EDITORIAL

Relationship-based leadership: Current trends and future prospects

Robin Martin (University of Manchester, robin.martin@manchester.ac.uk)

Olga Epitropaki (Durham University, olga.epitropaki2@durham.ac.uk)

Berrin Erdogan (Portland State University, berrine@pdx.edu)

Geoff Thomas (University of Surrey, geoff.thomas@surrey.ac.uk)

Corresponding author:

Professor Robin Martin

Alliance Manchester Business School

Booth Street West

Manchester, M15 6PB, UK

Email: robin.martin@manchester.ac.uk

PLEASE CITE AS:

Martin, R., Epitropaki, O., Erdogan, B. & Thomas, G. (2019). Relationship based leadership: Current trends and future prospects. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 92 (3), 625-674.

The most important single ingredient in the formula of success is knowing how to get along with people. (Theodore Roosevelt)

Preamble

An observer of the leadership literature might be struck by two aspects; first, how large it is and second, how diverse it is. There is a bewildering range of different approaches each focusing on different aspects of leadership with relatively little integration across approaches (see Lord, Day, Zaccaro, Avolio, & Eagly 2017; Yukl, 2013). Given the diversity of approaches, one might ponder if one were to ask leadership scholars 'what is the best way to lead?', one might receive as many different answers as those asked! However, one indisputable fact is that leadership involves at least two people (one who 'leads' and another who, to some extent, is 'led') and that these people are in a *relationship* (Ferris, Liden, Munyon, Summers, Basik, & Buckley, 2009; Liden, Anand, & Vidyarthi, 2016). It is this core aspect of leadership - the relationship between a leader and follower - that is the subject matter of this special issue. Before progressing, it may be helpful to position the perspective of this special issue within the historical development of the leadership field. To understand the development of the leadership literature, one needs to be aware of the social context in which research has been conducted. In doing this we can identify three very broad historical waves of research each with their own perspectives.

Initially, leadership was seen as a top-down process (leader → follower) and hence primarily a property of the leader with little role for the follower. Under this approach, research focused on who the leader is and what they do to the follower i.e., the leader has certain traits, skills, abilities (e.g., Lord, de Vader, & Alliger, 1986), employs a range of influence and power tactics (e.g., Yukl & Tracey, 1992), or uses specific styles of behavior (e.g., Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004) that impact the follower who is relatively passive in this role. Indeed, the nomenclature such as 'follower' or 'subordinate' reinforces this passive role. One could refer to this period as the *era of the leader* (up to 1960s). This approach might have been relevant for

dominant managerial practices at the time that reflected formal, command, authoritarian, and bureaucratic organizational designs.

However, changes in social conventions, technological advances, flatter organizational structures, to name a few, led to different leader-follower contexts that necessitate greater flexibility, co-operation, and interdependence. Here theories began to focus on the context or situation that leadership occurs where leaders use different styles of leadership dependent on a range of contingent factors in the environment and/or characteristics of the followers. An obvious development from the earlier approach was the recognition of the role of the follower in the leadership process. Research identified many contingency factors that focused on the environment (e.g., path-goal theory; House, 1971), the leader (e.g., contingency model; Fiedler, 1967) and, in some theoretical perspectives, characteristics of the follower (e.g., situational leadership theory; Blanchard, Hersey, & Johnson, 1969). One could refer to this period as the *era of the context* (1960s -1980s).

The third and final wave of research reflects further radical changes in organizational processes such as globalization, advanced communication systems, complex organizational designs that place emphasis on both the leader and follower as a dyad and one that is embedded in wider relationship networks. Leadership is seen as a reciprocal process (leader ←→ follower) where both the leader and the follower play an active role in the relationship. Correspondingly, more emphasis in research is placed on the cognitive roles of leadership (e.g., Implicit Leadership Theory; Epitropaki, Sy, Martin, Tram-Quon, & Topakas, 2013), identity processes (e.g., Social Identity Theory; Hogg, van Knippenberg, & Rast, 2012; leader and follower identities; e.g., Epitropaki, Kark, Lord, & Mainemelis, 2017), and the quality of the relationship between leaders and followers (e.g., Leader-member Exchange (LMX) theory; Bauer & Erdogan, 2015, Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). One could refer to this period as the *era of relationships* (1980s - present). A common theme in these perspectives is that leadership is a relationship between two people and effective leadership concerns how this relationship is

defined, developed, and managed. It is this final wave of research that is the subject matter for this special issue.

The era of relationships

Relationships are a ubiquitous aspect of human life. As Berscheid (1999) noted "We are born into relationships, we live our lives in relationships and when we die, the effects of our relationships survive in the lives of the living…" (p. 261). Our lives are shaped by a multitude of relationships that occur in both work (such as leader-follower) and non-work (such as friendship, familial, and romantic) contexts. Indeed, leadership scholars are increasingly seeing useful synergy by integrating knowledge in relationship science to workplace leadership (Thomas, Martin, Epitropaki, Guillaume, & Lee, 2013). Before we progress, we should clarify what constitutes a *relationship* and how this applies to the leader-follower context. According to Clark and Reis (1988), a close relationship is defined "… as close to the extent that it endures and involves strong, frequent, and diverse causal interconnections" (p. 611). Examining this more closely reveals some salient indicators of a close relationship such as, partners frequently influence each other (e.g., emotions, cognitions, and actions), influence is diverse (i.e., across different kinds of behaviors and not specific to one), and that the pattern of interactions continues for some period (i.e., there is an expectation that the relationship will continue over time). Based on these characteristics, one can see how the leader-follower relationship shares many, if not all, of the defining aspects of a close relationship.

While there are clear similarities between leader-follower and close relationships, there may be some notable differences such as power relations, voluntariness of interactions, and goal instrumentality (Ferris et al., 2009; van Lear, Koerner, & Allen, 2008). However, these factors may also be prevalent in close relationships. For example, non-work close relationships can vary in terms of power relations (e.g., friendships vary in status), the voluntariness of interactions (e.g., parent-child relationships), and they can be instrumental to achieving one's goals (e.g., friendship co-operation). Perhaps the main difference between leader-follower

relations and close friendships is that some of these characteristics (such as power, frequency of interaction) are typically defined by the organization and are less under voluntary control. Nevertheless, on balance, we would argue that there are more similarities than differences between close non-work and leader-follower relationships (Epitropaki, Martin, & Thomas, 2017; Martin, Epitropaki, Thomas, & Topakas, 2010) to the extent that knowledge from one domain could be usefully applied to the other.

The most dominant relationship-based approach to examining leadership is Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory that now represents one of the most influential approaches to understanding organizational leadership (see Bauer & Erdogan, 2015; Liden et al., 2016; Dinh, Lord, Gardner, Meuser, Liden, & Hu, 2014). The basic premise of LMX theory is that leaders, through engaging in different exchanges, develop different quality relationships (low vs. high) with each follower in their team. In low LMX relationships the exchanges focus primarily on the employment contract and consequently relationships are characterized by low trust, interaction, support, and rewards (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). In contrast, in high LMX relationships the exchanges extend beyond what is specified in the formal job description (Liden & Graen, 1980). Compared to low LMX followers, high LMX followers are more likely to be given interesting work activities, receive more supervisory support, and obtain more opportunities for advancement (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) It is therefore not surprising that LMX quality positively correlates with a wide range of work-related attitudes and behaviors (Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer, & Ferris, 2012; Gerstner & Day, 1997) and work performance (Martin, Guillaume, Thomas, Lee, & Epitropaki, 2016).

Special issue papers

The special issue consists of six papers. The main features of these papers are shown in Table 1. All the papers focus on aspects of relationship-based leadership but in different ways and they can be grouped into three themes. The first two papers focus on the role of follower and leader behaviors in shaping LMX relationships, the next two papers focus on the implications

of having different LMX relationships within the team on a range of outcomes, and the final two papers examine both follower and leader perceptions of LMX quality. Summary descriptions of each paper are provided below.

<Table 1 about here>

The first paper is by Xu, Loi, Cai and Liden and is titled 'Reversing the lens: How followers influence Leader-Member Exchange quality'. While the role of leader characteristics and behaviors in determining LMX quality has been extensively examined, the role of follower behaviors as predictors of LMX has received comparatively little attention. This paper addresses this issue by focusing on how followers' behaviors can affect LMX quality and, in doing so, provides a complementary perspective to the one dominant in the literature that examines mainly leader behaviors. The authors propose that followers' proactive behaviors in taking charge (i.e., proactive engagement in implementing more effective work methods, policies or practices) will be positively viewed by leaders resulting in better LMX quality. To explain this effect the authors draw upon resource theory (Foa & Foa, 1974) and hypothesize that followers taking charge act as an important service resource for leaders and their perceptions of this will mediate the follower taking charge to LMX quality relation. However, the extent that leaders will value this exchange as a resource will depend on their achievement and communion goal orientations that act as moderators. The study hypotheses were supported in a sample of hospitality industry workers in China with data collected from both leaders and followers over a number of time points. In summary, this paper shows the importance of follower characteristics in determining LMX quality and that of service orientation as an important resource followers can exchange with their leaders to enhance LMX quality but also that the value given to this resource depends on characteristics of the leader such as their goal orientation.

The second paper is by Radulovic, Thomas, Epitropaki and Legood titled 'Forgiveness in Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) relationships: Mediating and moderating mechanisms'.

The aim of this paper is to focus on how leader-follower relationships are maintained by followers' forgiveness of their leader's transgressions. The paper makes a parallel between interpersonal and workplace relationships and, in doing so, draws upon theoretical concepts from the relationship science literature (such as interdependence theory) to better understand workplace relationships. They propose that high LMX quality increases forgiveness for leader transgressions that leads to greater effort to maintain the relationship which results in positive work outcomes (such as job satisfaction and subjective well-being). Forgiveness climate is proposed to moderate the link between LMX quality and forgiveness. The research model is supported in two organizational samples and one experiment utilizing scenarios. In summary, this paper advances our understanding of how and when follower forgiveness can act as an effective relationship maintenance strategy within leader-follower relationships.

The third paper is by King, Ryan and Van Dyne titled 'Voice resilience: Fostering future voice after non-endorsement of suggestions'. This paper focuses on the concept of follower voice that is a form of communication with the aim to enact proactive changes to the work place. Research shows many potential benefits of voice in the workplace but little has focused on situations when it is not endorsed. The offer of giving voice can be considered an item of exchange between the leader and follower. Voice, by its nature, requires a change in the work environment that the leader may not be able to reciprocate the exchange for reasons beyond their control (e.g., lack of resources, power), and voice non-endorsement might occur. Theoretically and practically it is important to examine how voice can be reinstated following voice non-endorsement (what the authors refer to as 'voice resilience'). The authors hypothesize that one way to achieve voice resilience is through the way the leader accounts for the initial voice non-endorsement. They specifically argue that sensitive and specific explanations show sincere concern and reinforce the mutually beneficial nature of the leader-follower relationship. As a result, leader explanations can restore voice safety and encourage future use of voice. The hypotheses were tested across two studies (one field and one

experimental) utilizing samples of various occupations in the USA and showed consistent support for explanation sensitivity. No support was found for voice specificity. The authors emphasize the more personal and relationship-oriented nature of sensitivity (versus the objective and factual nature of specificity) as a potential explanation for their differential results. In summary, this paper highlights the important role of leaders' explanations for voice non-endorsement as a way to meet the social exchange norm of reciprocity in leader-follower relationships and sustain voice resilience.

The fourth paper is by Emery, Booth, Michaelides and Swaab titled 'The importance of being psychologically empowered: Buffering the negative effects of employee perceptions of Leader-Member Exchange differentiation'. The focus of this paper is on LMX differentiation i.e., the extent that managers have different quality LMX relationships with members of their team. Previous research generally shows a negative relation between LMX differentiation and work outcomes (e.g., Erdogan & Bauer, 2010). However, we know little of when and how LMX differentiation affects work outcomes (Martin, Thomas, Legood, & Dello Russo, 2018). The authors point out that most of this research is conducted at the group level and makes the case for examining the relation between individual perceptions of LMX differentiation and judgments of job satisfaction. They make two main hypotheses. First, that psychological empowerment (i.e., feeling of self-control and active involvement with one's work) will moderate the negative relationship between LMX differentiation and job satisfaction such that it will be higher under low empowerment conditions. Second, that perception of supervisor fairness (i.e., believing that the leader treats group members fairly) will mediate this moderated relationship when psychological empowerment is low. These hypotheses were supported in three studies that employed different methodologies (cross-sectional surveys of employed samples and an experimental study using vignettes). In summary, this paper shows the need to consider the role of perceptions of LMX differentiation, in addition to LMX quality, in

predicting work outcomes and it identifies important moderating and mediating mechanisms for these effects.

The fifth paper is by Lee, Gerbasi, Schwarz and Newman titled 'Leader-Member Exchange social comparisons and follower outcomes: The roles of felt obligation and psychological entitlement'. This paper focuses on employees' perception of how the LMX quality they have with their manager is compared to other people managed by the same person (i.e., whether it is perceived as higher relative to the relationship quality one's peers have with the leader). Most previous studies examined LMX relative position in mathematical terms (i.e., RLMX, LMX score minus mean team LMX score e.g., Henderson, Wayne, Shore, Bommer, & Tetrick, 2008), while the authors conceptualize this as a social process and better measured as individual perceptions of how their LMX quality compares to others in the team (using the LMXSC measure of Vidyarthi, Liden, Anand, Erdogan, & Ghosh, 2010). The paper argues that perceptions of relative LMX position in the team have implications for work outcomes (such as commitment and performance) in addition to that attributed to LMX quality itself. This general hypothesis was supported in two studies of employees from a variety of occupations (one from USA and other from China) in relation to judgments of organizational commitment and supervisor-rated job performance. In addition, building on social exchange theory, the authors found that felt obligation to the leader (i.e., the desire to repay/reciprocate positive behaviors) mediates the relation between LMX relative position and outcomes showing the importance of the role of reciprocity to LMX quality. The research also found a boundary condition, the level of psychological entitlement (i.e., belief that one deserves special treatment compared to others), reduced the effect of LMX relative position on outcomes. In summary, this paper shows the need to acknowledge that the impact of LMX quality on outcomes is not simply due to the quality of the relationship itself (low vs. high) but how the leader treats other members of the team and consequently how people believe their LMX quality compares to other team members.

The sixth and final paper is by Loignon, Gooty, Rogelberg and Lucianetti titled 'Disagreement in leader-follower dyadic exchanges: Shared relationship satisfaction and investment as antecedents'. This paper makes the important point that in order to adequately examine the relationship between the leader and follower, it is important to consider both perspectives while the majority of the literature has examined the nature of the relationship through the lens of the follower. Research that does focus on the level of LMX agreement between the leader and follower show only a moderate level of agreement (Sin, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2009) and some moderators have been examined (e.g., Matta, Scott, Koopman, & Conlon, 2015). This paper takes a different approach and focuses on the level of *dis*agreement between leader and follower LMX ratings and when this might occur. The authors draw upon the investment model of relationships (Rusbult, 1980) to conceptualize some important antecedents for relationship development, namely the amount of relationship satisfaction (i.e., the difference between rewards and costs of being in the relationship) and investments (i.e., the material and non-material resources that partners put into the relationship to ensure that it continues). The perennial problem in this area is the analysis of difference scores (in this case comparing LMX rating from the follower and leader) which are prone to a multitude of problems. The authors propose an analytical technique originally developed to examine dyadic relations referred to as one-with-many (in this case, the 'one' is the leader and the 'many' are the followers cf. Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006). In a sample of leaders and team members from various organizations in Italy, they find that both relationship satisfaction and investment predict LMX quality as expected. Interestingly, the way in which leaders and followers rely on these concepts vary and that LMX disagreement occurs under specific combinations of relationship satisfaction and investment - being greatest when there is incongruity between them (e.g., low satisfaction/high investment and high satisfaction/low investment). In summary, this paper shows the benefits of utilizing theories from relationship science to

understand leader and follower perceptions of LMX and that the level of disagreement in LMX quality between the leader and follower varies.

Concluding postscript

We believe that individually and collectively these papers make significant contributions to understanding the role of relationships in workplace leadership. Each paper makes clear its own contributions to the literature and, therefore, we focus on a few general observations, from this special issue, which we believe are important in shaping future research. First, research is employing a greater range of theoretical frameworks and these are increasingly coming from related disciplines such as relationship science. These have the potential to give a much better conception of relationships in leader-follower dyads and provide new theoretical concepts to understand how they form and affect outcomes. Second, research models are becoming more sophisticated in not only identifying key moderators and mediators but also combining these into more complex models to better capture the phenomena under investigation. For example, the relation between relationship quality and work outcomes is affected by many factors and research is getting better at identifying these. Third, research designs are becoming more rigorous and mixed. In particular, increasingly similar research questions are examined using multiple methods (such as organizational surveys, experimental designs) as a way to attend to potential threats to internal and external validity of research designs. Fourth, sophisticated techniques of statistical analysis are being employed that are better able to deal with many inferential issues, e.g., common method variance and single source data.

Finally, the papers in this special issue confirm the Zeitgeist in the literature - that the relationship between the leader and follower is critical to understanding the leadership process. We do not deny that leader traits/skills/behaviours and the leadership context are important for understanding leadership; however, the research in this special issue shows that these factors need to be examined through the leader-follower relational lens. We hope the papers in this

special issue will continue to stimulate debate and research in this area. The ‘era of relationships’ is here - and it is likely to stay!

References

Bauer, T. N., & Erdogan, B. (2015). *The Oxford handbook of leader-member exchange*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Berscheid, E. (1999). The greening of relationship science. *American Psychologist, 54*, 260-266.

Blanchard, K. H., Hersey, P., & Johnson, D. (1969). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Clark, M. S., & Reis, H. T. (1988). Interpersonal processes in close relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology, 39*, 609-672.

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

Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*, 36-62.

Dulebohn, J. H., Bommer, W. H., Liden, R. C., Brouer, R. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange. *Journal of Management, 38*, 1715-1759.

Epitropaki, O., Kark, R., Mainemelis, C. & Lord, R.G. (2017). Leadership, followership and identity processes: A multilevel review. *The Leadership Quarterly, 28*, 104-129.

Epitropaki, O., Martin, R. & Thomas, G. (2017). Relational Leadership. In Antonakis, J. & Day, D. V. (Eds). *The Nature of Leadership* (pp. 109-137). Sage.

Epitropaki, O., Sy, T., Martin, R., Tram-Quon, S. & A. Topakas. (2013). Implicit Leadership and Followership Theories "in the wild": Taking stock of information-processing approaches to leadership and followership in organizational settings. *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*, 858-881.

Erdogan, B., & Bauer, T. N. (2010). Differentiated leader–member exchanges: The buffering

role of justice climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95,* 1104-1120.

Ferris, G. R., Liden, R. C., Munyon, T. P., Summers, J. K., Basik, K. J., & Buckley, M. R. (2009). Relationships at work: Toward a multidimensional conceptualization of dyadic work relationships. *Journal of Management, 35,* 1379-1403.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Foa, U. G., & Foa, E. B. (1974). *Societal structures of the mind*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 827-844.

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly, 6,* 219-247.

Henderson, D. J., Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., Bommer, W. H., & Tetrick, L. E. (2008). Leader--member exchange, differentiation, and psychological contract fulfillment: a multilevel examination. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93,* 1208-1219.

Hogg, M. A., van Knippenberg, D., & Rast III, D. E. (2012). The social identity theory of leadership: Theoretical origins, research findings, and conceptual developments. *European Review of Social Psychology, 23,* 258-304.

House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16,* 321-339.

Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Ilies, R. (2004). The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 36-51.

Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. New York: Guilford press.

van Lear, C. A., Koerner, A., & Allen, D. M. (2008). Relationship typologies. In A. L.

Vangelista, & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 91–113). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Liden, R. C., Anand, S., & Vidyarthi, P. R. (2016). Dyadic relationships. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 3,* 139-166.

Liden, R. C., & Graen, G. (1980). Generalizability of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Academy of Management Journal, 23,* 451-465.

Lord, R. G., de Vader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 402-410.

Lord, R. G., Day, D. V., Zaccaro, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Eagly, A. H. (2017). Leadership in applied psychology: Three waves of theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102,* 434-451.

Martin, R., Epitropaki, O., Thomas, G., & Topakas, A. (2010). A critical review of Leader-Member Relationship (LMX) research: Future prospects and directions. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 25,* 61-91.

Martin, R., Guillaume, I., Thomas, G., Lee A., & Epitropaki, O. (2016). Leader-member Exchange (LMX) and performance: A Meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology, 69,* 67-121.

Martin, R., Thomas, G., Legood, A., & Dello Russo, S. (2018). Leader-member exchange (LMX) differentiation and work outcomes: Conceptual clarification and critical review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39,* 151-168.

Matta, F. K., Scott, B. A., Koopman, J., & Conlon, D. E. (2015). Does seeing "eye to eye" affect work engagement and OCB? A role theory perspective on LMX agreement. *Academy of Management Journal, 58,* 1686-1708.

Rusbult, C. E. (1980). Commitment and satisfaction in romantic associations: A test of the investment model. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 16,* 172-186.

Sin, H. P., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2009). Understanding why they don't see eye to eye: An examination of leader–member exchange (LMX) agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 1048-1057.

Thomas, G., Martin, R., Epitropaki, O., Guillaume, Y. R. F., & Lee, A. (2013). Social cognition in leader-follower relationships: Applying insights from relationship science to understanding relationship-based approaches to leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*, 63-81.

Vidyarthi, P. R., Liden, R. C., Anand, S., Erdogan, B., & Ghosh, S. (2010). Where do I stand? Examining the effects of leader–member exchange social comparison on employee work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 849-861.

Yukl, G., & Tracey, J. B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 525-535.

Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations*. Harlow, England: Pearson.

Table 1: Main features of papers in the special issue.

Authors	Main Content Focus	Primary Theoretical Focus	Study Designs	Samples		Data Source	Main Variables			
				Job Types	Country		Independent Variables	Moderators	Mediators	Dependent Variables
Xu, Loi, Cai and Liden	Follower behaviors influencing LMX	Resource Theory	Longitudinal	Hotel employees	China	Follower and Leader	Taking charge	Goal orientations	Service orientation	LMX
Radulovic, Thomas, Epitropaki and Legood	Forgiveness following leader transgressions	Interdepend-ence theory Investment model	Cross-sectional Experimental	Various	Australia Greece Serbia UK USA	Follower	LMX	Forgiveness climate	Forgiveness Relational effort	Job satisfaction Well-being
King, Ryan and Van Dyne	Leader voice safety and voice resilience	Social Exchange Theory	Cross-sectional Experiment	Various	USA	Follower	Leader Voice non endorsement		Voice safety	Voice resilience
Emery, Booth, Michaelides and Swaab	LMX differentiation (LMX variation)	Organizational Justice Theory	Cross-sectional Experiment	Various	UK	Follower	LMX differentiation	Psych empowerment	Supervisory fairness	Job satisfaction
Lee, Gerbasi, Schwarz and Newman	LMX differentiation	Social Exchange Theory	Cross-sectional	Various	USA China	Follower and Leader	LMX social comparisons LMX	Psych entitlement	Felt Obligation	Org commitment Performance

	(LMX social comparisons)							
Loignon, Gooty, Rogelberg and Lucianetti	Leader-follower LMX disagreement	Investment Model	Cross-sectional	Various	Italy	Follower and Leader	Relationship satisfaction Investment	LMX