinates experience greater intrinsic motivation, feelings of self-worth, a sense of self-determination (Deci, Connell, & Ryan, 1989). Subordinates are more likely to be committed to the organization if they have leaders who encourage them to participate in decision making (Jermier & Berkes, 1979; Rhodes & Steers, 1981). Moreover, Ahearne, Mathieu, and Rapp (2005) found that empowering leader behavior (defined as enhancing the meaningfulness of work, fostering participation in decision making, expressing confidence in high performance, and providing autonomy from bureaucratic constraints) predicted subordinates’ sense of self-efficacy, which is a key characteristic of psychological empowerment.

Subordinates who have a strong sense of psychological empowerment are more likely to hold positive attitudes and engage in positive behavior at work when compared to their less empowered colleagues. This is because empowered subordinates perceive themselves as being more competent in their jobs and have the ability to influence their work and organizations in a meaningful way. For example, the argument has been made that in order for organizational citizenship behaviors to be displayed, “employees must
have discretion in how they carry out their job responsibilities” (Morrison, 1996, p. 500). Subordinates who are psychologically empowered are likely to reciprocate through engaging in organizational citizenship behavior (Morrison, 1996) as well as through their commitment to the organization (Liden, Wayne, & Sparrow, 2000; Kraimer, Seibert, & Liden, 1999; Sims & Kroeck, 1994; Spreitzer, 1995). Moreover, given that a key premise of empowerment theory is that empowered individuals should perform better in their jobs than their empowered counterparts (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990), I expected psychological empowerment to be associated with job performance. In addition, considering that psychological empowerment enables subordinates to gain control and mastery over their work life (Berger & Neuhaus, 1977, as cited in Molix & Bettercourt, 2010), thereby diminishing feelings of powerlessless, psychologically empowered subordinates should experience higher levels of psychological well-being.

Research indicates that psychological empowerment is positively associated with leader-member exchange (Wat & Shaffer, 2005), affective organizational commitment (Castro, Perinan, & Bueno, 2008; Koberg, Boss, Senjem, & Goodman, 1999), well-being (Hochwalder & Brucefors, 2005; Molix & Bettercourt, 2010), organizational citizenship behavior (Chan, Taylor, & Markham, 2008), and job performance (Butts, Vandenberg, DeJoy, Shaffer & Wilson, 2009; Koberg et al., 1999).

Overall, I expected that more (vs. less) authentic leaders’ influence upon subordinates’ psychological sense of empowerment would be mediated by the authentic leaders’ reliance upon empowering behavior. In turn, subordinates’ psychological empowerment should predict positive subordinate outcomes. Taking together my aforementioned rationale for trust and empowerment as key mediators of the relations
between authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes, I proposed the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 4a:** The relation between authentic leadership and leader-member exchange will be mediated through two routes, each of which are expected to partially mediate this relation. First, trust in leader will mediate the relation between authentic leadership and LMX. Second, authentic leadership will predict leader empowering behavior, which will foster psychological empowerment in subordinates, which in turn will be positively associated with LMX.

**Hypothesis 4b:** The relation between authentic leadership and affective organizational commitment will be mediated through two routes, each of which are expected to partially mediate this relation. First, trust in leader will mediate the relation between authentic leadership and affective organizational commitment. Second, authentic leadership will predict leader empowering behavior, which will foster psychological empowerment in subordinates, which in turn will be positively associated with affective organizational commitment.

**Hypothesis 4c:** The relation between authentic leadership and psychological well-being will be mediated through two routes, each of which are expected to partially mediate this relation. First, trust in leader will mediate the relation between authentic leadership and psychological well-being. Second, authentic leadership will predict
leader empowering behavior, which will foster psychological empowerment in subordinates, which in turn will be positively associated with psychological well-being.

*Hypothesis 4d:* The relation between authentic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior will be mediated through two routes, each of which are expected to partially mediate this relation. First, trust in leader will mediate the relation between authentic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. Second, authentic leadership will predict leader empowering behavior, which will foster psychological empowerment in subordinates, which in turn will be positively associated with organizational citizenship behavior.

*Hypothesis 4e:* The relation between authentic leadership and job performance behavior will be mediated through two routes, each of which are expected to partially mediate this relation. First, trust in leader will mediate the relation between authentic leadership and job performance. Second, authentic leadership will predict leader empowering behavior, which will foster psychological empowerment in subordinates, which in turn will be positively associated with job performance.

In summary, the purpose of this dissertation is to advance our theoretical and empirical understanding of authentic leadership in a number of ways. First, a unique feature of this research is the inclusion of managers’ and subordinates’ perspectives and
the measurement of predictors, mediators and outcomes by different sources, which allowed for the examination of relations between managers’ and subordinates’ ratings of authentic leadership, while minimizing the potential effects of monomethod bias. I expected a weak but positive and significant correlation to emerge between managers’ and subordinates’ ratings of authentic leadership. Second, this research addresses gaps in the theory and operationalization of the authentic leadership construct by identifying the content of authentic leaders’ internally held values and ethical behavior. I expected more authentic leaders to subscribe more to self-transcendent values and less to self-enhancement values, and to engage in more ethical decision making, when compared to less authentic leaders. Third, this research replicates previously examined subordinate outcomes of authentic leadership (i.e., organizational citizenship behavior, job performance, organizational commitment) and tests hypothesized links with leader member exchange and psychological well-being. Finally, this research proposes and tests two key mediating mechanisms – trust and empowerment – that are hypothesized to account for the relations between authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes.

**Method**

Two groups of participants, managers and their subordinates, took part in a Manager Survey and a Subordinate Survey, respectively. Participant information, procedures, materials, and measures associated with each participant group are outlined below.
Methodology – Managers

Participants.

One hundred and eighty eight participants in managerial positions volunteered to complete an online Manager Survey. Ninety five participants were employed individuals who were current or former University of Guelph MBA or MA Leadership students, one was recruited through an online newsletter sent out by an independent consultant to her distribution list, and 92 were referrals (individuals that were referred by managerial participants, those that received a recruitment email who were not eligible to participate themselves but referred others, or personal contacts of the researcher).

Procedure.

Prospective participants were asked to take part in the online manager survey through a recruitment email sent by one of the following individuals endorsing the study: a) the Associate Dean of Executive Programs at the University of Guelph (an email was sent to MBA and MA Leadership students and alumni; see Appendices A and B); b) an Independent Consultant (information about the study was posted in an online newsletter which is sent out monthly to the distribution list; see Appendix C) and c) by the researcher, Evelina Rog (see Appendices D and E). In each case, the recruitment email

5 Several versions of recruitment and consent forms were used because I was serving as a TA for some participants; to prevent conflict of interest and assure confidentiality, these students, and their referrals, were contacted by the Assistant Dean of Executive Graduate Programs or the survey administrator on my behalf. Also, to maximize participation rates, recruitment emails were sent to all other current/former MA Leadership/MBA students by Geoff Smith on my behalf. In Appendices A through H Group A = students I TA’d;
informed prospective participants that the study was part of my doctoral research and that I was examining leadership processes from the perspectives of both managers and their subordinates. Prospective participants were informed that the online survey would take about 20-30 minutes to complete and that a draw for a $250 gift certificate was being offered as a reward for participating.

Next, the recruitment email stipulated eligibility for the study. For the purposes of this research, I used the following criteria to help participants determine their eligibility for the manager survey: 1) Participants must have been employed in a management capacity at the time of the study (i.e., had at least one individual directly reporting to them); and, 2) Participants must have supervised at least one of their subordinates for the past six months or more. I chose six months as a minimum time frame for the manager-subordinate relationship because I wanted to investigate established relationships. Individuals who were eligible to participate in the survey were directed to a link to the consent form (see Appendices F, G and H) whereas those who were not eligible to participate were directed to a referrals link where they were asked to refer colleagues to the survey (see Appendix I).

Participants were asked to read the consent form and to use the confidential password provided to them in the recruitment email to access the survey. The consent form informed participants of key aspects of the survey and they were informed about their rights (e.g., participation is voluntary, results would be reported in aggregate form

Group B = all other students/alumni; Group C = managers referred by Group B managers/researcher’s contacts; and Group D = managers referred by Group A managers.
only, responses would be automatically encrypted and stored in a secure server). Participants indicated their consent by clicking on the survey link.

The Manager Survey, contained in Appendix J, consisted of nine sections. In section one, background employment information was collected (e.g., organizational tenure, number of subordinates). In section two, participants’ self-rated a) authentic leadership and b) empowering leader behavior. Section three assessed participants’ values and included an impression management scale. In Section four, participant demographic information of a more sensitive nature was collected (e.g., level of education, annual income).

Next, in section five, participants were asked to list up to three subordinates whom had reported to them for at least the past six months. Using a semi-random selection procedure, one subordinate was selected to be rated by the manager. Managers were asked to refer to the selected subordinate when completing this section of the survey and they were informed that they would be asked for this subordinate’s contact information at the end of the survey. Managers responded to questions about their relationship with the subordinate (i.e., how long the manager had known the subordinate, how long the manager had been the subordinate’s manager, how frequently they had interacted and how well the manager knew the subordinate). In this section, managers also rated their subordinate on his or her organizational citizenship behavior and job
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6 Managers were instructed to select one subordinate from the list they generated based on the following criteria: if they listed one subordinate, they were asked to select that person; if they listed two subordinates, they were asked to select the second subordinate; and, if they listed three subordinates, they were asked to select the third subordinate.
performance. In section six, participants were asked to provide the contact information for the subordinate rated in the survey.

In section seven, participants were provided with a space to write “any additional comments regarding leadership processes”. In section eight, participants provided their own contact information if they were interested in entering the reward draw and receiving a summary of the research. Finally, in the last section of the survey, section nine, participants were asked to refer up to 10 colleagues to the survey. Referrals by participants as well as those who were not eligible to participate were used as part of a snowball sampling technique in order to increase sample size. For every referral provided, the participant’s name was entered into a draw for a $250 gift certificate.

Once participants submitted their survey responses, they were automatically directed to a separate URL with the debriefing form (see Appendix K). The debriefing form expanded on the study rationale and instructed participants to contact the primary researcher if any questions, comments or concerns about the research arose. Participants were also informed that a summary of the research findings would be provided to them through email upon completion of the study. Participants who did not respond to the recruitment email were sent a follow-up reminder email requesting their participation in the research (see Appendix L).

Measures.

**Background employment information.** Managers’ self-reported employment information included: gender (-1 = female, 1 = male), country of employment (1 = Canada, 2 = United States, 3 = Other), sector (1 = not-for-profit, 2 = public, 3 = private), organizational tenure (total tenure at organization in years and months), level in the
organization (1 = non-managerial employee, 2 = supervisor, 3 = manager, 4 = senior manager, 5 = director, 6 = vice president, 7 = president or executive director, 8 = executive officer), job title, primary language used in workplace (1 = English, 2 = French, 3 = other), job tenure (total job tenure in years), and number of subordinates. For job and organizational tenure, participants were asked to manually type into the survey software the years, as well as months, for each of these variables; prior to calculating descriptive statistics, data were converted into a decimal such that 1 month represented 1/12th of a year (i.e., 1 month = .08; 2 months = .17 years…11 months = .92 years). Appendix M contains managers’ background employment information.

**Authentic leadership.** I used the 16-item Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) developed and validated by Walumbwa et al. (2008) to measure participants’ self-reported authentic leadership. The ALQ consists of four dimensions, including self-awareness, relational transparency, internalized moral perspective and balanced processing. In response to the stem “As a leader I…,” managers provided self-ratings on a 5-point scale from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always). The self-awareness subscale consists of four items and assesses a leader’s demonstrated understanding of his or her strengths and weaknesses, how others see him or her and how his or her actions impact others. A sample item is: “Accurately describe how others view my capabilities.” The relational transparency subscale consists of five items and assesses a leader’s expression of his or her authentic self to others and his or her encouragement of others to do the same; a sample item is: “Say exactly what I mean.” The internalized moral perspective subscale contains four items and assesses the extent to which a leader’s behavior and decision-making is guided by high internal standards of ethical conduct as
opposed to external pressures. A sample item is: “Demonstrate beliefs that are consistent with my actions.” Finally, the balanced processing subscale consists of three items and assesses the extent to which a leader analyzes all relevant data, considers others’ perspectives and solicits input even if it challenges his or her deeply held positions prior to coming to conclusions. A sample item is: “Listen carefully to different points of view before coming to conclusions.” An aggregate score was calculated based on the average of the 16 items of the ALQ. Cronbach’s alpha was .84. Appendix N contains the managers’ self-report version of the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire.

Empowering leader behavior. In the absence of an instrument measuring empowering leader behavior as defined in this dissertation, this construct was measured with the delegating and consulting subscales from the Managerial Practices Survey (MPS; Yukl, 1990; Yukl et al., 1990) as well as an informing subscale developed for the purpose of this research. These three dimensions were selected to represent the most prevalent empowering behaviors noted in the empowerment literature. Each subscale contains seven items. In response to the stem “As a leader I…,” managers self-rated on a 5-point scale from 1 (never, not at all) to 5 (almost always or to a very great extent). The operationalization of the consulting subscale of the Managerial Practices Survey reflects what is often referred to in the empowerment literature as participative decision-making.

Although the MPS contains an Informing subscale, personal communication with Dr. Yukl indicated that the content reflected in the published subscale items was outdated; thus, new items were developed in consultation with Dr. Yukl to measure the informing construct (Personal Communication with Dr. Gary Yukl, October 29, 2008).
rating scale also included a sixth option labeled “don’t know or not applicable.”

The delegating subscale assesses the degree to which managers allow others to have substantial responsibility and discretion in carrying out their work activities and giving them the authority necessary to make important decisions (Yukl; Yukl et al.); a sample item is: “Assign an important task and let them decide how to do it without interfering.”

The consulting subscale assesses the extent to which managers check in with their subordinates prior to making changes that affect them, encourage participation in decision-making, and allow others to influence decisions (Yukl; Yukl et al.); a sample item is: “Consult with them before making decisions that affect them.” The informing subscale assesses the extent to which managers disseminate relevant information to their subordinates about decisions, plans and activities. A sample item is: “Communicate changes and events that may affect their work.” An aggregate score was calculated based on the average of the 21 items of the Empowering Leader Behavior measure. Cronbach’s alpha was .86. Appendix O contains the Empowering Leader Behavior measure.

**Values.** The Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ; Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess, Harris, & Owens, 2001) was used to measure managers’ values. Compared to the Schwartz’ Values Scale (SVS; Schwartz’ 1992), the PVQ is considered appropriate
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9 The “don’t know or not applicable” rating response is usually scored as a "1" (the same as a "not at all" response), but any respondent who uses the response frequently is deleted from the data set (Personal communication with Dr. Gary Yukl, November 19, 2008). In this dissertation, any participant who used the “don’t know or not applicable option more than once within any subscale was excluded from analyses involving the empowering leader behavior subscales.
for all populations, equally valid, and significantly less time consuming (Personal communication with Dr. Shalom Schwartz, August 24, 2008). As with the SVS, the 40-item PVQ measures the ten value types proposed by Schwartz including: conformity, tradition, benevolence, universalism, self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, power and security. These values are considered related but independent factors (Schwartz). Participants completed the entire 40-item scale; however, for the purposes of this dissertation, only four value types were of interest. Specifically, I was particularly interested in assessing managers’ responses to subscales that reflect self-enhancement values (i.e., power, achievement) and self-transcendence values (i.e., benevolence, universalism).

The PVQ is adapted for participant gender; thus, participants are asked to read descriptions of people and to think about how much a target person is or is not like either him or herself. Managers self-rated the extent to which they agreed with each item on a 6-point scale from 1 (not like me at all) to 6 (very much like me). The power value contains three items and reflects the importance of social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources; a sample item is: “He/she likes to be in charge and tell others what to do. He/she wants people to do what he says.” The achievement value contains four items and reflects the importance of personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards; a sample item is: “Being very successful is important to him/her. He/she likes to stand out and to impress other people.” The universalism value contains six items and reflects the importance of understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature; a sample item is: “He/she thinks it is important that every person in the world should be
treated equally. He/she wants justice for everybody, even for people he doesn’t know.”

The *benevolence* value contains four items and reflects the importance of the preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact; a sample item is: “He/she always wants to help the people who are close to him/her. It’s very important to him/her to care for the people she knows and likes.” An aggregate score was calculated for each of the four subscales based on the average of the items contained within each subscale. Cronbach’s alpha was .74 for the benevolence subscale, .69 for the universalism subscale, .81 for the achievement subscale, and .64 for the power subscale. Appendices P and Q contain the male and female versions of the Portrait Values Questionnaire, respectively.

**Impression management.** Managers completed the 12-item short version of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding-Impression Management subscale (BIDR-IM; Paulhus, 1991), which measures the tendency to present one’s actions in the most positive manner in order to control the social image that one projects. Responses are rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*not true*) to 7 (*very true*). Negatively keyed items are reverse scored and one point is added to every item rated as a “6” or “7” prior to calculating an aggregate average of the 12 items. Sample items include: “When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening,” and ”I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit”(R). Cronbach’s alpha was .69. Appendix R contains the BIDR-Impression Management subscale.

**Demographic information.** Manager self-reported demographic information was collected including: level of education (1 = *some high school*, 2 = *high school graduate*, 3 = *some college or technical school*, 4 = *college or technical school graduate*, 5 = *some*...
university undergraduate training, 6 = university degree, 7 = some university graduate training, 8 = masters degree, 9 = doctorate degree or equivalent), marital status (1 = single, 2 = common law, 3 = married, 4 = separated or divorced, 5 = widowed), age (in years), annual income (in Canadian dollars), income range (1 = Under $25,000, 2 = $25,000-$49,000, 3 = $50,000-$74,999, 4 = $75,000-$99,999, 5 = $100,000-$124,999, and 6 = Over $125,000), and ethnic origin (-1 = visible minority (East Asian or Southeast Asian, South Asian, African, Arab, Latin, Central or South American, Caribbean, Aboriginal); 1 = white (British Isles, Western European, Northern European, Eastern European, Southern European, French, Canadian). Appendix S contains managers’ demographic information.

Relationship with subordinate. Managers responded to several questions about their relationship with their subordinate, created by the researcher for the purposes of this study, including: “How long have you known this person?” (in years and months, which was converted into a decimal), “How long have you been this person’s manager?” (in years and months, which was converted into a decimal), “How frequently do you interact with this person?” (1 = once per month or less, 2 = once every other week, 3 = 1-2 times per week, 4 = 3-4 times per week, and 5 = at least once per day), and “How well do you think you know this person?” (1 = not very well, 2 = somewhat well, 3 = quite well, and 4 = very well). Appendix T contains managers’ relationship variable questions.

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCBs). Managers reported on the extent to which their subordinates demonstrated OCBs on Podsakoff et al. (1990) Organizational

---

10 Participants were considered Visible Minority if they selected any of the Visible Minority ethnic groups in addition to any of the White groups.
Citizenship Behavior Scale, which is based on Organ’s (1988) theoretical framework. Typically a 24-item scale, I used the three highest loading items on each of the five dimensions of the scale for the purpose of this research. The altruism dimension refers to discretionary behaviors that help another individual with an organizationally relevant task or problem; a sample item is: “Is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him/her.” Conscientiousness refers to discretionary behaviors that reflect going above and beyond minimum role requirements such as attendance, obeying rules etc.; a sample item is: “Is one of my most conscientious employees.” Sportsmanship refers to an employee’s willingness to tolerate less than ideal circumstances without complaining; a sample item is: “Tends to make ‘mountains out of molehills’” (R). Courtesy refers to discretionary behavior that aims at preventing work-related problems with others from occurring; a sample item is: “Is mindful of how his/her behavior affects other people’s jobs.” Civic Virtue refers to discretionary behavior that reflects responsible participation and involvement in the life of the company; a sample item is: “Attends meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important.” Response options ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Negatively keyed items were reverse coded and an aggregate score was calculated based on the average of the 15 items. Cronbach’s alpha was .88. Appendix U contains the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale.

**Job performance.** Managers rated their subordinates’ job performance on Williams and Anderson’s (1991) 7-item measure of In-Role Behavior, which assesses those behaviors that are recognized by formal reward systems and reflect requirements stated in job descriptions. Responses are rated on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). A sample item is: “Meets formal performance
requirements of the job.” Negatively keyed items were reverse coded and an aggregate score was calculated based on the average of the 7 items. Cronbach’s alpha was .90. Appendix V contains the job performance measure.

Methodology – Subordinates

Participants.

Seventy five participants (49 women and 26 men), who were subordinates of the managerial participants, volunteered to complete the online Subordinate Survey.

Procedure.

Prospective participants were asked to take part in an online Subordinate Survey through a recruitment email sent by the researcher (see Appendices W and X). The recruitment email informed them that the study was part of my doctoral research examining manager-employee processes, that I was recruiting managers and their subordinates to participate in an online survey, and that their manager had already participated in the manager portion of this study and had passed on their contact information to me. Prospective participants were also informed that the online survey would take about 20-30 minutes to complete and that a draw for a $250 gift certificate was being offered as a reward for their participation.

Next, the recruitment email directed prospective participants to a link to the consent form (see Appendix Y). Participants were asked to read the consent form and to use the confidential password provided to them in the recruitment email to access the survey. The consent form informed participants of the following aspects of the survey. They would be asked about their thoughts and experiences in relation to their work, organization, and manager. To allow me to match up the data from managers with that of
their subordinates, participants were informed that each manager-subordinate dyad was provided with a unique and confidential password. Finally, participants were informed about their rights (e.g., participation is voluntary, results would be reported in aggregate form only, responses would be automatically encrypted and stored in a secure server). Participants indicated their consent by clicking on the survey link.

The Subordinate Survey, contained in Appendix Z, consisted of five sections. In section one, background employment information was collected (e.g., sector, industry, level in the organization). Participants also responded to questions about their relationship with the direct manager (i.e., how long the participant had reported into his or her direct manager, how long the participant had known the direct manager, how frequently they had interacted and how well the participant knew his or her direct manager). Other demographic information of a more sensitive nature (e.g., income) was collected later in the survey.

Section two assessed participants’ perceptions of their direct managers’ a) authentic leadership and b) ethical decision-making. In this section, participants also self-reported the quality of their relationship with their manager (i.e., leader-member exchange). In section three, participants self-reported their level of psychological empowerment, affective organizational commitment, and psychological well-being. In section four, participant demographic information was collected (e.g., gender, age, ethnic origin). Also, participants were provided with a space to write “any additional comments regarding the manager-employee processes survey.” Finally, in the last section of the survey, section five, participants provided their own contact information if they were interested in entering the reward draw and receiving a summary of the research. Once
participants submitted their survey responses, they were automatically directed to a separate URL with a debriefing form (see Appendix AA). The debriefing form expanded on the study rationale and instructed participants to contact the primary researcher if any questions, comments or concerns about the research arose. Participants were also informed that a summary of the research findings would be provided to them via email upon completion of the study. Participants who did not respond to the recruitment email were sent a follow-up reminder email requesting their participation in the research (see Appendix AB).

**Measures.**

*Background employment information.* Subordinates’ self-reported employment information included: country of employment (1 = Canada, 2 = United States, 3 = Other), primary language used in workplace (1 = English, 2 = French, 3 = other), sector (1 = not-for-profit, 2 = public, 3 = private), industry (1 = agriculture and other resource-based industries, 2 = construction, 3 = manufacturing, 4 = wholesale trade, 5 = retail trade, 6 = finance and real estate, 7 = health care and social services, 8 = educational services, 9 = business services, 10 = other), level in the organization (1 = non-managerial employee, 2 = supervisor, 3 = manager, 4 = senior manager, 5 = director, 6 = vice president, 7 = president or executive director, 8 = executive officer), job title, organizational tenure (in years and months) and job tenure (in years and months). For job and organizational tenure, participants were asked to manually type into the survey software the years, as well as months, for each of these variables; prior to calculating descriptive statistics, data were converted into a decimal such that 1 month represented
1/12\textsuperscript{th} of a year (i.e., 1 month = .08; 2 months = .17 years…11 months = .92 years).

Appendix AC contains subordinates’ background employment information.

\textbf{Relationship with manager.} Subordinates responded to several questions about their relationship with their direct manager, created by the researcher for the purposes of this study, including: “How long have you been reporting to your direct manager?” (in years and months, which was converted into a decimal), “How long have you known your direct manager in total?” (in years and months, which was converted into a decimal), “How frequently do you interact with your direct manager?” (1 = \textit{once per month or less}, 2 = \textit{once every other week}, 3 = \textit{1-2 times per week}, 4 = \textit{3-4 times per week}, and 5 = \textit{at least once per day}), and “How well do you think you know your direct manager?” (1 = \textit{not very well}, 2 = \textit{somewhat well}, 3 = \textit{quite well}, and 4 = \textit{very well}).

Appendix AD contains subordinates’ relationship variable questions.

\textbf{Authentic leadership.} I used the same 16-item Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ; Walumbwa, et al., 2008) to measure subordinates’ perceptions of their direct manager’s authentic leadership (as was used to assess managers’ self-reported authentic leadership). However, the stem was appropriately modified to read “My manager…” and items were modified to read appropriately from the third person perspective (e.g., “says exactly what he or she means.”). An aggregate score was calculated based on the average of the 16 items of the ALQ. Cronbach’s alpha was .93.

Appendix AE contains the subordinate-rated version of the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire.
Trust in leader. I used 8 items from Mayer and Gavin’s (2005) Trust Scale to assess the extent to which subordinates’ trust their direct manager. Response options ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Sample items include: “If I had my way, I wouldn’t let my manager have any influence over issues that are important to me” (R), and “I would tell my manager about mistakes I’ve made on the job, even if they could damage my reputation.” Cronbach’s alpha was .65. Appendix AF contains the trust in leader measure.

Leader-member exchange (LMX). To assess the strength of LMX, I used Graen and Scandura’s (1987) 7-item LMX VII Scale, with response options ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Sample items include: “I always know where I stand with my supervisor” and “My working relationship with my supervisor is very effective.” Cronbach’s alpha was .91. Appendix AG contains the Leader-Member Exchange Scale.

Ethical decision making. Subordinates reported their perceptions of their manager’s ethical decision making on a 5-item Ethical Decision Making Scale (EDMS) developed for the purpose of this research. The primary interest in this research was specifically on managers’ ethical decision making, rather than more broadly on ethics.

---

11 Only 8 of 10 items of the Trust Scale were used in error, which may have had an impact on the scale’s reliability (Cronbach’s alpha of .65 in this study in comparison to .82 in Mayer & Gavin’s study). Each of the 10 items of the Trust Scale measure a respondent’s willingness to be vulnerable to the trustee. An examination of the items used in this research in comparison to the two items omitted did not reveal any meaningful thematic differences.
Because the business ethics literature is primarily focuses on measuring general ethical behavior (e.g., lying, cheating, stealing) using case scenarios, a suitable measure of ethical decision making was not found. Therefore, items were generated from a review of the ethical decision making literature (e.g., O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005; Trevino, Weaver, & Reynolds, 2006), an examination of the authentic leadership literature regarding internalized moral perspective, and the researcher’s own ideas concerning ethical decision making as being guided more by internal ethical standards than external stakeholder pressures. Initially eight items were generated, which were refined and reduced to five through a consensus discussion with my advisor, Dr. Leanne Son Hing (Personal communication with Leanne Son Hing, August 8, 2008), who has researched ethical decision making (Song Hing, Bobocel, Zanna, & McBride, 2007). The EDMS scale assesses the extent to which managers engage in ethical decision making and has a response scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). A sample item includes: “Places a higher value on the ethicality of a decision than on his or her own self-interests.” Cronbach’s alpha was .95. Appendix AH contains the Ethical Decision Making Scale.

**Psychological empowerment.** Spreitzer’s (1995) 12-item scale was used to measure psychological empowerment (PE) with responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Spreitzer’s scale consists of four subscales: meaning (e.g., “The work I do is very important to me’’), competence (e.g., “I am confident about my ability to do my job’’), self-determination (e.g., “I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job’’), and impact (e.g., “My impact on what happens in my department is large’’). Each subscale consists of three items. A global psychological
empowerment score was created by computing the mean of the four dimensions to reflect the psychological empowerment construct composed of the shared variance of these dimensions (Spreitzer, 1995). Cronbach’s alpha was .86. Appendix AI contains the Psychological Empowerment Scale.

**Affective organizational commitment.** I used Meyer, Allen and Smith’s (1993) Affective Organizational Commitment (AOC) Scale to measure the affective connection to one’s organization which leads one to remain with their current organization. The 6-item scale has response options ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). A sample item is: “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.” Cronbach’s alpha was .79. Appendix AJ contains the Affective Organizational Commitment Scale.

**Psychological well-being (MIDUS-II; 2004).** Ryff’s (1989) Psychological Well-Being Scale assesses six dimensions: *environmental mastery, personal growth, purpose in life, self-acceptance, autonomy and positive relations*. Five of the six scales were relevant and thus utilized in this research; *self-acceptance* was excluded. The MIDUS-II-2004, 7-item per scale version was used in this research. Participants indicated their response on a 6-point Likert-type scale, with response options ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), with higher scores on each scale indicating greater well-being on each dimension. Sample items include: “I enjoy personal and mutual conversations with family members or friends” (*positive relations with others*) and “When I think about it, I haven’t really improved much as a person over the years” [R] (*personal growth*). Cronbach’s alpha was .92. Appendix AK contains the Psychological Well-Being Scale.
Demographic information. Subordinates’ self-reported demographic information was collected including: gender (-1 = female, 1 = male), level of education (1 = some high school, 2 = high school graduate, 3 = some college or technical school, 4 = college or technical school graduate, 5 = some university undergraduate training, 6 = university degree, 7 = some university graduate training, 8 = masters degree, 9 = doctorate degree or equivalent), marital status (1 = single, 2 = common law, 3 = married, 4 = separated or divorced, 5 = widowed), age (in years), annual income (in Canadian dollars), income range (1 = Under $25,000, 2 = $25,000-$49,000, 3 = $50,000-$74,999, 4 = $75,000-$99,999, 5 = $100,000-$124,999, and 6 = Over $125,000), and ethnic origin (-1 = visible minority (East Asian or Southeast Asian, South Asian, African, Arab, Latin, Central or South American, Caribbean, Aboriginal); 1 = white (British Isles, Western European, Northern European, Eastern European, Southern European, French, Canadian).\footnote{Participants were considered visible minority if they selected any of the visible minority ethnic groups in addition to any of the White groups.}

Appendix AL contains subordinates’ demographic information.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Descriptive statistics of managers.

Descriptive statistics for demographic variables are presented in Tables 1 and 2 for managers. While 188 participants in managerial positions volunteered to complete an online Manager Survey, 25 were excluded from analyses; nine participants did not meet the study criteria (i.e., must have had a reporting relationship with a subordinate of at least six months) and data on reporting relationship was missing for three participants. In
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Categorical Variables for Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Reported categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1 = Female</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Male</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 = Single</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Common law</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Married</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Separated or divorced</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic origin&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1 = Visible Minorities (East Asian or</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southeast Asian, South Asian, African, Arab, Latin, Central or South American, Caribbean, Aboriginal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = White (British Isles, Western European, Northern European, Eastern European, Southern European, French, Canadian)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of employment&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 = Canada</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = United States</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace language&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 = English</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = French</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 = Not-for-Profit</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Public</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Private</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: <sup>a</sup>n = 163; <sup>b</sup>n=150; <sup>c</sup>n = 162.
Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Continuous Variables for Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Reported categories</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age(^a)</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.99</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education(^b)</td>
<td>1 = some high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = high school graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = some college or technical school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = college/technical school graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = some university training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 = university degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 = some university graduate training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 = masters degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 = doctorate degree or equivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income category(^c)</td>
<td>1 = under $24,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = $25,000-49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = $50,000-74,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = $75,000-99,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = $100,000-124,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 = over $125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational tenure(^b)</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>33.58</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job tenure(^b)</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational level(^d)</td>
<td>1 = Non-managerial employee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Senior Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 = Vice President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 = President/Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 = Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of subordinates(^e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>30.56</td>
<td>75.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have you known this person?(^a)</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Reported categories</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have you been this person’s manager?</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently do you interact with this person?</td>
<td>1 = Once per month of less</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Once every other week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = 1-2 times per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = 3-4 times per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = At least once per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well do you think you know this person?</td>
<td>1 = Not very well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Somewhat well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Quite well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(^a n = 162; \(^b n = 163; \(^c n = 161; \(^d n = 150; \(^e n = 160\)
addition, 13 participants had incomplete data across managerial measures and were excluded to have a consistent sample size across analyses. Thus, analyses are based on 163 participants (79 women and 84 men). The majority were White (77%); 23% were visible minorities. Participants ranged in age from 25 to 66 (M = 42.99, SD = 8.9), had on average a university degree or higher, and an average annual income in the range of $75,000-$99,999. Participants were employed in various industries, across all sectors (i.e. public, private, and not-for-profit) and represented all levels of management ranging from supervisor to CEO. While analyses are based on overall aggregated scales, for the interested reader, subscale descriptive statistics and internal consistency for managers can be found in Appendix AM.

Descriptive statistics of subordinates.

Descriptive statistics for demographic variables are presented in Tables 3 and 4 for subordinates. While 75 subordinates volunteered to complete the online Subordinate Survey, five were excluded because they did not have complete data across all subordinate measures, enabling the use of a consistent n across analyses. Thus, analyses are based on 70 participants (47 women and 23 men). The majority (82%) were White; 18% were considered visible minorities. Participants ranged in age from 23 to 60 (M = 41.32, SD = 9.9), had on average some undergraduate university training, and an average annual income in the range of $50,000-$74,999. Participants represented non-managerial through to director level ranks in their organizations. Subscale descriptive statistics and internal consistency for subordinates can be found in Appendix AN.

13 While managers and subordinates were asked to report their total annual income, many did not answer this question; thus, only income category is reported.
Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Categorical Variables for Subordinates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Reported categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1 = Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 = Single</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Common law</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Married</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Separated or divorced</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic origin&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1 = Visible Minorities (East Asian or</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southeast Asian, South Asian, African, Arab,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latin, Central or South American, Caribbean,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aboriginal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = White (British Isles, Western European,</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern European, Eastern European,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern European, French, Canadian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of employment&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 = Canada</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace language&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 = English</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 = Not-for-Profit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Public</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Private</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 = Agriculture &amp; other resource-based</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Wholesale trade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Retail trade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 = Finance &amp; Real Estate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 = Health Care &amp; Social Services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 = Educational Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 = Business Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 = Other Services</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  
<sup>a</sup> n = 70;  
<sup>b</sup> n=69;  
<sup>c</sup> n = 66;  
<sup>d</sup> n = 68.
Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics of Continuous Variables for Subordinates*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Reported categories</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age(^a)</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41.32</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education(^b)</td>
<td>1 = some high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = high school graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = some college or technical school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = college or technical school graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = some university training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 = university degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 = some university graduate training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 = masters degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 = doctorate degree or equivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income category(^a)</td>
<td>1 = under $24,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = $25,000-49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = $50,000-74,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = $75,000-99,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = $100,000-124,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 = over $125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational tenure(^c)</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job tenure(^c)</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational level(^a)</td>
<td>1 = Non-managerial employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Senior Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 = Vice President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 = President/Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 = Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have you known your manager?(^c)</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have you been reporting to your manager?(^c)</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Reported categories</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently do you interact with your manager?</td>
<td>1 = Once per month or less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Once every other week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = 1-2 times per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = 3-4 times per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = At least once per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well do you think you know your manager?</td>
<td>1 = Not very well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Somewhat well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Quite well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \[^a n = 69; \]^b \[n=70; \]^c \[n = 68; \]^d \[n = 67\]
Exclusion of participants based on study criteria.

To ensure eligibility criteria for the study were met (i.e., the manager and subordinate must have been in a reporting relationship for at least six months), I examined participant responses to relationship variables reflecting how long the manager and subordinate had known each other and how long they had been in a reporting relationship. Managerial participants were excluded from analyses if: a) their subordinate indicated reporting into their manager for less than 6 months, or b) when subordinate data was not available, when the manager indicated serving as the subordinate’s manager for less than six months. When discrepancies between respondents arose, subordinate responses were used. Twelve managerial participants were excluded from the study because the criteria for inclusion were not met or data on this variable were missing.

Semi-random selection of subordinate.

Not all managers followed survey instructions to ensure that subordinates were semi-randomly selected to be rated by the manager to participate in the subordinate survey. Thus, I conducted preliminary analyses to examine the potential effects of managers’ selection of the subordinate. Overall, 101 managerial participants (53.7%) complied with the instructions and selected a subordinate according to the instructions provided, 51 (27.1%) disregarded the instructions and self-selected one of the subordinates to be rated, and in 36 (19.2%) cases, it was not possible to determine whether or not the manager had followed instructions because either the subordinate contact information was not provided or it was not possible to match up the list of subordinates (listed by job title rather than by name) with the contact name provided. One-way ANOVAs revealed no significant differences among the type of subordinate
selections made by managers for any of the predictor and outcome measures (all \( ps > .22 \)). Therefore, all data were retained.

**Main Analyses**

**Relation between managers’ self-reported and subordinates’ perceptions of their manager’s authentic leadership.**

A test of hypothesis 1 revealed a weak positive marginal correlation between managers’ self-reported authentic leadership and subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership, \( r(62) = .22, p = .08 \) (see Table 5).\(^{14}\) To test whether the relation between managers’ and subordinates’ ratings of managers’ authentic leadership depends on how long and how well they have known each other, moderation analyses were conducted. Specifically, I tested the conditional effect of manager-subordinate relationship (i.e., how long and how well managers and subordinates knew each other) on the relation between managers’ self-rated authentic leadership and subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership. Thus, an interaction term was created

\(^{14}\) For the interested reader, a scatterplot plotting subordinates’ ratings of their managers’ authentic leadership against managers’ self-reported authentic leadership scores appears in Appendix AN and one plotting the same against managers’ self-awareness appears in Appendix AO. In the former scatterplot, a slight pattern is visible, with more managers and subordinates in agreement about managers’ authentic leadership (i.e., managers’ and subordinates’ scores are either both above or below the median for each source) than those not in agreement (managers’ ratings are high/above median while subordinates ratings are low/below median, or vice versa). In the latter scatterplot, the pattern is less evident.
by multiplying the centered moderator (i.e., manager-subordinate relationship) by the centered independent variable (i.e., managers’ self-reported authentic leadership). The dependent variable was subordinates’ perceptions of managers’ authentic leadership. This analysis revealed a non-significant interaction (Beta = -.05, B = -.11, SE B = .29, p = .70). Therefore, the relation between managers’ and subordinates’ ratings of authentic leadership was not dependent on how long and how well managers and subordinates knew each other.

Because there was only a marginal correlation between manager and subordinate ratings of managers’ authentic leadership, I examined correlations between authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes for both sources when testing hypotheses 2 and 3.

**Relations between authentic leadership and values and ethical decision making.**

To examine hypotheses 2a and 2b – that authentic leadership is positively associated with self-transcendence values of benevolence and universalism, and negatively associated with self-enhancement values of achievement and power – correlational analyses were conducted. However, to ensure that managers’ self-reported authentic leadership was not being influenced by social desirability, first I tested the correlation between manager self-reported authentic leadership and the impression management subscale of the BIDR. Results indicated that there was no correlation between manager-rated authentic leadership and impression management, \( r(161) = .13, p = .11 \). Because impression management does not influence managers’ authentic leadership, any relations between managers’ self-reported authentic leadership and
outcome variables cannot be spurious social desirability effects. Therefore, impression management was not used as a covariate in any analyses.

All descriptive statistics, correlations, and scale reliabilities are presented in Table 5. Correlational analyses showed that managers’ self-reported authentic leadership was positively correlated with values of benevolence, $r(161) = .35, p < .001$, and universalism, $r(161) = .27, p = .001$. Thus, hypothesis 2a was fully supported, indicating that more authentic leaders subscribe more to self-transcendent values than do less authentic leaders. Correlational analyses showed that managers’ self-reported authentic leadership was negatively correlated with values of power $r(161) = -.17, p = .03$; however, while the correlation was in the expected direction, the achievement value was not significantly correlated with managers’ self-reported authentic leadership, $r(161) = -.07, p = .38$. Thus, hypothesis 2b only received partial support, indicating that more authentic leaders subscribe less to power values than do less authentic leaders, but that there is no difference between more or less authentic leaders with regards to the degree to which they subscribe to achievement values. As can be seen in Table 5, there were no significant correlations between subordinate ratings of authentic leadership and any of the managers’ self-reported values. Also in Table 5, subordinate-rated authentic leadership was positively correlated with their perceptions of their managers’ ethical decision making, $r(62) = .55, p < .001$. Thus, hypothesis 2c was supported, suggesting that more (vs less) authentic leaders are perceived as more ethical in their decision making. As can be seen in Table 5, there was no significant correlation between managers’ self-reported authentic leadership and ethical decision making. Therefore, the extent to which leaders
view themselves as authentic is not associated with the extent to which their subordinates view them as ethical in their decision making.

To test whether the relations between authentic leadership and values and ethical decision making depends on how long and how well managers and subordinates have known each other, moderation analyses were conducted. Specifically, I tested the conditional effect of manager-subordinate relationship on the relation between subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership and managers’ self-reported values, as well as on the relation between managers’ self-reported authentic leadership and subordinates’ perceptions of managers’ ethical decision making. For the interested reader, these results can be found in Appendix AP.
Table 5

Descriptive Statistics and Inter-Correlations Among Managers’ Values and Correlations with Manager and Subordinate-Rated Authentic Leadership and Managers’ Ethical Decision Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. manAuth&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. subAuth&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Benevolence&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Universalism&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Achievement&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Power&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ethical DM&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. manAuth = manager self-reported authentic leadership and subAuth = subordinate-rated authentic leadership (5-point scales from 0 to 4); Ethical DM = manager ethical decision making (7-point scale ranging from 1 to 7). Cronbach’s alpha’s are reported along the diagonal in parentheses.

<sup>a</sup>Bold font is manager data (n = 163). <sup>b</sup>Regular font is subordinate data (n = 64).

*p < .05. ***p < .001.
Authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes.

I hypothesized that authentic leadership would be associated with a variety of subordinate outcomes (hypotheses 3a through 3e). As can be seen in Table 6, consistent with hypotheses 3a and 3b, respectively, subordinate perceptions of authentic leadership was positively correlated with their perceptions of the quality of the manager-employee relationship (LMX), \( r(62) = .72, p < .001 \), and affective organizational commitment, \( r(62) = .32, p = .01 \). Thus, the more subordinates perceived their managers as authentic leaders, the more they reported having higher quality relationships with their managers and being more affectively committed to their organizations. However, manager self-reported authentic leadership was not significantly correlated with the quality of the manager-employee relationship, \( r(62) = .08, p = .51 \) or affective organizational commitment, \( r(62) = -.16, p = .22 \). Thus, the extent to which managers saw themselves as authentic leaders was not related to subordinates’ perceptions of the quality of their relationship with their manager or the extent to which subordinates felt affectively committed to their organization.

The hypothesized relation between authentic leadership and psychological well-being (hypothesis 3c) was not supported for either manager self-reported authentic leadership, \( r(161) = -.03, p = .82 \) or subordinate-rated authentic leadership, \( r(62) = -.05, p = .66 \). Thus, authentic leadership is not associated with psychological well-being, regardless of the source of authentic leadership ratings.
Table 6

*Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Internal Consistency for Predictor, Mediator, and Outcome Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. manAuth</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. subAuth</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Trust</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ELB</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PsychEmp</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. LMX</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. AOC</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PWB</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. OCBs</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. JP</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* manAuth = manager self-reported authentic leadership and subAuth = subordinate-rated authentic leadership (5-point scale from 0 to 4); ELB = empowering leader behaviors (5-point scale from 1 to 5). All other subordinate variables had 7-point scales from 1 to 7, including: Trust; PsychEmp = psychological empowerment; LMX = leader-member exchange; AOC = affective organizational
commitment; PWB = psychological well-being; OCBs = organizational citizenship behavior; JP = job performance. Cronbach’s alphas are reported along the diagonal in parentheses.

*Bold font is manager data (n = 163). *Regular font is subordinate data (n = 64).

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Also consistent with hypotheses, manager self-reported authentic leadership was positively correlated with their ratings of subordinates’ organizational citizenship behaviour, \( r(161) = .28, p < .001 \) (hypothesis 3d), and job performance, \( r(161) = .19, p = .01 \) (hypothesis 3e). However, subordinate-rated authentic leadership was not significantly correlated with managers’ ratings of subordinates’ organizational citizenship behaviour, \( r(62) = .19, p = .13 \) or job performance, \( r(62) = .19, p = .13 \). Thus, on the one hand, the more managers perceived themselves to be authentic leaders, the more they reported that their subordinates engaged in organizational citizenship behaviour and had higher job performance. On the other hand, there was no relation between subordinate perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership and manager’s perceptions of subordinates’ organizational citizenship behaviour or job performance. For the interested reader, additional moderation analyses testing the conditional effect of manager-subordinate relationship on the relations between authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes can be found in Appendix AP.

Of note, none of the correlations between the manager-reported predictor variable (i.e., self-perceptions of authentic leadership) and subordinate-reported outcome variables was significant. Similarly, there were no significant relations between the subordinate reported predictor variable (i.e., perceptions of manager’s authentic leadership) and manager reported outcome variables. In other words, correlations between predictor and outcome variables were only significant within source (i.e., when managers rated both the predictor and outcome variables or when subordinates rated both the predictor and outcome variables). However, it is important to note that, while not significant, the size of the correlations between subordinate-rated authentic leadership and organizational
citizenship behaviour and job performance is the same as the size of the correlation between manager-rated authentic leadership and job performance, which is significant. These non-significant findings could be due in part to the small subordinate sample size. Thus, any conclusions drawn about the nature of the findings being only within source need to be made with this possibility in mind, and tested in future research.

Mediation.

Preliminary analyses to determine if conditions for testing mediation are met.

I followed procedures recommended by Baron and Kenny (1986) to test for mediation. To meet the conditions for testing mediation, the predictor must correlate with the outcome, the predictor must correlate with the mediator, and the mediator must correlate with the outcome. Table 6 results indicate that some of these conditions were not met. First, as noted earlier, authentic leadership was only significantly correlated with outcomes when both predictor and outcome variables were rated by the same source. Second, correlations between the predictor and mediating variables – empowering leader behaviour, psychological empowerment, and trust in leader – were only significant within source. Third, the mediating variables only correlated with outcomes within source (i.e., when managers rated both the mediator and outcome variables or when subordinates rated both the mediator and the outcome variables). Finally, the hypothesized link between the two mediators – empowering leader behaviour and psychological empowerment – was not significant.

Because there was only a weak marginally significant relation between manager self-reported authentic leadership and subordinate-rated authentic leadership, and because the conditions for testing mediation were met only when predictor, mediator and outcome
variables were rated within source, the main hypothesized model (shown in Figure 1), in which I proposed that the relations between authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes would be mediated through two routes – empowering leader behavior and psychological empowerment, and through trust in leader – was not fully supported. Thus, revised mediation models were tested within source (represented in Figures 2 and 3). In Figure 2, I present the revised mediation model with psychological empowerment and trust as mediators of the relations between subordinate-rated authentic leadership and subordinate-reported outcomes (i.e., leader member-exchange, affective organizational commitment). In Figure 3, I present the revised mediation model with empowering leader behavior as the mediating mechanism through which managers’ self-reported authentic leadership influences managers’ ratings of subordinates’ organizational citizenship behavior.

Because conditions for testing mediation were met within source, next I followed Baron and Kenny’s (1986) steps to establish whether there is mediation: 1) the predictor must be significantly related to the criterion variable - that is, there is a direct effect; 2) the predictor must be significantly related to the mediator; and 3) when the criterion is regressed on both the predictor and the mediator(s), the indirect effect is significantly weaker than the direct effect (partial mediation) or the predictor is no longer significantly related to the criterion (full mediation), and the mediator has a significant effect on the criterion while controlling for the predictor. As a formal test of mediation, I conducted Sobel tests for indirect effects (Sobel, 1988) to test whether relations between the predictor and criterion dropped significantly from the first to the third step. I used the calculator presented at http://people.ku.edu/~preacher/sobel/sobel.htm (accessed March
Figure 2. The revised mediation model with trust and psychological empowerment as mediators of the relations between subordinate-rated authentic leadership and subordinate self-reported outcomes.
Figure 3. The revised mediation model with empowering leader behaviors as a mediator of the relation between manager self-rated authentic leadership and managerial ratings of organizational citizenship behavior.
2011). Descriptive statistics, correlations, and internal consistency values for mediating variables are presented in Table 6.

**Does trust and psychological empowerment mediate the relation between authentic leadership and leader-member exchange?**

As can be seen in Figure 4, subordinates who perceived their managers as more authentic leaders were more likely to trust their manager (\(Beta = .57, B = .63, SE B = .12, p < .001\)) and to feel psychologically empowered (\(Beta = .31, B = .35, SE B = .14, p = .01\)) when compared to less authentic leaders. When controlling for subordinates’ ratings of authentic leadership, trust in manager (\(Beta = .24, B = .39, SE B = .18, p = .03\)), but not psychological empowerment (\(Beta = .11, B = .17, SE B = .15, p = .26\)), was related to LMX. Consistent with earlier analyses, the more subordinates perceived their managers as authentic leaders, the more they reported higher levels of LMX, \(Beta = .72, B = 1.32, SE B = .16, p < .001\). When controlling for the two mediators, this relation remained significant (\(Beta = .55, B = 1.01, SE B = .19, p < .001\)). Thus, there is evidence of a partial mediating effect of trust in the relation between authentic leadership and LMX, \(z = 2.00, p = .05\). Therefore, there is partial support for hypothesis 4a as analyses are consistent with partial mediation: subordinates with more authentic leaders reported higher quality relationships with their managers in part because they trusted their managers more. The extent to which subordinates felt psychologically empowered did not play a role in explaining the relation between authentic leadership and LMX.
Figure 4. Psychological empowerment and trust as mediators of the relation between authentic leadership and leader-member exchange. Standardized regression coefficients are displayed. The number in parentheses represents the total effect and the number to its right represents the direct effect. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Does trust and psychological empowerment mediate the relation between authentic leadership and affective organizational commitment?

As can be seen in Figure 5, subordinates who perceived their managers as more authentic leaders were more likely to trust their manager (Beta = .57, B = .63, SE B = .12, p < .001) and to feel psychologically empowered (Beta = .31, B = .35, SE B = .14, p = .01) when compared to less authentic leaders. When controlling for subordinates’ ratings of authentic leadership, the more they trusted their manager, Beta = .32, B = .54, SE B = .21, p = .01, and the more psychologically empowered they felt, Beta = .47, B = .76, SE B = .17, p < .001, the more affectively committed they were to their organization. Consistent with earlier analyses, the more subordinates perceived their managers as authentic leaders, the more affectively committed they were to their organization, Beta = .32, B = .58, SE B = .22, p = .01, and when controlling for the two mediators, this relation dropped to zero (Beta = -.01, B = -.02, SE B = .22, p = .92). The drop in the beta was significant when considering the indirect path through each of the mediators: trust, z = 2.36, p = .02; psychological empowerment, z = 2.19, p = .03. Thus, hypothesis 4b was partially supported as analyses are consistent with full mediation: subordinates with more authentic leaders were more affectively committed to their organization because they trusted their managers more and felt more psychologically empowered. In other words, subordinates who perceived their managers as more authentic leaders were more likely to report higher levels of affective organizational commitment and this relation was fully explained by their sense of psychological empowerment and trust in their manager.
Figure 5. Psychological empowerment and trust as mediators of the relation between authentic leadership and affective organizational commitment. Standardized regression coefficients are displayed. The number in parentheses represents the total effect and the number to its right represents the direct effect. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Does empowering leader behavior mediate the relation between authentic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior?

As can be seen in Figure 6, managers who perceived themselves as more, versus less, authentic leaders reported engaging in more empowering leader behavior (Beta = .61, B = .59, SE B = .06, p < .001). When controlling for managers’ self-reported authentic leadership, the more managers engaged in empowering leader behavior, the more they reported that their subordinates engaged in organizational citizenship behavior (Beta = .20, B = .46, SE B = .22, p = .03). Consistent with earlier analyses, the more managers perceived themselves as authentic leaders, the more they perceived their subordinates to engage in organizational citizenship behavior (Beta = .28, B = .61, SE B = .17, p < .001); however, when controlling for empowering leader behavior, this relation dropped significantly (Beta = .15, SE B = .34, p = .11) when considering the indirect path through the mediator, z = 2.09, p = .04. Thus, hypothesis 4d was partially supported as analyses are consistent with full mediation: managers who saw themselves as more (vs. less) authentic leaders perceived their subordinates to engage in more organizational citizenship behavior because they themselves engaged in more empowering leader behavior. In other words, managers who saw themselves as more authentic leaders were more likely to report higher levels of organizational citizenship behavior in their subordinates and this relation was fully explained by managers’ empowering leader behavior.
Figure 6. Empowering leader behavior as a mediator of the relation between authentic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. Standardized regression coefficients are displayed. The number in parentheses represents the total effect and the number to its right represents the direct effect. *p < .05. ***p < .001.
Post-Hoc Power Analyses

To assess the level of confidence in the results obtained, I conducted post hoc power analyses (Cohen, 1988) to determine whether there was sufficient power to detect significant correlations among the relations examined in this research. It should be noted that given the limited empirical research published to date on authentic leadership, expected effect sizes used in the power analyses are based on related research or single empirical studies; thus, caution is required when drawing conclusions based on these post-hoc analyses.

To determine whether there was sufficient power to detect a significant correlation between managers’ and subordinates’ perceptions of managers’ authentic leadership, a post-hoc power analysis was conducted using a population effect size of .22 (based on Harris & Schaubroeck’s, 1988 meta-analytical findings examining the relation between managers’ self-ratings and their subordinates’ ratings on leadership), an alpha level of 0.05, and an expected power of .80. Results revealed that a sample size of 163 would have been required to detect a significant correlation.

To determine whether there was sufficient power to detect a significant correlation between managers’ self-reported authentic leadership and subordinates’ perceptions of their affective organizational commitment, a post-hoc power analysis was conducted based on a population effect size of .28 (based on similar size correlations reported by Walumbwa et al., 2008), an alpha level of 0.05, and an expected power of .80. Results revealed that that a sample size of 101 would have been required to detect a significant correlation.
To determine whether there was sufficient power to detect a significant correlation between subordinates’ perceptions of managers’ authentic leadership and managers’ ratings of subordinates’ organizational citizenship behavior, a post-hoc power analysis was conducted based on a population effect size of .15 (based on similar size correlations reported by Walumbwa et al., 2010), an alpha level of 0.05, and an expected power of .80. Results revealed that a sample size of 349 would have been required to detect a significant correlation.

To determine whether there was sufficient power to detect a significant correlation between subordinates’ perceptions of managers’ authentic leadership and managers’ ratings of subordinates’ job performance, a post-hoc power analysis was conducted based on a population effect size of .44 (based on similar size correlations reported by Walumbwa et al., 2008), an alpha level of 0.05, and an expected power of .80. Results revealed that a sample size of 41 would have been required to detect a significant correlation.

Because the population effect sizes for the relations between authentic leadership (as well ethical and transformational leadership) and values (i.e., benevolence, universalism, achievement, power) were not found in the literature, Cohen’s (1988) medium effect size of .30 was used in power analyses given strong theoretical rationale for the relations between authentic leadership and values. Thus, to determine whether there was sufficient power to detect significant correlations between managers’ and subordinates’ perceptions of authentic leadership and managers’ self-reported values, post-hoc power analyses were conducted. Based on an expected effect size of .30, an
alpha level of 0.05, and an expected power of .80, results revealed that that a sample size of 88 would have been required to detect significant correlations.

Overall, power analyses indicated that the small subordinate sample size (n = 64) contributed to the lack of significant results obtained for correlational analyses, with the exception of the relation between subordinates’ perceptions of managers’ authentic leadership and managers’ ratings of subordinates’ job performance. Thus, future research is needed to confirm the results obtained in this research.

**Discussion**

**Contributions to the Authentic Leadership Literature**

This dissertation research makes several contributions to our understanding of the relatively new theory of authentic leadership. First, this research is the first to examine whether managers’ self-reported authentic leadership aligns with subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership. Unlike most leadership research, which relies exclusively upon subordinates’ self-report data, the use of multiple sources (managers and subordinates) enables for a more comprehensive examination of authentic leadership; this strategy also helps to minimize monomethod bias (Avolio, Yammarino, & Bass, 1991). Second, this research identifies the content of authentic leaders’ values and provides preliminary empirical support for the theoretical proposition that leaders who are more authentic subscribe more to self-transcendent values and less to self-enhancement values than do leaders who are less authentic. Third, this research addresses the call for research to identify the relations between authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes by testing outcomes not previously examined while replicating results for other outcomes. Fourth, it helps to address the black box of leadership by exploring two
mediating mechanisms, namely, trust and empowerment, in the relations between authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes. Importantly, this research included not only the typically studied psychological empowerment construct, but also its less established but theoretically relevant predictor – empowering leader behavior.

**Is the Construct of Authentic Leadership in the Eye of the Beholder?**

I found only a weak, positive, marginally significant correlation between managers’ self-reported authentic leadership and subordinates’ ratings of their managers’ authentic leadership (Hypothesis 1). This finding raises interesting questions for the authentic leadership phenomenon: Is the construct of authentic leadership in the eye of the beholder? Are managers capable of accurately assessing their own leadership authenticity? Whose perspective is more important, and does this depend on what we are measuring?

While many of the aforementioned questions remain to be answered in future research, the findings from this study suggest that it is subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership that better predicts their experiences in the workplace. In other words, if I perceive my manager to be aware of her impact on others, transparent in her interactions, objective in how she makes decisions, and willing to stand up for what is right, I am more likely to feel a sense of emotional attachment to the organization (affective organizational commitment) and experience a higher quality relationship with my manager (leader-member exchange), irrespective of whether or not my manager sees herself as an authentic leader. Although the validity of self-reports have been questioned, it is important to note that the perceptions subordinates develop about their managers’
authentic leadership, as opposed to how those same managers see themselves, predicted subordinates’ own reported experiences and responses in the work environment.

Although more (vs. less) authentic leaders are characterized by self-awareness, relational transparency, a close alignment between their emotions and behavior, and objectivity in their decision making – characteristics that one would imagine would translate into observable behavior for subordinates, and therefore, closer alignment in perceptions of managers’ authenticity – a number of factors may have contributed to the weak marginally significant relation, and these are described next.

First, post-hoc power analyses indicated that the small subordinate sample size contributed to the failure to detect a potentially real, albeit weak, significant relation. Second, research on multisource feedback shows that a discrepancy between managers’ self-ratings and others’ ratings on leadership constructs is common (e.g., Brutus et al., 1999; Morgeson, et al., 2005), with correlations between managers’ self-ratings and others’ ratings being weak (see meta analysis by Harris & Schaubroecks, 1988), and due in part to managers’ inflated self-ratings (Gentry, Hannum, Ekelund, & de Jong, 2007; Harris & Schaubroecks, 1988). Thus, at best, a weak significant correlation was expected.

---

15 It is important to note that self-ratings are not always higher than others’ ratings (Atwater et al., 2005). Specifically, Atwater and Yammarino (1992) assigned self-other differences into three categories: over-estimators, in-agreement, and under-estimators. That is, those categorized as over-estimators rated themselves higher and were rated by others lower than those categorized in-agreement. On the other hand, those categorized as
In addition, upon examination of the items of the authentic leadership questionnaire, underlying many of the behaviors that define authentic leadership appear to be internal mental processes that may be more readily accessible to managers than to their subordinates. Thus, managers and subordinates may be using a different frame of reference when rating the manager on authentic leadership; one that is subjective to each of them, rather than a shared objective lens. For instance, authentic leaders are posited to make decisions based on their core values, analyze relevant data before coming to decisions, and display emotions exactly in line with feelings. Unless my manager verbally articulates the values he has relied on to come to a decision and shares the data he considered before coming to decisions, as a subordinate, I would not be in a position to “objectively” evaluate my manager’s authentic behavior. Moreover, other authentic leadership behaviors may be difficult to detect, such as the extent to which managers seek feedback to improve their interactions with others. Unless my manager seeks feedback in a very open manner and/or specifically seeks feedback from myself, it may be difficult for me to confidently and accurately rate my manager. Related research indicates that raters are significantly more accurate in rating others on performance dimensions for which performance is the least ambiguous and most consistent (Borman, 1979).

Similarly, Eichinger and Lombardo (2004) found that raters are more likely to say they do not know or cannot rate clearly on competencies that are harder for many people to see directly. Specifically, people are more likely to disagree on their ratings when the competencies being rated are more ambiguous, abstract, not observable, value related, or under-estimators rated themselves lower and were rated by others higher than those categorized as in-agreement.
trait defined (Dai, Stiles, Hallenbeck, & De Meuse, 2007), which reflect some of the items that make up the authentic leadership questionnaire.

**More Authentic Leaders are more Ethical in their Internally Held Values and Behavior**

Given the existing debate about whether more authentic leaders are inherently more ethical in nature, I sought to test the assumption that more authentic leaders subscribe more self-transcendent values, namely benevolence and universalism, and less to self-enhancement values, namely power and achievement. With the exception of the achievement value, the remaining three values were significantly correlated with authentic leadership in the expected direction, providing general support for Hypotheses 2a and 2b. More specifically, when compared to less authentic leaders, leaders who perceive themselves as more authentic subscribe more to values of benevolence and universalism and less to the value of power, while they appear to be indifferent to the value of achievement. Results also supported Hypothesis 2c, that subordinates who perceived their managers as more (vs. less) authentic leaders also perceived them as more ethical in their decision making. Thus, not only are more authentic leaders more ethical in their internally held beliefs, they are also perceived as more ethical in their actions, compared with less authentic leaders.

**Relations Between Authentic Leadership and Subordinate Outcomes – Whom you ask Matters**

Overall, this research provides empirical support for Avolio et al.’s (2004) argument that more authentic leaders should have a positive impact on employee attitudes and behaviors, when compared to less authentic leaders. Tests of Hypotheses 3a through
3e indicated that with the exception of psychological well-being, authentic leadership was associated with all hypothesized subordinate outcomes, namely leader member exchange, affective organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and job performance. Because empirical research to date has only examined the impact of subordinate-rated authentic leadership on organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and satisfaction with supervisor, this research has expanded our knowledge of the relations between authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes.

Particularly noteworthy are findings related to outcome variables examined for the first time in relation to authentic leadership, namely, leader-member exchange, and psychological well-being. Of all the outcomes examined, the relation between authentic leadership and leader-member exchange was the strongest (a correlation of .72). This suggests that when subordinates experience their managers as authentic, they benefit in a meaningful and significant way from a high quality exchange relationship. Yet, it is important to acknowledge, given the cross-sectional nature of this study, that reverse causality is a possibility. In other words, subordinates who have high quality exchange relationships with their managers may, over time, come to view their manager as more authentic.

The lack of a significant relation between authentic leadership and psychological well-being fails to support a primary prediction of authentic leadership theory. This could be because the measure of psychological well-being used in this research is a very general construct of well-being whose items appear unrelated to the context of work in which this research is set. Perhaps it is too distal of a variable to be detected as a direct outcome of authentic leadership. It may also be the case that what may predict
subordinates’ psychological well-being is not their managers’ authentic leadership but their own authentic leadership,\(^{16}\) which was not the focus of this research, but fits in line with the broader theory of authentic leadership and follower development.

Interestingly, correlations between the predictor (i.e., ratings of authentic leadership) and the aforementioned outcome variables were only significant within source; that is, when the predictor and outcome was rated by the same source, namely, manager or subordinate. Specifically, subordinate-rated authentic leadership was positively correlated with their ratings of leader-member exchange and affective organizational commitment, while manager self-reported authentic leadership was positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior and job performance. In other words, irrespective of managers’ perceptions of their own authentic leadership, when subordinates’ experience their managers as more (vs less) authentic leaders, they also report higher quality relations with their managers and stronger emotional attachment to their organizations. On the other hand, irrespective of subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership, when managers see themselves as more (vs less) authentic leaders, they report that their subordinates devote extra effort in the form of job performance and going above and beyond their job description for the good of the organization. The aforementioned results suggest that if our goal is to understand and predict the impact of authentic leadership on subordinates’ experiences in the workplace, it is important to focus on subordinates’ perceptions of their leader and

\(^{16}\)Leadership here is referred to in a broad sense, not as a formal managerial position with accountability for direct reports, but instead, as a way of being (i.e., self-aware, transparent in interactions, ethical in actions, and objective in decision making).
their experiences. However, further research is required to draw firm conclusions about these relations given that post-hoc power analyses suggested that the small subordinate sample size affected my ability to detect significant correlations among variables examined.

As mentioned earlier, it is also important to take into consideration the variety of factors that may have contributed to the differences in perspectives with regards to how managers see themselves and how subordinates see their managers when it comes to authentic leadership. In addition, it should be acknowledged that even though managers’ impression management did not influence their self-reported authentic leadership, because relations between authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes were found primarily within source, it is possible that monomethod bias, as well as other sources of bias, may be have influenced the results, and these are addressed in the limitations section.

**Three Mediating Mechanisms Explain how Authentic Leaders Impact Subordinates**

This dissertation research contributes to our understanding of the mediating mechanisms through which authentic leaders impact subordinates. Specifically, this research indicates that authentic leaders build trusting relationships with their subordinates, which in turn affects the quality of their exchange relationships. Thus, subordinates who perceived their managers as more (vs. less) authentic leaders experienced higher quality relationships with their managers and this was due in part to the greater levels of trust subordinates had in their managers. Thus, when my manager is aware of his strengths, transparent in his interactions, objective in how he makes decisions, and holds himself to high standards of ethical conduct, I will be more likely to
trust that my manager has my best interests at heart, which ultimately contributes to my perceptions of my relationship with my manager as highly effective. Yet, it is important to acknowledge that due to the cross-sectional nature of this study, reverse causality remains a possibility. That is, the quality of the exchange relationship could mediate the relation between authentic leadership and trust in leader.  

In addition, this research suggests that authentic leaders cultivate trust and psychological empowerment in subordinates, which in turn engenders their affective organizational commitment. Specifically, subordinates who perceived their managers as more (vs. less) authentic leaders developed a stronger sense of emotional attachment to their organization. Two processes contribute to this link, which are described next.

First, when I see that my manager’s words are consistent with his actions, that he acts in accordance with high ethical standards, solicits my input when making decisions, additional mediation analyses supported possible reverse causality. Subordinates who perceived their managers as more authentic leaders had higher quality exchange relationships with their managers \((Beta = .72, B = 1.20, SE_B = .14, p < .001)\) when compared to less authentic leaders. When controlling for subordinates’ ratings of authentic leadership, LMX \((Beta = .30, B = .20, SE_B = .09, p = .03)\) was related to trust. The more subordinates perceived their managers as authentic, the more they reported trusting their leader, \(Beta = .62, B = .67, SE_B = .10, p < .001\). When controlling for LMX, this relation remained significant \((Beta = .41, B = .44, SE_B = .14, p = .003)\), thereby supporting a partial mediating effect of LMX in the relation between authentic leadership and trust in leader, \(z = 2.22, p = .03\). Thus, future research is needed to determine direction of causality.
and understands how his actions impact me, I am likely to trust that my manager has my best interests at heart, which fosters my sense of belonging to my organization and my desire to take on the organization’s problems as my own. Second, when I observe that my manager models and encourages me to openly share my opinions, truly listens before coming to his own conclusions and demonstrates that he understands how his actions impact me, I am more likely to find my work meaningful, feel that I have influence over what happens in my department, and develop a sense of confidence in my job, all of which increase my affective commitment towards my organization. Yet, it is important to acknowledge that due to the cross-sectional nature of this study, reverse causality remains a possibility. That is, committed subordinates may be more inclined to trust their manager and to feel psychologically empowered; authentic leadership could also mediate the relations between trust or psychological empowerment and affective organizational commitment.

In addition, managers who see themselves as more (vs. less) authentic leaders report that their subordinates engage in more organizational citizenship behavior, and this is because these leaders report engaging in empowering leader behavior. In other words, as a manager, if I see myself as in tune with my capabilities, willing to share the hard truth with my subordinates while also soliciting their input and even encouraging them to take positions that support their core values, I am also likely to consult with, delegate to, and keep them informed of important organizational matters. In turn, I perceive my subordinates as going above and beyond their job descriptions for the greater good of the organization. Given that these managers are more actively involved with their subordinates and are motivated to empower them, it may be the case that they are more
likely to notice or have more opportunity to observe their subordinates going above and beyond their job descriptions for the greater good of the organization.

Interestingly, the hypothesized link between managers’ self-reported empowering leader behavior and subordinates’ self-reported psychological empowerment (as illustrated in Figure 1) was not significant. That is, subordinates’ experiences of feeling psychologically empowered were not impacted by their managers’ own perceptions of empowering leader behavior. Consistent with other results, in which relations among variables were only found within source, it is quite plausible that it is not managers’ own views of their empowering leader behavior that is important, but that of subordinates. Future research is required to determine if empowering leader behavior and psychological empowerment are related when both are reported by subordinates.

Limitations and Future Research

In interpreting the results of this research, it is important to keep several issues in mind. First, I used self-reports to assess all independent, mediating, and outcome variables. The validity of self-report has been questioned because such data may artificially inflate the size of relevant relations due to common method variance; however, this occurs infrequently in practice (Crampton & Wagner, 1994). Nonetheless, in an attempt to alleviate potential problems associated with self-report data, I followed Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee and Podsakoff’s (2003) guidelines and used different sources for the predictor, mediating, and criterion variables, where possible. Unfortunately, as mentioned earlier, relations among research variables were primarily evident within source (managers and subordinates), with fewer significant relations occurring between sources. Thus, it is possible that monomethod bias affected the size of correlations found
within source. In other words, the size of the relation between, for example, subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership and the extent to which they trusted their manager, may have been inflated because subordinates self-reported on both variables. That is, subordinates general impression of their manager may have influenced their perceptions of their manager’s authentic leadership as well as how much they trust their manager, such that that they would rate their manager as high or low on both variables of interest, thereby producing inflated correlations.

Other potential sources of bias cannot be ignored. While impression management did not influence managers’ self-reported authentic leadership ratings, it is possible that other sources of bias not measured in this research affected the results. For example, managers’ ratings may have been impacted by self-deceptive enhancement, a type of social desirability bias that refers to an unconscious favourability bias in self-descriptions (Pauhus, 1991). In addition, it is possible that subordinates’ responses were also influenced by biases in responding. For instance, a halo effect (Thorndike, 1920, as cited in Hoyt, 2000), which reflects artificially high correlations among variables rated by the same observer, may be operating with regards to subordinates’ ratings of their manager. This refers to situations in which observers’ general impressions of a target influence their ratings on specific attribute dimensions (Lance, LaPointe, & Fisicaro, 1994, as cited in Hoyt, 2000). That is, subordinates who perceived their manager in a generally positive light may have been more likely to see their manager as both authentic and trustworthy, which would have artificially inflated the relation between subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership and the extent to which they reported trusting their manager.
Second, working within the limitations of the survey software and the chosen method of participant recruitment, a semi-random selection procedure was designed that instructed managers to select a subordinate chosen by the researcher rather than by their own accord. Not all managers followed these instructions. Part way through the data collection, I added an additional question to the survey to test whether managers were rating the same person for whom they were providing contact information to participate in the subordinate survey. Since nearly all managers’ confirmed that the subordinate contact information provided matched perfectly to the subordinate they rated in the manager survey, I am confident that the remainder of the data is also valid. Nevertheless, managers who had more than three direct reports had the choice about which subordinates to list in the survey. Therefore, while it is possible that managers selected subordinates with whom they had better relationships or those they felt would be likely to participate in the subordinate survey, this concern is tempered by the lack of consistency found between managers’ and subordinates’ self-report data. To ascertain the generalizability of this study’s results, it is important that future research utilize a selection process that approximates random selection.

Third, given the cross-sectional nature of the study, it is not possible to draw conclusions about causality. While the relations found in this dissertation research were in line with predictions, future research would need to examine these relations longitudinally to determine causality. In addition, given that one of the fundamental propositions of authentic leadership theory states that authentic leaders foster veritable and sustainable performance, longitudinal research would provide further support for the cross-sectional findings in this dissertation research showing a positive relation between
authentic leadership and both organizational citizenship behavior and job performance. Thus, future research should pursue a longitudinal design to allow for stronger causal interpretations.

Practical Implications

In today’s workplace where integrity and trust have come to the forefront, and flatter organizational structures demand more empowered employees, managers may need to display new forms of leadership that go beyond traditional heroic types (Fletcher, 2004; Uhl-Bien, 2006). Through a form of leadership that encourages transparency, open communication, high ethical standards, behavioral integrity as well as shapes trustful and empowering work environments in the organization, managers can potentially foster the kinds of employee attitudes and behaviors that matter to the success of their organizations. Practically speaking, more authentic leaders are more likely to cultivate high-quality trusting relationships and foster empowered subordinates than leaders who are less aware of their capabilities, fail to walk the talk, avoid having their opinions challenged and have questionable ethics.

The results provide preliminary support for the idea that any intervention aimed at developing managers’ authentic leadership with the hopes of positively influencing subordinates’ attitudes and behaviors must focus on how subordinates perceive their managers’ leadership. This is not to suggest that how managers perceive their own authentic leadership is irrelevant or unimportant. Instead, what the results suggest is that the starting point for an intervention may need to be on increasing managers’ self-awareness by helping them to understand how their subordinates perceive them on
authentic leadership dimensions, and to help them reduce the discrepancy between how they see themselves and how they are perceived by others.

Given that values reflect internally held beliefs that may be difficult for subordinates to observe, it is not surprising that subordinate-rated authentic leadership did not correlate with leaders’ self-reported values. Nonetheless, values that reflect transcending one’s own interests and a concern for others’ welfare rather than the pursuit of one’s own interests aligned closely with managers’ own perceptions of their authentic leadership. Moreover, subordinates who saw their managers as more (vs. less) authentic were more likely to report that their managers engaged in ethical decision making. This pattern of results suggests that managers may need to be more explicit about the values they subscribe to and upon which their actions and decisions are based. Moreover, gaining insight into one’s values may be a particularly valuable component of authentic leadership development interventions.

Importantly, one issue this research did not address is the impact of the organizational context on the relations between authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes. Strong theoretical arguments suggest that a supporting organizational climate (i.e., one that is ethical and strengths-based) is most conducive to the development of authentic leadership (Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Gardner, et al., 2005). Empirical research is required to determine whether authentic leadership can be developed, and if so, whether it can have positive influences on subordinates’ attitudes and behaviors in different organizational contexts, otherwise, attempts to develop authentic leadership may fail to deliver a return on investment.
In conclusion, the present research makes a significant contribution to the authentic leadership literature. At a conceptual level, it raised the possibility that authentic leadership is in the mind of the beholder, identified the values that authentic leaders subscribe to, examined the subordinate outcomes associated with authentic leadership, and tested two mediating mechanisms that contribute to our understanding of how authentic leaders positively impact subordinate outcomes. At a more pragmatic level, this research raised implications for authentic leadership development.
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Appendix A

Recruitment Email for Managers [GROUP A]

From: Geoffrey Smith (gwsmith@uoguelph.ca)
To: [Email of MA Leadership student registered in LEAD6740 being TA’d by Evelina]
Date: 
Subject: Seeking Your Help with a Leadership Study

Dear [name],

I hope this email finds you well and that your leadership journey in our MA Leadership program is a challenging and rewarding one.

I am contacting you to ask for your assistance with an online leadership survey being conducted by Evelina Rog, one of our dedicated Graduate Teaching Assistants. Evelina’s PhD thesis is examining leadership processes from the perspectives of both managers and their direct reports, which will make the design of more comprehensive educational and leadership development programs possible in the future.

While I am certain that time is in short supply for you, I hope you can contribute 20-30 minutes within the next week to complete Evelina’s online survey. As a token of her appreciation, Evelina is offering a draw for a $250 Sears gift certificate.

Please note that while I personally endorse and support Evelina’s research and encourage you to participate, this study is in no way affiliated with the executive programs. Thus, please be assured that your participation will have no bearing on your educational evaluations. As described in the Consent Form below, because Evelina may be serving as a Graduate Teaching Assistant for some of you this term, she has taken specific measures to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of your survey responses.

To be eligible to participate in the survey, you must meet two criteria:

1. You are currently employed in a management capacity (i.e., you have at least one individual directly reporting to you); and
2. You have supervised at least one direct report for the past six months or more.

If you meet these criteria and are willing to contribute to this research, please read the following consent form and use this confidential password to complete your survey.
(PASSWORD: XXXXX). CLICK here to begin: CONSENT FORM AND SURVEY FOR MANAGERS.

NOT ELIGIBLE? Please help by referring your colleagues:

If you do not meet the criteria above, you can still make a valuable contribution by referring colleagues who may be interested in this research. For every referral you provide, your name will be entered into the draw. To provide referrals, please click here: REFERRALS TO LEADERSHIP PROCESSES STUDY.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey Smith,
on behalf of Evelina Rog

Geoffrey Smith, M.B.A., C.H.R.P.
Assistant Dean, Executive Graduate Programs
College of Management and Economics
150 Research Lane, #205
Guelph, Ontario, Canada N1H 4T2
519-824-4120 ext. 58855
E-mail: gwsmith@uoguelph.ca
www.leadership.uoguelph.ca
www.mba.uoguelph.ca
Appendix B

Recruitment Email for Managers [GROUP B]

From: Geoffrey Smith (gwsmith@uoguelph.ca)
To: [Email of MA Leadership or MBA student or alumni (not being TA’d by Evelina)]
Date:
Subject: Seeking Your Help with a Leadership Study

Dear [name],

I hope this email finds you well. I am contacting you to ask for your assistance with an online leadership study being conducted by Evelina Rog, one of our dedicated Graduate Teaching Assistants. Evelina’s PhD thesis is examining leadership processes from the perspectives of both managers and their direct reports, which will make the design of more comprehensive educational and leadership development programs possible in the future.

While I am certain that time is in short supply for you, I hope you can contribute 20-30 minutes within the next week to complete Evelina’s online survey. As a token of her appreciation, Evelina is offering a draw for a $250 gift certificate.

Please note that while I personally endorse and support Evelina’s research and encourage you to participate, this study is in no way affiliated with the executive programs. Thus, please be assured that your participation will have no bearing on your educational evaluations.

To be eligible to participate in the survey, you must meet two criteria:
1. You are currently employed in a management capacity (i.e., you have at least one individual directly reporting to you); and
2. You have supervised at least one direct report for the past six months or more.

If you meet these criteria and are willing to contribute to this research, please read the following consent form and use this confidential password to complete your survey (PASSWORD: XXXXX). CLICK here to begin: CONSENT FORM AND SURVEY FOR MANAGERS.
NOT ELIGIBLE? Please help by referring your colleagues:

If you do not meet the criteria above, you can still make a valuable contribution by referring colleagues who may be interested in this research. For every referral you provide, your name will be entered into the draw. To provide referrals, please click here: REFERRALS TO LEADERSHIP PROCESSES STUDY.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey Smith,
on behalf of Evelina Rog

Geoffrey Smith, M.B.A., C.H.R.P.
Assistant Dean, Executive Graduate Programs
College of Management and Economics
150 Research Lane, #205
Guelph, Ontario, Canada N1H 4T2
519-824-4120 ext. 58855
E-mail: gwsnith@uoguelph.ca
www.leadership.uoguelph.ca
www.mba.uoguelph.ca
Leaders are Invited Participate in Cutting Edge Leadership Research

Much of what we understand about leadership today is from the perspective of either employees OR managers. My colleague Evelina Rog has designed her dissertation research to examine the perspectives of both within the same study. I endorse and support her research and am seeking your help with her online survey.

Benefit to you:

By taking 20-30 minutes to complete the online leadership survey, you will:

• Gain insight into your leadership style
• Receive a summary of the study results (Summer 2010)
• Contribute to cutting edge research that examines leadership from both manager and employee perspectives
• Help to make possible more comprehensive leadership development programs in the future
• Get a chance to win a draw for a $250 gift certificate

To be eligible for this research, you must meet two criteria:

• You are currently employed in a management capacity (i.e., you have at least one individual directly reporting to you); and
• You have supervised at least one direct report for the past six months or more.

If you meet these criteria and are willing to contribute to this research, please CLICK here: LINK TO LEADERSHIP STUDY.

NOT ELIGIBLE? Please help by referring your friends or colleagues:

If you do not meet the criteria above, you can still make a valuable contribution by referring friends or colleagues who may be interested in this research. For every referral you provide, your name will be entered into the draw. To provide referrals, please click here: REFERRALS TO LEADERSHIP STUDY. Please do not forward this email as each potential participant must receive a unique and confidential password to complete the survey.
Sincerely,

Evelina Rog

Evelina Rog, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
erog@uoguelph.ca
(647) 938-9030
Appendix D

Recruitment Email for Managers [GROUP C]

From: Evelina Rog (erog@uoguelph.ca)
To: [email of referred manager]
Date:
Subject: Seeking Your Help with a Leadership Study

Dear [name],

My name is Evelina Rog and I am a PhD candidate in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at the University of Guelph. One of your colleagues, [name of referee] thought you might be interested in taking part in my online leadership survey and referred you to me.

My doctoral research examines leadership processes from the perspectives of both managers and their direct reports. Because much of what we understand about leadership today is from the perspectives of *either* employees *or* managers, this research will make the design of more comprehensive educational and leadership development programs possible in the future.

While I am certain that time is in short supply for you, I hope you can contribute 20-30 minutes within the next week to complete the online survey. As a token of my appreciation, I am offering a draw for a $250 gift certificate.

To be eligible to participate in the survey, you must meet two criteria:
1. You are currently employed in a management capacity (i.e., you have at least one individual directly reporting to you); and
2. You have supervised at least one direct report for the past six months or more.

If you meet these criteria and are willing to contribute to this research, please read the following consent form and use this confidential password to complete your survey (PASSWORD: XXXXX). CLICK here to begin: CONSENT FORM AND SURVEY FOR MANAGERS.

NOT ELIGIBLE? Please help by referring your colleagues:
If you do not meet the criteria above, you can still make a valuable contribution by referring colleagues who may be interested in this research. For every referral you provide, your name will be entered into the draw. To provide referrals, please click here: REFERRALS TO LEADERSHIP PROCESSES STUDY.

Sincerely,

Evelina Rog

Evelina Rog, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
erog@uoguelph.ca
(647) 938-9030
Appendix E

Recruitment Email for Managers [Group D]

From: survey@westresearch.ca
To: [email of referred manager (referred by Group A Manager)]
Date:
Subject: Seeking Your Help with a Leadership Study

Dear [name],

My name is Evelina Rog and I am a PhD candidate in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at the University of Guelph. One of your colleagues, [name of referee] thought you might be interested in taking part in my online leadership survey and referred you to me.

My doctoral research examines leadership processes from the perspectives of both managers and their direct reports. Because much of what we understand about leadership today is from the perspectives of either employees or managers, this research will make the design of more comprehensive educational and leadership development programs possible in the future.

While I am certain that time is in short supply for you, I hope you can contribute 20-30 minutes within the next week to complete the online survey. As a token of my appreciation, I am offering a draw for a $250 gift certificate.

To be eligible to participate in the survey, you must meet two criteria:
  1. You are currently employed in a management capacity (i.e., you have at least one individual directly reporting to you); and
  2. You have supervised at least one direct report for the past six months or more.

If you meet these criteria and are willing to contribute to this research, please read the following consent form and use this confidential password to complete your survey (PASSWORD: XXXXX). CLICK here to begin: CONSENT FORM AND SURVEY FOR MANAGERS.

NOT ELIGIBLE? Please help by referring your colleagues:
If you do not meet the criteria above, you can still make a valuable contribution by referring colleagues who may be interested in this research. For every referral you provide, your name will be entered into the draw. To provide referrals, please click here: REFERRALS TO LEADERSHIP PROCESSES STUDY.

Sincerely,

Evelina Rog

Evelina Rog, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
erog@uoguelph.ca
(647) 938-9030
Appendix F

Consent Form for Managers (GROUP A)

Leadership Processes Study
Consent Form for Managers

Thank you for your interest in this research. Much of what we understand about leadership today is from the perspectives of employees; rarely are the perspectives of both managers and their direct reports studied together. This important dynamic is the focus of my doctoral research. For this purpose, I’ve developed an online survey and am requesting your participation.

In the online survey to follow, you will be asked about your own leadership behaviours and the work-related behaviours of one of your direct reports. You will also be asked to provide the contact information for your direct report so that I may ask for their assistance with the employee portion of this research.

This study has been reviewed and received ethics approval through the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board. As such, I would like to inform you about several things:

- Your responses will be automatically encrypted and stored in a secure server in Canada.

- To ensure that I can connect the survey responses of managers and their direct reports, this study uses a unique password for each manager-direct report dyad. To ensure the confidentiality of your responses, all contact information will be held separately from the survey data in a password-protected file. Contact information will be destroyed once data collection is completed (approximately Summer 2010).

- Since I will be serving as a GTA for some of the MA Leadership students who may take part in this research, I want to assure you that I will not have access to any identifying information. My website administrator, Julie West, will handle all correspondence and survey data involving these participants and will hold onto any identifying information until the end of the academic term. Thus, the identity of these participants will be unknown to myself, my faculty advisor, and the students’ instructor.
• Under no circumstances will your survey responses be shared with your direct report, nor will you have access to the responses provided by your direct report.

• Individual survey results will not be reported anywhere. I will email a summary of the results of this research to all participants upon completion of the study (around Summer 2010). Results reported in my dissertation (and any other publications, such as journal articles or conference presentations) will be aggregated/averaged with data from about 250 managers and 250 direct reports participating in this research.

• Your participation is voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty of any kind. Further, you may refuse to answer any question that you do not wish to answer by simply moving onto the next question. Finally, all data will be kept for seven years and then destroyed.

Please feel free to contact myself, my faculty advisor, or the research ethics officer with any questions about this research.

To thank you for your contribution to this research, your name will be entered into a draw for a $250 Sears gift certificate. Your chances of winning this prize are about 1/250. At the end of the survey, you will have an opportunity to increase your odds of winning the prize by referring colleagues to this research.

By clicking the SUBMIT button below, you will indicate that you have read this Consent Form and consent to participate in the online survey.

Sincerely,

Evelina Rog

Evelina Rog, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
erog@uoguelph.ca
(647) 938-9030

Leanne Son Hing, Ph.D.
Associate Professor & Dissertation Advisor
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
sonhing@uoguelph.ca
(519) 824-4120 *54475

Sandra Auld
Research Ethics Officer
University of Guelph
437 University Centre
Guelph, ON, N1G2W1
519-824-4120 *56606
sauld@uoguelph.ca
fax: 519-821-5236

Julie West
Survey Administrator
Westresearch
survey@westresearch.ca

“SUBMIT”
Appendix G

Consent Form for Managers (GROUP B)

Leadership Processes Study
Consent Form for Managers

Thank you for your interest in this research. Much of what we understand about leadership today is from the perspectives of employees; rarely are the perspectives of both managers and their direct reports studied together. This important dynamic is the focus of my doctoral research. For this purpose, I’ve developed an online survey and am requesting your participation.

In the online survey to follow, you will be asked about your own leadership behaviours, and about the work-related behaviours of one of your direct reports. You will also be asked to provide the contact information for your direct report so that I may ask for their assistance with the employee portion of this research.

This study has been reviewed and received ethics approval through the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board. As such, I would like to inform you about several things:

- Your responses will be automatically encrypted and stored in a secure server in Canada.

- To ensure that I can connect the survey responses of managers and their direct reports, this study uses a unique password for each manager-direct report dyad. To ensure the confidentiality of your responses, all contact information will be held separately from the survey data in a password-protected file. Contact information will be destroyed once data collection is completed (approximately Summer 2010).

- Under no circumstances will your survey responses be shared with your direct report, nor will you have access to the responses provided by your direct report.

- Individual survey results will not be reported anywhere. I will email a summary of the results of this research to all participants upon completion of the study (around Summer 2010). Results reported in my dissertation (and any other publications, such as journal articles or conference presentations) will be aggregated/averaged with data from about 250 managers and 250 direct reports participating in this research.
• Your participation is voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any
time without penalty of any kind. Further, you may refuse to answer any question that
you do not wish to answer by simply moving onto the next question. Finally, all data
will be kept for seven years and then destroyed.

Please feel free to contact myself, my faculty advisor, or the research ethics officer with
any questions about this research.

To thank you for your contribution to this research, your name will be entered into a draw
for a $250 Sears gift certificate. Your chances of winning this prize are about 1/250. At
the end of the survey, you will have an opportunity to increase your odds of winning the
prize by referring colleagues to this research.

By clicking the SUBMIT button below, you will indicate that you have read this Consent
Form and consent to participate in the online survey.

Thank you very much for your time and interest.

Evelina Rog

Evelina Rog, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
erog@uoguelph.ca
(647) 938-9030

Leanne Son Hing, Ph.D.
Associate Professor & Dissertation Advisor
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
sonhing@uoguelph.ca
(519) 824-4120 *54475

Sandra Auld
Research Ethics Officer
University of Guelph
437 University Centre
Guelph, ON, N1G2W1
519-824-4120 *56606
sauld@uoguelph.ca
fax: 519-821-5236

Julie West
Survey Administrator
Westresearch
survey@westresearch.ca
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Consent Form for Managers (GROUPS C, D and Independent Consultant’s Participants)

Leadership Processes Study
Consent Form for Managers

Thank you for your interest in this research.

In the online survey to follow, you will be asked about your own leadership behaviours and the work-related behaviours of one of your direct reports. You will also be asked to provide the contact information for one of your direct reports so that I may ask for their assistance with the employee portion of this research.

This study has been reviewed and received ethics approval through the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board. As such, I would like to inform you about several things:

• Your responses will be automatically encrypted and stored in a secure server in Canada.

• To ensure that I can connect the survey responses of managers and their direct reports, this study uses a unique password for each manager-direct report dyad. To ensure the confidentiality of your responses, all contact information will be held separately from the survey data in a password-protected file. Contact information will be destroyed once data collection is completed (approximately Summer 2010).

• Under no circumstances will your survey responses be shared with your direct report, nor will you have access to the responses provided by your direct report.

• Individual survey results will not be reported anywhere. I will email a summary of the results of this research to all participants upon completion of the study (around Summer 2010). Results reported in my dissertation (and any other publications, such as journal articles or conference presentations) will be aggregated/averaged with data from about 250 managers and 250 direct reports participating in this research.

• Your participation is voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty of any kind. Further, you may refuse to answer any question that
you do not wish to answer by simply moving onto the next question. Finally, all data will be kept for seven years and then destroyed.

Please feel free to contact myself, my faculty advisor, or the research ethics officer with any questions about this research.

To thank you for your contribution to this research, your name will be entered into a draw for a $250 Sears gift certificate. Your chances of winning this prize are about 1/250. At the end of the survey, you will have an opportunity to increase your odds of winning the prize by referring colleagues to this research.

By clicking the SUBMIT button below, you will indicate that you have read this Consent Form and consent to participate in the online survey.

Thank you very much for your time and interest.

Evelina Rog

Evelina Rog, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
erog@uoguelph.ca
(647) 938-9030

Sandra Auld
Research Ethics Officer
University of Guelph
437 University Centre
Guelph, ON, N1G2W1
519-824-4120 *56606
sauld@uoguelph.ca
fax: 519-821-5236

Leanne Son Hing, Ph.D.
Associate Professor & Dissertation Advisor
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
sonhing@uoguelph.ca
(519) 824-4120 *54475

Julie West
Survey Administrator
Westresearch
survey@westresearch.ca
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Request for Referrals from Non-Participants

Thank you for offering your help with this research. Please feel free to refer anyone you know who is currently employed in a management capacity (i.e., has at least one direct report) by completing the form below.

As a token of my appreciation, for every referral you provide, I will enter your name into a draw to win a $250 Sears gift certificate. The more referrals you provide, the greater your chances of winning the draw. Your chances of winning are about 1/250.

Please note that the contact information you provide for yourself and your referrals will be kept in a confidential password-protected file. In my recruitment email to your referrals, I will only mention your name as the referring colleague. The individual(s) you refer will not know whether or not you have participated in this research and they will be under no obligation to participate.

Please provide the contact information for your referrals below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral #1:</th>
<th>Referral #2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address:</td>
<td>E-mail address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Phone number:</td>
<td>Work Phone number:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral #3:</th>
<th>Referral #4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address:</td>
<td>E-mail address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Phone number:</td>
<td>Work Phone number:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral #5:</th>
<th>Referral #6:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address:</td>
<td>E-mail address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Phone number:</td>
<td>Work Phone number:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral #7:</th>
<th>Referral #8:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address:</td>
<td>E-mail address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Phone number:</td>
<td>Work Phone number:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Referral #9:
Name: ____________________________  
E-mail address: ____________________  
Work Phone number: ________________

Referral #10:
Name: ____________________________  
E-mail address: ____________________  
Work Phone number: ________________

“SUBMIT”

Please provide your contact information below to be entered into the draw. For each referral you provided, you will receive one draw for the reward.

Your name: ____________________________________________________________  
Your email address: _____________________________________________________

This study has been reviewed and received ethics approval through the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board. Please feel free to contact myself, my faculty advisor, or the research ethics officer, if you have any questions about this research.

Best regards,

Evelina Rog

Evelina Rog, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
erog@uoguelph.ca
(647) 938-9030

Leanne Son Hing, Ph.D.
Associate Professor & Dissertation Advisor
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
sonhing@uoguelph.ca
(519) 824-4120 *54475

Sandra Auld
Research Ethics Officer
University of Guelph
437 University Centre
Guelph, ON, N1G2W1
519-824-4120 *56606
sauld@uoguelph.ca
fax: 519-821-5236

Julie West
Survey Administrator
Westresearch
survey@westresearch.ca
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Manager Survey

Please enter your password (provided in email) to begin the survey:

Survey Instructions: The survey questions will ask you about your experiences, attitudes, and beliefs, and therefore, there are no “right” or “wrong” answers. Your honesty in responding to the survey is extremely important for the accuracy and validity of our results. For each question please select the one answer that most accurately reflects your response.

SECTION ONE: Employment Information

1. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. In what country are you currently employed?
   a. Canada
   b. United States
   c. Other:___________________(please specify)

3. In what sector are you currently employed?
   a. Not-for-profit
   b. Public
   c. Private
   d. Other___________________(please specify)

4. How long have you been employed by your current organization (i.e., total tenure at this organization)?
   ______ years______months.

5. What is your current level within the organization?
   a. Executive officer (i.e., CEO, COO, CIO etc)
   b. President or Executive Director
   c. Vice President
   d. Director
   e. Senior Manager
f. Manager
g. Supervisor
h. Non-managerial employee
i. Other:________(please specify)

6. What is your current job title?
_________________________________

7. In what language do you primarily communicate in your workplace?
a. English
b. French
c. Other________(please specify)

8. How long have you been in your current position (i.e., total tenure at this job)?
______years.

9. How many employees currently directly report to you (i.e., you are likely responsible for managing these individuals in all aspects, including conducting their performance appraisals)?
_______(number of direct reports).

SECTION TWO: Leadership Behaviours

LEADERSHIP STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE
[Authentic Leadership Questionnaire]

The following survey items\(^\text{18}\) refer to your leadership style, as you perceive it. Please judge how frequently each statement fits your current leadership style using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a leader I...

1. say exactly what I mean
2. admit mistakes when they are made
3. demonstrate beliefs that are consistent with actions
7. listen carefully to different points of view before coming to conclusions
14. accurately describe how others view my capabilities

\(^\text{18}\) Due to copyright only 5 of 16 items are published in this dissertation.
LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR SCALE
[Empowering Leader Behaviour Scale]

This questionnaire is designed to study the ways managers work with direct reports. Please describe your behaviour towards your direct reports using the following scale.

Never, Not at all | Seldom, or to a limited extent | Sometimes, or to a moderate extent | Usually, or to a considerable extent | Almost always, or to a very great extent | Don't know or not applicable
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ?

As a leader, I...

1. Assign an important task and let them decide how to do it without interfering.
2. Encourage them to determine for themselves the best way to carry out an assignment or accomplish a task.
3. Encourage them to take the initiative to resolve work problems on their own rather than waiting for someone to tell them what to do.
4. Ask them to take primary responsibility for planning a major activity or project for the work unit.
5. Trust them to make an important decision without getting prior approval.
6. Allow them to decide when to do the different work activities in their job.
7. Let them monitor the quality of their work and correct any problems they find.
8. Consult with them before making decisions that affect them.
9. Ask for their ideas and suggestions when making decisions about the work.
10. Describe a plan or proposal as a preliminary rough draft and encourage them to suggest ways to improve it.
11. Encourage them to express any concerns they may have about a decision or plan I have proposed.
12. Listen carefully to any concerns they have without getting defensive.
13. Modify a proposal or plan to incorporate their suggestions and deal with their concerns.
14. Ask them to participate in planning changes or new activities for the work unit.
15. Provide them with the information needed to make good decisions.
16. Help them to understand how their actions and decisions affect the organization.
17. Communicate changes and events that may affect their work.
18. Explain how my decisions and actions will affect their work.
19. Help them understand how decisions made by higher management might affect them.
20. Ensure they have access to information to problem-solve independently.
21. Check-in with them to ensure they have sufficient information to do their work effectively.
**SECTION THREE: Personal Beliefs and Opinions**

**PERSONAL BELIEFS SCALE**
[Portrait Values Questionnaire – Male version]

Please read each description below and think about how much each person is or is not like you. Put an X in the box to the right that shows how much the person in the description is like you.

|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|

1. Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to him. He likes to do things in his own original way.

2. It is important to him to be rich. He wants to have a lot of money and expensive things.

3. He thinks it is important that every person in the world be treated equally. He believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.

4. It's very important to him to show his abilities. He wants people to admire what he does.

5. It is important to him to live in secure surroundings. He avoids anything that might endanger his safety.

6. He thinks it is important to do lots of different things in life. He always looks for new things to try.

7. He believes that people should do what they're told. He thinks people should follow rules at all times, even when no-one is watching.

8. It is important to him to listen to people who are different from him. Even when he disagrees with them, he still wants to understand them.

9. He thinks it's important **not** to ask for more than what you have. He believes that people should be satisfied with what they have.

10. He seeks every chance he can to have fun. It is important to him to do
things that give him pleasure.

11. It is important to him to make his own decisions about what he does. He likes to be free to plan and to choose his activities for himself.

12. It's very important to him to help the people around him. He wants to care for their well-being.

13. Being very successful is important to him. He likes to impress other people.

14. It is very important to him that his country be safe. He thinks the state must be on watch against threats from within and without.

15. He likes to take risks. He is always looking for adventures.

16. It is important to him always to behave properly. He wants to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong.

17. It is important to him to be in charge and tell others what to do. He wants people to do what he says.

18. It is important to him to be loyal to his friends. He wants to devote himself to people close to him.

19. He strongly believes that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to him.

20. Religious belief is important to him. He tries hard to do what his religion requires.

21. It is important to him that things be organized and clean. He really does not like things to be a mess.

22. He thinks it's important to be interested in things. He likes to be curious and to try to understand all sorts of things.

23. He believes all the world's people should live in harmony. Promoting peace among all groups in the world is important.
24. He thinks it is important to be ambitious. He wants to show how capable he is.

25. He thinks it is best to do things in traditional ways. It is important to him to keep up the customs he has learned.

26. Enjoying life's pleasures is important to him. He likes to ‘spoil’ himself.

27. It is important to him to respond to the needs of others. He tries to support those he knows.

28. He believes he should always show respect to his parents and to older people. It is important to him to be obedient.

29. He wants everyone to be treated justly, even people he doesn't know. It is important to him to protect the weak in society.

30. He likes surprises. It is important to him to have an exciting life.

31. He tries hard to avoid getting sick. Staying healthy is very important to him.

32. Getting ahead in life is important to him. He strives to do better than others.

33. Forgiving people who have hurt him is important to him. He tries to see what is good in them and not to hold a grudge.

34. It is important to him to be independent. He likes to rely on himself.

35. Having a stable government is important to him. He is concerned that the social order be protected.

36. It is important to him to be polite to other people all the time. He tries never to disturb or irritate others.

37. He really wants to enjoy life. Having a good time is very important to him.
38. It is important to him to be humble and modest. He tries not to draw attention to himself.

39. He always wants to be the one who makes the decisions. He likes to be the leader.

40. It is important to him to adapt to nature and to fit into it. He believes that people should not change nature.
PERSONAL BELIEFS SCALE
[Portrait Values Questionnaire – Female version]

Please read each description below and think about how much each person is or is not like you. Put an X in the box to the right that shows how much the person in the description is like you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW MUCH LIKE YOU IS THIS PERSON?</th>
<th>Very much like me</th>
<th>somewhat like me</th>
<th>a little like me</th>
<th>not like me</th>
<th>not like me at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to her. She likes to do things in her own original way.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is important to her to be rich. She wants to have a lot of money and expensive things.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. She thinks it is important that every person in the world be treated equally. She believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It's very important to her to show her abilities. She wants people to admire what she does.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is important to her to live in secure surroundings. She avoids anything that might endanger her safety.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. She thinks it is important to do lots of different things in life. She always looks for new things to try.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. She believes that people should do what they're told. She thinks people should follow rules at all times, even when no-one is watching.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is important to her to listen to people who are different from her. Even when she disagrees with them, she still wants to understand them.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. She thinks it's important not to ask for more than what you have. She believes that people should be satisfied with what they have.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. She seeks every chance she can to have fun. It is important to her to do things that give her pleasure.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. It is important to her to make her own decisions about what she does. She likes to be free to plan and to choose her activities for herself.

12. It's very important to her to help the people around her. She wants to care for their well-being.

13. Being very successful is important to her. She likes to impress other people.

14. It is very important to her that her country be safe. She thinks the state must be on watch against threats from within and without.

15. She likes to take risks. She is always looking for adventures.

16. It is important to her always to behave properly. She wants to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong.

17. It is important to her to be in charge and tell others what to do. She wants people to do what she says.

18. It is important to her to be loyal to her friends. She wants to devote herself to people close to her.

19. She strongly believes that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to her.

20. Religious belief is important to her. She tries hard to do what her religion requires.

21. It is important to her that things be organized and clean. She really does not like things to be a mess.

22. She thinks it's important to be interested in things. She likes to be curious and to try to understand all sorts of things.

23. She believes all the world’s people should live in harmony. Promoting peace among all groups in the world is important to her.
24. She thinks it is important to be ambitious. She wants to show how capable she is.

25. She thinks it is best to do things in traditional ways. It is important to her to keep up the customs she has learned.

26. Enjoying life’s pleasures is important to her. She likes to ‘spoil’ herself.

27. It is important to her to respond to the needs of others. She tries to support those she knows.

28. She believes she should always show respect to her parents and to older people. It is important to her to be obedient.

29. She wants everyone to be treated justly, even people she doesn’t know. It is important to her to protect the weak in society.

30. She likes surprises. It is important to her to have an exciting life.

31. She tries hard to avoid getting sick. Staying healthy is very important to her.

32. Getting ahead in life is important to her. She strives to do better than others.

33. Forgiving people who have hurt her is important to her. She tries to see what is good in them and not to hold a grudge.

34. It is important to her to be independent. She likes to rely on herself.

35. Having a stable government is important to her. She is concerned that the social order be protected.

36. It is important to her to be polite to other people all the time. She tries never to disturb or irritate others.

37. She really wants to enjoy life. Having a good time is very important to her.

38. It is important to her to be humble and modest. She tries not to draw attention to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW MUCH LIKE YOU IS THIS PERSON?</th>
<th>Very much like me</th>
<th>somewhat like me</th>
<th>a little like me</th>
<th>not like me</th>
<th>not like me at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
39. She always wants to be the one who makes the decisions. She likes to be the leader.

40. It is important to her to adapt to nature and to fit into it. She believes that people should not change nature.
PERSONAL OPINIONS SCALE
[BIDR – Impression Management Scale]

Using the scale below, select a number beside each statement to indicate how much
you agree with it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not True</th>
<th>Somewhat True</th>
<th>Very True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I never cover up my mistakes.
2. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone. [R]
3. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
4. I have said something bad about a friend behind his/her back. [R]
5. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
6. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her. [R]
7. When I was young I sometimes stole things. [R]
8. I have never dropped litter on the street.
9. I never look at sexy books or magazines.
10. I have done things that I don't tell other people about. [R]
11. I have pretended to be sick to avoid work or school. [R]
12. I don't gossip about other people's business.

SECTION FOUR – Demographic Information

The following demographic information is collected to assess potential differences in
patterns of survey results across different demographic categories. All information is
confidential and any results reported will be in aggregate form only.

1. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
   a. Some high school
   b. High school graduate
   c. Some college or technical school
   d. College or technical school graduate
   e. Some university undergraduate training
   f. University degree
   g. Some university graduate training
   h. Masters Degree
   i. Doctorate degree or equivalent

2. What is your marital status?
   a. Single
   b. Common Law
   c. Married
   d. Separated or Divorced

3. How old are you?
   ________ years.
4. What is your current annual income?  
______________ (in Canadian dollars)

5. In what category does your annual level of income fall?
   a. Under $25,000
   b. $25,000-49,999
   c. $50,000-74,999
   d. $75,000-99,999
   e. $100,000-124,999
   f. Over $125,000

6. What is your ethnic origin? Please check the appropriate box below. (Ethnic origin refers to the ethnic or cultural group(s) to which your ancestors belong. Ancestry should not be confused with citizenship or nationality).
   a. British Isles (e.g., Irish)
   b. Western European
   c. Northern European
   d. Eastern European
   e. Southern European
   f. French
   g. African
   h. Arab
   i. East Asian or Southeast Asian
   j. South Asian (e.g., East Indian)
   k. Latin, Central or South American
   l. Caribbean
   m. Aboriginal
   n. Canadian
   o. Other origins:_____ (please specify)

SECTION FIVE: Perceptions of Direct Report’s Workplace Behaviours

As noted in the Consent Form, my research examines the relationship between leader behaviours and employee behaviours. In this section, I will ask you about your direct reports.

List up to 3 direct reports that you have regularly interacted with over the last six months or more.
   1. _____________________
   2. _____________________
   3. _____________________

The next section of the survey will ask you to rate ONE of your direct reports.

Please select ONE direct report according to the following criteria:
If you listed 1 direct report, select the person whose name you typed in Box #1 above.
If you listed 2 direct reports, select the person whose name you typed in Box #2 above.
If you listed 3 direct reports, select the person whose name you typed in Box #3 above.

Please refer to Direct Report when completing the following survey items. You will also be asked for this employee’s contact information at the end of the survey.
DIRECT REPORT’S BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

1. How long have you known this person? 
   _______ years, _______ months.

2. How long have you been this person’s manager?
   _______ years, _______ months.

3. How frequently do you interact with this person?
   a. Once per month or less
   b. Once every other week
   c. 1-2 times per week
   d. 3-4 times per week
   e. At least once per day

4. How well do you think you know this person?
   a. Not very well
   b. Somewhat well
   c. Quite well
   d. Very well

DIRECT REPORT WORK-RELATED BEHAVIOURS SCALE
[Organizational Citizenship Behavior, 1-15 & Job Performance, 16-22]

Thinking about your direct report (selected above), please use the scale below to respond to each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This direct report...

1. Is the classic “squeaky wheel” that always needs greasing. [R]
2. Consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters. [R]
3. Tends to make “mountains out of molehills.” [R]
4. Considers the impact of his/her actions on coworkers.
5. Attends meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important.
6. Is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him/her.
7. Attends functions that are not required, but help the company image.
8. Reads and keeps up with organization announcements, memos, and so on.
9. Helps others who have been absent.
10. Willingly helps others who have work related problems.
11. Takes steps to try to prevent problems with other workers.
12. Has attendance at work that is above the norm.
13. Is mindful of how his/her behaviour affects other people’s jobs.
15. Is one of my most conscientious employees.
18. Performs tasks that are expected of him/her.
19. Meets formal performance requirements of the job.
20. Engages in activities that will directly affect his or her performance evaluation.
21. Neglects aspects of the job he or she is obliged to perform [R].
22. Fails to perform essential duties [R]

In the final section of the survey, I will ask you to provide contact information for your direct report, for yourself (for the purposes of the draw), and for any colleagues you wish to refer to this research. Please note this information is confidential and will be stored separately from your survey data.

SECTION SIX: Contact Information

Direct Report Contact Information

Please provide the contact information for the direct report whom you rated in the questionnaire above. Your survey responses will NOT be shared with your direct report in any way.

Name of Direct Report:________________________

E-mail Address:______________________________

Work Telephone Number:______________________

SECTION SEVEN: Comments

Before moving onto the final portion of the survey, please provide us with any additional comments regarding leadership processes.
SECTION EIGHT: Contact Information for the Draw and Research Summary

As a token of my appreciation for your participation, I will enter your name into a draw for a $250 gift certificate for Sears. The winner will be announced around Summer 2010. If you win the draw, please provide an email address where I can reach you.

Name:_____________________________
E-mail address:____________________

A summary of the results of this research, based upon the aggregated perspectives of managers and their direct reports, will be made available to all participants around Summer 2010. To receive this summary, please select one of the following options:

☐ Send the summary to the email address provided above
☐ Send the summary to the following email address:____________________

“SUBMIT”

SECTION NINE: Contact Information for Referrals and Bonus Reward

To obtain an adequate sample size, I am requesting your assistance with the recruitment of managers for this research. Do you know any colleagues in management positions who may be interested in this research? If so, please provide their contact information below.

As a token of my appreciation, for each referral, you will obtain an additional opportunity to win the $250 Sears gift certificate, thereby increasing your chances of winning the draw.

Please note that your survey data will NOT be connected to that of your referrals. Only your name will be mentioned in my recruitment email as the referring colleague. Your referrals will not be informed about whether or not you participated in this study and they will be under no obligation to participate in the research.

Referral #1:
Name:___________________________
E-mail address:____________________
Work phone number:_______________

Referral #2:
Name:___________________________
E-mail address:____________________
Work phone number:_______________

Referral #3:
Name:___________________________
E-mail address:____________________
Work phone number:_______________

Referral #4:
Name:___________________________
E-mail address:____________________
Work phone number:_______________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral #5:</th>
<th>Referral #6:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: ______________________________</td>
<td>Name: ______________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address: ____________________</td>
<td>E-mail address: ____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work phone number: _________________</td>
<td>Work phone number: _________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral #7:</th>
<th>Referral #8:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: ______________________________</td>
<td>Name: ______________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address: ____________________</td>
<td>E-mail address: ____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work phone number: _________________</td>
<td>Work phone number: _________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral #9:</th>
<th>Referral #10:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: ______________________________</td>
<td>Name: ______________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address: ____________________</td>
<td>E-mail address: ____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work phone number: _________________</td>
<td>Work phone number: _________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO THIS RESEARCH.

When you hit ‘SUBMIT’ you will be taken to the Debriefing Letter that provides additional information about this research.

“SUBMIT”
Dear participant,

Thank you for your valuable contribution to my dissertation research and to the field of leadership research.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relations between the attitudes, beliefs, and leadership behaviours of managers and employee workplace attitudes, behaviours, and experiences. In participating in this survey, you completed a number of questionnaire measures that related to your beliefs, leadership style, and behaviours (including, for example, the extent to which you feel that success is important to you, how you make decisions as a leader, the extent to which you involve your direct reports in decisions that affect them) as well as measures assessing your perceptions of one of your direct report’s job performance (e.g., fulfills responsibilities in job description) and discretionary behaviours (e.g., takes steps to prevent problems with coworkers).

Your survey responses, along with data collected from other managers like yourself, provide important clues to the dynamic and interactive nature of leadership. For instance, data collected from the managers’ survey will shed light on the extent to which certain values (e.g., achievement, fairness) held by managers are related to their self-reported leadership style (e.g., participative decision-making). On the other hand, the survey responses of the direct reports will provide other valuable clues to the nature of leadership, including an enhanced understanding of how employees’ perceptions of their managers’ leadership style relate to their psychological well-being and commitment to their organization.

A unique feature of my doctoral research is the examination of leadership processes from the perspectives of both managers and their direct reports. By matching up the survey data from managers and their direct reports at a dyadic level (i.e., manager-employee), my research will be able to address important and interesting questions such as: What better predicts managers’ assessments of their employees’ performance on the job – is it the managers’ perceptions of their own leadership style or is it the employees’ perceptions of their managers’ leadership style? Do managers see their leadership style in the same way that employees see it?
We hope that this research will contribute to a better understanding of leadership processes and help to identify the specific means by which managers have an influence on the attitudes and behaviours of their direct reports. By combining the survey results from managers and their direct reports, we hope to contribute to a richer understanding of manager-employee relations, which may facilitate future development of more comprehensive and meaningful organizational interventions.

In this study, we asked you to evaluate your perceptions of your own leadership as well as the performance of one of your direct reports. If you found this experience at all distressing and would like to obtain a list of resources to help you deal with any distress, please contact your local Canadian Mental Health Association (national phone number: 613-745-7750, website: www.cmha.ca; local contact information can be found on the website).

We would like to thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have any further questions about this study, please feel free to contact Evelina Rog at erog@uoguelph.ca or at (647) 938-9030. We would appreciate that you do not discuss the information shared in this debriefing form with anyone (in particular, those who may later participate in this study) until the completion of the study.

A summary of the results of this study, based upon the aggregated perspectives of managers and their direct reports, will be made available to all participants around Summer 2010. If you would like the summary to be sent to an email address other than the one at which you were contacted, please type it in here:________________________.

Sincerely,

Evelina Rog

Evelina Rog, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
erog@uoguelph.ca
(647) 938-9030

Leanne Son Hing, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Dissertation Advisor
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
sonhing@uoguelph.ca
(519) 824-4120 *54475
Manager Reminder Email Request for Participation

Leadership Processes Study
Request for Participation in Survey - Reminder

From: Geoffrey Smith (gwsmith@uoguelph.ca) (for Groups A & B)
      Evelina Rog (erog@uoguelph.ca) (for Groups C)
      Julie West (survey@westresearch.ca) (for Group D)
To:   [Email address of manager]
Date:
Subject: Seeking Your Help with a Leadership Study – Reminder

Dear [name],

I am following up on an email you received on [date] inviting you to participate in Evelina Rog’s dissertation research on leadership processes. I am contacting you to ask for your assistance with this research.

To participate in the online survey or to refer colleagues who may be interested in taking part in the research, please see the original email message with links below.

If you would like your name to be taken off of the potential participant recruitment list, please click here: REMOVE NAME.

Original recruitment email to follow.
Appendix M

Managers’ Background Employment Information

1. What is your gender? [SEX: response is linked to the male/female PVQ values scale]
   a. Male [1]
   b. Female [-1]

2. In what country are you currently employed? [COUNTRY]
   a. Canada [1]
   b. United States [2]
   c. Other:______________________(please specify) [3]

3. In what sector are you currently employed? [SECTOR]
   a. Not-for-profit [1]
   b. Public [2]
   c. Private [3]
   d. Other__________________(please specify) [4]

4. How long have you been employed by your current organization (i.e., total tenure at this organization)? ______ years______months [TENORG]

5. What is your current level within the organization? [LEVEL]
   a. Executive officer (i.e., CEO, COO, CIO etc) [8]
   b. President or Executive Director [7]
   c. Vice President [6]
   d. Director [5]
   e. Senior Manager [4]
   f. Manager [3]
   g. Supervisor [2]
   h. Non-managerial employee [1]
   i. Other:___________________(please specify) [9]

6. What is your current job title? ___________________ ______________ [TITLE]

7. In what language do you primarily communicate in your workplace? [LANG]
   a. English [1]
   b. French [2]
   c. Other________(please specify) [3]

8. How long have you been in your current position (i.e., total tenure at this job)?______years [TENJOB]

9. How many employees currently directly report to you (i.e., you are likely responsible for managing these individuals in all aspects, including conducting their performance appraisals)? ________ (number of direct reports) [NUMBDRS]
Appendix N

Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) [Managers’ Self-Report Version]
(Copyright 2007 by Bruce Avolio, William Gardner, and Fred Walumbwa.
The instrument is available for research purposes at
http://www.mindgarden.com/products/alq.htm.)

The following survey items\textsuperscript{19} refer to your leadership style, as you perceive it. Please judge how frequently each statement fits your current leadership style using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a leader I…

1. say exactly what I mean. [Relational Transparency]
2. admit mistakes when they are made. [Relational Transparency]
3. demonstrate beliefs that are consistent with actions. [Internalized Moral Perspective]
7. listen carefully to different points of view before coming to conclusions. [Balanced Information Processing]
13. accurately describe how others view my capabilities. [Self-Awareness]

\textsuperscript{19}Due to copyright only 5 of 16 items are published in this dissertation.
Appendix O

*Empowering Leader Behaviour Measure*
(Yukl, Wall & Lepsinger, 1990; Informing Subscale Developed for this Study)

This questionnaire is designed to study the ways managers work with direct reports. Please describe your behaviour towards your direct reports using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never, Not at all</th>
<th>Seldom, or to a limited extent</th>
<th>Sometimes, or to a moderate extent</th>
<th>Usually, or to a considerable extent</th>
<th>Almost always, or to a very great extent</th>
<th>Don’t know or not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a leader, I…

1. Assign an important task and let them decide how to do it without interfering.  
   [Delegating]
2. Encourage them to determine for themselves the best way to carry out an assignment or accomplish a task. [Delegating]
3. Encourage them to take the initiative to resolve work problems on their own rather than waiting for someone to tell them what to do. [Delegating]
4. Ask them to take primary responsibility for planning a major activity or project for the work unit. [Delegating]
5. Trust them to make an important decision without getting prior approval. [Delegating]
6. Allow them to decide when to do the different work activities in their job. [Delegating]
7. Let them monitor the quality of their work and correct any problems they find. [Delegating]
8. Consult with them before making decisions that affect them. [Consulting]
9. Ask for their ideas and suggestions when making decisions about the work. [Consulting]
10. Describe a plan or proposal as a preliminary rough draft and encourage them to suggest ways to improve it. [Consulting]
11. Encourage them to express any concerns they may have about a decision or plan I have proposed. [Consulting]
12. Listen carefully to any concerns they have without getting defensive. [Consulting]
13. Modify a proposal or plan to incorporate their suggestions and deal with their concerns. [Consulting]
14. Ask them to participate in planning changes or new activities for the work unit. [Consulting]
15. Provide them with the information needed to make good decisions. [Informing]
16. Help them to understand how their actions and decisions affect the organization. [Informing]
17. Communicate changes and events that may affect their work. [Informing]
18. Explain how my decisions and actions will affect their work. [Informing]
19. Help them understand how decisions made by higher management might affect them. [Informing]
20. Ensure they have access to information to problem-solve independently. [Informing]
21. Check-in with them to ensure they have sufficient information to do their work effectively. [Informing]
Appendix P

*Portrait Values Questionnaire* [Male version]
(Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess, Harris & Owens, 2001)

Please read each description below and think about how much each person is or is not like you. Put an X in the box to the right that shows how much the person in the description is like you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much like me</th>
<th>Like me</th>
<th>Somewhat like me</th>
<th>A little like me</th>
<th>Not like me</th>
<th>Not like me at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much like you is this person?

1. Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to him. He likes to do things in his own original way. [Self-direction]
2. It is important to him to be rich. He wants to have a lot of money and expensive things. [Power]
3. He thinks it is important that every person in the world be treated equally. He believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life. [Universalism]
4. It's very important to him to show his abilities. He wants people to admire what he does. [Achievement]
5. It is important to him to live in secure surroundings. He avoids anything that might endanger his safety. [Security]
6. He thinks it is important to do lots of different things in life. He always looks for new things to try. [Stimulation]
7. He believes that people should do what they're told. He thinks people should follow rules at all times, even when no-one is watching. [Conformity]
8. It is important to him to listen to people who are different from him. Even when he disagrees with them, he still wants to understand them. [Universalism]
9. He thinks it's important not to ask for more than what you have. He believes that people should be satisfied with what they have. [Tradition]
10. He seeks every chance he can to have fun. It is important to him to do things that give him pleasure. [Hedonism]
11. It is important to him to make his own decisions about what he does. He likes to be free to plan and to choose his activities for himself. [Self-direction]
12. It's very important to him to help the people around him. He wants to care for their well-being. [Benevolence]
13. Being very successful is important to him. He likes to impress other people. [Achievement]
14. It is very important to him that his country be safe. He thinks the state must be on watch against threats from within and without. [Security]
15. He likes to take risks. He is always looking for adventures. [Stimulation]
16. It is important to him always to behave properly. He wants to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong. [Conformity]

17. It is important to him to be in charge and tell others what to do. He wants people to do what he says. [Power]

18. It is important to him to be loyal to his friends. He wants to devote himself to people close to him. [Benevolence]

19. He strongly believes that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to him. [Universalism]

20. Religious belief is important to him. He tries hard to do what his religion requires. [Tradition]

21. It is important to him that things be organized and clean. He really does not like things to be a mess. [Security]

22. He thinks it's important to be interested in things. He likes to be curious and to try to understand all sorts of things. [Self-direction]

23. He believes all the world's people should live in harmony. Promoting peace among all groups in the world is important to him. [Universalism]

24. He thinks it is important to be ambitious. He wants to show how capable he is. [Achievement]

25. He thinks it is best to do things in traditional ways. It is important to him to keep up the customs he has learned. [Tradition]

26. Enjoying life’s pleasures is important to him. He likes to ‘spoil’ himself. [Hedonism]

27. It is important to him to respond to the needs of others. He tries to support those he knows. [Benevolence]

28. He believes he should always show respect to his parents and to older people. It is important to him to be obedient. [Conformity]

29. He wants everyone to be treated justly, even people he doesn’t know. It is important to him to protect the weak in society. [Universalism]

30. He likes surprises. It is important to him to have an exciting life. [Stimulation]

31. He tries hard to avoid getting sick. Staying healthy is very important to him. [Security]

32. Getting ahead in life is important to him. He strives to do better than others. [Achievement]

33. Forgiving people who have hurt him is important to him. He tries to see what is good in them and not to hold a grudge. [Benevolence]

34. It is important to him to be independent. He likes to rely on himself. [Self-direction]

35. Having a stable government is important to him. He is concerned that the social order be protected. [Security]

36. It is important to him to be polite to other people all the time. He tries never to disturb or irritate others. [Conformity]

37. He really wants to enjoy life. Having a good time is very important to him. [Hedonism]

38. It is important to him to be humble and modest. He tries not to draw attention to himself. [Tradition]
39. He always wants to be the one who makes the decisions. He likes to be the leader. [Power]

40. It is important to him to adapt to nature and to fit into it. He believes that people should not change nature. [Universalism]
Appendix Q

*Portrait Values Questionnaire* [Female version]
(Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess, Harris & Owens, 2001)

Please read each description below and think about how much each person is or is not like you. Put an X in the box to the right that shows how much the person in the description is like you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much like me</th>
<th>Like me</th>
<th>Somewhat like me</th>
<th>A little like me</th>
<th>Not like me</th>
<th>Not like me at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much like you is this person?

1. Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to her. She likes to do things in her own original way. [Self-direction]
2. It is important to her to be rich. She wants to have a lot of money and expensive things. [Power]
3. She thinks it is important that every person in the world be treated equally. She believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life. [Universalism]
4. It's very important to her to show her abilities. She wants people to admire what she does. [Achievement]
5. It is important to her to live in secure surroundings. She avoids anything that might endanger her safety. [Security]
6. She thinks it is important to do lots of different things in life. She always looks for new things to try. [Stimulation]
7. She believes that people should do what they're told. She thinks people should follow rules at all times, even when no-one is watching. [Conformity]
8. It is important to her to listen to people who are different from her. Even when she disagrees with them, she still wants to understand them. [Universalism]
9. She thinks it's important **not** to ask for more than what you have. She believes that people should be satisfied with what they have. [Tradition]
10. She seeks every chance she can to have fun. It is important to her to do things that give her pleasure. [Hedonism]
11. It is important to her to make her own decisions about what she does. She likes to be free to plan and to choose her activities for herself. [Self-direction]
12. It's very important to her to help the people around her. She wants to care for their well-being. [Benevolence]
13. Being very successful is important to her. She likes to impress other people. [Achievement]
14. It is very important to her that her country be safe. She thinks the state must be on watch against threats from within and without. [Security]
15. She likes to take risks. She is always looking for adventures. [Stimulation]
16. It is important to her always to behave properly. She wants to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong. [Conformity]
17. It is important to her to be in charge and tell others what to do. She wants people to do what she says. [Power]
18. It is important to her to be loyal to her friends. She wants to devote herself to people close to her. [Benevolence]
19. She strongly believes that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to her. [Universalism]
20. Religious belief is important to her. She tries hard to do what her religion requires. [ Tradition]
21. It is important to her that things be organized and clean. She really does not like things to be a mess. [Security]
22. She thinks it's important to be interested in things. She likes to be curious and to try to understand all sorts of things. [Self-direction]
23. She believes all the world's people should live in harmony. Promoting peace among all groups in the world is important to her. [Universalism]
24. She thinks it is important to be ambitious. She wants to show how capable she is. [Achievement]
25. She thinks it is best to do things in traditional ways. It is important to her to keep up the customs she has learned. [Tradition]
26. Enjoying life’s pleasures is important to her. She likes to ‘spoil’ herself. [Hedonism]
27. It is important to her to respond to the needs of others. She tries to support those she knows. [Benevolence]
28. She believes she should always show respect to her parents and to older people. It is important to her to be obedient. [Conformity]
29. She wants everyone to be treated justly, even people she doesn’t know. It is important to her to protect the weak in society. [Universalism]
30. She likes surprises. It is important to her to have an exciting life. [Stimulation]
31. She tries hard to avoid getting sick. Staying healthy is very important to her. [Security]
32. Getting ahead in life is important to her. She strives to do better than others. [Achievement]
33. Forgiving people who have hurt her is important to her. She tries to see what is good in them and not to hold a grudge. [Benevolence]
34. It is important to her to be independent. She likes to rely on herself. [Self-direction]
35. Having a stable government is important to her. She is concerned that the social order be protected. [Security]
36. It is important to her to be polite to other people all the time. She tries never to disturb or irritate others. [Conformity]
37. She really wants to enjoy life. Having a good time is very important to her. [Hedonism]
38. It is important to her to be humble and modest. She tries not to draw attention to herself. [Tradition]
39. She always wants to be the one who makes the decisions. She likes to be the leader. [Power]

40. It is important to her to adapt to nature and to fit into it. She believes that people should not change nature. [Universalism]
Appendix R

Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding - Impression Management Subscale
(Paulhus, 1991)

Using the scale below, select a number beside each statement to indicate how much you agree with it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not True</th>
<th>Somewhat True</th>
<th>Very True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I never cover up my mistakes.
2. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone. [R]
3. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
4. I have said something bad about a friend behind his/her back. [R]
5. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
6. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her. [R]
7. When I was young I sometimes stole things. [R]
8. I have never dropped litter on the street.
9. I never look at sexy books or magazines.
10. I have done things that I don't tell other people about. [R]
11. I have pretended to be sick to avoid work or school. [R]
12. I don't gossip about other people's business.
Appendix S

Managers’ Demographic Information

1. What is the highest level of education you have attained? [EDU]
   a. Some high school [1]
   b. High school graduate [2]
   c. Some college or technical school [3]
   d. College or technical school graduate [4]
   e. Some university undergraduate training [5]
   f. University degree [6]
   g. Some university graduate training [7]
   h. Masters Degree [8]
   i. Doctorate degree or equivalent [9]

2. What is your marital status? [MAR]
   a. Single [1]
   c. Married [3]
   d. Separated or Divorced [4]

3. How old are you? ________ years [AGE]

4. What is your current annual income? ________ (in Canadian dollars) [INCTOT]

5. In what category does your annual level of income fall? [INCCAT]
   a. Under $25,000 [1]
   b. $25,000-49,999 [2]
   c. $50,000-74,999 [3]
   d. $75,000-99,999 [4]
   e. $100,000-124,999 [5]
   f. Over $125,000 [6]

6. What is your ethnic origin? Please check the appropriate box below. (Ethnic origin refers to the ethnic or cultural group(s) to which your ancestors belong. Ancestry should not be confused with citizenship or nationality).
Appendix T

Managers’ Relationship Variable Questions

1. How long have you known this person? ___ years ___ months [KNOWN]

2. How long have you been this person’s manager? ___ years ___ months [LONGM]

3. How frequently do you interact with this person? [FREQINT]
   a. Once per month of less [1]
   b. Once every other week [2]
   c. 1-2 times per week [3]
   d. 3-4 times per week [4]
   e. At least once per day [5]

4. How well do you think you know this person? [WELLKNOW]
   a. Not very well [1]
   b. Somewhat well [2]
   c. Quite well [3]
   d. Very well [4]
Appendix U

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale
(Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990)

Thinking about your direct report (selected above), please use the scale below to respond to each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This direct report…

1. Is the classic “squeaky wheel” that always needs greasing. [R] [Sportsmanship]
2. Consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters. [R] [Sportsmanship]
3. Tends to make “mountains out of molehills.” [R] [Sportsmanship]
4. Considers the impact of his/her actions on coworkers. [Courtesy]
5. Attends meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important. [Civic Virtue]
6. Is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him/her. [Altruism]
7. Attends functions that are not required, but help the company image. [Civic Virtue]
8. Reads and keeps up with organization announcements, memos, and so on. [Civic Virtue]
9. Helps others who have been absent. [Altruism]
10. Willingly helps others who have work related problems. [Altruism]
11. Takes steps to try to prevent problems with other workers. [Courtesy]
12. Has attendance at work that is above the norm. [Conscientiousness]
13. Is mindful of how his/her behaviour affects other people’s jobs. [Courtesy]
14. Does not take extra breaks. [Conscientiousness]
15. Is one of my most conscientious employees. [Conscientiousness]
Appendix V

*In-Role Behavior [Job Performance Measure]*
(Williams & Anderson, 1991)

Thinking about your direct report (selected above), please use the scale below to respond to each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This direct report…

1. Adequately completes assigned duties.
2. Fulfills responsibilities specified in job description.
3. Performs tasks that are expected of him/her.
4. Meets formal performance requirements of the job.
5. Engages in activities that will directly affect his or her performance evaluation.
6. Neglects aspects of the job he or she is obliged to perform [R].
7. Fails to perform essential duties [R]
Appendix W

Recruitment Email for Subordinates [of GROUP A Managers]

From: survey@westresearch.ca
To: [email of employee (of Group A Managers)]
Date: 
Subject: Seeking Your Help with a Manager-Employee Processes Study

Dear [name of employee,]

My name is Evelina Rog and I am a PhD candidate in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at the University of Guelph. I am currently carrying out my dissertation research examining manager-employee processes and am recruiting managers and their direct reports to participate in an online survey.

Your manager, [name of manager], has already participated in the manager portion of this study and has passed on your contact information to me in hopes that you might be willing to assist me in the employee portion of this research.

While I am certain that time is in short supply for you, I hope you can contribute 20-30 minutes to complete the online survey. As a token of my appreciation, I am offering a draw for a $250 gift certificate.

If you are willing to contribute to this research, please read the following consent form and use this confidential password to complete your survey (PASSWORD: XXXXX). CLICK here to begin: CONSENT FORM AND SURVEY FOR DIRECT REPORTS.

Sincerely,

Evelina Rog

Evelina Rog, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Department of Psychology
Appendix X

*Recruitment Email for Subordinates [of GROUP B & C & D Managers]*

**From:** Evelina Rog (erog@uoguelph.ca)  
**To:** [email of employee (of Group B & C Managers)]  
**Date:**  
**Subject:** Seeking Your Help with a Manager-Employee Processes Study

---

Dear [name of employee,]

My name is Evelina Rog and I am a PhD candidate in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at the University of Guelph. I am currently carrying out my dissertation research examining manager-employee processes and am recruiting managers and their direct reports to participate in an online survey.

Your manager, [name of manager], has already participated in the manager portion of this study and has passed on your contact information to me in hopes that you might be willing to assist me in the employee portion of this research. Please note that your manager will not be told whether or not you participated in this research and will not have access to your survey responses.

While I am certain that time is in short supply for you, I hope you can contribute 20-30 minutes to complete the online survey. As a token of my appreciation, I am offering a draw for a $250 gift certificate.

If you are willing to contribute to this research, please read the following consent form and use this confidential password to complete your survey (PASSWORD: XXXXX). CLICK here to begin: CONSENT FORM AND SURVEY FOR DIRECT REPORTS.

Sincerely,

Evelina Rog

Evelina Rog, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
erog@uoguelph.ca
(647) 938-9030
Appendix Y

Consent Form for Subordinates

Manager-Employee Processes Study
Consent Form for Direct Reports

Thank you for your interest in this research. Typically, only the perspectives of employees OR managers are studied. By examining the important dynamics between managerial behaviour and employee experiences, this research will make the design of more comprehensive organizational interventions possible in the future.

In the online survey to follow, you will be asked about your thoughts and experiences in relation to your work, your organization, and your manager (the individual who referred you to this study).

This study has been reviewed and received ethics approval from the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board. As such, I would like to inform you about several things:

- Your responses will be automatically encrypted and stored in a secure server in Canada.

- To ensure that I can connect the survey responses of managers and their direct reports, this study uses a unique password for each manager-direct report dyad. To ensure the confidentiality of your responses, all contact information will be held separately from the survey data in a password-protected file. Contact information will be destroyed once data collection is completed (approximately Summer 2010).

- Under no circumstances will your survey responses be shared with your manager, nor will you have access to your manager’s responses. Your manager will not know whether or not you participated in this research.

- Individual survey results will not be reported anywhere. I will email a summary of the results of this research to all participants upon completion of the study (around Summer 2010). Results reported in my dissertation (and any other publications, such as journal articles or conference presentations) will be aggregated/averaged with data from about 250 managers and 250 direct reports participating in this research.
Your participation is voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty of any kind. Further, you may refuse to answer any question that you do not wish to answer by simply moving onto the next question. Finally, all data will be kept for seven years and then destroyed.

Please feel free to contact myself, my faculty advisor, or the research ethics officer with any questions about this research.

To thank you for your important contribution to this research, your name will be entered into a draw for a $250 gift certificate from Sears. Your chances of winning this prize are about 1/250.

By clicking the SUBMIT button below, you will indicate that you have read this Consent Form and consent to participate in the online survey.

Thank you very much for your time and interest.

Evelina Rog

Evelina Rog, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
erog@uoguelph.ca
(647) 938-9030

Leanne Son Hing, Ph.D.
Associate Professor & Dissertation Advisor
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
sonhing@uoguelph.ca
(519) 824-4120 *54475

Sandra Auld
Research Ethics Officer
University of Guelph
437 University Centre
Guelph, ON, N1G2W1
519-824-4120 *56606
sauld@uoguelph.ca
fax: 519-821-5236

Julie West
Survey Administrator
Westresearch
survey@westresearch.ca

“SUBMIT”
Appendix Z

Subordinate Survey

Manager-Employee Processes Study
Direct Report Survey

Please enter your password (provided in email) to begin the survey: ___

Survey Instructions: The survey questions will ask about your attitudes and experiences and therefore, there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Your honesty in responding to the survey is extremely important for the accuracy and validity of our results. For each question please select the one answer that most accurately reflects your response.

SECTION ONE: Employment Information

1. In what country are you currently employed?
   a. Canada
   b. United States
   c. Other:________________(please specify)

2. In what language do you primarily communicate in your workplace?
   a. English
   b. French
   c. Other:________________(please specify)

3. In what sector are you currently employed?
   a. Not-for-profit
   b. Public
   c. Private
   d. Other:________________(please specify)

4. In what industry are you currently employed?
   a. Agriculture and other resource-based industries
   b. Construction
   c. Manufacturing
   d. Wholesale trade
   e. Retail trade
   f. Finance and real estate
   g. Health care and social services
   h. Educational services
   i. Business services
j. Other services:______________(please specify)

5. What is your current level within the organization?
   a. Non-managerial employee
   b. Supervisor
   c. Manager
   d. Senior Manager
   e. Director
   f. Vice President
   g. President or Executive Director
   h. Executive officer (i.e., CEO, COO, CIO etc)
   i. Other:_____________________(please specify)

6. What is your current job title?
   ______________________________(please specify)

7. How long have you been employed by your current organization (i.e., total tenure at this organization)?
   ______ years_______months.

8. How long have you been in your current position (i.e., total tenure at this job)?
   ______ years,_______months.

9. How long have you been working for your direct manager (i.e., the individual who referred you to this study)?
   ______years,_______months.

10. How long have you known your direct manager in total?
    ______years,_______months.

11. How frequently do you interact with your direct manager?
    a. Once per month or less
    b. Once every other week
    c. 1-2 times per week
    d. 3-4 times per week
    e. At least once per day

12. How well do you think you know your direct manager?
    a. Not very well
    b. Somewhat well
    c. Quite well
    d. Very well
SECTION TWO: Direct Manager’s Leadership Behaviours

LEADERSHIP STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE
[Authentic Leadership Questionnaire]

The following survey items refer to your manager’s leadership style, as you perceive it. Judge how frequently each statement fits his or her current leadership style using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My manager…

1. says exactly what he or she means.
2. admits mistakes when they are made.
3. demonstrates beliefs that are consistent with actions.
4. listens carefully to different points of view before coming to conclusions.
5. accurately describes how others view his or her capabilities.

OPINIONS ABOUT MANAGER
[Trust in Leader]

Thinking about your manager, please use the scale provided to respond to each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. If I had my way, I wouldn’t let my manager have any influence over issues that are important to me. [R]
2. I would be willing to let my manager have complete control over my future in this company.
3. I really wish I had a good way to keep an eye on my manager. [R]
4. I would be comfortable giving my manager a task or problem which was critical to me, even if I could not monitor his/her (its) actions.
5. I would tell my manager about mistakes I’ve made on the job, even if they could damage my reputation.
6. I would share my opinion about sensitive issues with my manager even if my opinion were unpopular.
7. I am afraid of what my manager might do to me at work.
8. If my manager asked why a problem happened, I would speak freely even if I were partly to blame.

Due to copyright, only 5 of 16 items are published in this dissertation.
MANAGER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONSHIP SCALE
[Leader-Member Exchange]

Thinking about your work relationship with your manager, please use the scale provided to respond to each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My working relationship with my supervisor is very effective.
2. I always know how satisfied my supervisor is with what I do.
3. My supervisor would use his/her power to help me solve work-related problems.
4. I always know where I stand with my supervisor.
5. My manager understands my job problems and needs.
6. My manager recognizes my potential well.
7. My supervisor would “bail me out” at his/her expense.

MANAGER’S DECISION-MAKING STYLE
[Leader Ethical Decision Making]

Thinking about your manager’s decision-making style, please use the scale provided to respond to each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My manager…

1. Considers the ethical impact of a decision before he/she implements it.
2. Holds him/herself to high ethical standards when making decisions.
3. Values ethics above pleasing stakeholders (e.g., superiors, customers) when making decisions that impact the organization.
4. Is not afraid to challenge decisions made by others that violate ethical standards.
5. Places a higher value on the ethicality of a decision than on his own self-interests.
SECTION THREE: Work Attitudes and Experiences

OPINIONS ABOUT WORK SCALE
[Psychological Empowerment]

Thinking about your work, please use the scale provided to respond to each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The work I do is very important to me.
2. My job activities are personally meaningful to me.
3. The work I do is meaningful to me.
4. I am confident about my ability to do my job.
5. I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities.
6. I have mastered the skills necessary for my job.
7. I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.
8. I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work.
9. I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job.
10. My impact on what happens in my department is large.
11. I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department.
12. I have significant influence over what happens in my department.

OPINIONS ABOUT ORGANIZATION SCALE
[Affective Organizational Commitment]

Thinking about your organization, please use the scale provided to respond to each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.
2. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
3. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization. [R]
4. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization. [R]
5. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
6. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. [R]
DESCRIBING MYSELF SCALE
[Psychological Well-Being]

The following set of questions deals with how you feel about yourself and your life. Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers. Please use the scale provided to respond to each of the following statements:

1. I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people.
2. My decisions are not usually influenced by what everyone else is doing.
3. I tend to worry about what other people think of me. [R]
4. I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions. [R]
5. I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus.
6. It's difficult for me to voice my own opinions on controversial matters. [R]
7. I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important.
8. In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.
9. The demands of everyday life often get me down. [R]
10. I do not fit very well with the people and the community around me. [R]
11. I am quite good at managing the many responsibilities of my daily life.
12. I often feel overwhelmed by my responsibilities. [R]
13. I have difficulty arranging my life in a way that is satisfying to me. [R]
14. I have been able to build a home and a lifestyle for myself that is much to my liking.
15. I am not interested in activities that will expand my horizons. [R]
16. I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and the world.
17. When I think about it, I haven't really improved much as a person over the years. [R]
18. I have the sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time.
19. I do not enjoy being in new situations that require me to change my old familiar ways of doing things. [R]
20. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.
21. I gave up trying to make big improvements or changes in my life a long time ago. [R]
22. Most people see me as loving and affectionate.
23. Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me. [R]
24. I often feel lonely because I have few close friends with whom to share my concerns. [R]
25. I enjoy personal and mutual conversations with family members or friends.
26. People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.
27. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others. [R]
28. I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.
29. I live life one day at a time and don't really think about the future. [R]
30. I have a sense of direction and purpose in life.
31. My daily activities often seem trivial and unimportant to me. [R]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
32. I don't have a good sense of what it is I'm trying to accomplish in life. [R]
33. I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.
34. Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them.
35. I sometimes feel as if I've done all there is to do in life. [R]

SECTION FOUR: Demographic Information

The following demographic information is collected to assess potential differences in patterns of survey results for different demographic categories. All information is confidential and any results reported will be in aggregate form only.

1. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
   a. Some high school
   b. High school graduate
   c. Some college or technical school
   d. College or technical school graduate
   e. Some university undergraduate training
   f. University degree
   g. Some university graduate training
   h. Masters Degree
   i. Doctorate degree or equivalent

3. What is your marital status?
   a. Single
   b. Common Law
   c. Married
   d. Separated or Divorced
   e. Widowed

4. How old are you?
   ________ years.

5. What is your current annual income?
   ___________ (in Canadian dollars)

6. In what category does your annual level of income fall?
   a. Under $25,000
   b. $25,000-$49,999
   c. $50,000-$74,999
   d. $75,000-$99,999
   e. $100,000-$124,999
   f. Over $125,000
7. What is your ethnic origin? (Ethnic origin refers to the ethnic or cultural group(s) to which your ancestors belong. Ancestry should not be confused with citizenship or nationality). Check all that apply.
   a. British Isles (e.g., Irish)
   b. Western European
   c. Northern European
   d. Eastern European
   e. Southern European
   f. French
   g. African
   h. Arab
   i. East Asian or Southeast Asian
   j. South Asian (e.g., East Indian)
   k. Latin, Central or South American
   l. Caribbean
   m. Aboriginal
   n. Canadian
   o. Other origin(s): ________________ (please specify)

Any additional comments regarding the manager-employee processes survey?

In the final section of the survey, I will ask you to provide your contact information for the purposes of the draw and research summary. Please note this information is confidential and will be stored separately from your survey data.

SECTION FIVE: Contact Information for Draw and Research Summary

As a token of my appreciation for your participation, I will enter your name into a draw for a $250 gift certificate for Sears. The winner will be announced around Summer 2010. If you win the draw, please provide your contact information so that I can reach you.

Name: __________________________________________

E-mail address: __________________________________

A summary of the results of this research, based upon the aggregated perspectives of managers and their direct reports, will be made available to all participants around Summer 2010. To receive this summary, please select one of the following options:

☐ Send the summary to the email address provided above
☐ Send the summary to the following email address: ____________________________
THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO THIS RESEARCH!

Please click “SUBMIT” to complete your survey. You will be taken to a Debriefing Letter that provides additional information about this research.

“SUBMIT”
Appendix AA

Subordinate Debriefing Form

Manager-Employee Processes Study
Direct Report Debriefing Form

Dear participant,

Thank you for your valuable contribution to this research.

The purpose of my doctoral research is to examine the relations between managerial attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours and employee attitudes, behaviours, and experiences. In participating in this survey, you completed a number of questionnaire measures that related to your thoughts, feelings, and experiences in the workplace (including, for example, the extent to which you find your job meaningful, the degree to which you feel emotionally attached to your organization) as well as measures assessing your perceptions of your manager’s leadership style (e.g., the extent to which he or she listens to different points of view before coming to a decision), and the quality of your relationship with your manager (e.g., your comfort in talking to him or her about sensitive issues, the extent to which you feel that he or she understands your problems and needs).

Your survey responses, along with data collected from other employees like yourself, provide important clues to the dynamic nature of manager-employee processes. For instance, data collected from the employee survey will shed light on the extent to which employees’ perceptions of their managers’ leadership style relates to the degree to which they feel they can trust their manager. On the other hand, the survey responses from the manager survey will provide other valuable clues to the nature of manager-employee processes, including an enhanced understanding of how their own perceptions of their leadership style relates to their willingness to empower their direct reports.

A unique feature of my doctoral research is the examination of manager-employee processes from the perspectives of both managers and their direct reports. By matching up the survey data from managers and their direct reports at a dyadic level (i.e., manager-employee), my research will be able to address important and interesting questions such as: What better predicts employees’ willingness to go above-and-beyond at work – is it their perceptions of their managers’ leadership style or the managers’ own perceptions of his or her leadership style? Do managers see their leadership style in the same way that employees see it?
We hope that this research will contribute to a better understanding of manager-employee processes and help to identify the specific means by which managers have an influence on the attitudes and behaviours of their direct reports. By combining the survey results from managers and their direct reports, we hope to contribute to a richer understanding of manager-employee relations, which may facilitate future development of more comprehensive and meaningful organizational interventions.

In this study, we asked you to evaluate your perceptions of your manager’s leadership style, the quality of your relationship with your manager, as well as your own thoughts and feelings about your job and your workplace. If you found this experience at all distressing and would like to obtain a list of resources to help you deal with any distress, please contact your local Canadian Mental Health Association (national phone number: 613-745-7750, website: www.cmha.ca; local contact information can be found on the website).

We would like to thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have any further questions about this study, please feel free to contact Evelina Rog at erog@uoguelph.ca or at (647) 938-9030. We would appreciate that you do not discuss the information shared in this debriefing form with anyone (in particular, those who may later participate in this study) until the completion of the study.

A summary of the results of this study, based upon the aggregated perspectives of managers and their direct reports, will be made available to all participants around Summer 2010. If you would like the summary to be sent to an email address other than the one at which you were contacted, please type it in here:________________________.

Sincerely,

Evelina Rog

Evelina Rog, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
erog@uoguelph.ca
(647) 938-9030

Professor Leanne Son Hing
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
sonhing@uoguelph.ca
(519) 824-4120 *54475
Manager-Employee Processes Study
Request for Participation in Survey - Reminder

From: Geoffrey Smith (gwsmith@uoguelph.ca) (for Groups A & B)
       Evelina Rog (erog@uoguelph.ca) (for Groups C)
       Julie West (survey@westresearch.ca) (for Group D)
To:   [Email address of manager]
Date: [Date]
Subject: Seeking Your Help with a Manager-Employee Processes Study – Reminder

Dear [name],

I am following up on an email you received on [date] inviting you to participate in Evelina Rog’s dissertation research on manager-employee processes. I am contacting you to ask for your assistance with this research.

To participate in the online survey or to refer, please see the original email message with links below.

If you would like your name to be taken off of the potential participant recruitment list, please click here: REMOVED NAME.

Original recruitment email to follow.
Appendix AC

Subordinates’ Background Employment Information

1) In what country are you currently employed? [ECOUNTRY]
   a. Canada [1]
   b. United States [2]
   c. Other:________________(please specify) [3]

2) In what language do you primarily communicate in your workplace? [ELANG]
   a. English [1]
   b. French [2]
   c. Other:________________(please specify) [3]

3) In what sector are you currently employed? [ESECTOR]
   a. Not-for-profit [1]
   b. Public [2]
   c. Private [3]
   d. Other:________________(please specify) [4]

4) In what industry are you currently employed? [EINDUSTRY]
   a. Agriculture and other resource-based industries [1]
   b. Construction [2]
   c. Manufacturing [3]
   d. Wholesale trade [4]
   e. Retail trade [5]
   g. Health care and social services [7]
   h. Educational services [8]
   i. Business services [9]
   j. Other services:________________(please specify) [10]

5) What is your current level within the organization? [ELEVEL]
   a. Non-managerial employee [1]
   b. Supervisor [2]
   c. Manager [3]
   d. Senior Manager [4]
   e. Director [5]
   f. Vice President [6]
   g. President or Executive Director [7]
   h. Executive officer (i.e., CEO, COO, CIO etc) [8]
   i. Other:________________(please specify) [9]

6) What is your current job title? ________________________(please specify) [ETITLE]
7) How long have you been employed by your current organization (i.e., total tenure at this organization)? ______ years_______months [ETENORG]

8) How long have you been in your current position (i.e., total tenure at this job)? ______ years_______months [ETENJOB]
Appendix AD

Subordinates’ Relationship Variable Questions

1. How long have you been working for your direct manager (i.e., the individual who referred you to this study)? ______years_______months [EWORKMAN]

2. How long have you known your direct manager in total? ______years_______months [EKNOWMAN]

3. How frequently do you interact with your direct manager? [EFREQINT]
   a. Once per month or less [1]
   b. Once every other week [2]
   c. 1-2 times per week [3]
   d. 3-4 times per week [4]
   e. At least once per day [5]

4. How well do you think you know your direct manager? [EKNOWMAN]
   a. Not very well [1]
   b. Somewhat well [2]
   c. Quite well [3]
   d. Very well [4]
Appendix AE

*Authentic Leadership Questionnaire* [Subordinate-Rated Version]

(Copyright 2007 by Bruce Avolio, William Gardner, and Fred Walumbwa. The instrument is available for research purposes at http://www.mindgarden.com/products/alq.htm.)

The following survey items refer to your manager’s leadership style, as you perceive it. Judge how frequently each statement fits his or her current leadership style using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My manager…

1. says exactly what he or she means. [Relational Transparency]
2. admits mistakes when they are made. [Relational Transparency]
3. demonstrates beliefs that are consistent with actions. [Internalized Moral Perspective]
4. listens carefully to different points of view before coming to conclusions. [Balanced Information Processing]
5. accurately describes how others view his or her capabilities. [Self-Awareness]

---

21 Due to copyright only 5 of 16 items are published in this dissertation.
Appendix AF

*Trust Scale* [Trust in Leader Measure]
(Mayer & Gavin, 2005)

Thinking about your manager, please use the scale provided to respond to each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. If I had my way, I wouldn’t let my manager have any influence over issues that are important to me. [R]
2. I would be willing to let my manager have complete control over my future in this company.
3. I really wish I had a good way to keep an eye on my manager. [R]
4. I would be comfortable giving my manager a task or problem which was critical to me, even if I could not monitor his/her (its) actions.
5. I would tell my manager about mistakes I’ve made on the job, even if they could damage my reputation.
6. I would share my opinion about sensitive issues with my manager even if my opinion were unpopular.
7. I am afraid of what my manager might do to me at work.
8. If my manager asked why a problem happened, I would speak freely even if I were partly to blame.
Appendix AG

Leader-Member Exchange Scale
(Graen & Scandura, 1987)

Thinking about your work relationship with your manager, please use the scale provided to respond to each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My working relationship with my supervisor is very effective.
2. I always know how satisfied my supervisor is with what I do.
3. My supervisor would use his/her power to help me solve work-related problems.
4. I always know where I stand with my supervisor.
5. My manager understands my job problems and needs.
6. My manager recognizes my potential well.
7. My supervisor would “bail me out” at his/her expense.
Appendix AH

Ethical Decision Making Scale
(Developed for this study)

Thinking about your manager’s decision-making style, please use the scale provided to respond to each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My manager…

1. Considers the ethical impact of a decision before he/she implements it.
2. Holds him/herself to high ethical standards when making decisions.
3. Values ethics above pleasing stakeholders (e.g., superiors, customers) when making decisions that impact the organization.
4. Is not afraid to challenge decisions made by others that violate ethical standards.
5. Places a higher value on the ethicality of a decision than on his own self-interests.
Appendix AI

Psychological Empowerment Scale
(Spreitzer, 1995)

Thinking about your work, please use the scale provided to respond to each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The work I do is very important to me.  [Meaning]  
2. My job activities are personally meaningful to me.  [Meaning]  
3. The work I do is meaningful to me.  [Meaning]  
4. I am confident about my ability to do my job.  [Competence]  
5. I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities.  [Competence]  
6. I have mastered the skills necessary for my job.  [Competence]  
7. I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.  [Self-Determination]  
8. I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work.  [Self-Determination]  
9. I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job.  [Self-Determination]  
10. My impact on what happens in my department is large.  [Impact]  
11. I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department.  [Impact]  
12. I have significant influence over what happens in my department.  [Impact]
Appendix AJ

Affective Organizational Commitment Scale
(Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993)

Thinking about your organization, please use the scale provided to respond to each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.
2. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
3. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization. [R]
4. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization. [R]
5. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
6. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. [R]
Appendix AK

Psychological Well-Being Scale
(Ryff, 1989)

The following set of questions deals with how you feel about yourself and your life. Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers. Please use the scale provided to respond to each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Agree somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people. [Autonomy]
2. My decisions are not usually influenced by what everyone else is doing. [Autonomy]
3. I tend to worry about what other people think of me. [R] [Autonomy]
4. I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions. [R] [Autonomy]
5. I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus. [Autonomy]
6. It's difficult for me to voice my own opinions on controversial matters. [R] [Autonomy]
7. I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important. [Autonomy]
8. In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live. [Environmental Mastery]
9. The demands of everyday life often get me down. [R] [Environmental Mastery]
10. I do not fit very well with the people and the community around me. [R] [Environmental Mastery]
11. I am quite good at managing the many responsibilities of my daily life. [Environmental Mastery]
12. I often feel overwhelmed by my responsibilities. [R] [Environmental Mastery]
13. I have difficulty arranging my life in a way that is satisfying to me. [R] [Environmental Mastery]
14. I have been able to build a home and a lifestyle for myself that is much to my liking. [Environmental Mastery]
15. I am not interested in activities that will expand my horizons. [R] [Personal Growth]
16. I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and the world. [Personal Growth]
17. When I think about it, I haven't really improved much as a person over the years. [R] [Personal Growth]
18. I have the sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time. [Personal Growth]
19. I do not enjoy being in new situations that require me to change my old familiar ways of doing things. [R] [Personal Growth]
20. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth. [Personal Growth]
21. I gave up trying to make big improvements or changes in my life a long time ago. [R] [Personal Growth]
22. Most people see me as loving and affectionate. [Positive Relations with Others]
23. Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me. [R] [Positive Relations with Others]
24. I often feel lonely because I have few close friends with whom to share my concerns. [R] [Positive Relations with Others]
25. I enjoy personal and mutual conversations with family members or friends. [Positive Relations with Others]
26. People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others. [Positive Relations with Others]
27. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others. [R] [Positive Relations with Others]
28. I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me. [Positive Relations with Others]
29. I live life one day at a time and don't really think about the future. [R] [Positive Relations with Others]
30. I have a sense of direction and purpose in life. [Positive Relations with Others]
31. My daily activities often seem trivial and unimportant to me. [R] [Positive Relations with Others]
32. I don't have a good sense of what it is I'm trying to accomplish in life. [R] [Positive Relations with Others]
33. I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality. [Positive Relations with Others]
34. Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them. [Positive Relations with Others]
35. I sometimes feel as if I've done all there is to do in life. [R] [Positive Relations with Others]
Appendix AL

Subordinates’ Demographic Information

1. What is your gender? [ESEX]
   a. Male [1]
   b. Female [-1]

2. What is the highest level of education you have attained? [EEDU]
   a. Some high school [1]
   b. High school graduate [2]
   c. Some college or technical school [3]
   d. College or technical school graduate [4]
   e. Some university undergraduate training [5]
   f. University degree [6]
   g. Some university graduate training [7]
   h. Masters Degree [8]
   i. Doctorate degree or equivalent [9]

3. What is your marital status? [EMAR]
   a. Single [1]
   c. Married [3]
   d. Separated or Divorced [4]
   e. Widowed [5]

4. How old are you? ________ years [EAGE]

5. What is your current annual income? ________ (in Canadian dollars) [EINCTOT]

6. In what category does your annual level of income fall? [EINCCAT]
   a. Under $25,000 [1]
   b. $25,000-49,999 [2]
   c. $50,000-74,999 [3]
   d. $75,000-99,999 [4]
   e. $100,000-124,999 [5]
   f. Over $125,000 [6]
7. What is your ethnic origin? (Ethnic origin refers to the ethnic or cultural group(s) to which your ancestors belong. Ancestry should not be confused with citizenship or nationality). Check all that apply. [EETHNIC]

a. British Isles (e.g., Irish) [1]  
b. Western European [2]  
c. Northern European [3]  
d. Eastern European [4]  
e. Southern European [5]  
g. African [7]  
h. Arab [8]  
i. East Asian or Southeast Asian [9]  
j. South Asian (e.g., East Indian) [10]  
k. Latin, Central or South American [11]  
l. Caribbean [12]  
m. Aboriginal [13]  
n. Canadian [14]  
o. Other origins:___(please specify) [15]
### Manager Survey Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Transparency</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized Moral Perspective</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Processing</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leader Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Virtue</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subordinate Survey Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Transparency</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized Moral Perspective</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Processing</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence/Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination/Choice</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mastery</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relations</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(^a n = 163; \(^b n = 70\)
Appendix AN

Scatterplot of Managers’ Self-Reported Authentic Leadership Scores Plotted Against Subordinates’ Reports of Their Managers’ Authentic Leadership.

*Note.* Manager overall ALQ median = 3.38; subordinate overall ALQ median = 3.38.
Appendix AO

*Scatterplot of Managers’ Self-Awareness Scores Plotted Against Subordinates’ Reports of Their Managers’ Authentic Leadership.*

*Note.* Manager self-awareness median = 3.25; subordinate self-awareness median = 3.
Appendix AP

*Moderation Analyses Testing the Conditional Effect of Manager-Subordinate Relationship*

**Conditional effect of manager-subordinate relationship on the relation between managers’ self-rated authentic leadership and subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ ethical decision making**

Moderation analyses testing the conditional effect of manager-subordinate relationship on the relation between managers’ self-rated authentic leadership and subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ ethical decision making revealed a non-significant interaction term ($Beta = .01$, $B = .06$, $SE B = .65$, $p = .93$). Therefore, the relation between managers’ self-rated authentic leadership and managers’ ethical decision making do not depend upon how long and how well managers and subordinates know each other.

**Conditional effect of manager-subordinate relationship on the relation between subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership and managers’ self-reported values**

Moderation analyses testing the conditional effect of manager-subordinate relationship on the relation between subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ authentic leadership and managers’ self-reported values revealed non-significant results. Specifically, the interaction terms were not significant for benevolence ($Beta = .12$, $B = .20$, $SE B = .22$, $p = .37$), universalism ($Beta = .22$, $B = .35$, $SE B = .22$, $p = .12$), achievement ($Beta = .02$, $B = .05$, $SE B = .31$, $p = .87$), or power ($Beta = -.13$, $B = -.24$, $p = .13$).
Therefore, the relations between subordinates’ self-rated authentic leadership and managers’ values of benevolence, universalism, achievement and power are not dependent on how long and how well managers and subordinates know each other.

**Conditional effect of manager-subordinate relationship on the relations between managers’ self-rated authentic leadership and subordinates’ self-rated outcomes**

Moderation analyses testing the conditional effect of manager-subordinate relationship on the relations between managers’ self-rated authentic leadership and subordinates’ self-rated outcomes revealed non-significant results. Specifically, the interaction term was not significant for leader-member exchange ($Beta = .14, B = .55, SE B = .52, p = .30$), affective organizational commitment ($Beta = -.16, B = -.67, SE B = .54, p = .22$), or psychological well-being ($Beta = .08, B = .17, SE B = .30, p = .58$). Similarly, moderation analyses testing the conditional effect of manager-subordinate relationship on the relations between subordinates’ perceptions of managers’ authentic leadership and managers’ ratings of subordinate outcomes revealed non-significant results. Specifically, the interaction term was not significant for organizational citizenship behavior ($Beta = -.08, B = -.21, SE B = .32, p = .53$) or job performance ($Beta = .12, B = .35, SE B = .38, p = .36$). Therefore, the relations between authentic leadership and subordinate outcomes are not dependent on how long and how well managers and subordinates know each other.